

**Council**

## **Budget Amendment Proposal 2015/16**

**Amendments of the Deputy Leader of the Main Opposition,  
Liberal Democrat Group, Councillor John McCann**

25 February 2015

**Officer Contact:** David Hodgkinson, Assistant Borough Treasurer

### **Purpose of Report**

This paper presents the Oldham Liberal Democrat Group's Alternative Budget proposals to Council. The report sets out seven budget options and four investments which amend the Administration's proposed budget.

### **Executive Summary**

There are seven savings proposals and four investment proposals put forward totalling £439k in 2015/16 and £272k in 2016/17.

### **Recommendations**

Council is recommended to consider the budget proposals as set out.

## **1 Background**

- 1.1 This report sets out the budget options of the main Opposition Party, The Liberal Democrats, which are submitted for consideration by Members of the Council.
- 1.2 The Oldham Liberal Democrat Group is determined to act as a responsible Opposition to the Labour Administration.
- 1.3 Following examination by Overview and Scrutiny, some points have been clarified or expanded. There are no new options or changes in the text to incorporate into the presentation to the council, which have arisen from the O&S PVfM discussion.
- 1.4 The Group will be proposing 7 additional savings and 4 investments to amend the Administration's proposals. The investments are to be funded by additional savings options. This follows on from the approach taken for 2014/15.
- 1.5 Accordingly, we accept the vast bulk of the Administration's savings and have no wish to make work. There are inevitably proposals where we would have done things differently in detail but it is not a good use of time to pick at details. Thus the documentation in this paper relates only to changes and additional proposals for savings and investments.
- 1.6 We recognise that the environment within which Local Government has to work is currently particularly challenging and is likely to remain so for a number of years to come. Cross party working and consensus has a major part to play in ensuring the future success of the Borough, and consistency of decision making is vital if we are to ensure the best possible future for our citizens, irrespective of changes in political control of the Council.
- 1.7 In the interests of putting the Borough first, we have deliberately called upon our extensive knowledge and experience gained from three years running the Council. In order to add value to the current Administration's proposals, we present a set of proposals which we consider to be the natural successor to our budgets when in administration.
- 1.8 Clearly there are a number of proposals within the Administration's budget which they themselves flag up as difficult or unpalatable. We recognise that and agree that in an ideal world those would not be under consideration.
- 1.9 That said, we recognise the hard work which both members and officers have put into this budget, and the difficult choices made.
- 1.10 We remain consistent in our long term approach to budgets. We continue to support the principle of keeping Council tax as low as

possible and in the years when Oldham's own resources do not permit it and Government does not provide subsidies to keep the Council tax rise down, our commitment is to keep any Council tax rises at inflation or below. We are pleased that the administration has accepted the Council Tax freeze grant this year, and will use it to avoid an increase in 2015/16.

- 1.11 We believe that in addition to ensuring the Council lives within its means, there is a real need to seek ways of increasing the size of the cake, rather than cutting it ever more finely.
- 1.12 Our Budget suggestions take cognizance of what Oldham needs to do to deal with the headwinds it will face in the next few years. We will co-operate with the administration and will continue to work with them on the long term solutions which address the problems of 2015/16 and beyond.
- 1.13 This paper sets out the Liberal Democrat opposition's proposals for the council budget for the coming year, 2015/16.
- 1.14 The Liberal Democrats have experience of running the Council from 2008/9 to 2010/11, and are therefore confident of making an authoritative contribution. We have a strong track record.
- 1.15 The Alternative Budget mechanism is a vehicle for the opposition to provide:
  - Constructive challenge to the Administration's proposals.
  - Ideas for alternatives which the administration is welcome to adopt, as both parties have done in the past.
  - A disciplined debate in which proposals for extra/alternative investment must be balanced with corresponding savings.
- 1.16 Opposition members have held a series of meetings with senior finance officers, to consider proposals put forward by officers and reach agreement on benefits and feasibility. When published, the Administration's proposals are similarly explored. The package is then put together with assistance from finance officers before being submitted to the Section 151 officer (the Interim Director of Finance) for certification. This procedure ensures rigour and also provides valuable experience for future Section 151 officers. We received excellent support from our officers this year and thank them for their hard work and professionalism.
- 1.17 There are limitations. The opposition team necessarily relies heavily on the main work stream commissioned by the administration, so the full picture is not available to them until publication late in the process. The

opposition's research is thus always supplementary, and does not purport to be a complete alternative working.

- 1.18 The upshot is that these suggestions are more limited in scope than in previous years. Nonetheless, we put it forward in the spirit of constructive challenge and to flag up where extra savings are possible.

## **2.1 Interim Director of Finance Comments**

- 2.1 I confirm in my role as Responsible Officer under Section 151 of the Local Government Act that the budget amendments as presented are robust and deliverable.
- 2.2 As it is an alternative set of budget options the opportunity for testing the risks associated with the proposals are more limited and it is therefore necessary to afford a level of caution in presenting these alternatives.

(Anne Ryans)

## **3 Continuity and Agreement**

- 3.1 The Administration's budget as a whole includes a large core of both policy and specific savings and investment which the Liberal Democrats agree with and will lend public support.
- 3.2 The reason is simple; much of the current work on savings takes forward initiatives begun by the Liberal Democrats. These include:
- Reducing to the minimum resource spent on back office administration.
  - Rationalising duplication of effort with partners, especially the NHS.
  - Transferring the emphasis to capability and independence for areas in social care
  - Reducing layers of management and bureaucracy
  - Having fewer buildings and using office space more effectively, e.g. hot-desking
  - Promoting self-service on-line
  - Reducing waste on energy and other utilities
  - Modernising and rationalising computer systems
  - Multi-skilling the workforce

3.3 Similarly, there are many initiatives the Liberal Democrats invested in which are thriving and taking Oldham forward, for instance:

- Metrolink – The reopened line and the Town Centre route
- Mahdlo
- The Regional Science Centre
- Bloom and Grow
- Oldham Town Hall
- New housing
- Energy efficiency – homes and street lighting
- Refurbishing the Coliseum

3.4 We are pleased to see these initiatives keep moving forward and achieving greater efficiency and/or improved service for Oldham's citizens. Oldham Council is at its best when the political parties act in the common interest.

3.5 Accordingly, we accept the vast bulk of the Administration's savings and have no wish to challenge them. There are inevitably proposals where we would have done things differently in detail but it is not a good use of time to pick at details. Thus the documentation in this paper relates only to changes and additional proposals for savings and investments or prudent delays in implementation of change.

3.6 Having had a chance to ask questions at Overview and Scrutiny regarding risks and mitigations, we judge that we can rely on them.

#### **4 Liberal Democrat ideals and practicality**

4.1 Having set out where we agree, we now turn to the areas where we are distinctive.

4.2 Liberal Democrats believe that we want to help residents by giving them a hand up rather than a hand out, which means in everyday terms, we must:

- Focus on the future by improving the life chances of citizens, especially the young
- Support and strengthen individuals and communities to work in partnership

- Protect the vulnerable
- Provide quality essential services which are value for money

4.3 In the present economic climate, shifting resource has become more challenging, but that is all the more reason to back our ideals with efficiency and consistency. As usual we have set out to find additional savings we could recycle. We believe that serving the citizens means leaving no stone unturned in the quest for the best use of every penny of public money.

4.4 The savings and investments are put forward to Council. Some savings have no impact on the public; others involve sacrifice. Budgeting is not about perfect solutions but about weighing the pros and cons of different courses of action. We have found £439k within 2015/16, and an additional £272k in 2016/17, which could and should be better used.

## **5 Saving and investment proposals**

5.1 In compiling our amendment to the Administration's budget we have continued to focus on:-

- The reduction of Elected Members from 60 to 40, and a wider review of the cost of democracy within the council. While this is not applicable for 2015/16 we wish to put this forward as an 'in principle' decision for 2016/17.
- Efficiencies in the Street Lighting contract
- Reduced Management and Administration
- Reduction in non-staffing expenditure such as publications and subscriptions

5.2 The shift is modest compared to past years. This is inevitable given the straitened nature of the budget and a leaner organisation. It is also a function of the council's stage of development which focuses on the radical reconfiguration of whole services. In these cases, the entire enterprise is a work in progress and not susceptible to meaningful adjustment.

### **5.3 Savings**

5.3.1 Our proposal to reduce the number of councillors reflects public opinion, repeatedly expressed in consultations and in the press. We consider that modern communications, the provision of paid caseworkers and a much-reduced number of committees have reduced the load on councillors. Although no savings could accrue in

2015/16, it is high time to initiate an open and democratic debate with full public participation.

- 5.3.2 The street lighting project has been bedevilled by problems and needs radical consideration to improve both efficiency and performance. Further money can be saved by a reduction in the intensity of lighting in appropriate locations. In fact many residents have said that the new lights are too bright near houses. The proposal suggests further savings in streetlighting over the next 2 financial years. There is an acknowledgement that there could be risks to decreasing the lighting further however as per the savings proposal officers would work closely with members and other stakeholders to minimise any risk to safety.
- 5.3.3 The Lifelong Learning Centre will be set an additional income target of £50k through external funding.
- 5.3.4 We would discontinue publication of Borough Life, Family Life and the leaflet that is included within the Council Tax bill because we do not believe these represent value for money. Our feedback from the public is that it is seen as propaganda, and lacking in useful information. Whilst we recognise that the public need to be informed alternative communication methods should be utilised such as those addressed in channel shift programmes. Particularly in relation to Family Life, we believe that schools have the most highly developed literacy for IT with all children having access to computers. Also, the introduction of electronic billing could result in savings but with the investment required it is likely that savings would not accrue until 2018/19. In addition there would be a savings target set in relation to internal communication campaigns. The total saving target for the items identified above is £93k in 2015/16 and an additional £10k in 2016/17.
- 5.3.5 The Civic and Political Support Manager Role is currently vacant. It is proposed that this post is deleted.
- 5.3.6 A savings target for the Authority would also be set in relation to conferences and subscription costs at 10% with a total saving expected of £9k.
- 5.3.7 Within the 2015/16 proposed budget there is a Revenue Priorities budget of £1.475m. This has been set aside by the Administration as during the current financial year a number of central government grants have been reduced in-year and additional pressures have been identified. It is proposed that £210k of this is utilised in the financial year for our proposed investments whilst still retaining a budget of £1.265m for other pressures which is good financial management.

#### 5.4 **Investments**

- 5.4.1 A savings proposal was put forward by the current Administration in relation to a reduction in devolved revenue budgets to District Executives with a saving of £180k. It is proposed that this saving is rescinded. This will ensure that the Districts are able to continue to support priority themes such as Get Oldham Working and that joint commissioning between Districts on initiatives can continue.
- 5.4.2 Investment in gulley cleaning is to reinstate provision to its level under the Liberal Democrats. The administration's cut is a false economy because of the erosion of roads when gullies become blocked; the disproportionate cost of digging out blocked gullies; and the serious hazard of ice or surface water on roads.
- 5.4.3 Our proposal for investment in enforcement and street cleaning reflects public demand. Complaints about dumped rubbish and household items form a significant part of current casework loads. Detection and enforcement should lead the way but detection is not always possible, so clearance is necessary to protect public health. Poor street cleanliness hampers regeneration and was a major reason for the very poor image of Oldham which we are still working to dispel.
- 5.4.4 The savings identified above would enable an investment in youth services in 2016/17. An estimated £272k would be shared between the district partnerships. This would enable the district partnerships to commission youth services according to local need. These could be commissioned from MAHDLO or other local providers.

## **6 The Capital Programme**

- 6.1 The opposition is not putting forward an alternative Capital Programme, but proposes some important changes in principle to the process. The Administration's programme contains a number of attractive options, but the desirability of the objective does not of itself mean that the project is sound. The Liberal Democrat members have scrutinised the administration's proposals and have a number of concerns as to their viability and prudence. We would prefer to see more realistic timeframes and cost-benefit analyses. Savings arise from this approach. They are not a driver but can be quantified and reallocated to other priorities.
- 6.2 One concern is the repayment cost, especially should the schemes be funded through additional borrowing. The scale of the potential impact is documented in Treasury Management Strategy reports. This is not to argue against investment, but to make clear the magnitude of the capital programmes impact on the revenue budgets and the choices to be made.



## 7 Amendment Financial Analysis

Reference	Cluster	Proposal	2015/16 (£'000)	2016/17 (£'000)
<b>BUDGET INVESTMENTS</b>				
D040	Policy and Governance	Ward revenue cut reversals	(180)	0
OPB INV1	Cooperatives and Neighbourhoods	Extra street-cleaning & enforcement	(94)	0
OPB INV2	Cooperatives and Neighbourhoods	Gully Cleaning teams	(165)	0
OPB INV3	Cooperatives and Neighbourhoods	Investment in youth services	0	(272)
<b>TOTAL BUDGET INVESTMENTS</b>			<b>(439)</b>	<b>(272)</b>
<b>BUDGET OPTIONS</b>				
OPB SAV2	Corporate and Commercial Services	Lifelong Learning Income	50	0
OPB SAV3	Policy and Governance	Removal of Civic and Political Support Manager Role	37	0
OPB SAV4	Commissioning	Streetlighting reductions & dimming	40	50
OPB SAV5	Cooperatives and Neighbourhoods	Reduction of council publications and reduction in spend on internal communications	93	10
OPB SAV6	Policy and Governance	Reduction in Councillors and associated savings	0	212
OPB SAV9	Council Wide	Reduction in revenue priorities allocation	210	0
OPB SAV10	Council Wide	Council-wide Reduction in conferences and subscription costs	9	0
<b>TOTAL BUDGET OPTIONS</b>			<b>439</b>	<b>272</b>
<b>IMPACT ON MTFS</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## 8 Equality, community cohesion and crime implications

- 8.1 The Liberal Democrats support the procedures adopted for the production and scrutiny of Equality Impact Assessments. We have given careful consideration to the EIAs published by the administration and used these in our evaluation of options, together with our own questions to officers.
- 8.2 We are satisfied that all options have been carefully evaluated in accordance with legislation.
- 8.3 The effect of the alternative budget on community cohesion is entirely positive.

## 9. Public consultation

- 9.1 The public expects as a co-operative borough that the fullest possible consultation before and during the formulation of budget options and

before their implementation is essential to the democratic process. The budget is the implementation of the council's policy framework and priorities.

- 9.2 Statutory consultation with Social Services users, their families and carers follows a set pattern and we are satisfied that it has been properly conducted and fully reported. We are likewise satisfied that there has been due consultation with the Voluntary Sector.

**Administration proposal for information – investment for Opposition budget would see the reversal of this saving**



**Oldham**  
Council

**REFERENCE: D040 (Review District Arrangements)**

**TOTAL SAVING: 2015/16 £180k; 2016/17 £0k**

**FTE IMPACT (2015/16): 0 (Savings through transformation)**

**What service area/s does this proposal relate to?**

Commercial Services / Neighbourhoods  
Legal & Democratic Services / Neighbourhoods

**What is the proposal?**

This saving proposal has come forward following a strategic review of the costs associated to running the democratic processes of the council. The review, led by the Borough Solicitor and the Deputy Leader, looked at governance, administrative budgets and staffing costs, at the corporate centre and at a district level. The review covered all the costs associated with supporting the democratic and electoral process including support to elected members.

**Background to the proposed savings applied to District Executives**

In May 2012 at Annual Council the Building A Co-operative Future – Devolution to Districts was approved. This set out a fundamental shift by devolving services, budgets and decision making to a local district level.

A Local Leaders programme was also put in place, which set out to enhance members' skills in leading and championing local causes and working with communities towards a Co-operative borough - where everyone does their bit and everyone benefits.

In addition a small core team was also established in each district to support the District Executives, manage services and coordinate partnership activity and community engagement at a local level. The teams also deliver corporate as well as local events and campaigns such as Love Where You Live , Welfare Reform ,Illegal money lending (Loan Shark) campaigns, the teams connect with communities and make campaigns real on the ground

## **Saving Proposals – Total £ 180k**

### **1. Reduction in devolved revenue budgets to District Executives – Saving £180,000**

The current position is that each district has a devolved budget equivalent to £25,000 per ward. Total budget across all 20 wards is £500,000. In addition, each Councillor receives £3,000 as an individual budget to support local ward priorities. Total for all Councillors is £180,000

Current overall total of devolved ward and individual budgets = £680,000

This proposal is to reduce the devolved ward budget from £25,000 to £10,000, reducing the Borough total to £200,000. In addition, increase the individual Councillor budget from £3,000 to £5,000 = £300,000

### **Financial Impact**

Local commissioning by District Executives will be reduced and the ability for Districts to pool and commission against agreed priorities could be limited. District priority themes such as Get Oldham Working, where Districts have taken on apprentices and invested in local opportunities will be reduced. The capacity to jointly commissioning across Districts will also diminish such as current joint arrangements between Districts on the provision of welfare rights, environmental and crime reduction schemes. The increase in individual budgets could see a greater number of smaller grants given to groups and individual organisations at a ward level.

### **What impacts might the proposal have in terms of:**

- **The ability of the service to deliver its expected outcomes?**

The reduction in district budgets will impact on the local capacity to commission on a larger scale on district and corporate issues and to enhance service provision such as wider environmental schemes.

Through increased individual budgets Members will have flexibility to target local smaller ward and neighbourhood based projects

- **Communities?**

Communities could see an increase in smaller neighbourhood and local ward based schemes that local people prioritise, funded through the increase in Councillor budgets. Communities will see a decrease in wider commissions tackling District and area based issues such as health inequalities and worklessness.

- **Organisational Impact?**

The reduction in District Executive budgets will see an impact on services such as Children's, Adult Social Care and Environmental Services who have all received funding to add local value to wider service provision.

- **Equality Impact Screening**

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

EIA required:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Colette Kelly
Date:	January 2015

**Consultation information**

Discussions have taken place at the District Chairs and Vice Chairs session with the Executive Portfolio Holder for Co Operatives and Neighbourhoods. Chairs and Vice Chairs are feeding back to the Executive Member on the potential impact locally in their districts. Discussions with ward members in each district are also complete.

**REFERENCE: OPB INV-1**  
**TOTAL INVESTMENT: 2015/16 £94k; 2016/17 £0k**  
**FTE IMPACT (2015/16): 3**



## **Investment through transformation**

**What service area/s does this proposal relate to?**

Environmental Services

**What is the proposal?**

To increase the provision of Enforcement and Street Cleaning teams within the Borough.

**Financial Impact**

£94k in 2015/16

**What impacts might the proposal have in terms of:**

- **The ability of the service to deliver its expected outcomes?**

The outcome of the proposal is to increase the number of teams to invest in the up keep of neighbourhoods and reduce problems with street litter.

- **Communities?**

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

The enforcement team would reduce the amount of litter dropped.

- **Workforce?**

The investment is calculated to be £94k which covers the cost of 3 FTE with the remainder of the funding being used to purchase operational materials.

- **Organisational Impact?**

There will be no impact on other services.

- **Equality Impact Screening**

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

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

EIA required:	No
EIA to be completed by:	NA
Date:	NA

### **Consultation information**

There is no requirement for consultation in respect of this proposal.

**REFERENCE: OPB INV-2**  
**TOTAL INVESTMENT: 2015/16 £165k; 2016/17 £0k**



**Oldham**  
Council

**FTE IMPACT (2015/16): 4**  
**Investment through transformation**

**What service area/s does this proposal relate to?**

Highway Operations

**What is the proposal?**

To increase the provision of gully teams within the Borough

**Financial Impact**

£165k

**What impacts might the proposal have in terms of:**

- **The ability of the service to deliver its expected outcomes?**

The outcome of the proposal is to increase the number of teams to invest in the up keep of neighbourhoods and reduce problems with drainage.

- **Communities?**

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

Also, if there was a flood event the service would be able to deal with the situation more quickly due to the increased capacity.



- **Workforce?**

The investment is calculated to be £165,000 which covers the cost of four Grade 4 employees and one vehicle

- **Organisational Impact?**

There will be no impact on other services.

- **Equality Impact Screening**

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

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

EIA required:	No
EIA to be completed by:	NA
Date:	NA

**Consultation information**

There is no requirement for consultation in respect of this proposal.

**REFERENCE: OPB INV-3**  
**TOTAL INVESTMENT: 2015/16 £0k; 2016/17 £272k**



**FTE IMPACT (2015/16): NIL**  
**Savings through transformation**

**What service area/s does this proposal relate to?**

Neighbourhoods – District Youth

**What is the proposal?**

To allocate additional funding to District Executives to commission /fund Youth activities in each District

**Financial Impact**

Allocate £272,000 over the 6 Districts (£45,333 each District)

**What impacts might the proposal have in terms of:**

- **The ability of the service to deliver its expected outcomes?**

To enhance the local offer of Youth activity in each District. This will enable locally flexibility to support the local VCF sector and mitigate the impact of the reduction in Council delivery of youth services .

- **Communities?**

The impact to all communities within the borough will be positive, as the proposed investment allows each district to allocate ring-fenced funding to the provision of youth activity as they see fit.

- **Workforce?**

There are no Council staff implications but sessional workers in the VCF will benefit from local commissions This will be decided on a district-by-district basis.

- **Organisational Impact?**

There will be no impact on other services.

- **Equality Impact Screening**

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

EIA required:	No
EIA to be completed by:	NA
Date:	NA

**Consultation information**

There is no requirement for consultation in respect of this proposal.
---

**REFERENCE: OPB SAV-2**  
**TOTAL SAVING: 2015/16 £50k; 2016/17 £0k**  
**FTE IMPACT (2015/16): NIL**  
**Savings through transformation**



**What service area/s does this proposal relate to?**

Oldham Lifelong Learning Service

**What is the proposal?**

Lifelong Learning option to generate extra £50k income from a range of external funding.

**Financial Impact**

£50k in 15/16

**What impacts might the proposal have in terms of:**

- **The ability of the service to deliver its expected outcomes?**

There should be little impact on the Service's ability to deliver outcomes and meet targets. The high quality of the service will be maintained and outcomes and targets will remain in line with Skills Funding Agency (SFA) and Council requirements.

The development of a non SFA element of delivery may help to diversify the offer from the Service.

The Service currently:

- Is graded as outstanding by OFSTED
- Has circa 14,500 enrolments and engages circa 8,000 learners per year
- Contributes significantly to the Council's Get Oldham Working ambitions, the Public Service Reform agenda and our Health and Wellbeing ambitions by delivering provision which focuses on people who are:
  - Unemployed
  - Seeking work
  - Jobcentre Plus clients
  - Hard to reach and most disadvantaged
  - Parents and families
  - Minority ethnic groups
  - Experiencing learning difficulties and/or disabilities
  - Full level 2 learners
- Delivers vocational learning, English, Maths and English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), Family English, Maths and Language (FEML), ICT, community learning and community engagement, health and wellbeing
- Works closely with key partners to deliver the Council's vision and priorities these

include:  
 Oldham College  
 Jobcentre Plus  
 Work Programme providers  
 Positive Steps  
 National Careers Service  
 Work Clubs  
 Union learning representatives  
 Workforce development service  
 Schools  
 Children's centres  
 Voluntary and Community sector  
 Local businesses

- **Communities?**

Learners are already largely taking responsibility for their own learning. The only exceptions are Job Centre Plus clients who may be participating simply because they are mandated to attend.

- **Workforce?**

New skills and additional capacity would be required in terms of bid writing, submission and delivery, which will be met in-house. There will be no additional cost to service.

- **Organisational Impact?**

There will be no impact on other services.

- **Equality Impact Screening**

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

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

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

**Consultation information**

There is no requirement for consultation in respect of this proposal.



**REFERENCE: OPB SAV-3**

**TOTAL SAVING: 2015/16 £37k; 2016/17 £0k**

**FTE IMPACT (2015/16): 1.0 FTE**

## **Savings through transformation**

**What service area/s does this proposal relate to?**

*Commercial Services – Civic & Political Support*

**What is the proposal?**

*Removal of Civic and Political Support Manager Role*

**Financial Impact**

*Net saving of £37k in 15/16 if post is deleted*

**What impacts might the proposal have in terms of:**

- **The ability of the service to deliver its expected outcomes?**

The post is currently vacant with interim arrangements in place to cover the management of the team and the services provided. The management of civic and political support is important and a review is scheduled to take place to assess whether the interim arrangements have not affected detrimentally the provision of the services to identify whether the post is required.

- **Communities?**

N/A

- **Workforce?**

Impact of loss of 1 FTE.

- **Organisational Impact?**

There will be no impact on other services.

- **Equality Impact Screening**

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

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

EIA required:	No
EIA to be completed by:	NA
Date:	NA

### **Consultation information**

There is no requirement for consultation in respect of this proposal.





**REFERENCE: OPB-SAV4**  
**TOTAL SAVING: 2015/16 40k; 2016/17 50k**  
**FTE IMPACT (2015/16): Nil**  
**Savings through transformation**

**What service area/s does this proposal relate to?**

*Neighbourhoods and Commercial Services*

**What is the proposal?**

The Council has entered into a PFI agreement to replace 80% of the Boroughs street lights over a 5 year period. The newly installed lights have the ability to reduce the light output at preset times to reduce energy costs and the Council's carbon footprint. This is referred to as a variable lighting strategy.

The reduced lighting levels have already been determined and the impact is being monitored; however this exercise is to evaluate the feasibility of reducing the light output of street lights even further.

The current variable lighting strategy reduces the lighting level in residential areas from 100% to 50% between 22:00 hrs and 05:00hrs and traffic routes from 100% to 75% at 22:00, then to 50% between 24:00hrs and 05:00hrs. This proposal was put forward on the basis that the lighting levels have been designed to provide the correct level of light at switch on and would only be reduced when there was a change in the environment – ie reduced traffic and pedestrian use. This would ensure that the appropriate level of light is being provided at all times during the hours of darkness. It also ensures that the provision of light is not being wasted, through over-lighting.

It is not advisable to reduce the lighting levels below 50% as the light source would become unstable; however it is 'technically' possible to reduce the light level earlier than 22:00hrs and later than 05:00hrs. If the light was reduced throughout the full hours of darkness to 50%, it is estimated that there would be a further saving of £41k in 2015/16 and £90k in 2016/17.

The risk associated with reducing the lighting level earlier than the current regime is that it may put the public at risk. The new street lights are designed in accordance with British and European Lighting Standards to provide the required level of light to illuminate the highway and associated footways (ie not over lighting and not under lighting). The designed lighting levels remain at 100% at switch-on and are only reduced once the environment changes. The changes in environment are related to the levels of pedestrian activity and traffic volumes. It is considered that this approach helps to safeguard the public and would provide the council with a defence if a claim was presented as a result of the lighting level not meeting the required standard. If the lighting levels were to be reduced further the lighting would not accord to any lighting standard and may put the public at further risk of accident and increase the risks associated with wider community safety.

Council officers would work closely with Members and other stakeholders prior to

any proposal being implemented to minimise any risk to safety.

### **Financial Impact**

The current variable lighting strategy presents financial savings to the Council. If the decision was taken to reduce the light levels further, any savings realised could be offset by claims against the Council and has potential implications for partners in terms of managing community safety.

### **What impacts might the proposal have in terms of:**

- **The ability of the service to deliver its expected outcomes?**

Outcomes and service provision may be compromised – please see risk section above.

- **Communities?**

Maintaining the current variable lighting strategy will minimise further impact on Communities

Reducing the lighting levels further may impact on the safety of communities

- **Workforce?**

Not applicable as the Service is delivered by the external PFI Service Provider

- **Organisational Impact?**

*There will be no impact on other services.*

- **Equality Impact Screening**

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

EIA required:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Jonathan Hartley
Date:	5 February 2015

**Consultation information**

There is no requirement for consultation in respect of this proposal.
---

## Stage 1: Initial screening

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

## General Information

1a	Which service does this project, policy, or proposal relate to?	OPB-SAV4 Street Lighting
1b	What is the project, policy or proposal?	Reduction in lighting levels for street lighting
1c	What are the main aims of the project, policy or proposal?	Savings on energy as a result of a reduction in lighting levels.
1d	Who, potentially, could this project, policy or proposal have a detrimental effect on, or benefit, and how?	The proposal is for a reduction in lighting levels for the Authority's street lighting. There is a possibility that this could disproportionately impact on some groups. However, until detailed work is completed and a decision was made about which areas will be affected this is not possible to assess in detail.

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

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

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

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



**Oldham**  
Council

**REFERENCE: OPB-SAV5**

**TOTAL SAVING: 2015/16 £93k; 2016/17 £10k**

**FTE IMPACT (2015/16): NIL**

**Savings through transformation**

**What service area/s does this proposal relate to?**

Policy and Communications

**What is the proposal?**

Deletion of council publications and reduction in spend on internal communications

**Financial Impact**

Borough Life deletion £43k saving in 15/16

Family Life deletion £19k savings in 15/16

Discontinue the publication of Council tax leaflet from 16/17, £10k saving

Reduction in internal communication and events £31k in 15/16

**What impacts might the proposal have in terms of:**

- **The ability of the service to deliver its expected outcomes?**

Oldham Council produces a quarterly newsletter (Borough Life), to keep the residents of Oldham informed about council services and developments within the borough. It is a full colour paper, of approximately 12 pages. It is produced and distributed to all 93,000 households within the borough and delivered to key locations like libraries, doctor's surgeries, cafes and pubs. It is also available as a PDF document on the council website.

The council also produces a newsletter for families (Family Life) which is distributed through schools three times a year to coincide with major school holidays. Family Life updates parents about youth activities, signposts to available services for children and young people and promotes public health initiatives like immunisation and oral health.

The proposal is to remove both of these publications publication from circulation, to deliver a budget saving from all associated costs of the production and distribution of both magazines.

The council also has a duty to inform residents about the services we provide and use of alternative media will need to be considered to fulfil the council's commitments.

Readership of local newspapers has drastically reduced over the last five years and use of the council website, while increasing steadily, is not widespread in some areas of the community. Direct mail to each household is the only way to guarantee that every resident has the opportunity to access information about council services. As Family Life is distributed through schools (in every pupil's bookbag) it is the primary way to guarantee important messages reach all parents.

Removing Borough Life and Family Life may have a detrimental impact on levels of awareness and take-up of council services and could lead to reduced resident satisfaction.

In addition, the council produces an A5 booklet which is distributed to every resident alongside council tax bills.

We use our council tax leaflet to outline to residents how their council tax is spent, highlight the breadth of services available to residents and to explain how they access them. Research shows that perception of value for money is one of the major drivers of satisfaction with the council and the local area. Removing the council tax leaflet could lead to reduced resident satisfaction and impact on awareness and take-up of council services.

The council currently spends £31k on internal communication campaigns. This work helps to ensure that all of the council's 3,000 employees are provided with information relevant to them on issues such as health and safety, that they have the opportunity to learn about the wider work of the organisation and are informed about the significant changes being delivered as part of our budget challenge.

During periods of change it is vital to ensure staff are well informed and engaged as research shows that staff who are well engaged are more productive and motivated.

- **Communities?**

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

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

- **Workforce?**

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

- **Organisational Impact?**

There will be no impact on other services.

- **Equality Impact Screening**

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact

on any of the following groups:	
	Yes
Disabled people	No
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People on low incomes	Yes
People in particular age groups	Yes
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No

EIA required:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Shelley Kipling
Date:	16 February 2015

### Consultation information

There is no requirement for consultation in respect of this proposal.



# Equality Impact Assessment Tool

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

## General Information

1a	Which service does this project, policy, or proposal relate to?	Communications and Marketing
1b	What is the project, policy or proposal?	Proposal to reduce spend on communication and marketing activity.
1c	What are the main aims of the project, policy or proposal?	<p>To stop the publication of the council's newspaper – Borough Life and Family newsletter - Family Life and to reduce spend on internal communication which would achieve the following savings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Borough Life deletion £43k saving in 15/16</li> <li>• Family Life deletion £19k savings in 15/16</li> <li>• Discontinue the publication of Council tax leaflet from 16/17, £10k saving</li> <li>• Reduction in internal communication and events £31k in 15/16</li> </ul>
1d	Who, potentially, could this project, policy or proposal have a detrimental effect on, or benefit, and how?	<p>The council's Borough Life newspaper is delivered to every household in the borough four times a year. It is intended to inform residents about how their council tax is spent and how to access council services. Without Borough Life residents would have to rely on the council website and the local press for information about the council.</p> <p>Readership of the Oldham Evening Chronicle as fallen 46% over the last five years and the Manchester Evening News has recently announced that it will no longer be publishing the Oldham Advertiser which will be replaced by a Manchester wide weekly newspaper with very little Oldham content.</p> <p>The number of residents with access to the internet in Oldham is growing steadily, however, some groups are</p>

		<p>less likely to have access including older people and those on lower incomes.</p> <p>A communications strategy reliant on digital could potentially make it more difficult for these groups to access information about the council and its services.</p>
--	--	--

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

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

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

1g	<p>Using the screening and information in questions 1e and 1f, should a full assessment be carried out on the project, policy or proposal?</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/>      No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
----	--	---

1h	How have you come to this decision?	If these publications were ceased then officers would work with members and stakeholders to find alternative methods of delivering the information. The equality groups identified – low income and particular age groups – would be targeted to improve their access to this information through focussed communication methods and through the use of our libraries and our digital inclusion programme.
----	-------------------------------------	--

**REFERENCE: OPB-SAV6**

**TOTAL SAVING: 2015/16 £0k; 2016/17 £212k**

**FTE IMPACT (2015/16): NIL**

## **Savings through transformation**

**What service area/s does this proposal relate to?**

Commercial services - Democracy

**What is the proposal?**

Reduction in Councillors & associated savings

**Financial Impact**

£211,900 saving in 16/17 (12 month delay in implementation due to complexity and dependent upon outcome of Local Government Boundary Commission review).

Saving is £196k For reduction in Cllr's, through savings in the cost of elections and democracy and £15k Associated savings through IT and infrastructure

**What impacts might the proposal have in terms of:**

- **The ability of the service to deliver its expected outcomes?**

Currently, the Council operates election by thirds, which means that in a four year cycle, we elect a third of councillors in each of the first three years, and the fourth year is then a fallow year – meaning there is no election. Councillors serve a four year term of office. There are currently 60 Councillors serving 20 wards i.e. 3 Members per ward.

Currently, the 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 to metropolitan councils.

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 Local Government Boundary Commission for England 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 in principle decision.

If agreed, there would also be a change to the frequency pattern of local elections, resulting in a saving of one local election every 4 years.

The reduction in the number of Councillors will lead to a reduction in the Basic Allowances budget. The proposed saving would be approximately £196,000. This would of course reduce or increase if there was any movement in the basic allowance.

- **Communities?**

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.

There may be potential implications for ways of working within the District Partnerships.

- **Workforce?**

N/A

- **Organisational Impact?**

There will be no impact on other services.

- **Equality Impact Screening**

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

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

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

EIA required:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Paul Entwistle
Date:	11 February 2015

**Consultation information**

There is no requirement for consultation in respect of this proposal.
---

# Equality Impact Assessment Tool

## Stage 1: Initial screening

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

## General Information

1a	Which service does this project, policy, or proposal relate to?	Civic and Political Support
1b	What is the project, policy or proposal?	Proposed reduction in the number of members
1c	What are the main aims of the project, policy or proposal?	Reduction in the number of members
1d	Who, potentially, could this project, policy or proposal have a detrimental effect on, or benefit, and how?	The reduction in the number of Councillors could impact on the ability of people to get access to help and information. While this reduction would be across all areas of the borough, it is likely that more vulnerable residents (such as those on low incomes) would be likely affected by the proposal more than others.

1e. Does the project, policy or proposal have the potential to disproportionately impact on any of the following groups? If so, is the impact positive or negative?

	None	Positive	Negative	Not sure
Disabled people	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Particular ethnic groups	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Men or women (include impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People of particular sexual orientation/s	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People who are proposing to undergo, are	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment				
People on low incomes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People in particular age groups	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are there any other groups that you think may be affected negatively or positively by this project, policy or proposal?				
<i>Vulnerable residents (such as those with low incomes or those with complex needs)</i>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

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

1g	Using the screening and information in questions 1e and 1f, should a full assessment be carried out on the project, policy or proposal?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1h	How have you come to this decision?	It is difficult to estimate whether the proposal will have a significant impact given that it is difficult to estimate the level of reliance on councillors of our most vulnerable residents. There will also be the District Teams and two ward members in place to help with these enquiries.





**REFERENCE: OPB SAV-9**  
**TOTAL SAVING: 2015/16 £210k; 2016/17 £0k**  
**FTE IMPACT (2015/16): NIL**

## **Savings through transformation**

### **What service area/s does this proposal relate to?**

This does not affect any particular savings area

### **What is the proposal?**

Within the 2015/16 proposed budget there is a Revenue Priorities budget. In the current financial year, central government grants have been reduced in-year and additional pressures have been identified. In order to enable these budget issues to be addressed, a revenue priorities budget has been set up.

It is proposed that £210k of this is utilised in the financial year for other investments.

### **Financial Impact**

Reduction of £210k in the revenue priorities budget, reducing this to £1.265m.

### **What impacts might the proposal have in terms of:**

- **The ability of the service to deliver its expected outcomes?**

N/A as this budget is not allocated to any particular service.

- **Communities?**

N/A as this budget is not allocated to any particular service.

- **Workforce?**

N/A as this budget is not allocated to any particular service.

- **Organisational Impact?**

This budget is set aside for potential reduction in funding and additional pressures. Ongoing financial management will be required to ensure that the 2015/16 is balanced.

- **Equality Impact Screening**

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

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

EIA required:	No
EIA to be completed by:	NA
Date:	NA

### **Consultation information**

There is no requirement for consultation in respect of this proposal.

**REFERENCE: OPB SAV-10**  
**TOTAL SAVING: 2015/16 £9k; 2016/17 £0k**  
**FTE IMPACT (2015/16): NIL**



## **Savings through transformation**

### **What service area/s does this proposal relate to?**

Council wide saving across portfolios

### **What is the proposal?**

To reduce spending on newspapers, periodicals, subscriptions to printed media, and attendance of conferences by 10% across the council.

### **Financial Impact**

£9k saving in 2015/16

### **What impacts might the proposal have in terms of:**

- **The ability of the service to deliver its expected outcomes?**

There is currently a total of £54k budgeted spend across the council for Periodicals and subscriptions, £22k in Cooperatives and Neighbourhoods & £32k in Corporate and Commercial Services. A 10% reduction in these budgets would have minimal impact on the services ability to deliver, although managers would have to carefully prioritise and manage savings in the affected areas.

£38K is budgeted for conferences across all portfolios. A 10% reduction in these budgets would have minimal impact on the services ability to deliver, but would mean a lower attendance rate at conferences to achieve the saving.

- **Communities?**

Not Applicable

- **Workforce?**

No impact

- **Organisational Impact?**

The impact is council wide, across the organisation, although minimal.

- **Equality Impact Screening**

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

EIA required:	No
EIA to be completed by:	NA
Date:	NA

### **Consultation information**

There is no requirement for consultation in respect of this proposal.