

Leicester
City Council

WARDS AFFECTED:

ALL

TASK GROUPs:
COMMUNITY COHESION & SAFETY
ADULTS & HOUSING
CULTURE & LEISURE
ENVIRONMENT & SUSTAINABILITY

29th JANUARY 2010

DRAFT COMMISSIONING STATEMENT FOR THE CREATING THRIVING SAFE COMMUNITIES PRIORITY BOARD

Report of the Strategic Director and the Chief Finance Officer

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek the views of selected Task Groups on the draft Commissioning Statement, containing budget plans, for the Thriving Safe Communities Priority Board, which have been requested by lead Cabinet Members.

2. Summary

- 2.1 As members will be aware, the Council is committed to a system of medium-term financial planning.
- 2.2 Recent changes to the Council structure mean that departments no longer exist, and departmental revenue strategies will no longer be prepared. The new system of budgeting involves the Priority Board responsible for delivering each key programme in One Leicester:-
- firstly, assessing needs, past programmes and likely future commissioning requirements;
 - secondly, developing budget plans consistent with their requirements, whilst recognising the overall outlook for the overall public finances and the authority's resources.

This requires Priority Boards to plan their budgets within the context and framework of a corporate strategy. It does this by:

- (a) requiring each strategic director to prepare a forward looking commissioning statement, identifying all budget pressures, within an overall framework;

- (b) enabling draft commissioning statements to be discussed with task groups / scrutiny committees, partners and trade unions in good time prior to the commencement of the budget year.
- 2.3 A corporate revenue strategy will be submitted to the Council for approval in February. A draft is currently available on the internet.
- 2.4 Priority Board draft commissioning statements reflect the financial pressures faced by the Council. Budgets are expected to remain under pressure for the duration of the three year statement. Future government spending plans to be announced for 2011/12 onwards remain unknown, but are expected to reflect the need to contain overall public spending and be much tighter than has been experienced in previous years.
- 2.5 Attached as appendix 1 to this report is the draft commissioning statement for the non adult social care responsibilities of the Creating Thriving Safe Communities Priority Board. Appendix 2 comprises the Adult Social Care draft commissioning statement. There is a list of contents at the start of each appendix. Together the two appendices make up the overall draft commissioning statement for this board. This has been prepared by the responsible strategic director in consultation with those Cabinet Members with responsibilities contained within this project board. Its status is purely a draft for consultation. No formal decisions will be made until the proposals, together with task group / scrutiny comments, are considered by the Cabinet in February.
- 2.6 Lead Cabinet Members have asked for the views of the invited Task Groups on the attached commissioning statement, and in particular have asked:
 - (a) whether your Task Groups endorse the draft commissioning statement as the best way forward in the context of the strategic framework;
 - (b) whether your Task Groups have any alternative proposals they would wish the Cabinet to consider;
 - (c) what your Task Groups' views are on the options contained within the commissioning statement.
- 2.7 In giving your views, your Task Groups are asked to be mindful of the obligation to balance the budget for the next 3 years.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 Your Task Groups are asked to consider the draft commissioning statements at Appendices 1 and 2 and make comments to the Cabinet.

4. Financial and Legal Implications

- 4.1 This report is exclusively concerned with financial issues.
- 4.2 As this report deals with next year's budget, Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act, 1992 applies to members in arrears of council tax.

5. Other Implications

| Other Implications | Yes/No | <u>Paragraph within Papers</u> <u>References Supporting</u> |
|---------------------------------|---------------|---|
| Equal Opportunities | Yes | Equality Assessment Impact |
| Policy | Yes | Whole document |
| Sustainable and Environmental | Yes | |
| Crime & Disorder | Yes | |
| Human Rights Act | No | |
| Elderly / People on Low Incomes | Yes | Equality Assessment Impact |

Kim Curry
Strategic Director

Mark Noble
Chief Finance Officer

Creating Thriving Safe Communities

DRAFT

Commissioning Statement

List of Contents Thriving and Safe

| Section | Page | |
|-------------------|---|---------|
| Appendix 1 | | |
| 1 | Outcomes and Evaluation of Performance & Progress to Date | 6 |
| 2 | Needs Analysis | 20 |
| 3 | Delivery Plan for 2010/11 | 24 |
| 4 | Service Delivery Current Challenges | 28 |
| 5 | Commissioning Priorities | 33 |
| 6 | Further Work | 36 |
| 7 | Efficiencies | 38 |
| 8 | Budget Growth and Reduction Proposals | 40 - 89 |

Outcomes and Evaluation of Performance & Progress to Date

Priority: Creating Thriving Safe Communities

Key

Performance against target

↑ above target

↓ below target

↔ meeting target

P plus RAG rating based on the tolerance set

★ Exceptional performance exceeding target by 10% or more or set tolerance

▲ Poor performance below target by 10% or more or set tolerance

● Within tolerance set

Outcomes:

Outcome LAA NI 16 Serious acquisitive crime rate

Number of serious acquisitive crimes per 1,000 population

Evaluation of Performance and Progress to date:

| | | |
|--------|--------|----------|
| YTD | Target | Forecast |
| -13.8% | 26.5 | ↑ ★ |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|------|--------------|------|
| Current performance | YTD | Targets | 09/10 | 26.5 | 10/11 | 25.6 |
| | - 13.8% | | | | | |
| | (9 months) | | | | | |

This indicator comprises of a number of elements, robbery, burglary and vehicle crime, outlined below is an evaluation of performance and progress against each.

- Burglary (-3.3%), we are 13th within our most similar family grouping (MSFG) of 15. Smart water and target hardening have started to make a real impact and burglary is notably reducing now for the first time in almost eighteen months. This success will be built on with intelligence based target hardening in hotspot areas, which is still ongoing.
- Robbery (-5.8%), 10th in our MSFG. Good progress made with work with Student unions and schools in order to spread messages about personal safety. Lighting improvements are being guided by crime statistics relating to late night robberies where lighting could be a significant factor in preventing further opportunities for re-offending in those areas.

- Robbery Business (-49%), 7th in our MSFG. Applications have been put in for money to target-harden and secure business' identified throughout the city as being subject to repeat victimisation. A separate fund for Leicestershire Chamber of commerce for those business' that don't fulfil the Home-office criteria has also been set up.
- Theft from vehicle (-15.7), 11th in our MSFG. Car crime campaign in car parks intensifying over Christmas period with people being reminded not to leave things - especially shopping/goods just purchased - on open display in cars.
- Theft of a vehicle (-22.6), 6th in our MSFG. As above - advice handed out to drivers also includes general advice on keeping your vehicle safe.

Outcome LAA NI 18 Adult re-offending rates for those under probation supervision

The percentage of offenders aged 18 or over on the Probation caseload who are proven to have reoffended within a 3 month measurement period.

Evaluation of Performance and progress to date

YTD Target Forecast
7.99% 8.26% reduction ↔ ●

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--|
| Current performance | YTD 7.99% | Targets | 09/10 | -8.26% reduction | 10/11 | -7.97% (reduction against predicted reoffending rate for cohort) |
|----------------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--|

- Decrease in re-offending against predicted for community sentences There will be a focus on resettlement cases, which has been included in vigilance bid.
- Reduction measured over July 08 – June 09.
- Actual reduction is still under target therefore flagged as Amber for both community order and licence.

Outcome LAA NI 19 Rate of proven reoffending by young offenders

The average number of offences committed per person by members of a cohort of young people (aged 10-17) during a 12-month tracking period. January to March cohort.

Evaluation of Performance and progress to date

YTD Target Forecast
0.3 (first 3 months) 3.4% ↑ ★

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-----|
| Current performance | YTD 0.3 | Targets | 09/10 | 3.4% yearly | 10/11 | 212 |
|----------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-----|

(offenders first 3 months) reduction 9.8% reduction 2005-11ion

- There is a 16.1% reduction from 05/08 cohort in the proportion of young people who commit at least one offence in the tracking period. YTD performance on track. For the first three months of measurement the YOS can report that these significant reductions have been maintained for the 2009 cohort, as the re-offending rate is within 0.02 offences per offender of the 2008 cohort for the same period. YTD performance on track.
- The YOS is performing well against both LAA and statutory indicators and has been externally assessed as excellent with “outstanding prospects for the future”

Outcome LAA NI 20 Assault with injury crime rate

Number of 'Assaults with less serious injury' offences per 1000 population.

Evaluation of Performance and progress to date

| | | | |
|------|--------|----------|-------|
| YTD | Target | Forecast | MSFG |
| 6.33 | 12.3 | ↑ ★ | 13/15 |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|------|--------------|------|
| Current performance | YTD | Targets | 09/10 | 12.3 | 10/11 | 11.9 |
| | 6.33 | | | | | |
| | (6 months) | | | | | |
| | Forecast | | | | | |
| | 12.66 | | | | | |

- On track to achieve target
- Between April and October this year there were 111 fewer offences when compared to the same timescale last year which is a reduction of – 4.96%.

LAA NI 27 Understanding of local concerns about antisocial behaviour and crime issues by the local council and police.

Evaluation of performance and progress to date

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|----------|
| YTD | Target | Forecast |
| 26% (08/09Place Survey) | 26% | ↔ ★ |
| 48% (Using the CRAVE survey) | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|----|--------------|-----|
| Current performance | YTD | Targets | 09/10 | 26 | 10/11 | 40% |
| | 26% | | | | | |

48%
(CRAVE
Survey)

- Formal evaluation information is based on the Place Survey, but the SLP use the Police's CRAVE survey to provide information on the direction of travel.
- Current information suggests that we are seeing good progress on this area of work. The areas of activity taken forward to date include; the neighbourhood crime & justice initiative and youth crime action plan, both aimed at working in communities to deal with anti social behaviour within a multi-agency context.

The development of Neighbourhood Working and through this a more effective and efficient response to problem solving at a local level aimed at improving outcomes for local people will also assist in raising public confidence in the future

Outcome LAA NI 32 Repeat incidents of domestic violence (for introduction in 2009/10)

Percentage reduction in repeat victimisation for those domestic violence cases being managed by a MARAC. Repeat victimisation refers to a violent incident occurring within 12 months of the original incident coming to the MARAC

Evaluation of Performance and progress to date

On track

| | | |
|-----|--------|----------|
| YTD | Target | Forecast |
| 21% | 30 % | ↑ ★ |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|-----|--------------|-----|
| Current performance | YTD | Targets | 09/10 | 30% | 10/11 | 27% |
| | 21% | | | | | |

- A Multi agency Domestic Violence Strategy has been developed which is currently in draft form and will be coming to SMB. On track.
- The repeat % should rise until the MARAC is at least 24 months mature.

Outcome LAA NI 39 Rate of Hospital Admissions per 100,000 for Alcohol Related Harm

The number of alcohol-related admissions to hospital per 100,000 population.

Evaluation of Performance and progress to date

| | | |
|------|--------|----------|
| YTD | Target | Forecast |
| 2167 | 2970 | ↑ ★ |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|------|--------------|------|
| Current performance | YTD | Targets | 09/10 | 2970 | 10/11 | 3118 |
| | 2167 | | | | | |

- Priorities established and implementation of partnership based alcohol harm reduction plan broadly on track incl training on alcohol brief intervention for front- line staff across a broad partnership.
- Domestic Violence Strategy developed – also relevant re alcohol harm.
- Locally calculated data also suggests that the increase in the rate of alcohol-related admissions is slowing and we are on track to meet the targets set.

Outcome LAA NI 40 Number of drug users recorded as being in effective treatment

The change in the number of drug users (crack and opiates) in effective treatment this year compared to the number that were in effective treatment in the baseline year 2007/08.

Evaluation of Performance and progress to date

- Currently YTD performance on track.
- New NTA classification of discharges is reducing the number of problem drug users in effective treatment.
- There may also be issues around access to treatment, the DAAT Team are liaising with providers to identify issues and develop relevant actions

| | | |
|------|--------|----------|
| YTD | Target | Forecast |
| 1217 | 1203 | ↑ ★ |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|------|--------------|------|
| Current performance | YTD | Targets | 09/10 | 1204 | 10/11 | 1216 |
| | 1217 | | | | | |

Outcome LAA NI 143 Offenders under probation supervision living in settled and suitable accommodation at the end of their order or licence

The percentage of offenders under probation supervision living in settled and suitable accommodation at the end of their order or licence.

Evaluation of performance and progress to date

| | | |
|------|--------|----------|
| YTD | Target | Forecast |
| 83.3 | 87% | ↔ ★ |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|-----|--------------|-----|
| Current performance | YTD | Targets | 09/10 | 87% | 10/11 | 85% |
| | 83.3 | | | | | |
| | (08/09) | | | | | |

- The rent deposit scheme is being put in place
- A range of interventions are being progressed through the Safer Leicester Partnership's Reducing Re-offending Delivery Group (with the use of WNF monies in some instances)

Outcome NI 1 % who agree their local area place where people from different backgrounds get on well together.

Place Survey

Evaluation of performance and progress to date

YTD Target Forecast
76.2% 80%

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|----------------|--------------|-----|--------------|-----|
| Current performance | YTD 76.2% (08/09) middle quartile | Targets | 09/10 | 80% | 10/11 | tbc |
|----------------------------|--|----------------|--------------|-----|--------------|-----|

The Community Cohesion Executive agreed a revised Community Cohesion strategy and action plan in November 2009. This is now being developed into a commissioning plan for February 2010 that will set out the outcomes of evaluation of current activities and future commissioning priorities.

Middle quartile performance East Midlands average 76.9%

Outcome NI 5 Overall / General satisfaction with local area

Place Survey

Evaluation of performance and progress to date

YTD Target Forecast
71.8% 80%

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|----------------|--------------|-----|--------------|-----|
| Current performance | YTD 71.8% (08/09) lower quartile | Targets | 09/10 | 80% | 10/11 | tbc |
|----------------------------|---|----------------|--------------|-----|--------------|-----|

Place Survey Bi- annual survey. Sheila Lock has tasked officers to develop a new neighbourhood working strategy and action plan for spring 2010. One of the main objectives of the strategy and action plan will be put in place measures to improve performance against the measure.

Performance is lower quartile .East Midlands average 79.9%

Outcome: NI 147 Proportion of former care leavers aged 19 who are in suitable accommodation

To improve accommodation outcomes for young adults formerly in care (a key group at risk of social exclusion)

Evaluation of performance and progress

YTD Target Forecast

95% 95% ↑ ★

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-----|----------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|
| Current performance | 95% | Targets | 10/11 | To be set | 11/12 | To be set | 12/13 | To be set |
|----------------------------|-----|----------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|

Outcome: NI 145 Proportion of adults (aged 18+) with learning disabilities in settled accommodation

To improve settled accommodation outcomes for adults with learning disabilities

Evaluation of performance and progress to date

| | | |
|------------|---------------|-----------------|
| YTD | Target | Forecast |
| 23.8% | 62% | ↓ |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------|----------------|--------------|----|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|
| Current performance | 23.8% | Targets | 10/11 | 65 | 11/12 | To be set | 12/13 | To be set |
|----------------------------|-------|----------------|--------------|----|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|

Currently below target due to reviews mainly undertaken in Q4. Work being undertaken by the Performance Clinics will focus on this area of work and action plans are in place for teams to help achieve the set target.

Outcome: LAA NI 149 - Proportion of adults (aged 18+) in contact with secondary mental health services in settled accommodation

To improve settled accommodation outcomes for adults with mental health problems (a key group at risk of social exclusion).

Evaluation of performance and progress to date

| | | |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| YTD | Target | Forecast |
| 76.8% (to November) | 70% | ↑ ★ |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------|----------------|--------------|----|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|
| Current performance | 76.8 | Targets | 10/11 | 70 | 11/12 | To be set | 12/13 | To be set |
|----------------------------|------|----------------|--------------|----|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|

Currently exceeded target due to the focused work being undertaken by the Performance Clinics

Outcome: Corporate Plan NI 158 – Percentage of non-decent LA homes at beginning of financial year

To measure progress in ensuring all council homes meet the Decent Homes Standard.

Evaluation of performance and progress to date

| | | |
|------------|---------------|-----------------|
| YTD | Target | Forecast |
| 3.8% | 0 Dec 2010 | on track ↔ |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|----------------|--------------|---|--------------|---|--------------|---|
| Current performance | 3.8% (Q2) | Targets | 10/11 | 0 | 11/12 | 0 | 12/13 | 0 |
|----------------------------|-----------|----------------|--------------|---|--------------|---|--------------|---|

Outcome: NI 156 number of households living in temporary accommodation

Reduce the number of households placed in temporary accommodation by 2010

Evaluation of performance and progress to date

On track.

| | | |
|---------|--------|----------|
| YTD | Target | Forecast |
| 34 (Q2) | 52 | 40 ↔ |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------|----------------|--------------|----|--------------|----|--------------|----|
| Current performance | 34 (Q2) | Targets | 10/11 | 45 | 11/12 | 40 | 12/13 | 35 |
|----------------------------|---------|----------------|--------------|----|--------------|----|--------------|----|

Outcome: Homeless Strategy -Homelessness prevented through housing advice casework

Maintain low levels of repeat homelessness acceptances

Evaluation of performance and progress to date

On track

| | | |
|-------|--------|----------|
| YTD | Target | Forecast |
| 13.76 | | ↔ |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|
| Current performance | 13.76 (Q2) | Targets | 10/11 | To be set | 11/12 | To be set | 12/13 | To be set |
|----------------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|

The CAA noted that the Council provides good services to stop people becoming homeless and to look after those that are.

Outcome: Homelessness Strategy – No. of households re-housed into the private rented sector (using the Leicester Let or Rent Deposit Guarantee Scheme)

Increase the number (year on year) of those helped to access private sector accommodation

Evaluation of performance and progress

| | | |
|----------|--------|----------|
| YTD | Target | Forecast |
| 139 (Q3) | 222 | 180 ↓ |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|----------------|--------------|-----|--------------|-----|--------------|-----|
| Current | 139 (Q3) | Targets | 10/11 | 242 | 11/12 | 262 | 12/13 | 282 |
|----------------|----------|----------------|--------------|-----|--------------|-----|--------------|-----|

performance

Progress in tackling private sector decent homes has slowed due to the reduction of resources Below target. Target has not been met due to the failure to attract enough landlords / properties onto the scheme. Demand still exceeds supply and further promotional work is being undertaken to secure more properties under the schemes.

for the Housing Capital Programme.

The city wide home maintenance service continues to support vulnerable households through a number of schemes (burglary reduction, installing assistive technology, alley gates, home energy, etc)

Outcome: Corporate Plan LCHS21 – No. of private Homes made decent

Increase the number of private sector homes that meet the decency standard

Evaluation of performance and progress

Progress in tackling private homes made decent slowed due to reduction of resources for the Housing Capital Programme

Below Target

| | | | |
|-----|--------|----------|---|
| YTD | Target | Forecast | |
| 248 | 350 | 300 | ↓ |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-----|----------------|--------------|-----|--------------|-----|--------------|-----|
| Current performance | 248 | Targets | 10/11 | 400 | 11/12 | 400 | 12/13 | 400 |
|----------------------------|-----|----------------|--------------|-----|--------------|-----|--------------|-----|

Outcome: Corporate Plan LCHS23 – Reduce the number of long standing empty homes (5+ years) in the City

Outcome : Tackle the shortage of housing in the City and improve immediate environment.

Evaluation of performance and progress

On track.

| | | |
|-----|-------------|----------|
| YTD | Target | Forecast |
| 144 | 115 (09/10) | ↔ |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-----|----------------|--------------|----|--------------|----|--------------|---|
| Current performance | 144 | Targets | 10/11 | 80 | 11/12 | 45 | 12/13 | 0 |
|----------------------------|-----|----------------|--------------|----|--------------|----|--------------|---|

Council interventions brought 202 properties back into use in first 9 months of this year.

Outcome NI 43 Young People with YJS receiving a conviction in court who are sentenced to custody

Evaluation of performance and progress to date

YTD Target Forecast
8.2 (Q2) downward trend

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------|----------------|---|--------------|-----|
| Current performance | YTD 8.2 (Q2) | Targets | 09/10 No prescribed target just downward trend required | 10/11 | tbc |
|----------------------------|------------------------|----------------|---|--------------|-----|

Following the rise of custodial sentences for Q2, Q3 and Q4 of 08/09 there was a significant reduction in both the proportion and actual number of custodial sentences for Q1 of 09/10. However custodial sentences have again increased for Q2 of 2009/10. The YOS are considering a number of measures to address the rise in custodial sentencing as part of the preparation for Scaled Approach and YRO sentences.

Outcome NI44 Ethnic composition of offenders on Youth Justice System disposals (Annual)

Measure and it's explanation.

This measure considers differences in the proportion of each BME group (White, Mixed, Asian/Asian British, Black/Black British, Chinese/Other) of young people on youth justice disposals against the proportion of each BME group in the local population.

Offender data is obtained from YOS case management numbers and general 10-17 population data is derived from up-to-date estimates of the local population derived from 2001 Census data.

NI44 data is calculated on an annual basis by the Youth Justice Board, so there are no updates available. The data below refers to the 2008-09 counting year.

Evaluation of performance and progress to date

2008-09 NI44 Data

| <i>Ethnic group</i> | <i>Number of offenders</i> | <i>Proportion of offenders</i> | <i>10 - 17 population</i> | <i>10 - 17 proportion</i> | <i>Proportion difference</i> | <i>Proportion Ratio</i> |
|------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| White | 535 | 68.9% | 15,988 | 54.3% | 14.5% | 1.3 |
| Mixed | 60 | 7.7% | 1,587 | 5.4% | 2.3% | 1.4 |
| Asian or Asian British | 104 | 13.4% | 10,362 | 35.2% | -21.8% | 0.4 |
| Black or Black British | 69 | 8.9% | 1,161 | 3.9% | 4.9% | 2.3 |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|---|------|-----|------|------|------------|
| Chinese/Other | 9 | 1.2% | 329 | 1.1% | 0.1% | 1.1 |
|---------------|---|------|-----|------|------|------------|

It is apparent that Black/Black British young people are the most significantly over represented group, as they represent a proportion of offenders which is 2.3 times greater than their proportion of the general population of the same age. The YOS Head of Service is the Senior Responsible Officer for monitoring and reporting progress to the LCJB. The YOS has agreed to work with the LCJB to further analyse data in relation to possible youth offending disproportionately in specific areas.

Outcome NI46 Young offenders access to suitable accommodation

Evaluation of performance and progress to date

On track

YTD Target Forecast
94.8% 97.5% ↔

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|-----|
| Current performance | YTD 94.8% | Targets | 09/10 97.5% | 10/11 | tbc |
|----------------------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|-----|

Outcome NI111 First time entrants to the Youth Justice System aged 10-17

Evaluation of performance and progress to date

YTD Target Forecast
174 600 ↔

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|-----|
| Current performance | YTD 174 (numbers) | Targets | 09/10 2.9% reduction | 10/11 | tbc |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|-----|

The 2009-10 Q1 and Q2 figures, despite being slightly above the figures for the same period last year, continues to maintain the low number of First Time Entrants locally and reinforce the longer-term downward trend.

The YJB have allocated a 2009-10 target to reduce the number of FTEs by 2.9% when compared to the 2007-08 figure. As there was a significant reduction for 2008-09 and only a slight increase when comparing 2009-10 with 2008-09 so far the YOS expects to meet this target over the forthcoming year.

All the YOS NI's are on track .

Outcomes: National Measure for Libraries

NI 9 Use of Public Libraries. During the last 12 months, have you used a public library service at least once?

Current performance

45.8% of the population. Target for 09/10 is 48%

Local PIs for Libraries

Libraries User Profile Out turn 08/09 High 49% Target 09/10 48% Actual Qr 2 49.1%
BME

Libraries User Profile Out turn 08/09 High 10.1% Target 09/10 8% Actual Qr 2 10.1%
Disability

Libraries User Profile out turn 08/09 High 58% Target 09/10 60% Actual Qr 2 58%
C2DE (Hard to reach)

Libraries User Profile Out turn 08/09 High 37% Target 09/10 36% Actual Qr 2
37.33%
Under 16

Libraries User Profile Out turn 08/09 High 14.83% Target 09/10 14% Actual Qr 2
14.8%
60+

User Satisfaction with Libraries 87%

Libraries Book Issues Target 09/10 1507200 3rd Qr results
due shortly

Libraries other issues – audio, visual, electronic & other Target 09/10 92800

Libraries ICT sessions Target 09/10 492000

Libraries Active borrowers Target 09/10 63500

Libraries Active ICT users (non borrowers) Target 09/10 11500

Libraries – total active users Target 09/10 75000

NI 195 Improved Street and Environmental Cleanliness (which also contributes to NI 5 Overall/General Satisfaction with Local Area)

This NI considers the percentage of land of an unacceptable standard in terms of litter, detritus, graffiti and flyposting (i.e. 4 sub-indicators). This is a key indicator for street cleaning and other services within the Environmental Services Division and contributes towards NI1: Overall/general satisfaction with Local Area.

Evaluation of performance and progress to date

| Current | YTD | Target 09/10 & | Target 10/11 |
|---------|-----|----------------|--------------|
|---------|-----|----------------|--------------|

| performance | | Forecast | |
|--------------------|-----|-----------------|---|
| 195a Litter | 13% | 10% | ↓ |
| 195b Detritus | 19% | 13% | ↓ |
| 195c Graffiti | 18% | 10% | ↓ |
| 195d Flyposting | 1% | 0% | ↓ |

Performance to date this year is disappointing and street cleaning services are being modified in order to try and improve performance over the second half of the year. However, some aspects, e.g. graffiti on private property, are outside of the direct control of the city council. The city-wide roll-out of the City Warden Service should also help to improve performance.

LAA NI 142 Number of people supported to maintain independent living

Evaluation of performance and progress to date

YTD Target Forecast
 99.1 97.6% ↑ ★

| Current performance | YTD | Targets | 09/10 | 97.6% | 10/11 |
|----------------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 99.1 | | | | |

A high performance has been sustained in respect of the above indicator. Performance is linked to the Supporting People Grant, which has been reduced by Government. This may have an impact on service delivery. There will be a strategic review of those services funded by Supporting People, with the aim of delivering savings whilst maintaining a high level of outcomes. To continue to monitor performance with bi monthly reporting to the Commissioning Board.

NI 9 Use of Public Libraries. During the last 12 months, have you used a public library service at least once?

Next result will be available in April 10. Targets 09/10 and 10/11 not yet agreed

LCHS21 – No. of private Homes made decent

LCHS23 – Reduce the number of long standing empty homes (5+ years) in the City

Needs Analysis

Need analysis:

What has needs analysis in relation to this priority shown in terms of the impact our actions are having and where we need to focus in the future. This will include national and local data for example on demand and supply and also data from consultation with communities, service users and other stakeholders. What this might mean in terms of resources.

Crime Reduction

Leicester is not achieving the same levels of crime reductions as other cities, and in addressing this the partnership needs to monitor total crime with a view to identifying and tackling emergent trends. We also need to understand the root causes of offending behaviour and direct resources to tackling those causes. As part of the current work undertaken within the integrated offender management model, offenders will be worked with closely in order to understand the motivations behind offending and enable agencies to deal with the issues identified in a proactive way.

Work undertaken with the Home Office's Performance Development Unit (PDU) has identified that in the main the initiatives we deliver are similar to other CDRPs but we are not good at communicating our work widely. Also, the PDU has identified, that the partnership needs better analytical information to support its work in reducing crime and disorder in general but more specifically around serious acquisitive crime. Both of these issues are being addressed as part of the current review of the SLP

Crime fell 14% over the 3-year period 2005-2009, however, the perception of crime and the fear of crime is that crime is on the increase. This is in line with the national picture.

- Leicester, like other cities of similar size and make-up, suffers from the negative impact of the night time economy where alcohol plays a huge part in anti-social behaviour (including criminal damage) and violent crime.
- The city centre has seen some impressive reductions in terms of violent crime. This current year to date, there has been a 17% reduction of all violent crime with the city centre.
- The level of violent crime on a Friday and Saturday evening has remained fairly constant over the past 3 years with a significant reduction in the more serious levels of violent crime.
- Leicester appears to be dealing positively with domestic violence issues, though domestic violence is still a significant contributor to statutory homelessness.
- Burglary of dwellings in Leicester has risen slightly in comparison to the same period last year. The increase can be attributed across the city, with the exception of the Highfields Area, which has seen a significant reduction in offences in recent months.
- Robberies in the city have seen a 15% reduction on the same period as last year. The detection rate also increased by almost 17%.

The current economic climate will impact significantly on all community safety issues, but it is particularly important that the Safer Leicester Partnership continue to focus attention on business crime, particularly as evidence indicates that businesses are reducing the levels of security staff, in a bid to lower staffing costs which in turn is increasing “theft from shop”. This issue could impact on our regeneration agenda with visitors not wanting to come to Leicester due to the fact that it is perceived as having unacceptable crime levels. This will require an improved and enhanced role for the business community in working with the SLP as part of a partnership approach to tackling crime and disorder. Reductions in retail crime will be a good barometer of the strength and efficacy of that relationship.

We are developing significant neighbourhood data profiles related to crime, disorder, victims and offenders. This information needs to be assessed and appropriate actions identified. Furthermore, neighbourhoods may suffer from a number of issues such as crime, unemployment and low school attainment levels, these issues must be understood so that the neighbourhood offer can be varied to meet the needs of that particular neighbourhood. The challenge is to ensure that partner agencies have a good understanding of the needs of the locality and work collaboratively.

In addition, the development of a city wide Safeguarding Adults Board will focus the attention of partners in respect of safeguarding and the need to identify vulnerability in the wake of the Pilkington case. There will be a direct link into the SLP and up to the LSP in a revised reporting structure that is aimed to address the issues arising from CAA but also to highlight the responsibilities of partners in relation to safeguarding.

Housing

Documents used to inform the needs analysis;

- Homelessness Strategy 2009-14,
- Supporting People Strategic Review of Homeless Services,
- Affordable Housing Strategy 2009-14, and
- The new Private Sector Housing Stock Condition Survey

Libraries

The Libraries Strategy 2008-13, ***Better Libraries-Better Lives: Putting libraries at the heart of sustainable communities***, based on national and local analysis of priorities and local consultation agreed by Council 2008 is closely matched to the One Leicester Priorities.

Key needs identified in the strategy that will be met by commissioned services that will;

- Ensure that all library buildings are welcoming, accessible and fit for a wide range of community uses,
- Make library services more accessible,
- Promote reading and learning to improve quality of life,
- Support mainstream learning provision for children and adults,
- Respond to changes in society and technology,
- Use technology to improve services and reduce the digital divide, and

- Strengthen the library workforce by ensuring a closer fit of skills and competencies to what will be required to deliver this strategy.

PLUS survey 2009 which is run to a national standard and is capable of being compared with other authorities surveys, results due January 2010. This 3 yearly survey of library users on satisfaction and many aspects of service will be used to develop targeted improvement in each area of the city. Initial feedback shows a high level of completed forms have been made from this exercise.

Consultation process as part of the New Parks Big Lottery Community Libraries Project has identified elements of the new build design and particularly service provision that have been used to create the new service. The New Parks Centre, closely linked to the Customer Services and Housing Services will open in Spring 2010.

Community Facilities

The City has a rapidly growing population, for which resources will need to be available to meet demand. Through the development of individual settings plans staff have been able to identify the key needs of the respective area and further more the needs and demands for the setting itself.

Performance outcomes have shown the need to increase the number of people using community settings, to help reduce social exclusion and anti-social behaviour, to empower citizens through support, and to facilitate the development of community groups.

Through staff consultation and the development of comprehensive Community Settings Plans priority measures have been identified for Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) communities. As the proportion of these communities is steadily rising it is necessary to focus services to meet the diverse needs of Leicester's established, and newly arriving communities.

Delivery Plan for 2010/11

Delivery plan for 2010/11: Projects / Programmes

Current projects/programmes in the Priority Board portfolio

Projects and programmes which have been agreed and are already underway - these should be listed in priority order.

| Project/Programme Name | Description of outcomes / target benefits | Programme / Project Manager | Start date | End date | Resourcing position including source of funding | Other comments |
|--|--|-----------------------------|------------|----------|---|---|
| Highfields Centre Completion Project Lottery Bid | To create a multi-purpose, world class Youth Arts Facility by reducing part of an existing centre with Highfields Community Offenders & Anti-social youths | Ann Habens | | | | Funding bid was unsuccessful |
| Modernisation of Community Centres | Review of the 43 community facilities | Ann Habens | On going | | £500.00 one off capital | |
| Challenge and Support Project | Multi-agency project to tackle youth anti-social behaviour | David Thrussel | 2009 | 2011 | Grant funding | Project has made good progress in engaging with groups of young people involved in or at risk of becoming involved in ASB |
| Preventing Violent Extremism (Youth Offending) | Multi-agency project to tackle young offenders at risk of supporting or committing terrorist acts. | Ann Habens | 2009 | 2011 | Grant Funding | Proactive targeting young |

| Project/Programme Name | Description of outcomes / target benefits | Programme / Project Manager | Start date | End date | Resourcing position including source of funding | Other comments |
|---|--|------------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | people at risk of becoming involved with extremist groups |
| Advertise & Bid' (a Choice Based Lettings System for Leicester) | A new choice based system of offering and letting empty properties, giving service users the opportunity to choose where they want to live and when they wish to move. Providing greater transparency and choice to applicants. Government commitment for all LAs to have a system in place by 2010. | Ann Branson | 2008 | TBD | HRA Funding | |
| New Parks Community Learning Centre | Building of new Library and Community Centre | Richard Watson/Lee Warner | 10/2007 | Practical Completion 18/12/09 Open 16/03/10 | Big Lottery | |
| Festival Services Infrastructure | To enhance the supporting infrastructure on city parks for future festivals & events | Richard Watson/Bob Mullins | 2008 | March 2010 | LCC Capital | |
| OpenAccess | Implementation of public access to their own housing application and revenue and benefits information. | Tracie Rees | 2010 | 2012 | TBD | |

Proposed projects

Any new projects / programmes which are being proposed.

| Project / Programme title | Description of outcomes / target benefits | Estimated cost to deliver | Funding source | Likely timescales | Current stage this has reached |
|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| None | None | None | None | None | None |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Service Delivery Current Challenges

Service Delivery

Current challenges (Housing)

- The Housing Options Service is being reviewed to identify the impact of the introduction of Choice Based Lettings, the need to introduce the Single Assessment and Referral (SAR) of hostels,. This will improve the outcomes for users and deliver efficiencies.
- While family homelessness is well managed in the city, single homelessness continues to present challenges. More work is underway to reduce the use of hostels for single homeless, by reconfiguring the prevention and support services. This work will be done in association with the Supporting People (SAR) project and aims to reduce number of hostel bed spaces in the City The cost of the City Council's homeless service is noted to be more expensive than those provided by similar local authorities, therefore a full review of cost and level of service will be completed in the next 6 months.
- Planned work will support improved outcomes for the PSA16 groups, (LD, MH, etc) particularly focusing on improvement for ex offenders and those with drug and alcohol problems.
- The target of making 390 private sector homes decent will not be met due to falling capital allocations. Leicester is one of four regional loans pilots. The outcome of the private sector stock condition survey is expected in January and will confirm the current position. Up until now estimates of the number of non decent homes have been derived from a model designed by the Building Research Establishment. This survey will be used to validate the data. The renewal and grants service is being reduced to reflect available capital, and in addition, to meet revenue pressures. Decent homes are essential to supporting independent living.
- Steady progress is being made with compulsory purchase orders (CPO) on long term private sector empty homes. It is too early to identify if the additional resource will have long term sustained impact on reducing the impact of CPO's agreed in previous budget settlement.
- Actions are being taken to reduce the unit costs of Disabled Facilities Grants, but assistance through the Home Improvement Agency is severely limited due to reductions in housing capital programme. It is unlikely the council can meet the CQC Annual Performance Assessment report recommendation to reduce waiting times and the number of people who have to wait. Further options are being worked up for consideration by cabinet.
- We need to expand the offer of Assistive Technology to non social care clients, on a charging basis. Assistive Technology can help older and vulnerable people to continue living independently at home. Under the Social Care Transformation Agenda, the Council will seek to make preventative services more widely available. Other Councils already offer this service for a charge. A project is underway to show how this could be piloted.

Current challenges (Safer & Stronger)

The service area is responsible for putting in place Council-based and partner-based activities in place to reduce crime and disorder in the city. A significant proportion of the overall budget managed within this area is external grants which officers bid for and then commission and deliver activities. The Council has recently been informed that it will be subject to a Red Flag in respect of crime reduction for its CAA. As part of their feedback in respect of this the Audit Commission

representative made reference to a perceived lack of commitment on the part of the Council to adequately tackle this issue.

The community safety work of the council is developed within a partnership infrastructure. A significant challenge is to ensure that the members of the Safer Leicester Partnership (SLP) work together and contribute to the community safety agenda as a whole. Currently whilst there is broad representation on the SLP Board and its constituent sub-groups, partners are not always aware of the contribution they can and need to make to reduce crime in the city. Work needs to take place within the partnership to identify ways in which this challenge can be addressed. Peer Support work will be another mechanism for addressing this issue. A revised structure for the SLP is being proposed to tackle the red flag and local priorities.

Domestic violence and sexual violence continues to be a high priority nationally and for the partnership. The SLP has produced and ratified a multi-agency domestic violence strategy which highlights both the progress to date and the issues which still need to be addressed to reduce the incidents of domestic violence in Leicester. Partners are now in the process of developing a resource plan which will ensure that the areas of work highlighted in the strategy are taken forward. In terms of the work around sexual violence, the partnership has more recently developed a Sexual Violence Strategy; an action plan is currently being drafted. The action plan will also take into account the recommendations of the National Support Team who reviewed our work on sexual violence in October 2009.

The partnership is looking to address the prevention agenda by introducing an Integrated Offender Management (IOM) model which seeks to address the needs of repeat offenders in a bid to reduce offending behaviour. Other strategic themes within the Leicester Partnership need to contribute to and reflect this work in their plans to ensure a joined up approach to resolving this issue. Evidence indicates that monies invested in this preventative work will save agencies far more in the future this is essentially an “invest to save” model.

Serious Acquisitive Crime (SAC) which comprises of robbery, burglary and vehicle crime is falling in Leicester but we are not seeing the same levels of decreases as other areas, we need a better understanding of why this is the case. Attention also needs to be focussed at other areas of acquisitive crime not named in the indicator - but, nevertheless, will have a significant impact on the volume of offences in the city. This includes the following offences; Burglary other than dwelling, theft other and cycle theft. Retail theft is also a significant issue and work is commencing with the business community to address this issue.

Whilst the partnership has been good at identifying broad priorities and working to these, improvements will be made in defining and “drilling-down” on these priorities (based on evidence and intelligence) which will ensure a level of sophistication in our commissioning process. This work then needs to be followed by the production of a SMART Strategic Partnership Plan, which identifies clear accountability for actions with precise timescales.

Partners agencies if they are to work effectively and collaboratively need to have a good understanding of the needs of the locality and work collaboratively. To support this neighbourhood data profiles related to crime, disorder, victims and offenders will need to be developed assessed and appropriate actions identified.

There are some significant gaps in the information the partnership currently has about victims of crime and we need to improve the equality monitoring information we have. It is acknowledged

that information relating to disability and sexual orientation is lacking, and that what we have relating to religion and belief is only very partial. We need to work with partners to improve data collection in relation to these gaps, an option could be that all partners agree and adopt categories used in the Councils Equalities Monitoring Form.

In the light of the Pilkington case and other safeguarding issues, we need to undertake an exercise which will identify the level of service and support that the local community can expect from agencies when dealing with ASB issues. In addition to this, the current ASB strategy needs to be refreshed in order to reflect and include changes in legislation and policy.

Current Challenges (Libraries)

Delivering the Libraries Strategy arrangements including reduced levels of resources will require existing and new partnership working and planning to deliver:-

- A significant Libraries network of delivery points (located wherever is best and deliverable in conjunction with other neighbourhood services)
- A bookfund that at least is not reduced or if possible grows
- The management capacity and skills to develop services and form partnerships in a rapidly changing environment

Current Challenges (Environmental Services)

The City Warden Service that was piloted in half of the city in 2009/10 will be rolled-out citywide in 2010/11 as part of the One Leicester policy of zero tolerance towards vandalism, litter and graffiti.

Cleansing Services will continue to provide street cleaning and graffiti removal services that are responsive to the needs of local communities.

Parks & Greenspace services will work to maintain the green flag status of city parks and will implement the Greenspace and Allotments strategies.

Environmental health and other statutory services will use enforcement powers where necessary to deal with rubbish accumulations, unsightly land and other similar problems relating to privately owned land and buildings.

The City Council provides a wide range of enforcement, regulatory and statutory services in relation to environmental health, trading standards, licensing and building control, which it has a statutory duty to provide. These services are also provided in response to service requests from businesses and the public. A number of budget reductions will reduce the services' capacity to respond to certain service requests from businesses and the public. However, whilst there may be some consequential public and business dissatisfaction with any reduced level of service, every effort will be made to ensure that priority issues are responded to and that the Council meets its minimum statutory obligations.

Current Challenges (Community Services)

The current building portfolio contains centres in varying states of usability. There are differing issues around the maintenance, repairs and general upkeep of centres, although investment has taken place over the previous two years. A significant increase has been recognised in those buildings where investment has taken place, however it is clear to see that further and more substantial investment is necessary. The change in the habits of people's leisure time has a marked impact on the use of community buildings. The elderly provide a large percentage of usage

however there needs are changing and the centres and activities on offer are not attracting new potential users.

The working adult is the lowest user as there are limited activities provided apart from the sports provision at four of the community building operated city wide.

The financial resource to operate the section have provided year on year challenges and options have been developed to provide efficiency reductions however the building stock stands at 38 and due to the complexities associated with each individual building this has provided to be a difficult exercise to resolve.

Commissioning Priorities

Commissioning Priorities (Community Services)

Community buildings do not operate on a commissioned basis but support LCC Services such as Adult Skills and Learning, Early Prevention, Youth Support Services and Learning Disabilities Service. The centres also provide meeting and office space for local groups and organisation at a cost.

One off investment has been proposed to improve community facilities, which will be undertaken in the wider context of Neighbourhood Working and integrated services.

The service also supports 6 voluntary community projects through a grant aid process which is currently being reviewed to introduce a commissioning process in line with the Council's Commissioning Strategy.

Commissioning Priorities (Environmental Services)

Statutory services within the Environmental Services Division will endeavour to fulfil the council's statutory responsibilities and to deliver services that, as far as is possible, reflect One Leicester priorities and meet customer expectations.

The City Warden Service that was piloted in half of the city in 2009/10 will be rolled-out citywide in 2010/11 as part of the One Leicester policy of zero tolerance towards vandalism, litter and graffiti.

Cleansing Services will continue to provide street cleaning and graffiti removal services that are responsive to the needs of local communities.

Parks & Greenspace services will work to maintain the green flag status of city parks and will implement the Greenspace and Allotments strategies.

Environmental health and other statutory services will use enforcement powers where necessary to deal with rubbish accumulations, unsightly land and other similar problems relating to privately owned land and buildings.

Commissioning Priorities Libraries

In order to deliver this agenda, Libraries will need to sustain capacity to develop services in the fast and flexible way that it has done over the last 5 years. Proposed efficiency savings will leave key capacity in place to deliver these outcomes, but only through strong partnership working across services within the priority board and with other services in other boards including Health and Wellbeing, Learning and Skills and Enterprise.

Key resource problems arise from the inability to invest in current library building stock. In order to be effective and well used, library services need to continue to work closely with other neighbourhood services to provide efficient and effective local services that deliver a wide offer.

This will link with the proposal to deliver more integrated services as part of Neighbourhood Working.

Commissioning Priorities (Safer & Stronger)

There are some significant gaps in the information we currently have about victims of crime. We need to improve the equality monitoring information we have. The main source of information comes from the police. It is acknowledged that information relating to disability and sexual orientation is lacking, and that what we have relating to religion and belief is only very partial. We need to work with partners to improve data collection in relation to these gaps, an option could be that all partners agree and adopt categories used in the Councils Equalities Monitoring Form.

Improved intelligence will ensure more outcome focused commissioning activities.

In terms of youth offending, future measures need to accommodate the predicted population growth for the city, which will result in an increase in demand for the service (in the form of referrals) from both the voluntary and statutory agencies.

In respect of developing a more joined up approach to improving outcomes for local people the development of a Neighbourhood Working Model will be a critical piece of work in respect of which the partnership has already dedicated some resources. A group has now been established whose priority it will be to develop a detailed commissioning plan to underpin this work

Further Work

Further work

The context within which our current proposals for efficiency savings have been developed is one of change where our ambition is to improve our customer focus and deliver services more locally in partnership with other providers both statutory and voluntary. We are working with colleagues from across the Council and with the Police to see how best to progress this and to incorporate what will be a different way of delivering services to achieve efficiencies.

In moving towards a Neighbourhood Working Model over the course of this year and next it is recognised that the way in which services are delivered in the future will require different staffing configurations both at an operational and management level across the Council. A Neighbourhood approach will require resources which currently sit in different Divisions and have discrete management and back office arrangements to be deployed at a local level through a local management structure to meet locally identified needs. This will reduce duplication of effort and over time make better use of buildings and staff.

Some quick wins in respect of bringing together Housing and Neighbourhood Managers to lead on co-ordinating services in their locality and making best use of building stock have already been identified in proposals which have been put forward both as part of this process by Community Services, Libraries and housing and as part of delivering the Community Services Modernisation agenda.

Current proposals include library provision, where appropriate, being relocated into community or children's centres. Where community centres have been assessed as not being cost effective consideration will be given to relocating services elsewhere within the locality e.g. if Netherhall were to be closed some services could go into Hamilton Library as part of creating a multi purpose site. Making best use of our current building stock will be further explored as part of the Housing Management review and the ongoing efficiency savings process over the course of the next two years.

Discussions are also taking place in respect of how the above work will compliment and link into the locality working being developed by CYPS through integrated service hubs and children's centres. Again this work is at a very early stage but will provide further opportunities to rationalise effort and to target services where they are most needed in communities.

Co-location of staff from different service areas in local neighbourhoods has already been achieved within the Brite Centre with improved customer access to a wide range of services. The development within some of our more substantive and structurally sound buildings of more multi purpose centres centred on meeting customer need would have the benefit of freeing up building stock at the centre and provide a rationale for closing buildings which are no longer fit for purpose without substantial inward investment. It would also, through co-location, encourage joint and cross service working approaches and therefore a customer rather than service based approach to delivery.

In effect, and as a means of mainstreaming a neighbourhood working approach, every member of staff working within a locality building could in the future carry out some of the community development functions currently embedded within a Community Service Officers post with facility management functions shared across a range of services including the community sector rather than be delivered just by one.

This would reduce duplication of effort and free up resources whilst still enabling the quality of service to improve.

Efficiencies

Efficiencies to be achieved

Describes the areas where the Priority Board has identified efficiencies can be achieved in projects/programmes, activities and services relating directly to the priority.

| Description of efficiency | | <u>2010/11</u> £000s | <u>2011/12</u> £000s | <u>2012/13</u> £000s | Accountable officer |
|----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Cash releasing: | | | | | |
| Efficiency Savings | | | | | |
| R1 | Reduction in Service Costs | (15) | (15) | (15) | D Pancholi |
| R2 | Community Safety Service | (0) | (0) | (28) | D. Pancholi |
| R29 | Efficiencies in Admin Support | (0) | (0) | (40) | A. Habens |
| R14 | YOS Admin Support | (0) | (0) | (50) | D. Pancholi |
| | Efficiencies through Neighbourhood Working | (0) | (100) | (100) | tba |
| R24 | Staff purchasing additional leave | (0) | (10) | (10) | tba |
| R55 | Management Savings | (0) | (10) | (10) | A. Russell |
| R59 | Team Assistant Reduction | (10) | (42) | (42) | A. Wills |
| Non-cash releasing: | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Cash releasing savings should also be reflected at Appendix A.

Budget Growth and Reduction Proposals

Budget Growth & Reduction Proposals

LCC THRIVING, SAFE COMMUNITIES PRIORITY BOARD CABINET MEETING 16/12/09

| BUDGET GROWTH & REDUCTION PROPOSALS | | 2010/11 | 2011/12 | 2012/13 |
|--|---------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 |
| GROWTH PROPOSALS | | | | |
| Safer & Stronger Communities Division | | | | |
| TSG1 | Community Facilities | 50.0 | 300.0 | 315.0 |
| TSG3 | Investment in Communities | 500.0 | | |
| Cultural Services | | | | |
| TSG5 | DeMonfort Hall re-furbishment | 200.0 | | |
| TSG6 | New Walk Museum improvements | 8.0 | | |
| TSG7 | Jewry Wall | 42.0 | | |
| TSG8 | Beaumont Leys library carpeting | 20.0 | | |
| TSG9 | Belgrave Hall historic guttering | 25.0 | | |
| TSG10 | Park improvements | 30.0 | | |
| City Centre Regeneration | | | | |
| TSG11 | Improvements to Christmas decorations | 70.0 | | |
| Housing | | | | |
| TSG12 | Aids and adaptations | 200.0 | | |
| Total Growth | | 1,145.0 | 300.0 | 315.0 |

| REDUCTION PROPOSALS | | 2010/11 | 2011/12 | 2012/13 |
|---|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 |
| Safer & Stronger Communities | | | | |
| <u>Community Safety</u> | | | | |
| R1&28 | Reduction in Service Costs eg room hire, printing etc | 15.5 | 15.5 | 15.5 |
| R2 | Inter-agency Community Safety Bureau(ICSB) reduce analytical posts from 3 to 2 | | | 28.0 |
| R29 | Efficiencies in Admin/PA support on A1(reduction of 2 posts) | | | 40.0 |
| <u>LASBU</u> | | | | |
| R13 | Legal fee savings already achieved | 17.0 | 17.0 | 17.0 |
| <u>YOS</u> | | | | |
| R14 | Delete 2.5 admin posts | | | 50.0 |
| R92 | Review of Neighbourhood working | | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|--|-------|-------|-------|
| | Housing | | | |
| | - | | | |
| | <u>Housing Options</u> | | | |
| R16 | B&B Budget not required | 66.0 | 66.0 | 66.0 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | <u>Priv Sector Housing & Development</u> | | | |
| R15 | Delete 1 Home Improvement Officer | 0.0 | 33.0 | 33.0 |
| R39 | Delete 1 Home Maintenance Advisor and 1 Decent Homes Officer | | 67.0 | 67.0 |
| | | | | |
| | <u>VOLOs</u> | | | |
| R41 | Reconfiguration of voluntary sector as part Supporting People Strategy | | 31.0 | 31.0 |
| | - | | | |
| | Environmental Services Division | | | |
| | <u>Street Scene Enforcement</u> | | | |
| R17 | City Wardens | 155.0 | 200.0 | 200.0 |
| R53 | Enviro Crime Team | | | 40.0 |
| R42 | Area Environmental Health | | | 45.0 |
| R43 | Private Sector Housing | | 45.0 | 45.0 |
| R44 | Gypsy & Traveller Liaison & Enforcement | | | 20.0 |
| | | | | |
| | <u>Business Regulation</u> | | | |
| R54 | Trading Standards | | 45.0 | 45.0 |
| | | | | |
| | <u>Licensing & Pollution Control</u> | | | |
| R18 | Licensing Income | 60.0 | 60.0 | 60.0 |
| R19&R45 | Noise Control | 45.0 | 45.0 | 90.0 |
| | One-off savings brought forward | | 45.0 | |
| R46 | Pollution Control Team | | 45.0 | 45.0 |
| | | | | |
| | <u>Parks & Green Spaces</u> | | | |
| R20&R47 | Leicester in Bloom | | 75.0 | 75.0 |
| R21 | Land Management | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| R49 | Review Play Area Provision | | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| | | | | |
| | <u>Waste & Cleansing</u> | | | |
| R23 | Additional Income | 25.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
| | | | | |
| | <u>Division/General</u> | | | |
| R24 | Staff voluntary purchase of additional leave/reduced hours | | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| R22,R48, R55 | Management and Organisational Savings | 25.0 | 190.0 | 190.0 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | Cultural Services (Libraries) | | | |
| R58 | Revised arrangements for management of Older | 5.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 |

Budget Plan:

Describes the rationale used for budget growth and savings proposed.

Equality Impact Assessment:

Identify expected significant equality impacts arising from budget growth and reduction proposals. These will be supported by formal EIAs (not reported here).

Formally EIAs are currently being finalised but at this stage it is expected that there will be no adverse equality implications that would negatively impact on Service Users' well being (as defined by the Equality and Human Rights Commission); nor any negative impact on equalities in so far as the proposals affect staffing.

Individual EIAs will be made available for scrutiny in the members' area once they have been completed.

BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | |
| <u>SAFER AND STRONGER COMMUNITIES DIVISION</u> | | | | |
| <u>BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11</u> | | | | |
| SERVICE AREA Community Services | | | Proposal No: TS G1 | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | |
| Improvements to community facilities | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Service Improvement | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| Balance of savings from original review of community centres, which now needs to be considered as part of wider moves to neighbourhood management in the city as a whole. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Decisions already taken/Service Improvement/Other | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | | | |
| | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | |
| | <u>Existing Budget</u> | <u>Proposed Addition</u> | | |
| Staff | 3,068 | | | |
| Non Staff Costs | 2,942 | | | |
| Income | (2,023) | | | |
| Net Total | 3,987 | 50 | 300 | 315 |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | | | |
| | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | | | |

SAFER AND STRONGER COMMUNITIES DIVISION

BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

Individual Pro-formas for growth and reduction proposals

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Community Services | | Proposal No: TS G3 | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | |
| One off investment into specific community activities. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Service Improvement | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| The investment will provide improvements to community facilities, in the wider context of management efficiencies that will be gained from the development of neighbourhood working. Specific proposals will be brought to Cabinet for approval. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | | | |
| | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Addition | | |
| Staff | 3,068 | | | |
| Non Staff Costs | 2,942 | 500 | | |
| Income | (2,023) | | | |
| Net Total | 3,987 | 500 | | |
| Staffing Implications | | | | |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | | | |

CULTURAL SERVICES DIVISION

BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA – Arts and Museums | | Proposal No: TS G5 | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | |
| Refurbishment of De Montfort Hall | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Service Improvement | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| This investment will enable selected improvements to be made to front of house facilities and other key areas to enable standards of customer service to be maintained and improved | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: During 2010/11 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Addition | | |
| Staff | 1,214 | | | |
| Non Staff Costs | 3,778 | 200 | 0 | 0 |
| Income | (4,261) | | | |
| Net Total | 731 | 200 | 0 | 0 |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | 0 | 0 | 0 |

CULTURAL SERVICES DIVISION

BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA – Arts and Museums | | Proposal No: TS G6 | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | |
| New Walk Museum – Improvements to entrance and decoration of former retail space | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Service Improvement | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| This will improve first impressions of customers when entering New Walk Museum and will enable the City Gallery Shop to operate from within the Museum whilst the replacement Gallery is being built | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: Summer 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | | | |
| | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Addition | | |
| Staff | 267 | | | |
| Non Staff Costs | 216 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| Income | | | | |
| Net Total | 483 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | | | |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | 0 | 0 | 0 |

CULTURAL SERVICES DIVISION

BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA – Arts and Museums | | Proposal No: TS G7 | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | |
| Jewry Wall Museum – Install Virtual Roman Leicester digital media experience (developed by DMU/ULAS in association with the Museums Service), including equipment and exhibition display | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Service Improvement | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| This project builds on recently excavated evidence to provide a 3D tour of Roman Leicester with interactive features and commentary. This will increase the number of visitors to Jewry Wall Museum and profile Leicester’s Roman heritage and its modern university and digital capabilities | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: Spring/Summer 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | | | |
| | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Addition | | |
| Staff | 57 | | | |
| Non Staff Costs | 17 | 42 | 0 | 0 |
| Income | | | | |
| Net Total | 74 | 42 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | | | |
| | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | 0 | 0 | 0 |

CULTURAL SERVICES DIVISION

BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA – Libraries | | Proposal No: TS G8 | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | | |
| Beaumont Leys Library – Replacement of Carpet and resolution of uneven floor surface | | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | | |
| Service Improvement | | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | | |
| Improvement in Customer service and resolution of potential Health and Safety Hazard | | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | | |
| Date: Spring/Summer 2010 | | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Addition | | | |
| Staff | 201 | | | | |
| Non Staff Costs | 60 | 20 | 0 | | 0 |
| Income | (22) | | | | |
| Net Total | 239 | 20 | 0 | | 0 |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> | |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | | |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | 0 | 0 | | 0 |

CULTURAL SERVICES DIVISION

BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA – Arts and Museums | | Proposal No: TS G9 | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | |
| Belgrave Hall – Re-instate historic guttering (originally removed to protect from theft) | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Service Improvement | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| Belgrave Hall’s historic lead gutters were removed in 2008 to protect them from theft at a time when high lead prices had led to an epidemic of thefts across the country. This has led to customer criticism and detracts from the visitor experience. This funding will enable an appropriate re-instatement in accordance with English Heritage Best Practice | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: Autumn 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Addition | | |
| Staff | 94 | | | |
| Non Staff Costs | 77 | 25 | 0 | 0 |
| Income | (7) | | | |
| Net Total | 164 | 25 | 0 | 0 |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | 0 | 0 | 0 |

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DIVISION

BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA – Parks | | Proposal No: TS G10 | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | | |
| Park Improvements | | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | | |
| Service Improvement | | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | | |
| To enable a small number of improvements to be made to selected parks to improve customer service and facilities available | | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | | |
| Date: 2010/11 | | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Addition | | | |
| Staff | 3,904 | | | | |
| Non Staff Costs | 2,024 | 30 | 0 | | 0 |
| Income | (1,940) | | | | |
| Net Total | 3,988 | 30 | 0 | | 0 |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> | |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | | |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | 0 | 0 | | 0 |

REGENERATION, TRANSPORT & HIGHWAYS DIVISION
BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA – Street Lighting | | Proposal No: TS G11 | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | | |
| Improvements to City Centre Christmas Decorations | | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | | |
| Service Improvement | | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | | |
| This proposal will provide further improvements to the visitor experience in the City Centre over the Christmas period, and is part of the wider programme of City Centre regeneration which has been progressing over a number of years. | | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | | |
| Date: Autumn 2010 | | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Addition | | | |
| Staff | | | | | |
| Non Staff Costs | 108 | 70 | 0 | | 0 |
| Income | | | | | |
| Net Total | 108 | 70 | 0 | | 0 |
| Staffing Implications | | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | | |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |

BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA – Housing | | Proposal No: TS G12 | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | |
| Aids and adaptations to help off-set reduced capital funding. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Service Improvement | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| To help reduce waiting lists for vulnerable people | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: Autumn 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | | | |
| | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Addition | | |
| Staff | | | | |
| Non Staff Costs | | 200 | 0 | 0 |
| Income | | | | |
| Net Total | 0 | 200 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | | | |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | 0 | 0 | 0 |

SAFER AND STRONGER DIVISION

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Community Safety | | Proposal No: TS R1 & 28 | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> The service area is responsible for putting in place council-based and partner-based activities in place to reduce crime and disorder in the city. Furthermore, the service is responsible for identifying and investigating anti-social behaviour in the city. A significant proportion of the overall budget managed within this area is external grant which officers bid for and then commission and deliver activities to meet the funding requirements. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Efficiency – reduction in certain running costs. | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> None. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> Date: 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | |
| Staff | | | | |
| Non Staff Costs | 29 | 15.5 | 15.5 | 15.5 |
| Income | | | | |
| Net Total | 29 | 15.5 | 15.5 | 15.5 |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | Not applicable | | | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | |

SAFER AND STRONGER DIVISION

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|----|
| SERVICE AREA Community Safety | | Proposal No: TS R2 | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> The service area is responsible for putting in place council-based and partner-based activities in place to reduce crime and disorder in the city. Furthermore, the service is responsible for identifying and investigating anti-social behaviour in the city. A significant proportion of the overall budget managed within this area is external grant which officers bid for and then commission and deliver activities to meet the funding requirements. | | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> | | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Efficiency. | | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> The function of the ICSB team is to provide analytical data, identifying ASB issues and hotspots in the city which would then benefit from multi-agency problem solving. The impact of reducing the number of analyst from 3 to 2 is difficult to gauge as the team has had a high turn-over and has rarely been at full strength. The council's contribution for 2008/09 was only £60k due to unfilled vacancies. | | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> Date: 2011 | | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | | | | |
| | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000 | |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | | |
| | <u>Existing Budget</u> | <u>Proposed Reduction</u> | | | |
| Staff | 84 | | | | 28 |
| Non Staff Costs | | | | | |
| Income | | | | | |
| Net Total | 84 | | | | 28 |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | | | | |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | | |

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | Proposal No: TS R13 | | | |
| All Areas | | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> | | | | |
| Leicester Anti Social Behaviour Unit. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> | | | | |
| Reduction in legal fees associated with the work of the LASBU | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Decisions already taken | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| .None – the legal fees budgets currently underspends | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: April 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | | | |
| | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | |
| Staff | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non Staff Costs | 166 | 17 | 17 | 17 |
| Income | | | | |
| Net Total | 166 | 17 | 17 | 17 |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | | | |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | |

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | Proposal No: TS R14 | | | |
| All Areas | | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> | | | | |
| <p>Youth Offending Service activities primarily support Creating Thriving Safe communities and investing in our Children priorities. YOS is the only Council service with statutory responsibility for preventing offending and reducing re-offending by Children and Young People.</p> <p>Associated priorities are also health and wellbeing linked to drug and alcohol and substance misuse services provided by YOS, and investing in skills and enterprise linked to NI 45 increasing young offenders into Education, Training and Employment.</p> <p>The YOS is currently rated as excellent with outstanding prospects for future improvement with green flag proposals, for CAA on reducing first time entrants and reducing reoffending by young people. This is in contrast to the wider CAA picture where overall crime is a red flag. This saving is proposed for 12/13 but not 10/11, in order to support the Authority's immediate improvement agenda in respect of crime reduction.</p> | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> | | | | |
| Delete 2.5 admin posts | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Efficiency cash releasing | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| .The YOS will be undertaking a full service review in 2010/11 and it is expected that this efficiency saving will be found without any impact upon the service. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: April 2012 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | | | |
| | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | |
| Staff | 2,401 | | | 50 |
| Non Staff Costs | 863 | | | |
| Income | (2,289) | | | |
| Net Total | 975 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | 91* of which Admin comprise 12 FTE | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | 2.5 FTE |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | 1.5 |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | 0 |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | |

Housing Strategy and Options DIVISION

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Housing Renewal and Grants | | Proposal No: TS R15 | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> The Renewal and Grants Service provides a range of services to vulnerable and low income home owners to help meet the corporate plan targets to increase the number of private sector homes that meet the Decent Homes target and reduce the number of private Empty Homes . The service helps <i>regenerate communities</i> by its work in Home Improvement Areas and supports <i>independent living</i> through the Citywide Home Maintenance services . Most assistance is provided through the Home Improvement Agency. Home Improvement grants and Disabled Facilities grants are provided and the agency service assists the homeowner through all stages of the process including supervision of the work on site. A lower level of assistance is provided to those people that choose to organise the work themselves, and independent Disabled Facilities Grants (DFG) are determined. In 2008-09 the service improved 329 owner-occupied homes, (305 occupied by vulnerable households and 24 by low-income households.) and adapted 165 homes for disabled people. 2590 vulnerable households were assisted through the City Wide Home Maintenance Service. 153 long term vacant homes were brought back into use over the last 9 months. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Delete one post of Home Improvement Officer | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Service Reduction | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> Less private homes brought up to decent homes standard, arising from reduction in capital available for private sector decent homes. It is most likely that further HIO posts that are currently capitalised will be deleted when the housing capital programme is agreed in January 2010. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> April 2011 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | | | |
| | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | |
| Staff | 1,514.4 | | 33 | 33 |
| Non Staff Costs | 419.1 | | | |
| Income | (1,265.4) | | | |
| Net Total | 668.1 | | 33 | 33 |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | <u>1</u> | <u>1</u> |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | 0 | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | 1 | | | |

Housing Strategy and Options DIVISION

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| SERVICE AREA Housing Options | | Proposal No: TS R16 | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> The strategic context for the Housing Options Service is provided by the Homelessness Strategy, approved by Cabinet in July 2009. The statutory functions of the Housing Options Service are to provide advice and assistance to prevent homelessness, to determine homeless applications, arrange temporary accommodation, and to produce the Council's Housing Allocation Policy and audit its implementation. Annual service users (including personal callers, telephone contacts, dedicated office interviews, repeat contacts and home visits) total circa. 60,600 pa. The service had c27, 000 personal contacts with customers and gave detailed Housing Options interviews to 2,400 clients in 2008/09. Bed and Breakfast is used as a last resort where efforts to prevent homelessness have failed and where there is a statutory duty to provide temporary emergency accommodation and there are no suitable hostel bed spaces. The length of stay in bed and breakfast is minimised by moving service users into hostels when next possible. | | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Reduce Bed and Breakfast budget to predicted 09/10 expenditure | | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Efficiency Cash Releasing : the budget is no longer required. | | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> Nil, but statutory service which must be provided if demand rises | | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> Date: April 2010 | | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | | | | |
| | <u>2009-10</u> | <u>2010-11</u> £66k | <u>2011-12</u> £66k | <u>2012-13</u> £66k | |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | | |
| | <u>Existing Budget</u> | <u>Proposed Reduction</u> | | | |
| Staff | | | | | |
| Non Staff Costs | 1,330 | 66 | 66 | 66 | |
| Income | | | | | |
| Net Total | 1,330 | 66 | 66 | 66 | |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | | | | |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | nil | nil | <u>nil</u> | <u>nil</u> | |

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA City Wardens | Proposal No: TS R 17 | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> Working with local communities to improve the quality of the local environment on a more proactive basis. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> The previously agreed growth of £200K for the city-wide roll-out of this service in 2010/11 would have provided a total budget sufficient to fund approximately 14 City Wardens. This proposal involves substituting that growth funding with short-term waste funding available within existing budgets so as to enable a total of 22 City Wardens (nominally one per ward) to be employed city-wide over the next two years. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Decision already taken (Cabinet, 30/11/2009) | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> This will maximise the impact of the service over the next 2 years as it is rolled-out citywide, helping to improve local environments throughout the city and helping to fully implement the One Leicester policy of zero tolerance towards vandalism, litter and graffiti. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> Date:1/4/10 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | |
| Staff | 380 | 155 | 200 | 200 |
| Non Staff Costs | 19 | | | |
| Income | 0 | | | |
| Net Total | 399 | 155 | 200 | 200 |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | |

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DIVISION

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Licensing | Proposal No: TS R 18 | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> To provide a range of statutory licensing services within the city. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Increase in the service's income budget by £60,000 to reflect increased income received in recent years. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Other | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> None, providing recent income trends are maintained. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> Date: 1/4/2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | |
| Staff | | | | |
| Non Staff Costs | | | | |
| Income | 606 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| Net Total | 606 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | |

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DIVISION

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Noise Control | Proposal No: TS R 19 & 45 | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> To provide a noise monitoring and control service in relation to complaints from the public about domestic, commercial and industrial noise problems. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> A noise monitoring service is currently provided daytimes and evenings, 7 days a week. It is proposed to reduce this to a Wednesday to Sunday service, with the team being reduced by one f.t.e., saving £45,000, with effect from 2010/11. A further £45,000 budget reduction will be introduced subsequently, but it is hoped that a review of the staffing arrangements within the service will minimise any further reduction in the operating hours of the service. A one off saving of £45k will be available in 2011/12 to maintain existing budgets for a further year. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Service Reduction | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> Residents experiencing noise problems on Mondays and Tuesdays may find it frustrating that no service is provided on these days of the week. However, in the vast majority of cases, such problems will occur on other days of the week (and especially on Friday nights and the weekend) when the service will be operating and the necessary evidence for action can be obtained. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> <p align="right">Date: 1/4/2010</p> | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | |
| Staff | 474 | 45 | 45 | 90 |
| Non Staff Costs | 49 | | 45 | |
| Income | 0 | | | |
| Net Total | 523 | 45 | 90 | 90 |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | 12 | | | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | 11 |

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DIVISION

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Parks & Green Spaces | Proposal No: TS R 20 & 47 | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> Provision and maintenance of attractive parks and green spaces in the city. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Reducing the Leicester in Bloom budget by £75,000 from 2011/12. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Service Reduction | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> In recent years Leicester has entered urban regeneration category of East Midlands in Bloom the regional competition of Britain in Bloom, organised by the Royal Horticultural Society. However, this category of the competition has been discontinued, which provides an opportunity to make savings in this area. The principal and most popular elements of floral displays in the city centre will continue to be provided over the next three years and additional external funding/sponsorship opportunities will be explored. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> Date: | | | | |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | |
| Staff | | | | |
| Non Staff Costs | 75 | 0 | 75 | 75 |
| Income | | | | |
| Net Total | 75 | 0 | 75 | 75 |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | |

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DIVISION

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Parks & Green Spaces | Proposal No: TS R 21 | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> Provision and maintenance of attractive parks and green spaces in the city. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> The arrangements and responsibilities for open space land and tree management within the Council will be reviewed with a view to delivering efficiency savings, against which a nominal target of £10,000 has been set. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Decisions already taken/Efficiency Cash Releasing/Efficiency- Non Cash Releasing/ Service Reduction/Other | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> This should improve the service provided to the public by making it easier for open space land and tree management responsibilities to be identified. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> Date: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | |
| Staff | | | | |
| Non Staff Costs | 1,998 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Income | | | | |
| Net Total | 1,998 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | |

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DIVISION

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Whole Division | | Proposal No: TS R 22, 48 & 55 | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> Provision of Environmental Services within the city. | | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Management and other organisational savings within the Division. | | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Decisions already taken/Efficiency Cash Releasing/ Efficiency - Non Cash Releasing/ Service Reduction/Other | | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> An organisational review of the management structure within the Parks & Green Spaces, Cleansing Services and other areas of the Division will be undertaken in 2010/11. Whilst it is hoped that there will be no significant service implications, this cannot be confirmed until the organisational review has been completed. | | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> Date: 01/04/09 (in part) | | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | | |
| | <u>Existing Budget</u> | <u>Proposed Reduction</u> | | | |
| Staff | 1,200 | 25 | 190 | 190 | |
| Non Staff Costs | | | | | |
| Income | | | | | |
| Net Total | 1,200 | 25 | 190 | 190 | |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> | |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | 30 | | | | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | 1 | 4-5 | 4-5 | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | 0 | 29 | 29 | |

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DIVISION

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Waste Management | Proposal No: TS R 23 | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> Provision of refuse collection and waste recycling services in the city | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> The criteria and charges for bulk waste collections and replacement wheelie bins will be revised so as to provide £25,000 additional income. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Decisions already taken/Efficiency Cash Releasing/Efficiency- Non Cash Releasing/ Service Reduction/ Other | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> The review of criteria and charges for bulk waste collections and replacement wheelie bins will focus on changes that will encourage residents to recycle & compost and to take better care of their wheelie bin. Consequently these changes should help to improve waste recycling & composting levels and help to ensure that wheelie bins are not left out on pavements where they can go missing. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> <p align="right">Date: 01/04/2010</p> | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | |
| Staff | | | | |
| Non Staff Costs | | | | |
| Income | 27 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| Net Total | 27 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | |

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DIVISION

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Environmental Services Division | Proposal No: TS R 24 | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> Provision of environmental services within the city | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Reducing overall staffing costs by allowing staff in appropriate areas to voluntarily purchase additional annual leave and/or to slightly reduce their working hours. A nominal savings target of £10,000 has been set whilst this new idea is piloted within the division. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Decisions already taken/Efficiency Cash Releasing/ Efficiency - Non Cash Releasing/ Service Reduction/Other | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> There should be no significant service implications as this will only be offered in relevant service areas. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> Date: | | | | |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | |
| Staff | | | 10 | 10 |
| Non Staff Costs | | | | |
| Income | | | | |
| Net Total | 18,641 | | 10 | 10 |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | |

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Libraries | | Proposal No: TS R 25 | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> Library information, informal learning, reading promotion and lending services in the city centre, for city centre workers, residents and citywide excluded communities | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Consolidating the 2 central library services into the existing Learning and Information library site to enable the development of a city centre multi-access centre in the existing central lending library | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Efficiency/Service improvement | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> The consolidation will provide a multi-access centre for developing the skills of unemployed people in the existing Central Lending Library building which supports a key aim of the Council's budget strategy. The location of the centre will become an integral part of the Adult Education College, whose buildings encircle the existing lending library. Consolidation will bring together complementary services in the same way as the city's successful neighbourhood libraries. The 2008 Libraries Strategy lays out the aim of bringing central services together in a modernised format in one building. Ideally this step would have been in a new purpose built building, but this measure brings services together in one location in Town Hall Square, which is rapidly becoming the focus of city centre front line service delivery. The consolidation will mean that the service can be run more efficiently with less staff. The printed music score service will be delivered from another city location, but the service will offer key services as now. CDs and DVDs for loan will continue to be available at the Central Library as will free access public computers. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> <div style="text-align: right;">Date: 2010 following consultation process with staff</div> | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | | | |
| | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £228.0 | <u>2012-13</u> £228.0 |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | |
| | <u>Existing Budget</u> | <u>Proposed Reduction</u> | | |
| Staff | 812.2 | | 228.0 | 228.0 |
| Non Staff Costs | | | | |
| Income | | | | |
| Net Total | | | 228.0 | 228.0 |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | | | |
| | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | 36.5 | 23.43 | 23.43 | 23.43 |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | 13.07 | 13.07 | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | 3.91 | 3.91 | | |
| Individuals at risk | 46 | 46 | | |

SERVICE AREA Planning and Policy**Proposal No: TS R 27****Purpose of Service:**

Planning and Policy

Details of Proposed Reduction:

Planning advertisements. Planning regulations are set to change in 2010 which will allow planning applications and other notices to be advertised through the Councils website, rather than through paid advertisement in the print media

Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)

Efficiency

Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)

Please note: Commissioning details for Planning Service included in 'Planning for People not Cars' Commissioning Statement.

Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication

Date: 2010 following consultation process with staff

Financial Implications of Proposal**2009-10****2010-11****2011-12****2012-13****Effects of Changes on budget**

| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Staff | | | | |
| Non Staff Costs | 183 | | 30 | 40 |
| Income | | | | |
| Net Total | 183 | | 30 | 40 |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | |
| Individuals at risk | | | | |

SAFER & STRONGER DIVISION

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Community Safety | | Proposal No: TS R29 | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> The service area is responsible for putting in place council-based and partner-based activities in place to reduce crime and disorder in the city. Furthermore, the service is responsible for identifying and investigating anti-social behaviour in the city. A significant proportion of the overall budget managed within this area is external grant which officers bid for and then commission and deliver activities to meet the funding requirements. | | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> | | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Delete from establishment on A1, two administrative/ PA posts. | | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> A review of back office functions is being carried out with a view to driving out duplication and also of reducing bureaucracy which is expected to identify these savings with minimal impact on service delivery in order to better support the Council's improvement plan for Community safety, their savings have been deferred until 12/13. | | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> Date: 2011 | | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £00,000 | <u>2012-13</u> £40,000 |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | | |
| Staff | 428 | | | | 40 |
| Non Staff Costs | | | | | |
| Income | | | | | |
| Net Total | 428 | | | | 40 |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | 19 | | | 2 | 2 |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | | |

Housing Strategy and Options DIVISION

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|--|------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Renewal and Grants | | Proposal No: TS R39 | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> | | | | |
| <p>The Renewal and Grants Service provides a range of services to vulnerable and low income home owners to help meet the corporate plan targets to increase the number of private sector homes that meet the Decent Homes target and reduce the number of private Empty Homes. The service helps <i>regenerate communities</i> by its work in Home Improvement Areas and supports <i>independent living</i> through the Citywide Home Maintenance services.</p> <p>Most assistance is provided through the Home Improvement Agency. Home Improvement grants and Disabled Facilities grants are provided and the agency service assists the homeowner through all stages of the process including supervision of the work on site. A lower level of assistance is provided to those people that choose to organise the work themselves, and independent Disabled Facilities Grants (DFG) are determined.</p> <p>In 2008-09 the service improved 329 owner-occupied homes, (305 occupied by vulnerable households and 24 by low-income households.) and adapted 165 homes for disabled people. 2590 vulnerable households were assisted through the City Wide Home Maintenance Service. 153 long term vacant homes were brought back into use over the last 9 months.</p> | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> | | | | |
| Delete one post of two Home Maintenance Advisor | | | | |
| Delete one post of two Decent Homes Officer | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Service Reduction | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| <p>The Home Maintenance Advisor offers advice and assistance to those living in non decent private homes that do not qualify for grant aid. The assistance includes provision of advisory work schedules and advice on DIY and /or employing a builder and referral to other services eg home energy, home handy person etc. In 2008/9 advice and assistance was given to 230 households.</p> <p>The Decent Homes Officer supports work in the Home improvement Areas (promotion, public consultation, pre grant liaison) and also visits cases where very vulnerable home owners live in homes well below the decent homes standard but who are not in Home Improvement Areas. They help identify other sources of help and advice and on whether grant should be given on an exceptional basis.</p> | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | | | |
| | <u>2009-10</u> | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | |
| Staff | 1,514.4 | | 67 | 67 |
| Non Staff Costs | 419.1 | | | |
| Income | (1,265.4) | | | |
| Net Total | 668.1 | | | |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | | | |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | 2 | | 2 | 2 |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | 1 | | 1 | 1 |

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Voluntary Sector Funding | | Proposal No: R41 | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> | | | | |
| To Provide support to Homeless people | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> | | | | |
| Reduce funding to voluntary sector as part of the Strategic review of Homeless services with no impact on service delivery. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Decisions already taken/Efficiency/Service Reduction/Other | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | | | |
| | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Addition | | |
| Staff | | | | |
| Non Staff Costs | 206 | | 31 | 31 |
| Income | | | | |
| Net Total | 206 | | 31 | 31 |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | | | |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | |

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Area Environmental Health | Proposal No: TS R 42 | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> To provide a range of local environmental health services in relation to nuisances, drainage, accumulation of rubbish on private land, derelict and insecure premises etc. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Reducing the team by one f.t.e. post from 2012/13 | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Service Reduction | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> This staffing reduction will reduce the capacity of the service to respond to service requests from the public and other services, such as the City Warden Service. However, this should not affect the service's ability to support the expanded City Warden service over the next two years. The specific nature of work that will not be undertaken from 2012/13 cannot be identified at this stage as this will be reviewed and prioritised on an on-going basis so as to ensure that work with a relatively high priority is protected. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> Date: 1/4/2012 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | |
| Staff | 287 | | | 45 |
| Non Staff Costs | 78 | | | |
| Income | 11 | | | |
| Net Total | 354 | | | 45 |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | 7 | | | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | 1 |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | 0 | | | 0 |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | 7 | | | 7 |

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Private Sector Housing | Proposal No: TS R43 | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> Providing statutory enforcement & regulation services in relation to private sector rented housing accommodation, including the licensing of houses in multiple occupation. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> To reduce the team by one f.t.e. post with effect from 2011/12. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Service Reduction/Other | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> This will result in a reduction in the amount of work undertaken by the team and is likely to result in a reduction in the number of inspections undertaken and service requests dealt with. The specific nature of work that will not be undertaken cannot be identified at this stage as this will be reviewed and prioritised on an on-going basis so as to ensure that work with a relatively high priority is protected. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> <p style="text-align: right;">Date:</p> | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | |
| Staff | 322 | | 45 | 45 |
| Non Staff Costs | 31 | | | |
| Income | 86 | | | |
| Net Total | 267 | | 45 | 45 |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | 6.5 | | | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | 1 | 1 |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | 5.5 | | 5.5 | 5.5 |

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DIVISION

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Pollution Control Team | | Proposal No: TS R 46 | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> To regulate atmospheric emissions from potentially polluting industries within the city, to investigate pollution complaints from the public, to monitor local air quality and to investigate and advise on contaminated land in the city. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Reducing the team by one f.t.e. post. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Service Reduction | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> This will result in a reduction in the amount of pollution control work undertaken within the city. The specific nature of work that will not be undertaken cannot be identified at this stage as this will be reviewed and prioritised on an on-going basis so as to ensure that work with a relatively high priority is protected. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> Date: 01/04/2011 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | |
| | <u>Existing Budget</u> | <u>Proposed Reduction</u> | | |
| Staff | 230 | | 45 | 45 |
| Non Staff Costs | 24 | | | |
| Income | 89 | | | |
| Net Total | 165 | | 45 | 45 |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | 5 | | | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | 1 | 1 |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | 0 | 0 |

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DIVISION

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Parks & Green Spaces | Proposal No: TS R 49 | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> Provision and maintenance of attractive parks and green spaces in the city. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> A review of play area provision will be undertaken with a view to identifying £50,000 savings. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Decisions already taken/Efficiency Cash Releasing/ Efficiency - Non Cash Releasing/ Service Reduction/Other | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> The review will aim to identify possible efficiency savings and will ensure that any are adverse impact on overall play area provision within the city is minimised. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> Date: 01/04/2011 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | |
| Staff | 172 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non Staff Costs | 174 | 0 | 50 | 50 |
| Income | -37 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 309 | 0 | 50 | 50 |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | |

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DIVISION

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Enviro-Crime Team | | Proposal No: TS R 53 | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> Undertaking special investigations, surveillance and enforcement in relation to fly-tipping and other forms of enviro-crime. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Delivering £40,000 of savings from 2012/13 through a review of the management and organisation of this service, with a view to bringing this service and the City Warden service together under a common management and support framework. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Decisions already taken/Efficiency Cash Releasing/Efficiency- Non Cash Releasing/ Service Reduction/Other | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> It is hoped that this will have minimal impact on service delivery. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> Date: 01/04/2012 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | |
| | <u>Existing Budget</u> | <u>Proposed Reduction</u> | | |
| Staff | 103 | | | 40 |
| Non Staff Costs | 36 | | | |
| Income | 0 | | | |
| Net Total | 139 | | | 40 |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | 3 | | | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | 1 |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | 0 | | | 0 |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | 3 | | | 3 |

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DIVISION

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Trading Standards | | Proposal No: TS R 54 | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> To provide a wide range of services in relation to trading standards and consumer protection within the city. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Reducing the service by one f.t.e. post from 2011/12. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Service Reduction | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> This will reduce the capacity of the service to undertake business inspections, investigations and deal with service requests from businesses and the public. The specific nature of work that will not be undertaken cannot be identified at this stage as this will be reviewed and prioritised on an on-going basis so as to ensure that work with a relatively high priority is protected. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | Date:1/4/2011 | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | |
| Staff | 701 | | 45 | 45 |
| Non Staff Costs | 132 | | | |
| Income | 19 | | | |
| Net Total | 814 | | 45 | 45 |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | 18.5 | | | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | 1 | 1 |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | 18.5 | | 18.5 | 18.5 |

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Libraries | | Proposal No: TS R 56 | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> The development of opportunities to improve the quality of life and opportunities for all residents through provision of informal learning, reading promotion, lending services, wide ranging reading development and study support opportunities for children and adults across the city. The creation of accessible neutral spaces where people of different backgrounds can meet, study or enjoy cultural opportunities that improve levels of mutual tolerance and understanding amongst Leicester's diverse population. | | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Review of library opening hours, with a view to making efficiency savings. | | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Efficiency | | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> Service impact would be minimised by careful selection of reducing opening hours at least used times | | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> Date: 2011 following consultation process | | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £13.0 | <u>2012-13</u> £148.0 |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | | |
| | <u>Existing Budget</u> | <u>Proposed Reduction</u> | | | |
| Staff | 3383.0 | | 13.0 | 148.0 | |
| Non Staff Costs | | | | | |
| Income | | | | | |
| Net Total | 3383.0 | | 13.0 | 148.0 | |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> | |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | 134.9 | | 134.4 | 127.9 | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | 7 | | 0.5 | 6.5 | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | Not known for 11/12 | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | 50 | | 5 | 45 | |

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Libraries | | Proposal No: TS R 58 | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> Management and development of citywide services for older people delivered through Libraries, including the Home Library service | | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Revised arrangements for management of Older Peoples Library Services. One half time manager post deleted. Responsibilities for managing service for older people moved to another management post within Libraries to make more efficient use of management resources. | | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Efficiency | | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> Management of development of older people's services will be come part of the responsibilities of another management post in Libraries. There are no direct front line implications for this reduction, as support for service delivery matters will be taken on by another management post. | | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> <div style="text-align: right;">Date: 2010 following staff consultation process</div> | | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £5.0 | <u>2011-12</u> £21.0 | <u>2012-13</u> £21.0 |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | | |
| | <u>Existing Budget</u> | <u>Proposed Reduction</u> | | | |
| Staff | 21.0 | 5.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 | |
| Non Staff Costs | | | | | |
| Income | | | | | |
| Net Total | 21.0 | 5.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 | |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> | |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | 0 | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | 0.5 | | | | |

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Libraries | | Proposal No: TS R 59 | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> Reader Development Service identifies, orders, pays for and puts into stock items for loan and information use in Libraries. Service also organises van delivery service and stationery ordering for Libraries. | | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Introduction of Admin/ICT Efficiency Measures in Reader Development Services. Reduction of posts within the service as an efficiency measure, based on improving efficiency of invoice handling and electronic ordering and payments reducing needs for clerical staff. Reorganisation of some other support tasks within the team and using supplier provided information to a greater extent to construct catalogue entries. | | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Efficiency | | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> Through improved use of electronic ordering and payment and by the removal of some team roles that can be carried out by our suppliers as part of the contract, services can continue to be delivered, but in a more efficient way. | | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> <div style="text-align: right;">Date: 2010 following staff consultation process</div> | | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £10.0 | <u>2011-12</u> £42.0 | <u>2012-13</u> £42.0 |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | | |
| | <u>Existing Budget</u> | <u>Proposed Reduction</u> | | | |
| Staff | 3383.0 | 10.0 | 42.0 | 42.0 | |
| Non Staff Costs | | | | | |
| Income | | | | | |
| Net Total | 3383.0 | 10.0 | 42.0 | 42.0 | |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> | |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | 9.2 | 7.2 | 7.2 | 7.2 | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | 2.0 | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | 2.0 | | | |

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Libraries: Home Library Service | | Proposal No: TS R 60 | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> Accompanied library visits for people with limited mobility, who are normally unable to leave the home, using a minibus and 2 driver/assistants. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Review Funding arrangements for Home Library Service including feasibility of using Adults Personal Budgets | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Change of funding source to personalisation budget | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> Service would from 2012/13 be funded as a commissioned service by Adults, assuming this is feasible. The proposal will be reviewed if not. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> <div style="text-align: right;">Date: 2010 following required consultation period.</div> | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | | | |
| | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | |
| Staff | 84 | | | |
| Non Staff Costs (Vehicle costs) | 123 | | | |
| Income | | | | 25.0 |
| Net Total | 207 | | | 25.0 |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | | | |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | |

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Libraries, (Children's and Young People's services team) Proposal No: TS R 62 | | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> Supports work for the delivery of children's services across city. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Delete 0.5 fte Senior Community Librarian post, leaving 0.5 post in place to manage services listed above. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Efficiency | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> Reduced amount of time for support work in delivery of Children's Services, but through more efficient deployment of staff these tasks taken on by other staff to ensure no front line service impact. Key work will be delivered as planned to support responsibilities and commissioned services of Learning Board and Thriving and Safe Communities Board. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> <p style="text-align: right;">Date: 2011 following consultation process</p> | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | | | |
| | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | |
| | <u>Existing Budget</u> | <u>Proposed Reduction</u> | | |
| Staff | 84 | | 12 | 12 |
| Non Staff Costs | | | | |
| Income | | | | |
| Net Total | 84 | | 12 | 12 |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | | | |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | 6.7 | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | 0.5 | | 0.5 | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | 0 | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | 2 | | | |

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Libraries | | Proposal No: TS R 63 | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> The development of opportunities to improve the quality of life and opportunities for all residents through provision of informal learning, reading promotion, lending services, wide ranging reading development and study support opportunities for children and adults across the city. The creation of accessible neutral spaces where people of different backgrounds can meet, study or enjoy cultural opportunities that improve levels of mutual tolerance and understanding amongst Leicester's diverse population. | | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Community Engagement Officer - Deletion of Vacant Post. | | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Efficiency | | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> The creation of methods of involving local people in decision making about their library service will be developed in alternative ways to using this post. Major projects at New Parks and Central Libraries will instead become the arenas where new methods of engaging local communities in their local library services will be developed, and used these techniques will be used across the city where appropriate. | | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> <p style="text-align: right;">Date: 2010</p> | | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | <u>2009-10</u> | <u>2010-11</u> £5.0 | <u>2011-12</u> £35.0 | <u>2012-13</u> £35.0 |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | | |
| Staff | 35.0 | 5.0 | 35.0 | 35.0 | |
| Non Staff Costs | | | | | |
| Income | | | | | |
| Net Total | 35.0 | 5.0 | 35.0 | 35.0 | |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> | |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | 0 | | | | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | 1 | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | 0 | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Planning and Policy | | Proposal No: TS R67 | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> Planning and Policy | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Increase in planning fee income – planning fee income is expected to rise through 2011/12 and 2012/13 as the economy recovers. The early stages of recovery will see an increase in activity from developers and land owners wishing to get permissions in advance of developments. The increase in planning applications will require some reorganisation within the service to better align available resources with priority developments eg major proposals with significant economic regeneration potential. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Efficiency | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> Please note: Commissioning details for Planning Service included in 'Planning for People not Cars' Commissioning Statement. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> Date: | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | | | |
| | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | |
| Staff | | | | |
| Non Staff Costs | | | | |
| Income | 958 | | | |
| Net Total | 958 | 0 | 60 | 200 |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | | | |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | |
| Individuals at risk | | | | |

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Libraries | | Proposal No: TS R95 | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> | | | | | |
| Promotion of reading to early years children, their parents and carers through storytelling | | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> | | | | | |
| Remove funding of Storyteller post from Libraries and seek funding on a commissioned basis from CYPS through “Whatever It takes”. | | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | | |
| Change of funding source from Libraries base budget to “Whatever it Takes” | | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | | |
| Service to be commissioned from “Whatever it Takes” funding to deliver Investing in our Children Agenda. | | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | | |
| Date: | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000 | <u>2012-13</u> £000 |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | | |
| Staff | 22.3 | | | | |
| Non Staff Costs | 3.7 | | | | |
| Income | | | 26.0 | 26.0 | |
| Net Total | 26.0 | | 26.0 | 26.0 | |
| Staffing Implications | | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | | |
| Individuals at risk | | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE

DRAFT COMMISSIONING STATEMENT

List of Contents Adult Social Care

| Appendix 2 | | Page |
|-------------------|---|-------------|
| 9 | Outcomes and Evaluation of Performance & Progress to Date | 92 |
| 10 | Needs Analysis | 96 |
| 11 | Delivery Plan, Projects and Programmes | 101 |
| 12 | Proposed Projects | 103 |
| 13 | Service Delivery | 104 |
| 14 | Commissioning Priorities | 106 |
| 15 | Efficiencies | 109 |
| 16 | Further Work | 111 |
| 17 | Budget Growth and Reduction Proposals | 115 - 154 |

Outcomes and Evaluation of Performance & Progress to Date

Describes key outcomes and specific measures/targets that the Priority Board is seeking to deliver including current performance and targets.

Includes evaluation of performance and progress to date where appropriate.

Key
Performance against target

↑ above target

↓ below target

↔ meeting target

P plus RAG rating based on the tolerance set

★ Exceptional performance exceeding target by 10% or more or set tolerance
▲ Poor performance below target by 10% or more or set tolerance
● Within tolerance set

Outcomes:

Outcome LAA NI 125 Achieving independence for older people through rehabilitation/intermediate care

The proportion of people aged 65 or over discharged from hospital to their own home, or to a residential or nursing care home, or extra care housing bed for rehabilitation.

| | | | |
|------|--------|----------|--|
| YTD | Target | Forecast | |
| 71.7 | 82% | ↓ ▲ | |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|-----|--------------|-----|
| Current performance | YTD | Targets | 09/10 | 82% | 10/11 | 84% |
| | 71.7% | | | | | |



Evaluation of Performance & Progress to date

This is underpinned by partnership work relating to wider determinants of health which will improve health in the longer term.

The reablement service commenced at the end of quarter 2, as planned. This will increase the numbers of people receiving services which qualify for inclusion in NI 125, and should increase performance overall. A bid to the Strategic Health Authority Innovation Forum has been made by health colleagues, to provide additional therapy staff to support the expansion of this service.

Outcome LAA NI 131 Delayed transfers of care

The average weekly rate of delayed transfers of care from all NHS hospitals per 100,000 population aged 18 or over.

YTD Target Forecast
 9.51 20.5  

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|------|--------------|------|
| Current performance | YTD | Targets | 09/10 | 20.5 | 10/11 | 19.4 |
| | 9.51 | | | | | |

Evaluation of Performance & Progress to date

The priority Board consider the LAA performance report routinely and engage in detailed examination of failing or struggling targets involving reports and presentation to the Board which provide a clear focus for improvement and a chance to garner support. Within the last year NI131 Delayed Transfers of Care has struggled, but is now back on track.

Outcome LAA NI 135 Carers receiving needs assessment or review and a specific carer’s service, or advice and information

The number of carers receiving a 'carer's break' or other specific service following a carer's assessment or review, as a percentage of the number of adults receiving community-based services.

YTD Target Forecast
 16.2% 27%  

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|-----|--------------|-----|
| Current performance | YTD | Targets | 09/10 | 27% | 10/11 | 29% |
| | 16.2% | | | | | |
| | Forecast | | | | | |
| | 25.2% | | | | | |

Evaluation of Performance & Progress to date

Showing signs of progress, the carer lead post has been filled during quarter 2, which will bring additional capacity to drive performance, based on delivery of the carers’ strategy across partners.

Outcome LAA NI 142 Percentage of vulnerable people who are supported to maintain independent living

The percentage of people receiving Supporting People Services who have established, or are maintaining, independent living.

| | | |
|-------|--------|----------|
| YTD | Target | Forecast |
| 99.1% | 98.5 | ↑ ★ |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|-------|--------------|-------|
| Current performance | YTD | Targets | 09/10 | 98.5% | 10/11 | 99.0% |
| | 99.1% | | | | | |

Evaluation of Performance & Progress to date

A high performance has been sustained in respect of the above indicator. Performance is linked to the Supporting People Grant, which has been reduced by Government. This may have an impact on service delivery. There will be a strategic review of those services funded by Supporting People, with the aim of delivering savings whilst maintaining a high level of outcomes. To continue to monitor performance with bi monthly reporting to the Commissioning Board.

NEEDS ANALYSIS

Needs Analysis

General Demographics: The population as a whole is expected to grow by over 20% by 2031.

Ageing population: Leicester is likely to remain a 'young' city overall, and therefore services should be delivered in line with the needs of a younger population. However, the older population of Leicester is also growing, although at a slower rate than in England and in Leicestershire County. Older people have specific health and social care needs, and these will need to be recognised and responded to.

Growth of ethnic minority populations: Leicester is likely to become the first English city with a majority population (up to 60%) made up of those from an ethnic minority background. Given the particular health and social needs of ethnic minority background populations, this will again impact across health and social care services, and will need to be factored into the planning processes across the City.

New arrivals: There are also relatively high numbers of 'new arrivals' into the City, including those from parts of Africa, the Middle East, and Eastern Europe. These groups may have particular health and social care needs, and in any case will place additional strain on existing services.

Key findings

- The population of Leicester is ageing although at a lower rate than surrounding areas, it is expected to rise by 20% by 2031.
- Prevalence rates suggest that there are 2,631 people in Leicester with dementia & increasing.
- 16-18% of working age adults in Leicester might be expected to be experiencing a common mental health problem at any time – around 50,000 people.
- Local figures for people with moderate and profound learning disabilities are higher than that anticipated by national prevalence rates.

Adult Social care services

- Social care packages were provided to 8,094 people aged over 18 years, during 2007/08 (approximately 4% of Leicester's population.)
- 67% of the people known to social care services are over 65 years old. Of those remaining (aged 18-64 years), 33% is made up of those with physical disability 34.8%, learning disabilities 33.5% and mental health 29.2%.
- In both the 18-64 age and 65+ age groups, white British (66.9%) was the largest ethnic background, and the second largest was Asian Indian (22.9%).
- Between 2006/07 and 2007/08, there was a 6.9% decrease in the number of new contacts and 2.5% decrease in the number passed on for further assessment, but a 2.4% increase in the number of packages provided.

Residential and nursing care

- Over the next 3 years the number of people in residential care or nursing care is expected to show a decrease of 6%.
- During 2007/08, there were 1,600 people aged 65+ in residential care.

- In the 18-64 age group, during 2007/08, there were 60 service users with physical disabilities, 212 with mental health and 298 with learning disabilities receiving residential care.

Community-based services

- During 2007/08, 6,248 (77%), in total, people were receiving community-based services.
- In the 18-64 year age group, 2,135 (80%) people received community-based services. The largest number were those with physical disability (41.5%), followed by learning disability (28.9%), then those with mental health (26.1%), 2.9% were people categorised as other and 0.5% people with dementia (early onset).
- In the 65+ age group, 4,113 (75.7%) people receiving community-based services and at 81.3% physical disabilities was the largest group, followed by dementia at 8.6%, mental health at 8.3%, other and learning disabilities at 0.8%.

Direct Payments and Personal Budgets

- Although Direct Payments were used by 282 service users in 2007/08, (an increase of 27% from the previous year), it only represents 3.5% of people over 18 years, who received social care packages in 2007/08.
- In 2007/08, 61.8% of direct Payments recipients were of white, followed by 35.9% of Black and Minority Ethnic backgrounds.
- At Jan 2010, 800 people locally were on an Individual Budget.
- In future Social Care Transformation, centred around the provision of Personal Budgets, will enable individuals to have more choice and control over how their social care needs are met.

Carers

- During 2007/08, 1,753 carers were recorded and had their needs assessed, either by a separate carer assessment or at the same time as the person that the person they support was assessed.
- Approximately, two-thirds of carers were female and one-third male.
- Around half were aged 45-64 years with one-third 65 years or over.
- Of the people these carers were supporting, 68% were aged 65 years and over.

Mental Ill Health

It is estimated that there are over 50,000 people in the City with some mental health problems.

- **Deprived areas of Leicester:** mental ill health is a major area of health and inequality locally, with more deprived areas of the city showing significantly higher rates of registration with mental health services, psychiatric inpatient admissions, and admission for self-harm
- **Young men:** across all ethnic groups young men are particularly over-represented at the more severe end of services and under-represented in services such as counselling and day services

- **Ethnicity:** there is over-representation of people from African and Caribbean communities in psychiatric inpatient and Mental Health Act statistics, a lack of recovery-focused support for people from African and Caribbean communities, and there is under-representation of BME communities in use of counselling/psychological therapies and stated desire of these communities for more access to talking therapies

Older People (65 years and over)

- Older people are known to have particular needs in a number of areas. These are:
- **Depression:** in Leicester, estimate suggests that there are between 3,500 and 5,400 older people known to have depression. Projection work suggests that there may be between 4440 and 6660 by 2025.
- **Dementia:** prevalence rates suggest that there are 2,632 people in Leicester with dementia. This is expected to rise to 2,635 by 2010 and to 2,707 by 2015.
- **Mobility:** the main illness/disability experienced by residents is mobility (58%) , especially within the home. There were 297 equipment and adaptation installations in the last financial year. The top three areas in Leicester, which report long standing illnesses, are New Parks, Braunstone and Rowley Fields.

Learning Disabilities

1,611 people with moderate to profound learning disabilities currently live in Leicester. A range of services are accessed, including community/outreach nursing, social care (social worker/day care), physiotherapy, and psychiatry and psychology. The numbers accessing these services are higher than the number on the Learning Disability Register, and are higher than that could be anticipated by the national prevalence rates for people with moderate and profound learning disabilities.

The key issues are:

- **Unmet need:** the numbers accessing services are higher than the number on the Learning Disability Register and this implies that some people who could be eligible for services are currently unknown and might be referred to services in the future
- **Growth:** the number of young people in education with severe or profound learning disabilities is increasing and will be expected to transfer to adult services in the future
- **The client profile is ageing:** the proportion of people aged less than 45 years, with a learning disability, will decline over the next fifteen years. Whilst over the same period, the number of people aged over 45 years will rise significantly this cohort of people is likely to make significant additional demands on health and social care services. They are likely to require longer-term care and support to

replace familial care and support. As part of our commissioning strategy we are seeking to better understand the needs of older people with learning disabilities and transition and the implications for the development of care services. It has long been recognised that this cohort of people make demands which are of greater complexity and higher cost than the general population.

The key inequalities across the Leicester population:

Leicester's population generally compares poorly to the England average across a range of conditions, and that sections of the population within the City compare adversely to others; these are generally the more deprived areas of the City that also impact on the need for Adult Social Care services

Future needs data relating to Health inequalities can be found in the Needs Analysis element of Health & Well being Commissioning Statement.

DELIVERY PLAN, PROJECTS & PROGRAMMES

| Project / Programme title | Description of outcomes / target benefits | Programme / Project Manager | Start date | End date | Resourcing position including source of funding | Other comments |
|--|---|------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|-----------------------|
| 138 LIFT – Southfields | Provision of a joint service centre at Southfields – partnership with NHS PFI project | Mick Bowers | Jan 08 | June 11 | Internal capital and external capital | |
| 350 PFI Dementia Centres | Building two Dementia Care Resource Centres. Procurement will be through LIFTCO and LCC will bid for funds to pay for infrastructure. | Mick Bowers | TBC | TBC | LIFTCO and PFI | |
| Electronic Social Care Records Electronic Scanning System | To electronically scan and hold all adults & children social care records. | Tracie Rees | 2006 | April 2910 | DOH Grants | |
| Transformation of Adult Social Care | To implement to the Putting People Agenda | Kim Curry | 2009 | 2011 | DOH Grant | |

PROPOSED PROJECTS

None

SERVICE DELIVERY

Current Challenges

Prevention and early intervention

Savings of £1.7 million per annum within 3 years. This will require a multi-agency approach to moving resources from acute to preventative services.

As part of the adult social care transformation programme a new core care pathway has been developed, which will focus on intervention rather than long term support.

Reablement (£3.4m) per annum within 3 years

Adult social care has developed its own reablement services. These provide 6 weeks intensive support and therapy to enable people to regain their independence as soon as possible. Therefore, people are less likely to need long term expensive care services.

Restructuring of adult social care services – (£550k) per annum within 3 years.

As part of the transformation programme, the way services are managed will change to incorporate a new core care pathway. This will enable services to be developed by function, with one access point. This change has provided the opportunity to review the management structure and to combine and change some posts, thus creating efficiencies.

Improved commissioning and procurement £1.8m per annum within 3 years.

As part of the personalisation agenda, people will be given a personal budget which will enable them to commission services directly, that meet their assessed outcomes. There will still be a need for some “commissioned” services, but the change will provide the opportunity to review contracts and to drive value for money efficiencies.

Potential cost to the Council

The potential introduction of this legislation could see free care at home for service users identified as critical.

Funding of Social Care and demographic pressures.

The needs analysis has identified increased pressures, to which Leicester will need to respond, although this is also a national issue. The Government are considering options for the long term funding of Social Care.

COMMISSIONING PRIORITIES

Challenges to Service Delivery

Social Care Transformation and the Personalisation Agenda

Probably the single biggest challenge facing Adult Social Care is to manage the transformation of social care services while at the same time meeting substantial increases in demand within limited resources.

A vision of high quality, personalised and flexible services has been set out in the White Paper 'Our Health, Our Care, Our Say' 2006. It outlines the Government's plans on the 'urgent need to begin the development of a new social care system'. Its value base is for a radical transformation of social care to shift away from paternalistic, reactive care of variable quality to a mainstream system focussed on prevention, early intervention, enablement and high quality personally tailored services. People will have maximum choice, control and power over the support services they receive.

Key Elements:

- 1) Local Authority Leadership and new relationship between Government, Local Authorities, the NHS, Independent Sector Providers and the Regulator.
- 2) A major shift of resources and practice to prevention, early intervention and re-enablement.
- 3) Putting maximum control and choice in the hands of the people who use these services and their Carers. This includes personal budgets for everyone eligible for publically funded adult social care support other than in circumstances where people require emergency access to provision, with increasing use of Direct Payments. This also includes mainstreaming person centred planning and streamlining assessment to give more time for support planning and brokerage.
- 4) A high quality, universal, accessible information and advice service available to all irrespective of financial means.
- 5) A commitment to treating carers as expert partners.

This programme of personalisation is being carefully project managed as part of the council's wider transformation agenda to ensure targets are achieved within a sustainable financial model.

Commissioning priorities will include the need to deliver the personalisation agenda and deal with demographic growth and unmet need.

Other areas of challenge are listed below:

- Transformation of Adult Social Care including Self Directed Support;
- Develop frameworks for joint commissioning with the Leicester PCT;

- Further develop services with our partners, co-locating staff and pooling budgets wherever possible;
- Accelerate the development of Extra Care Housing and Supported Living and alternatives to keep people at home;
- Develop a comprehensive user involvement strategy;
- Re-provide NHS campus homes enabling people with learning disabilities to live as part of the community;
- Develop a targeted prevention and early intervention strategy;
- Develop specialist services for the most vulnerable with high levels of need;
- Achieve a step change in re-ablement, rehabilitation, intermediate care and assistive technology;
- To continue to provide a range of support services which meet the needs of vulnerable people in housing crisis situations;
- To improve quality of service, particularly customer service as identified through customer satisfaction surveys and analysing performance;
- Work with other agencies so that older and disabled people can feel part of the main community in Leicester and still be active citizens;
- Review all IT systems to ensure they meet the needs of the Council and Service Users and enable the efficient operation of the Personalisation Agenda.

EFFICIENCIES

ASC Efficiencies

| | Description | 10/11 £'000 | 11/12 £'000 | 12/13 £'000 |
|--------------|--|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| R3 | Electronic Care Monitoring | (50) | (100) | (100) |
| R7 | Alternative ways of meeting need | (175) | (250) | (525) |
| R11 | Improved prevention and early intervention | (285) | (811) | (1,707) |
| R12 | Reablement – no further support | (546) | (1,519) | (2,119) |
| R13 | Reablement – reduced support | (537) | (968) | (1,268) |
| R14 | Self assessment | (20) | (30) | (40) |
| R16 | More efficient screening from contact centre | (0) | (125) | (250) |
| R19 | Efficiency gained from flexible mobile working | (0) | (0) | (150) |
| R22 | Reduced reliance on Residential Care | (73) | (278) | (584) |
| R24.1 | Improved commissioning | (239) | (657) | (1,140) |
| R24.2 | Care Funding calculator | (155) | (356) | (735) |
| R26 | Management reductions | (50) | (450) | (550) |

FURTHER WORK

Future Work

The way social care is delivered will change fundamentally through the personalisation agenda. Most obviously this will be through the introduction of a resource allocation system which will lead to the provision of personal budgets for all service users over time. This will in turn lead to significant changes to the type and range of services available. It will probably mean, for example, in house services will be subject to trading accounts and competition.

The Council will have to provide advice and information to all; not only to those who are eligible for Council services. It will increasingly move people away from residential care and into home care. The Council may decide to provide transitional protection to some of the bigger losers in the personal budget stakes. There is inevitably going to be some double running as a result of delays in closing existing service provision and under-utilisation of block contract provision. This is already happening as the result of direct payments.

There will be additional investment in prevention and re-ablement but an accompanying saving in subsequent care costs. Nationally, estimates around the value of these savings vary wildly. A major beneficiary in this investment is going to be NHS Leicester and ideally they would contribute to the expenditure. There will be changes around assessment processes and brokerage. The structure will change significantly with many changes in roles and responsibilities. There will be more investment in commissioning and reduced investment in other service areas. There are potentially big savings to be had from identifying continuing health care cases which should be funded by the NHS. The case study audit will identify areas where services are too costly for the level of need. It will enable immediate action to be taken to prevent the over-specification of new cases but it is likely to be hard to reduce services to service users on a case by case basis. Instead this is best managed through the new Resource Allocation System. Many other areas for potential efficiency savings have been identified.

Progressing the transformation programme including giving individuals their own personal budgets will be one of the key priorities of Adult Social Care. There will be a period of transition with a move away from some of the traditional services to enable individuals to commission community based support that meets their assessed outcomes.

Market development will also be required to ensure services are available to enable people to exercise choice and control.

Commissioning and improved procurement will also be a key feature in the coming year.

Further work will be required with partners, especially the NHS to develop integrated services, to promote improved outcomes and greater efficiencies.

Many of the LAA and One Leicester targets and priorities will be incorporated in the new Core Care pathway which should improve performance across the board.

Equality Impact Assessment

General Impact of Personal Budgets

Overall, the implementation of the government's personalisation agenda (much of which is reflected in the budget growth and reduction lines) will improve choice and control for service users and more effective use of funding. This will remove much of the inequality which is inherent in the current model of social care.

The introduction of personal budgets will have a different impact on every individual. The budgets of some people will be higher than the cost of the current services they receive; for others, their new personal budget will be lower. This means that some will have to manage their needs with different services, and with reduced services in some cases.

In order for individuals to cope with the change to personal budgets, a growth bid has been included to provide transitional protection for 12 months for those existing clients who will receive a reduced service. This will give them time to consider how to adjust their package of services.

It should be noted that the local authority continues to have a duty to meet eligible assessed need. Where a person's budget allocation is demonstrably insufficient to meet those needs then a contingency sum exists to top up their budget to a level that meets their assessed needs.

Impact on Client Groups

It is known that the current service packages for some individuals are excessive, and also that there is disparity between different client types. Personal budgets will introduce equity and equality between individuals, and between service types. An inevitable consequence of this is that historically under-funded client groups, such as older people, are likely to receive a greater level of service. It is anticipated that those with learning disabilities and physical disabilities will receive smaller budgets than the cost of their current services. However, it is impossible to state with certainty which groups of individuals will be most affected.

Impact on Ethnic Groups

Personal budgets are likely to result in fewer people choosing to attend day centres. The review of current Day Centres (R23) anticipates savings from the possible closure or merging of day centres. The day centres currently provide services for particular client types, and in some cases for particular ethnic groups. Closure of a centre could therefore impact on one group more than

others. It should be noted that this would only result from the service users themselves making the decision not to spend their personal budgets at a centre.

A growth bid has been included to help minimise the impact of any day centre closures.

It is widely recognised that there is a significant level of unmet need within BME communities, whereby individuals have chosen not to approach the Council for support. In addition, following an assessment they are more likely to refuse specific services that are offered. Personal budgets are anticipated to have a positive impact in this regard, since their flexibility of use is likely to be more appealing. To this extent G3.2 will help to address the historical disparity in support between different ethnic groups.

BUDGET, GROWTH & REDUCTION PROPOSALS

| Adult Social Care Budget Proposals 2010/11 to 2012/13 | | | | | |
|--|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----|
| | | 2010/11 £'000 | 2011/12 £'000 | 2012/13 £'000 | |
| <u>ADULT SOCIAL CARE</u> | | | | | |
| GROWTH | | | | | |
| <u>Savings from Earlier Years</u> | | | | | |
| G1 | Future Years Efficiencies | 1,500 | 2,500 | 2,500 | |
| <u>Unachievable savings from previous DRS's</u> | | | | | |
| G2 | Reduced savings expected from Best Value Review of EPH's | 219 | 1,077 | 1,077 | |
| NEW GROWTH ITEMS | | | | | |
| G4 | Potential Decrease in Specific Grants | 0 | 280 | 559 | |
| G5 | Ring-fenced grants dropping out in full | 0 | 946 | 946 | |
| G25 | Free Personal Care at Home - Impact of Government Bill | 850 | 1,700 | 1,700 | |
| Demographic Growth | | | | | |
| G3.1 | Increasing Need (Demographics) | 249 | 2,406 | 4,054 | |
| G3.2 | Unmet Need | 625 | 1,500 | 2,166 | FSM |
| Personalisation & PPF | | | | | |
| G6 | Unit Cost Increase Due to Personalised Support | 50 | 50 | 50 | FSM |
| G8 | Investment in Prevention & Early Intervention | 448 | 456 | 469 | FSM |
| G9 | Reablement Service | 1,000 | 1,500 | 1,500 | FSM |
| G10 | Investment in Universal Information & Support | 57 | 151 | 189 | FSM |
| G11 | Under-Utilised In-House Day Centres | 194 | 389 | 583 | FSM |
| G13 | Under-Utilised Independent Sector Block Contracts | 300 | 150 | 0 | FSM |
| G14 | Transitional Protection Costs | 283 | 566 | 850 | FSM |
| G15 | Investment for Carers | 220 | 220 | 220 | |
| Transformation (TOM) | | | | | |
| G18 | Increased Number of Reviews | 25 | 50 | 50 | |
| G17 | Central Contact Centre Ongoing Costs | 50 | 50 | 50 | |
| G22 | Safeguarding Unit - Ongoing Costs | 150 | 150 | 150 | |
| G23 | Commissioning Unit - Ongoing Costs | 300 | 300 | 300 | |
| TOTAL GROWTH | | | | | |
| | | 6,520 | 14,441 | 17,413 | |
| REDUCTIONS | | | | | |
| IDENTIFIED REDUCTION ITEMS | | | | | |
| R3 | Electronic Care Monitoring | (50) | (100) | (100) | |

| | | | | | |
|-------|--|----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----|
| R5 | Ring-fenced grants dropping out in full | 0 | (946) | (946) | |
| | | | | | |
| | Personalisation & PPF | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| R7 | General Deflator - alternative ways of meeting needs | (175) | (250) | (525) | FSM |
| R9 | Return of Unused Personal Budgets | (123) | (154) | (187) | FSM |
| R11 | People Not Requiring a Service due to improved Prevention & Early Intervention | (285) | (811) | (1,707) | FSM |
| R12 | People not Requiring a Service due to Reablement | (546) | (1,519) | (2,119) | FSM |
| R13 | People Requiring a Reduced Service due to Reablement | (537) | (968) | (1,268) | FSM |
| | | | | | |
| | Transformation (TOM) | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| R14 | Increased Focus on Self Assessment | (20) | (30) | (40) | |
| R16 | More Efficient Referrals/Screening From Contact Centre | 0 | (125) | (250) | |
| R19 | Efficiency Gains from Flexible Mobile Working | 0 | 0 | (150) | |
| R26 | Management Reductions | (50) | (450) | (550) | |
| | | | | | |
| | Savings Identified By Efficiency Group | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| R20 | Improved Application of Continuing Health Care | (500) | (750) | (1,000) | |
| R21 | Extension of Charging to All Services | (150) | (400) | (400) | |
| R22 | Reduced Reliance on Residential Care | (73) | (278) | (584) | |
| R23 | Re-Provision In-House Day Centres | 0 | (150) | (150) | |
| R24 | Commissioning Savings: | | | | |
| R24.1 | 1) Improved Commissioning | (239) | (657) | (1,140) | |
| R24.2 | 2) Roll-out of Care Funding Calculator | (155) | (356) | (735) | |
| | | | | | |
| | TOTAL REDUCTIONS | (2,903) | (7,944) | (11,851) | |
| | NET GROWTH / (SAVINGS) | 3617 | 6497 | 5562 | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

GROWTH & REDUCTION PROFORMAS

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

Individual Pro-formas for growth and reduction proposals

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | | Proposal No: ASC G1 | | |
| Future Years Efficiencies | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | |
| The 2009/10 to 2011/12 DRS required Adult Social Care to make savings of £1,500k in 2010/11 and 2,500k in 2011/12. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Decisions Already Taken | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: April 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | |
| | <u>Existing Budget</u> | <u>Proposed Addition</u> | | |
| Staff | 43,064 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non Staff Costs | 73,354 | 1,500 | 2,500 | 2,500 |
| Income | (34,445) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 81,973 | 1,500 | 2,500 | 2,500 |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

Individual Pro-formas for growth and reduction proposals

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | | Proposal No: ASC G2 | | |
| Elderly Person's Homes | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | |
| <p><u>Elderly Person's Homes Review</u> This growth represents reduced savings being expected from the Service Review of EPH's. The review will now take account of the emerging impact of transformation. This extends the period for consideration, and therefore the savings will not be achieved as set out in the 2009/10 DRS.</p> | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Other | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| <p>This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through supporting people to remain independent in their homes and communities.</p> <p>This links to the review of EPH's as detailed in the Older People SIEP, and efficiencies through reduced placements.</p> | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: April 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | | | |
| | <u>2009-10</u> | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | |
| | <u>Existing Budget</u> | <u>Proposed Addition</u> | | |
| Staff | 5,837 | 169 | 829 | 829 |
| Non Staff Costs | 1,699 | 50 | 248 | 248 |
| Income | (2,064) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 5,472 | 219 | 1077 | 1077 |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

Individual Pro-formas for growth and reduction proposals

| | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | | Proposal No: ASC G3.1 | | |
| All Areas | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | |
| <u>Demographic Growth</u> The number of Adult Social Care service users is expected to grow over the next 3 years, as is the complexity of their needs. Deloitte have calculated the increased cost of providing services to these individuals. | | | | |
| National predictive tools show an anticipated growth of people requiring support by 2013 of 12% in the number of younger adults with physical disabilities or mental ill health, 4% in the number of younger adults with learning disabilities, and 3% in the number of older people. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Other | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations. | | | | |
| This links to both the Older Peoples Services and Community Care Services SIEP in terms of demographic growth and efficiency drive. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: April 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | | | |
| | <u>2009-10</u> | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | |
| | <u>Existing Budget</u> | <u>Proposed Addition</u> | | |
| Staff | 13,299 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non Staff Costs | 63,965 | 249 | 2,406 | 4,054 |
| Income | (21,156) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 56,108 | 249 | 2,406 | 4,054 |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

Individual Pro-formas for growth and reduction proposals

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | | Proposal No: ASC G3.2 | | |
| All Areas | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | |
| <u>Current Unmet Need Being Met By Personal Budgets</u> | | | | |
| It is widely recognised that personal budgets are more appealing to the users of social care services than traditional offerings. There are currently a significant number of people who are offered services but reject them on the grounds that they do not like what is being offered and it is known that there are people who have chosen not to even approach the Council for support as they do not wish the potential stigma from involving social services. This is particularly known to be the case in BME communities. The increased opportunity to self assess, flexibility of personal budgets, and the opportunity to use these in alternative ways will mean that in future, all people who are offered support will accept it | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Other | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations. | | | | |
| This was noted as having a possible impact on growth items in the Older Peoples Services and Community Care Services SIEP. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: April 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | |
| | <u>Existing Budget</u> | <u>Proposed Addition</u> | | |
| Staff | 13,299 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non Staff Costs | 63,965 | 625 | 1,500 | 2,166 |
| Income | (21,156) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 56,108 | 625 | 1500 | 2166 |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

Individual Pro-formas for growth and reduction proposals

| | | | | |
|---|------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | | Proposal No: ASC G4 | | |
| Learning Disabilities, Mental Health, Carers, AIDS. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | |
| <u>Decrease in Specific Grants</u> It is anticipated that certain grants will be reduced by 5% year on year from 2011/12 to 2013/14. The grants to which this refers are Carers grant, Learning Disabilities Development Grant, Mental Capacity Act Grant, Mental Health Grant, Preserved Rights Grant, and the AIDS Support Grant. The growth included here therefore maintains the current level of service provision. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Other | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations. | | | | |
| This was noted as a possible risk and growth item (Community Care Services Division SIEP). | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: April 2011 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Addition | | |
| Staff | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non Staff Costs | 5,600 | 0 | 280 | 559 |
| Income | (5,600) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 0 | 0 | 280 | 559 |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

Individual Pro-formas for growth and reduction proposals

| | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | | Proposal No: ASC G5 | | |
| Learning Disabilities & Stroke Care | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | |
| <p><u>Ring-Fenced Grants Dropping Out</u> Two current ring-fenced grants (Learning Disability Campus Grant and Stroke Care Grant) were approved for the years 2008/09 to 2010/11 only. The growth here represents the end to these grants. This is offset by the corresponding reduction R5 which shows the reduced expenditure following the ceasing of these grants.</p> | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Other | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| <p>This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations.</p> <p>This was noted as a possible risk and growth item (Community Care Services Division SIEP).</p> | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: April 2011 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | |
| | <u>Existing Budget</u> | <u>Proposed Addition</u> | | |
| Staff | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non Staff Costs | 946 | 0 | 946 | 946 |
| Income | (946) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Net Total</u> | 0 | 0 | 946 | 946 |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

Individual Pro-formas for growth and reduction proposals

| | | | | |
|---|------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | | Proposal No: ASC G6 | | |
| All Areas | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | |
| <u>Increased Unit Costs Due to Personalised Support</u> | | | | |
| Under personalisation, there is a likelihood that people will demand their services to be delivered at the time of their request - indeed, this is seen to be one of the main benefits. Since it is likely that people will choose to use services at similar times such as getting up between 7 and 9 in the morning, and wanting to choose the time that they go to bed, it will be increasingly difficult for providers to schedule an efficient use of their staffing, and more staff will be required – at an additional cost, which providers are unlikely to be able to absorb. It is also likely that a larger number of providers will be chosen to provide support – thus reducing some of the economies of scale currently achieved through block contracts. The growth included here would be added to the pot of money for personal budgets to help offset the impact of this. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Other | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations. | | | | |
| This was noted as a risk as part of the personalisation agenda (Older Peoples Services and Community Care Services SIEPs). | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: April 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Addition | | |
| Staff | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non Staff Costs | 51,652 | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| Income | (17,812) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 33,840 | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

Individual Pro-formas for growth and reduction proposals

| | | | | |
|--|------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | | Proposal No: ASC G8 | | |
| Physical Disabilities & Older People | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | |
| <u>Prevention & Early Intervention</u> | | | | |
| This is a key part of the Putting People First vision. The focus of this is to identify individuals that will be in need of long term support and put low level services in place. This will both reduce and delay the need for larger scale support in the medium to long term. The growth included here is offset by savings included at R11, where the benefits of this investment are shown. | | | | |
| Examples include improving the targeting and quality of information provided to vulnerable people to ensure they maintain their independence, such as when people are unable to drive or elderly people are bereaved, and increasing the use of assistive technology, community equipment, community support and independent travelling training. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Other | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations. | | | | |
| This was noted as a risk as part of the personalisation agenda (Older Peoples Services and Community Care Services SIEPs). | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: April 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Addition | | |
| Staff | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non Staff Costs | 796 | 448 | 456 | 469 |
| Income | (377) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 419 | 448 | 456 | 469 |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

Individual Pro-formas for growth and reduction proposals

| | | | | |
|--|------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | | Proposal No: ASC G9 | | |
| All Areas | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | |
| <u>Reablement Service</u> Reablement is a short period (normally up to six weeks) of intensive support following hospital discharge or referral to social care, designed to enable people to carry out daily living activities without ongoing support. The investment shown here represents the additional costs of providing this service prior to determining people's longer term support needs. The anticipation is that this will result in significant long term savings shown at R12 and R13. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Other | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations. | | | | |
| This was noted as a risk as part of the personalisation agenda (Older Peoples Services and Community Care Services SIEPs). | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: April 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Addition | | |
| Staff | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non Staff Costs | 0 | 1,000 | 1,500 | 1,500 |
| Income | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 0 | 1,000 | 1,500 | 1,500 |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

Individual Pro-formas for growth and reduction proposals

| | | | | |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | | Proposal No: ASC G10 | | |
| All Areas | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | |
| <u>Universal Information & Support</u> | | | | |
| <p>This is another key aspect of Putting People First, and one in which all authorities are making improvements. There are a number of aspects to this, but in essence it involves ensuring that those who are ineligible for support from the Council (either because they do not meet the threshold for support, or because their finances mean that they self-fund) still receive the same level of information, advice and guidance on avenues of support as those the Council support. Whilst we already do this to some extent, this growth is a recognition that it needs to improve.</p> | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Service Improvement | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| <p>This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations.</p> <p>This was noted as a risk as part of the personalisation agenda (Older Peoples Services and Community Care Services SIEPs).</p> | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: April 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Addition | | |
| Staff | 644 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non Staff Costs | 619 | 57 | 151 | 189 |
| Income | (19) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 1,242 | 57 | 151 | 189 |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

Individual Pro-formas for growth and reduction proposals

| | | | | |
|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | | Proposal No: ASC G11 | | |
| In House Day Centres | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | |
| <u>Under-Utilised In-House Day Services</u> | | | | |
| Personal Budgets will result in people using their allocated money in alternative ways, and in the most cost effective ways. There is a likelihood that people will choose to purchase less traditional day care at day centres, using their budget in different ways. In addition to this, the more expensive in-house provision is likely to see a drop in demand as people spend their personal budgets on cheaper external provision. The growth shown here is a reflection of the double running costs resulting from people using their personal budgets differently, and is partly offset by the reduction shown in R23. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Other | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations. | | | | |
| This links to the personalisation agenda, with a move to greater choice and control for individuals, where many will choose alternative services, and highlighted as a risk (Older Peoples Services and Community Care Services SIEPs). | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: April 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Addition | | |
| Staff | 1,161 | 142 | 284 | 426 |
| Non Staff Costs | 421 | 52 | 105 | 157 |
| Income | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 1,582 | 194 | 389 | 583 |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | 39 | 39 | 39 |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

Individual Pro-formas for growth and reduction proposals

| | | | | |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | | Proposal No: ASC G13 | | |
| All Areas | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | |
| <u>Under-Utilised Independent Sector Block Contracts</u> | | | | |
| <p>Personal Budgets will result in people using their allocated money in different ways to those currently. There is a likelihood that people will choose to arrange more of their care themselves, perhaps engaging directly with providers or using different types of providers, and arrange less of their support through the Council's existing contracts with providers. This will result in double-running costs where current block contracts are under-utilised. The reducing figures over the 3 years reflect the management of these costs over time.</p> | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Other | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| <p>This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations.</p> <p>This links to the personalisation agenda, with a move to greater choice and control for individuals, where many will choose alternative services, and highlighted as a risk (Older Peoples Services and Community Care Services SIEPs).</p> | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: April 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Addition | | |
| Staff | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non Staff Costs | 57,130 | 300 | 150 | 0 |
| Income | (17,886) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 39,244 | 300 | 150 | 0 |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

Individual Pro-formas for growth and reduction proposals

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | | Proposal No: ASC G14 | | |
| All Areas | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | |
| <u>Transitional Protection Costs</u> As existing service users are moved onto personal budgets, their budget may be more or less than the cost of their current package of support. The figures shown here represent the additional cost of guaranteeing those existing service users who lose out from personal budgets that their current package of support will be maintained for a period of 12 months from their move onto a personal budget. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Other | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations. | | | | |
| This was noted as a risk as part of the personalisation agenda (Older Peoples Services and Community Care Services SIEPs). | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: October 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | |
| | <u>Existing Budget</u> | <u>Proposed Addition</u> | | |
| Staff | 13,299 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non Staff Costs | 63,965 | 283 | 566 | 850 |
| Income | (21,156) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 56,108 | 283 | 566 | 850 |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

Individual Pro-formas for growth and reduction proposals

| | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | Proposal No: ASC G15 | | | |
| Carers | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | |
| <u>Investment in Carers Services</u> The Putting People First concordat recognises the importance of carers, social capital being one of the 4 main themes. The growth shown here represents an extension of the Carer's Personal Budget Scheme to a full year (the current budget allowed only 6 months running, and has been well received and taken up by carers), alongside increased training for carers, development of user-led organisations, and investment in the voluntary sector for advice and advocacy for carers. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Service Improvement | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations. | | | | |
| This was noted as a risk as part of the personalisation agenda (Older Peoples Services and Community Care Services SIEPs). | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: April 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Addition | | |
| Staff | 331 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non Staff Costs | 834 | 220 | 220 | 220 |
| Income | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 1,165 | 220 | 220 | 220 |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

Individual Pro-formas for growth and reduction proposals

| | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | Proposal No: ASC G17 | | | |
| All Areas | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | |
| <p><u>Contact Centre Running Costs</u> As part of the process of putting the customer at the heart of the personalisation process, the setting up of a central contact centre will enable us to take advantage of new technology to support efficient processes, and to provide better contact with vulnerable people. Whilst additional costs are incurred here, this is necessary to generate savings highlighted elsewhere, including R16.</p> | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Decisions already taken/Service Improvement/Other | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| <p>This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations.</p> <p>This was noted as a risk as part of the personalisation agenda (Older Peoples Services and Community Care Services SIEPs).</p> | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: April 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Addition | | |
| Staff | 0 | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| Non Staff Costs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Income | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 0 | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | 2 | 2 | 2 |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

Individual Pro-formas for growth and reduction proposals

| | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | Proposal No: ASC G18 | | | |
| AI Areas | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | |
| <p><u>Increased Number of Reviews</u> Personalisation requires high quality reviews for every customer at least annually, and some customers will require more regular reviews to ensure they are safe and that their personal budget is being used appropriately to support them. In addition, the increased number of service users included in G3.1 and G3.2 will require also require reviews.</p> | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Service Improvement/Other | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| <p>This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations.</p> <p>This was noted as a risk as part of the personalisation agenda (Older Peoples Services and Community Care Services SIEPs).</p> | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: October 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | | | |
| | <u>2009-10</u> | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | |
| | <u>Existing Budget</u> | <u>Proposed Addition</u> | | |
| Staff | 548 | 25 | 50 | 50 |
| Non Staff Costs | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Income | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 567 | 25 | 50 | 50 |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | | | |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | 286 | 286 | 286 |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

Individual Pro-formas for growth and reduction proposals

| | | | | |
|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | | Proposal No: ASC G22 | | |
| All Areas | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | |
| <p><u>Safeguarding Unit</u> In order to meet the obligations for safeguarding, and in recognition of the increasing risks from personalising services and using different types of providers to support people, and to ensure proper investigation and recording of safeguarding concerns, additional specialist support is necessary.</p> | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Service Improvement | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| <p>This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations.</p> <p>This was noted as a risk as part of the personalisation agenda (Older Peoples Services, Community Care Services, and Personalisation & Business Support SIEPs).</p> | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: April 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Addition | | |
| Staff | 0 | 150 | 150 | 150 |
| Non Staff Costs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Income | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 0 | 150 | 150 | 150 |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | 4 | 4 | 4 |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

Individual Pro-formas for growth and reduction proposals

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Commissioning | | Proposal No: ASC G23 | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | |
| <u>Commissioning Unit</u> In order to ensure the right services are available for people to use for their care support, and to ensure the proper delivery of strategic outcomes, individual outcomes and value for money, additional capacity is necessary to deliver the necessary strategic commissioning approach. The changing emphasis to prevention and early intervention and personalisation requires additional capacity to ensure the effectiveness of our investment. This investment is necessary to achieve the savings reductions under R24.1 and R24.2 | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Service Improvement | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations. | | | | |
| This was noted as a risk as part of the personalisation agenda (Older Peoples Services, Community Care Services, and Personalisation & Business Support SIEPs). | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> Date: April 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Addition | | |
| Staff | 736 | 300 | 300 | 300 |
| Non Staff Costs | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Income | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 0 | 300 | 300 | 300 |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | 7 | 7 | 7 |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11

Individual Pro-formas for growth and reduction proposals

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA All Areas | | Proposal No: ASC G25 | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> | | | | |
| <u>Government Bill – Free Personal Care at Home</u> The cost of the recent government bill offering free personal care to certain individuals is due to be part funded by a central government grant, and part by the local authority. There are 3 options for distributing the grant to authorities which would result in very different grant allocations for Leicester. The 3 options under consideration will leave a burden to the authority of somewhere between £1.4m and £2m per annum. The middle option of £1.7m is included here. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Other | | | | |
| <u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations. | | | | |
| This was not identified in SIEPs, as this is only a recent government proposal. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> Date: October 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Addition | | |
| Staff | 3,273 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non Staff Costs | 8,137 | 850 | 1,700 | 1,700 |
| Income | (1,878) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 9,532 | 850 | 1,700 | 1,700 |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Extra post(s) (FTE) | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Domiciliary Care | | Proposal No: ASC R3 | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> To support vulnerable adults and older people in their own homes. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> <u>Electronic Care Monitoring</u> A new system of monitoring the delivery of home care was recently introduced, in September 2009, to enable all the independent sector home care assistants to electronically log in and out of duty by using the telephone. This will result in the authority being charged on a more accurate basis, leading to savings. It is difficult, at this early stage, to quantify these with confidence. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Efficiency Cash Releasing | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations. This is noted in the Older Peoples Division SIEP as an efficiency saving. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> <p align="right">Date: April 2010</p> | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | |
| Staff | 3,273 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non Staff Costs | 8,137 | (50) | (100) | (100) |
| Income | (1,878) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 6,435 | (50) | (100) | (100) |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | Proposal No: ASC R5 | | | |
| Learning Disabilities & Stroke | | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> | | | | |
| These grants provide support for people moving to and living in the community. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> | | | | |
| <u>Ring-Fenced Grants Dropping Out</u> | | | | |
| This offsets the growth under G5, and represents the reduced expenditure following the ceasing of the Learning Disabilities Campus Grant and the Stroke Care Grant from the end of 2010/11. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Service Reduction | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations. | | | | |
| This is noted as a possible risk, as in G5, under the Community Care Services Division SIEP. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: April 2011 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | | | |
| | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | |
| Staff | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non Staff Costs | 946 | 0 | (946) | (946) |
| Income | (946) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 0 | 0 | (946) | (946) |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | Proposal No: ASC R7 | | | |
| All Areas | | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> | | | | |
| Providing personal budgets to meet the social care needs of vulnerable adults and older people. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> | | | | |
| <u>Reduced Costs Under Personal Budgets – Alternative Ways of Meeting Need</u> | | | | |
| There is an intrinsic expectation based on substantive national evidence that personal budgets and their flexibility will result in people using their budgets on services that continue to meet their needs, but will do so at a lower cost both because personal budgets are used to buy the things that people truly need to affect the key issues in their lives and because they have control. This is widely expected due to the use of innovative and alternative services rather than traditional offerings. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Efficiency Cash Releasing | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations. | | | | |
| This was noted as an efficiency saving as part of the personalisation agenda, linking to the Older Peoples Services, Community Care Services, and Personalisation & Business Support SIEPs. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: April 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | | | |
| | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | |
| | <u>Existing Budget</u> | <u>Proposed Reduction</u> | | |
| Staff | 13,299 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non Staff Costs | 63,965 | (175) | (250) | (525) |
| Income | (21,156) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 56,108 | (175) | (250) | (525) |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | | | |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | Proposal No: ASC R9 | | | |
| All Areas | | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> | | | | |
| Providing personal budgets to meet the social care needs of vulnerable adults and older people. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> | | | | |
| <u>Clawback of Unused Personal Budgets</u> | | | | |
| Although people will plan to use all of their personal budget, the likelihood is that some will not be spent. While people will be allowed to build up a certain surplus, the amounts included here represent the clawing back of amounts above this level that remain unused. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Other | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations. | | | | |
| This was noted as an efficiency saving as part of the personalisation agenda, linking to the Older Peoples Services, Community Care Services, and Personalisation & Business Support SIEPs. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | |
| Staff | 13,299 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non Staff Costs | 63,965 | (123) | (154) | (187) |
| Income | (21,156) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 56,108 | (123) | (154) | (187) |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | Proposal No: ASC R11 | | | |
| Physical Disabilities & Older People | | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> | | | | |
| To provide prevention and early intervention services in order to reduce the level of ongoing support that is required. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> | | | | |
| <u>Improved Prevention and Early Intervention</u> This is linked to the investment made in G8, representing the savings associated with an investment in low level prevention services. Service users who would otherwise have required an ongoing service will no longer need this. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Efficiency Cash Releasing | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations. | | | | |
| This relates to efficiencies noted through reablement and early intervention linking to the Older Peoples Services, Community Care Services, and Personalisation & Business Support SIEPs. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: April 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | | | |
| | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | |
| | <u>Existing Budget</u> | <u>Proposed Reduction</u> | | |
| Staff | 13,299 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non Staff Costs | 63,965 | (285) | (811) | (1,707) |
| Income | (21,156) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 56,108 | (285) | (811) | (1,707) |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | | | |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | Proposal No: ASC R12 | | | |
| All Areas | | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> | | | | |
| To provide a reablement service in order to reduce the level of ongoing support that is required. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> | | | | |
| <u>Reablement Service – People Needing No Further Support</u> | | | | |
| The intention of the reablement service is that some people will no longer need an ongoing service which would otherwise have been provided. The savings shown here represent the reduction in costs as a result of this. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Efficiency Cash Releasing | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations. | | | | |
| This relates to efficiencies noted through reablement and early intervention linking to the Older Peoples Services, Community Care Services, and Personalisation & Business Support SIEPs. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: April 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | | | |
| | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | |
| | <u>Existing Budget</u> | <u>Proposed Reduction</u> | | |
| Staff | 13,299 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non Staff Costs | 63,965 | (546) | (1,519) | (2,119) |
| Income | (21,156) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 56,108 | (546) | (1,519) | (2,119) |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA All Areas | Proposal No: ASC R13 | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> To provide a reablement service in order to reduce the level of ongoing support that is required. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> <u>Reablement Service – People Needing a Reduced Level of Support</u> It is anticipated that people with higher level needs will continue to need services following a period of reablement, but will need a smaller package of support than they would otherwise have done. The savings shown here are in addition to those in R12. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Efficiency Cash Releasing | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations. This relates to efficiencies noted through reablement and early intervention linking to the Older Peoples Services, Community Care Services, and Personalisation & Business Support SIEPs. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> <p style="text-align: right;">Date: April 2010</p> | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | | | |
| | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | |
| | <u>Existing Budget</u> | <u>Proposed Reduction</u> | | |
| Staff | 13,299 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non Staff Costs | 63,965 | (537) | (968) | (1,268) |
| Income | (21,156) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 56,108 | (537) | (968) | (1,268) |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | | | |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | Proposal No: ASC R14 | | | |
| All Areas | | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> | | | | |
| To assess the social care needs of vulnerable adults and older people. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> | | | | |
| <u>Increase in Self-Assessment</u> | | | | |
| The personalisation of adult social care provides opportunities for customers to take greater direct control of their care including the assessment process. It is anticipated that a proportion of people will undertake their own assessment with reduced direct involvement of social work staff as a proportion of people will want to take a full and direct control of all of their involvement with social care. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Efficiency Cash Releasing | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations. | | | | |
| This was noted as an efficiency saving as part of the personalisation agenda, linking to the Older Peoples Services, Community Care Services, and Personalisation & Business Support SIEPs. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: April 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | | | |
| | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | |
| Staff | 1,080 | (20) | (30) | (40) |
| Non Staff Costs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Income | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 1,080 | (20) | (30) | (40) |
| Staffing Implications | | | | |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | 38 | 38 | 38 |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | | Proposal No: ASC R16 | | | |
| All Areas | | | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> | | | | | |
| To refer and screen individuals who contact the authority through the most appropriate route. | | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> | | | | | |
| <u>More Efficient Screening From Contact Centre</u> | | | | | |
| As a result of the growth included in G17, there are anticipated savings resulting from a more efficient process of referring individuals from the contact centre. | | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | | |
| Efficiency- Non Cash Releasing | | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | | |
| This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations. | | | | | |
| This was noted as an efficiency saving as part of the social care transformation programme, linking to the Older Peoples Services, Community Care Services, and Personalisation & Business Support SIEPs. | | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | | |
| Date: April 2011 | | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | <u>2009-10</u> | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| | | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | | |
| | <u>Existing Budget</u> | <u>Proposed Reduction</u> | | | |
| Staff | 1,538 | 0 | (125) | (250) | |
| Non Staff Costs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Income | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Net Total | 1,538 | 0 | (125) | (250) | |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> | |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | 286 | 286 | 286 | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA All Areas | | Proposal No: ASC R19 | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> To provide flexible, mobile working solutions. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> <u>Efficiency Gains From Flexible Mobile Working</u> To support the personalisation process and in working with people in their communities, the implementation of mobile working will provide some improvement in efficiency and the ability to support people in their own home. There is a need to transform our services and processes before this can be implemented. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Efficiency- Non Cash Releasing | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations. This was noted as an efficiency saving as part of the social care transformation programme, linking to the Older Peoples Services, Community Care Services, and Personalisation & Business Support SIEPs. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> <p align="right">Date: April 2012</p> | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | |
| Staff | 1,727 | 0 | 0 | (150) |
| Non Staff Costs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Income | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 1,727 | 0 | 0 | (150) |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | 286 | 286 | 286 |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | 0 | 0 | 4 |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | | Proposal No: ASC R20 | | |
| All Areas | | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> | | | | |
| To ensure that the appropriate organisation is funding the cost of people's care and support. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> | | | | |
| <u>Improved Application of Continuing Healthcare</u> | | | | |
| The Department of Health published the National Framework for NHS Continuing Healthcare and NHS-funded Nursing Care in 2007, supported by a set of tools. It is felt that by using this National Framework, there will be cases of current clients, where the cost is shared, that will come out as 100% continuing care and that the Primary Care Trust will have to pick up all the costs. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Efficiency Cash Releasing | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations. | | | | |
| SIEP - This was noted as a potential efficiency saving as part of an independent review into the increasing cost of adult social care. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: April 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | |
| Staff | 13,299 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non Staff Costs | 63,965 | (500) | (750) | (1,000) |
| Income | (21,156) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 56,108 | (500) | (750) | (1,000) |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA All Areas | | Proposal No: ASC R21 | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> To accurately determine the individual contributions that people make towards the cost of their care. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> <u>Extension of Charging to All Services</u> This represents the introduction of charging to all those services provided for through personal budgets. The main result of this is to commence charging for attendance at day centres and for transport, and to reduce the level of subsidy that is currently offered for other services, including home care. This will simplify the introduction of personal budgets substantially, as well as avoid a significant increase in the process costs. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Efficiency Cash Releasing | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations. This was noted as an efficiency saving as part of the transformation agenda, linking to the Older Peoples Services, Community Care Services, and Personalisation & Business Support SIEPs. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> <p align="right">Date: October 2010</p> | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | |
| Staff | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non Staff Costs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Income | (13,200) | (150) | (400) | (400) |
| Net Total | (13,200) | (150) | (400) | (400) |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | | Proposal No: ASC R22 | | | |
| Residential Services & Supported Living | | | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> | | | | | |
| To support vulnerable adults and older people in a residential care setting. | | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> | | | | | |
| <u>Reduced Reliance on Residential Care</u> This represents savings from moving clients from residential care into supported living arrangements. It has been found that these savings can be made if the appropriate individuals can be identified, and substantially increases the independence and choice of the people in supported living. | | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | | |
| Efficiency Cash Releasing | | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | | |
| This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations. | | | | | |
| This was noted as a reduction in residential placements due to people remaining independent for longer (linking to the Older Peoples Services and Community Care Services SIEPs). | | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | | |
| Date: April 2010 | | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | <u>2009-10</u> | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| | | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | | |
| | <u>Existing Budget</u> | <u>Proposed Reduction</u> | | | |
| Staff | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non Staff Costs | 27,659 | (73) | (278) | (584) | (584) |
| Income | (13,873) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 13,786 | (73) | (278) | (584) | (584) |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> | |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | | Proposal No: ASC R23 | | |
| In House Day Services | | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> | | | | |
| To support vulnerable adults and older people in the community. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> | | | | |
| <u>Re-Provision of In-House Day Services</u> | | | | |
| This saving is linked to the growth in G11. To counteract the underutilisation of in-house services, this represents the possibility of closing one or more day centres. An options appraisal will take place in February, but indicative savings are shown here. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Efficiency Cash Releasing | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations. | | | | |
| This was noted as an efficiency saving as part of the personalisation agenda, linking to the Older Peoples Services and Community Care Services. | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: April 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | |
| | <u>Existing Budget</u> | <u>Proposed Reduction</u> | | |
| Staff | 1,161 | 0 | (110) | (110) |
| Non Staff Costs | 421 | 0 | (40) | (40) |
| Income | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 1,582 | 0 | (150) | (150) |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | 39 | 39 | 39 |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | 0 | 3 | 3 |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA Commissioning & Procurement | | Proposal No: ASC R24.1 | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> To commission services appropriate to the needs of social care clients. | | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> <u>Improved Commissioning</u> Using the additional commissioning resources under G23, this reduction reflects the drive for value for money from our commissioned services whilst ensuring outcomes are achieved and the services people want to use are available. | | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Efficiency Cash Releasing | | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations. This is linked to efficiencies noted to improve commissioning and procurement activities for adult social care (linking to the Personalisation & Business Support SIEP). | | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> Date: April 2010 | | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | | |
| Staff | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non Staff Costs | 57,130 | (239) | (657) | (1,140) | (1,140) |
| Income | (17,886) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 39,244 | (239) | (657) | (1,140) | (1,140) |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> | |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA | | Proposal No: ASC R24.2 | | |
| Residential Services | | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> | | | | |
| To commission services appropriate to the needs of social care clients. | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> | | | | |
| <u>Care Funding Calculator</u> | | | | |
| The Care Funding Calculator is a tool for commissioners to improve their bargaining position with providers by advising on a reasonable price that should be paid for a given higher cost residential or supported living place (>£800 per week). This should drive through savings in addition to those in R24.1. It is however dependant upon a thriving external market which will need to be developed over time through commissioning activity, linked to G23. | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | |
| Efficiency Cash Releasing | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | |
| This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations. | | | | |
| This is linked to efficiencies noted to improve commissioning and procurement activities for adult social care (linking to the Personalisation & Business Support SIEP). | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | |
| Date: April 2010 | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| Effects of Changes on budget | | | | |
| | Existing Budget | Proposed Reduction | | |
| Staff | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non Staff Costs | 57,130 | (155) | (356) | (735) |
| Income | (17,886) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Total | 39,244 | (155) | (356) | (735) |
| Staffing Implications | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | | | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | | | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | |

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DIVISIONS

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA All Areas | | Proposal No: ASC R26 | | | |
| <u>Purpose of Service:</u> | | | | | |
| <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> | | | | | |
| <u>Management Reductions</u> The transformation of adult social care necessitates changes to our structure to align responsibilities to support transformation. A full and formal review provides opportunities to rationalise the levels and spans of control into a more efficient and effective management structure. | | | | | |
| <u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> | | | | | |
| Efficiency Cash Releasing | | | | | |
| <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> | | | | | |
| This supports the One Leicester priorities of Creating Thriving, Safe Communities, and Improving Wellbeing & Health, through providing support to a range of vulnerable people who fall under the remit of the Local Authority's statutory obligations. | | | | | |
| This was noted as an efficiency saving as part of the transformation agenda, linking to the Older Peoples Services, Community Care Services, and Personalisation & Business Support SIEPs. | | | | | |
| <u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u> | | | | | |
| Date: October 2010 | | | | | |
| <u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u> | | <u>2009-10</u> £000s | <u>2010-11</u> £000s | <u>2011-12</u> £000s | <u>2012-13</u> £000s |
| <u>Effects of Changes on budget</u> | | | | | |
| | <u>Existing Budget</u> | <u>Proposed Reduction</u> | | | |
| Staff | 27,421 | (50) | (450) | (550) | |
| Non Staff Costs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Income | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Net Total | 27,421 | (50) | (450) | (550) | |
| <u>Staffing Implications</u> | | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> | |
| Current service staffing (FTE) | | 10 | 54 | 54 | |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE) | | 2 | 8.5 | 8.5 | |
| Current vacancies (FTE) | | | | | |
| Individuals at risk (FTE) | | | | | |