



Service Challenge Savings (Consultation not required)

www.lancashire.gov.uk



Contents	Page
SC002 - Waste – Reduce non-recyclable waste disposal at HWRCs	4
SC012 - Integrated Transport Services	6
SC013 - Bus Shelter Advertising	8
SC029 - Highways – Gully Emptying	9
SC034 - Highways Network Regulation (Parking – On street pay and display)	11
SC035 - Highway Regulation (Bus Lane Enforcement)	13
SC048 - Highways Regulation (Street Works Permit Fees)	15
SC060 - Core Business Systems - Digital Contact by Consent	17
SC074 - Customer Access Service – LCC Customer Journey	20
SC075 - Customer Access Service – Reduce Opening Hours	25
SC078 - Customer Access Service – Stop Delivery of Highways Emails	27
SC103 - Lancashire Youth Offending Team (YOT)	30
SC104 – Lancashire Youth Offending Team	32
SC109 - Safeguarding, Inspection and Audit (Audit Team)	34
SC112 - Review of the management structure across Children's Social Care	36
SC113 - Education and Children's Services Business Support	38
SC122 - Lancashire Safeguarding Children's Board	40
SC123 - Demand Management Projects including an expansion of Family Group Conferencing	42
SC124 - Children's Social Care	44
SC134 - Special Educational Needs and Disabilities - Independent Non Maintained Special Schools	46
SC136 - School Improvement	48
SC312 – Exchequer	50
SC316 - Corporate Finance	51
SC317 – Corporate Finance	53
SC358 - Child Protection Legal Services Legal Fees/Disbursements	54
SC366 - Child Protection Legal Services Reduction of 25 Public Law Outline cases	56
SC368 - Child Protection Legal Services Police Disclosure costs	58

SC374 - Democratic Services – Freeze Annual Uplift	60
SC375 - Democratic Services – Member Subsistence	62
SC401 - Facilities Management	64
SC501 - Adult Social Care Community (Older People (OP) / Physical Disability (PD))	66
SC505 - Home care for older adults and people with physical disabilities – promoting single-handed care	69
SC507 - Changes in Night Time Support rate for commissioned services	73
SC508 - Modernisation of Supported Housing	77
SC511 - Enablement	83
SC512 - Acceleration of Disability Service Supported Living Remodelling	85
SC513 - Lancashire Care Foundation Trust (LCFT) supported living scheme transfer to LCCs Disability Service	87
SC518 - Adult Social Care – Reassessing Direct Payments	90
SC520 - Adult Social Care – Promoting Direct Debit	92
SC521 - Adult Social Care – Residential Care Status	94
SC602 - Children & Family Wellbeing (CFW)	96
SC605 - Bus Network Education Resource	98
SC616 - Patient Safety and Safeguarding	99
SC801 - Planning and Environment (environmental information charges)	100
SC805 - Economic Development - Increase Income from Lancashire County Developments Limited (Lancashire Business Park)	101
SC811 - Economic Development	103

Reference – SC002

Service Name:		Waste – Reduce non-recyclable waste disposal at HWRCs		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23		2019/20		
Gross budget 2018/19		£8.064m		
Income 2018/19		£0.600m		
Net budget 2018/19		£7.464m		
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.250	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.250
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings		Agree measures to reduce non-recyclable waste disposal at Household Waste Recycling Centres.		
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners		The saving will be delivered through changes in operations at Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs) in order to ensure recyclable waste is prevented from being deposited in the non-recyclable waste containers. This change may be noticeable to service users as it will result in increased scrutiny and separation of the wastes being delivered. There is potential that on some occasions customers may encounter minor delays in depositing their rubbish. Facilities may appear more untidy at busy times as separated items are gathered prior to storage.		
Actions needed to deliver the service change		<p>Changes to operations at HWRCs to reduce open accessibility to non-recyclable containers for members of the public.</p> <p>Increased engagement between HWRC staff and customers and greater promotion of waste separation.</p> <p>Staff will be encouraged to actively open bags, boxes or other containers containing waste in order to retrieve recyclable materials.</p>		

	Operations will be planned on a site by site basis to take into account the general layout, size and usage of each facility.	
Is external consultation required	No	
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	<p>Reducing the amount of non-recyclable waste may not be achieved in sufficient quantities although analysis of materials deposited in non-recyclable containers indicate that the required levels can be achieved. Delivery of this saving will be difficult to measure as the amount of non-recyclable waste collected varies each year</p> <p>Some customers may perceive the active sorting of their rubbish as an invasion of privacy. In general it is anticipated that customers will be encouraged to separate wastes themselves but where they refuse to do so staff will be trained on recovery of recyclable materials in this event. Procedures will be put in place to allow the disposal of personal or sensitive items without intrusion.</p> <p>It should be noted that the outcome of the separate HWRC budget saving has the potential to impact delivery of this saving.</p>	
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?		Not required

Reference – SC012

Service Name:		Integrated Transport Services - Provision of Bus Passes for Secondary Excluded, wherever possible		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23		2019/20		
Gross budget 2018/19		£23.982m		
Income 2018/19		£2.658m		
Net budget 2018/19		£21.324m		
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	-0.400	0.000	0.000	-0.400
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings		To cease the practice of procuring taxi transport as the first choice option for secondary excluded school pupils, and provide a bus pass in its place.		
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners		The proposal will affect the excluded pupils who otherwise would have received taxi transport. They would instead be expected to travel by bus. This may impact upon attendance and punctuality. It may also impact upon the Pupil Referral Units with increased absenteeism and late arrivals. There may also be an impact on bus operators and other passengers on buses should an increase in anti-social behaviour occur.		
Actions needed to deliver the service change		<p>Development of an assessment procedure to determine suitability to travel by bus or justification for taxi transport.</p> <p>Engagement with Pupil Referral Units</p> <p>Pupils/families/Head teachers informed of change and involved in planning for the impact. Full headteacher engagement in the development of pupil's transport plans and engaged in discussing strategies to ensure excluded pupils access education closer to home if there are viable alternatives.</p>		

Is external consultation required	No
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	Risk that pupils are unable or unwilling to travel by bus and therefore do not attend thereby disrupting their education or disrupt schools because of late arrival and bus services because of poor behaviour. This can be mitigated through use of an assessment procedure.
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?	Not required

Reference – SC013

Service Name:	Bus Shelter Advertising			
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23	2019/20			
Gross budget 2018/19	£0.000m			
Income 2018/19	£0.000m			
Net budget 2018/19	£0.000m			
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.050	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.050
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	To agree to sell advertising space on appropriate bus shelters and develop other opportunities at bus stations in conjunction with other county council advertising initiatives.			
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	Management and administration resources will be required to establish and maintain a client base.			
Actions needed to deliver the service change	Collaboration within the county council to develop a strategy and implementation plan for commercial advertising			
Is external consultation required	No			
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	There is a risk that demand for advertising will fluctuate.			
Is an Equality Analysis required and,	Not required			

if so, has one been undertaken?	
---------------------------------	--

Reference – SC029

Service Name:	Highways – Gully Emptying
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23	2020/21
Gross budget 2018/19	£1.547m
Income 2018/19	£0.000m
Net budget 2018/19	£1.547m

Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):

2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	-0.283	0.000	0.000	-0.283

FTE implications:

2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	3.00

Investment Required (Invest to Save):

2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings

To procure an external contract for routine and reactive gully cleansing.

Approve the establishment and investment of 3.0 fte to support the implementation of this saving proposal. The saving of £0.283m is net of the additional investment required.

Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners

The service delivers the programme of works through in house delivery with directly employed operatives and 12 county council owned vehicles. It is supplemented by contractors when required.

The service routinely cleanses 105,000 gullies per year and undertakes reactive cleaning and jetting works all within a budget of £1.547m.

The service experiences a high turnover of staff, recruitment has become more difficult leading to driver shortages and the consequent use of contractors who have their own vehicles which means that our vehicles under-utilised.

	<p>County council vehicles are ageing and require increasing maintenance or replacement.</p> <p>It is proposed to employ a contractor to undertake routine gully cleansing works, with six vehicles being retained to support the in house delivery of reactive work. The proposals include the establishment of 3 posts to provide supervision of the contract.</p>
Actions needed to deliver the service change	Through a competitive tendering process, establish a framework contract for the delivery of routine gully cleansing.
Is external consultation required	No
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	<p>There is no proposed change to current service levels.</p> <p>Contractor performance will be monitored to ensure service standards are met.</p> <p>The contractor will be required to provide records in a format consistent with the county council's asset management system</p>
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?	Not required

Reference – SC034

Service Name:	Highways Network Regulation (Parking – On street pay and display)			
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23	2019/20			
Gross budget 2018/19	£2.105m			
Income 2018/19	£2.675m			
Net budget 2018/19	-£0.570m			
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	-0.100	-0.085	0.000	-0.185
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.114	0.098	0.000	0.000	0.212
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	Increase the number of on street pay and display machines and chargeable parking spaces.			
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	Currently there is charging for parking on street in Lancaster and Preston only, which is confined to a relatively small number of streets in the city centres. The proposal is to expand provision in the city centres and implement on street charging for parking into other towns and localities in Lancashire. It is also proposed to review the level of on street parking charges.			
Actions needed to deliver the service change	Charging can help to manage the availability of kerbside parking space where there is a demand for it. Initial areas for consideration in addition to Lancaster and Preston comprise Burnley, Lytham, Ormskirk, Clitheroe, Whalley, Carnforth, Colne, Padiham, Nelson, Chorley, Cleveleys, Poulton and Great Harwood. It is estimated that the number of pay and display ticket machines would increase from 27 to 80 and the number of chargeable parking spaces would increase from approximately 190 to approximately 560.			

	<p>The introduction of on street parking charges would require the promotion of a traffic regulation order which is subject to statutory public consultation and the consideration of any consequent objections.</p>	
Is external consultation required	No	
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	<p>Objection to the introduction of the on street charging is highly likely.</p> <p>The introduction of charges may lead to the migration of parking into adjacent streets which could be mitigated through the promotion of traffic regulations.</p>	
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?	Yes - completed	

Reference – SC035

Service Name:	Highway Regulation (Bus Lane Enforcement)			
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23	2019/20			
Gross budget 2018/19	£2.105m			
Income 2018/19	£2.675m			
Net budget 2018/19	-£0.570m			
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-1.500*	-0.458	0.000	0.000	-1.958
<i>*Includes £1m for sites that are currently subject to camera enforcement</i>				
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.0
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.150	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.150
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	Approval to expand the use of camera enforcement to promote compliance with bus lane restrictions in Lancashire.			
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	Bus lanes have been introduced across Lancashire in order to promote the use of public transport through improving journey times and service reliability. Camera enforcement provides an effective means of securing compliance with bus lane restrictions, protecting the investment that has been made in them. 10 sites at which bus lanes exist or are approved for introduction have been identified for camera enforcement - Greyhound Bridge (2 sites), Morecambe Road (2 sites) and Parliament Street in Lancaster; Tithebarn Street, Fishergate/Cheapside and Fishergate Hill in Preston; and Whitebirk link and Accrington Town Centre in Hyndburn. .			
Actions needed to deliver the service change	The introduction of bus lane enforcement cameras would require a review of signing and road marking requirements and the promotion of traffic regulation orders, which require statutory public consultation and the consideration of objections.			

	Procurement and installation of cameras. Recruitment of staff to manage administrative processes.	
Is external consultation required	No	
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	Objection to the introduction of bus lane camera enforcement is highly likely.	
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?	Not required	

Reference – SC048

Service Name:	Highways Regulation (Street Works Permit Fees)			
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23	2019/20			
Gross budget 2018/19	£1.438m			
Income 2018/19	£3.242m			
Net budget 2018/19	-£1.804m			
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.380*	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.380
<i>*Includes £0.300m for income already being recovered</i>				
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	To increase the fees associated with the Lancashire Permit Scheme for Street Works.			
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	The permit scheme fees have been reviewed as part of the 3 year statutory review period. This review has indicated that an increase could be applied to the fees. All the fees associated with the Lancashire Permit Scheme would still be below the maximum statutory level. An increase in the fees will mean higher charges to the utility companies which may be passed on to utility company customers.			
Actions needed to deliver the service change	2 month consultation with utility companies and the Department for Transport and the subsequent consideration of any objections. Consultation required with utility companies and the Department for Transport.			
Is external consultation required	No			

What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	There is a risk of objections from utility companies which would be mitigated by the analysis of income and expenditure in the detailed review that has taken place.	
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?	Not required	

Reference – SC060

Service Name:	Core Business Systems - Digital Contact by Consent			
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23	2019/20			
Gross budget 2018/19	£4.097m			
Income 2018/19	£0.302m			
Net budget 2018/19	£3.795m			
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	-0.021	-0.019	-0.017	-0.057
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	<p>This would involve gaining customer consent to being contacted electronically and not via 'hard copy' mail. Once consent is given all correspondence will be via electronic/digital means.</p> <p>Cabinet decision to accept Digital Contact by Consent (links to development and adoption of Digital First Strategy).</p>			
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	<p>This is a complex piece of work with multiple stakeholders and customers. However, it has the potential to generate significant savings year on year if executed correctly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The approach will impact upon all services users accessing LCC services, with varying digital skill levels and varying access to digital mediums • Requirement for involvement of all services that communicate with services users via hard copy mail/letters as processes would need to be consistent across the organisation, that is to say, digital first. • Customer Access and Communications will be key in the management of messages surrounding this change of approach. • BTLS ICT technical advice required on the implementation of digital consent and development of 			

	<p>processes and system integration to ensure we capture a services users consent (or refusal) and ensure this follows them on their user journey throughout the organisation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Longer term investment in the wider development of digital skills within the organisation and the wider community to support service users with the transition. This will link to the delivery of a Digital First Strategy and have implications for a range of services including Skills, Learning & Development and Economic Development as well as external groups and partner organisations.
<p>Actions needed to deliver the service change</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adoption of the Digital First Strategy • A robust, integrated, technical infrastructure will need to be in place in order to capture consent and facilitate its movement throughout a service user journey when accessing multiple services. • Consistent support and adoption of the principle of digital consent across the organisation. • This would need to be managed as a distinct programme of work with underpinning work streams, representatives and leads from all areas of the organisation would be needed in order to understand all aspects of a service users' journey and how moving to digital would impact them • Working groups established with service users to fully understand how we can work together to put them at the heart of the digital journey. • An effective communications campaign to communicate the coming changes to service users • Investment may be required to support the delivery of Digital Contact by Consent.
<p>Is external consultation required</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential reputational risk. The organisation may be seen to be making it unnecessarily difficult for service users to interact with us. <p>Mitigate the risk by ensuring that informed consent is given and not assumed or forced. As processes improve and customers become more familiar with effective digital first transactions this risk will diminish.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is an innovative and new way of working with a significant risk that we are unable to adequately capture consent for digital contact in a consistent way. If this cannot be done effectively it will mean service users receive contact via a range of mediums, even if they have already consented to

	<p>digital contact. This would have both reputational and financial implications.</p> <p>This risk will be mitigated through the establishment of a programme of work to establish the issues to be resolved and an effective development and implementation programme with a phased delivery. The management of communication and customer expectations will also be key.</p>
<p>Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?</p>	<p>Yes - completed</p>

Reference – SC074

Service Name:		Customer Access Service – LCC Customer Journey		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23		2019/20 .		
Gross budget 2018/19		£5.339m		
Income 2018/19		£2.205m		
Net budget 2018/19		£3.134m		
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.040	-0.030	-0.030	-0.020	-0.120
<i>*Please note, further savings of £0.020m will be made in 2023/24</i>				
FTE implications:				
Temporary:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
3.00	-3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Recurrent:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
-1.70	-1.30	-1.20	-0.90	-5.10
<i>*Please note, further savings of 0.80 fte will be made in 2023/24</i>				
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
Temporary:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.120	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.120
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adoption of Digital First Strategy and commitment to support a digital channel shift 2. A decision is required to update the LCC Customer Journey, and to implement, prioritise and maintain digital contact options across all services (links to Digital Contact by Consent SC0 60). 3. Approval of funding to recruit a dedicated Change Manager and technical support function within Customer Access to implement necessary changes to support digital channel shift. 4. A commitment to review, rationalise and reduce customer routes into the authority by delivering a single 'front door' provided by the Customer Access Service. 5. A commitment to encourage and maximise self-service, manage the level of direct engagement with the customer and control quality. 			

	<p>6. A decision is required to bring responsibility for all customer interactive services to the Customer Access Service, including responsibility for on-line services, to allow better partnership working and improve the consistency and quality of the customer experience.</p>
<p>Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners</p>	<p>If this proposal is realised, there will be a change in the nature of enquiries Customer Access handle.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customers seeking information will be enabled to access this directly online without needing to contact the authority through Customer Access or through other services. • Transactional interactions will have been moved online and automated maximising the opportunity for customers to self-serve 24/7. • Customer Access will focus on handling complex interactions that require specialist skills and can't be resolved through self-service or automated transactions. This may require fewer but longer interaction lengths. • Customer Access will work more closely with services across the organisation and with partners, developing stronger working relationships with all services with an aspect of customer interaction, delivering a consistent level of customer engagement • Through this, Customer Access will have full responsibility for the LCC customer journey and will realise improvements to reduce escalations and complaints through tracing the full journey to identify and correct errors. • The knowledge and data collected through this co-ordinated model of joint working between services and Customer Access will be capitalised on to enable the authority to better understand our customer and their experiences, to continually develop and improve the customer journey. <p>In line with the new ways of working, LCC services will see changes in their customer interaction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The bulk of information-seeking and transactional enquiries will be online, and services will see less of the trickle-through enquiries. • No services outside Customer Access will handle any first point of contact (FPOC) customer interactions.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Services will be responsible for keeping Customer Access updated on any changes to their service information so that the online information remains current. • Resource freed for other duties. • BTLS will be required to support all systems and tools required to support this new way of working. <p>The customer will see an improvement in experience when interacting with LCC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information will be easily-available online at any time, increasing the convenience for customers by allowing them to interact with LCC services as they wish to fit around their other commitments. • Quick and easy to report things/apply for things/find updates on things online. • Can interact via new channels - social media and webchat. • Customer Access Service there for focussed help when needed - with shorter waiting times. • Customers have a better opinion of LCC. <p>External partners will interact with LCC in a different way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They will share information with us digitally. • They will support our channel shift and encourage customers to self-serve where appropriate.
<p>Actions needed to deliver the service change</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Finalisation and adoption of Digital First Strategy 2. Thorough business analysis and data collection undertaken by Customer Access and any other services involved, including BTLS, to allow informed planning and delivery of the work required to implement the proposals. 3. A SMART project plan for delivery should then be developed, using the information found in the business analysis work as a basis for timescales. 4. Corporately, existing systems should be exploited to their full potential to support the LCC Customer Journey proposal, with planned programmes of work to digitise customer access to all services being prioritised and maximised to realise full potential.

	<p>5. Particular consideration to be given to Genesys Phase 2, Report It, Apply for It, and the Social Care Portal which could be expanded to include customers, allow two-way information sharing, and other non-social care services?</p>
<p>Is external consultation required</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated</p>	<p>RISK: Lack of appetite within the organisation for the adoption or implementation of a Digital First Strategy, reducing the ability to deliver a digital channel shift for the organisation and the customer</p> <p>MITIGATION: Effective engagement with Cabinet and Corporate Management Team to determine leadership objectives and priorities. Development of appropriate digital priorities linking with Corporate Plan (when available) supported by an effective communication plan.</p> <p>RISK: Transforming the LCC customer journey in line with a Digital First Strategy has a risk that required tools and systems will not be available when needed to realise savings.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Development of challenging but realistic project delivery plans which take full account of realistic technology delivery timescales and resource availability across all services involved.</p> <p>RISK: Transforming the LCC customer journey in line with a Digital First Strategy carries a risk of not truly achieving channel shift, instead moving customer contacts into services and shifting the cost elsewhere rather than realising any savings.</p> <p>MITIGATION: The shift should be done in a robust manner to ensure true customer channel shift, automating processes that are currently manual, using appropriate tools that integrate to back office systems and truly avoid human involvement in handling the incoming interaction. This will avoid moving customer enquiries around the organisation.</p> <p>RISK: There is a risk that customers will still be able to access existing contact details and use them to bypass the digital journey. This will affect potential to realise savings.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Work with LCC's partner organisations to ensure that they support the changes and update their information in line with ours. The older contact channels will have auto responses added to direct customers to correct channel to further enforce this.</p>

	<p>RISK: There is a risk that LCC staff will not want to support this new way of working when it does not directly affect their service or budget. This will affect the ability of the organisation to achieve customer channel shift and realise savings.</p> <p>MITIGATION: LCC CMT to affect organisational culture change by leading on the digital channel shift and promoting a Digital First Strategy, holding all services responsible for their role in this.</p> <p>RISK: Transforming the LCC customer journey in line with a Digital First Strategy risks having a high setup cost as there are large scale changes required.</p> <p>MITIGATION: This is unavoidable, and any changes would need to be supported by a clear business case outlining costs and benefits.</p> <p>RISK: Transforming the LCC customer journey in line with a Digital First Strategy without a maintenance strategy risks online information becoming out of date and generating additional contacts in the future.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Responsibility for maintaining the quality of on-line information will be owned by CAS, supported by Communications and individual services. The delivery plan should include resource provision for regularly revising and updating online information. This should be corporately supported with services responsible for providing CAS with up to date and accurate information.</p> <p>RISK: Putting information online and encouraging our customers to interact with us digitally carries information security risks.</p> <p>MITIGATION: CAS to work with Information Governance and consider the GDPR when designing the customer journey, working with services to complete Privacy Impact Assessments for each new element.</p>
<p>Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?</p>	<p>Not required</p>

Reference – SC075

Service Name:		Customer Access Service – Reduce Opening Hours		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23		2019/20		
Gross budget 2018/19		£5.339m		
Income 2018/19		£2.205m		
Net budget 2018/19		£3.134m		
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.070	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.070
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
-3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-3.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	Cabinet approval to reduce the opening hours of the Customer Access Service to align with County Hall cover. Reducing from 8am – 6pm to 8am – 5pm.			
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First Point Of Contact (FPOC) customer interactions will need to be handled in the new, reduced time period. • The offer to Schools HR (income generating) service would also reduce in line with this. <p>The impact on customers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced operating hours for customer contacts through Customer Access. Currently receive limited number of calls (1.3% of all calls) between 5-6pm. <p>The impact to external partners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced opening hours for external partner contacts through Customer Access 			
Actions needed to deliver the service change	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Corporate and Cabinet approval of reduced operating hours 2. Business analyses process and development of implementation plan to ensure all issues are 			

	addressed before change to new operating hours. This will include an effective communications plan and promotion of new hours.
Is external consultation required	The offer to Schools for the (income generating) HR service would also need to reduce in line with this and therefore needs to be considered when the decision is made. Communication with Schools is required.
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	<p>RISK: Customers find a route into services when CAS not available. It is estimated that non-CAS interactions cost 1/3 more for the same function which would reduce the savings achieved.</p> <p>MITIGATION: This should be avoided by maximising the on-line offer (linking to SCO 74) and actively managing the customer away from direct contact with services.</p> <p>RISK: Customer confusion or misunderstanding of Customer Access availability leading to reputational risks.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Clear and effective communication plan for CAS operating hours, updating of all automated messages, and ensure correct information is provided by partner organisations.</p> <p>RISK: If CAS stop handling first point of contact interactions for a service, and this function instead becomes an online-only facility, then this offer needs to be fit for purpose to support true channel shift rather than generating additional contacts and customer dissatisfaction.</p> <p>MITIGATION: There should be a full project to plan and implement the changes to make sure this is completed properly.</p>
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?	Yes - completed

Reference – SC078

Service Name:		Customer Access Service – Stop Delivery of Highways Emails		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23		2019/20		
Gross budget 2018/19		£5.339m		
Income 2018/19		£2.205m		
Net budget 2018/19		£3.134m		
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.040	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.040
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
-1.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	-1.90
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings		<p>A decision is required that Customer Access will stop delivering email access for Highway enquiries, directing customers to Report It.</p> <p>Email interactions are particularly inefficient as they seldom provide adequate levels of information for action, and become 'conversations' rather than reports for action.</p>		
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners		<p>Customer Access will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See a reduction in the number and variety of email interactions and will actively direct customers to the on-line Report It facility. • Reduce number of FTEs due to reduced demand for email correspondence. This will be achieved through vacancy management in the first instance. <p>The impact on LCC services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for email enquiries to find alternative routes in to the authority and reach Councillors and the Highway Service itself • Expectation that all interactions will be encouraged to take place on-line 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collection of adequate and accurate information at first contact via Report It forms, ensuring appropriate remediation actions can be undertaken by the Highway Service quickly and effectively <p>The impact on customers :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customers affected are those who are already digitally enabled as they are making contact via email • The service will still be delivered by LCC as an online offering, the customer will be able to find information online, and will be required to interact with us online.. • On-line reporting will ensure adequate information is provided by the customer at FPOC and avoid repeat contacts and prolonged interactions. • No anticipated impact on external partners
<p>Actions needed to deliver the service change</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Approval to stop dealing with Highway enquiries via email 2. Thorough business analysis and data collection to allow informed planning and delivery of the work required to implement the proposals. 3. A SMART project plan for delivery will be developed, using the information found in the business analysis work as a basis for timescales. 4. Customers will be actively directed to the on-line Report It facility
<p>Is external consultation required</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated</p>	<p>RISK: If CAS stop handling first point of contact for Highway email, there is a risk that these emails are redirected by customers to the Highways service, VIP mail or Councillors directly.</p> <p>MITIGATION: This should be avoided and on-line options promoted by all parties within the authority.</p> <p>RISK: If CAS stop handling first point of contact interactions for a service, and this function instead becomes an online-only facility, then this offer needs to be fit for purpose to support true channel shift rather than generating additional contacts and customer dissatisfaction.</p>

	<p>MITIGATION: There should be a full project to plan and implement the changes to make sure this is completed properly.</p> <p>RISK: That online options are not appropriate for all customers and some are unable to make reports.</p> <p>MITIGATION: This proposal is specifically directed at customers already contacting the authority on-line (via email) and therefore it is anticipated that they will be able to use the Report it facility</p>
<p>Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?</p>	<p>Not required</p>

Reference – SC103

Service Name:		Lancashire Youth Offending Team (YOT)		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23		2020/21		
Gross budget 2018/19		£2.718m		
Income 2018/19		£1.851m		
Net budget 2018/19		£1.074m		
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	-0.500	0.000	0.000	-0.500
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	0.00*	0.00	0.00	0.00
<i>*this will be determined once budgets are pooled and may result in a staff reduction across the pooled resource.</i>				
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	<p>Agree for discussions to take place with Chief Executives of Lancashire, Blackburn with Darwen and Blackpool Local Authorities and respective Youth Justice Management Boards to agree to combine local YOTs to form a Pan Lancashire YOT and achieve a saving of £0.500m for Lancashire County Council.</p> <p>Agree that a consultation with the National Youth Justice Board takes place as they are a key financial partner in YOT's.</p>			
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Youth Offending Team work to reduce first time entrants to the youth justice system (prevention and diversion), reduce offending behaviour and reduce the use of custody. YOT services will continue to be provided to service users as per national standard requirements for Youth Justice. Impact would be positive for improving efficiencies with partner agencies in YOTs who already provide a Pan Lancashire Service i.e. Lancashire Constabulary, National Probation Service, HM Courts, Victim Services and UCLan. There are already Pan Lancashire Service Level Arrangements in place for these services. 			

<p>Actions needed to deliver the service change</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consult with Local Authorities and Youth Justice Management Board (YJMB) financial partners for agreement. • Consult with Chief Executives of Lancashire, Blackburn with Darwen and Blackpool Local Authorities for agreement. • Consult with YJMB in relation to budgets. • Review of YOTs caseloads and service provision. • Review Pan Lancs YOT staffing arrangements including managers with a view to making efficiencies. • Combine governance, financial and Human Resources arrangements - 1 Youth Justice Management Board instead of 3. • Develop service level agreement for Pan Lancashire YOT health services. • Develop Pan Lancashire working arrangements with Local Authorities Children's Services – e.g. Education, Children's Social Care, Children and Families Well Being Service and SEND. • Share resources e.g. programmes, interventions, reparation schemes, Junior Attendance Centres (including pooled budget from Youth Justice Board), unpaid work, Saturday Court cover, evening and weekend working with young people and families, volunteer's service. • Develop Pan Lancashire Performance Management Framework supported by one Business Intelligence Team. • Develop shared commissioning arrangements (currently separate arrangements for Appropriate Adults Service and Triage). • Consult HM Inspectorate of Probation in relation to arrangements for YOT Inspections. • Develop a single volunteer service.
<p>Is external consultation required</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although the benefits outweigh the risks, the Unitary Authorities and respective multi agency YJMB's may not agree with the proposal. This key risk will be mitigated through early dialogue with partners to establish the appetite for merger, including discussion relating to current vacancies and proposals to recruit to vacancies in Partner YOTs.
<p>Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?</p>	<p>Not required</p>

Reference – SC104

Service Name:		Lancashire Youth Offending Team (YOT)		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23		2019/20		
Gross budget 2018/19		£2.718m		
Income 2018/19		£1.851m		
Net budget 2018/19		£1.074m		
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.197	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.197
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	Agree that the Youth Offending Team will complete assessments on behalf of Children's Social Care of young people who display sexually harmful behaviour. Currently these assessments are commissioned out.			
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	Impact will be limited to service users as Lancashire Youth Offending Team core staff currently have the experience in providing the assessments and interventions for young people over 10 years within the youth justice system.			
Actions needed to deliver the service change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation is taking place with Children's Social Care representative on the Youth Justice Management Board to prepare for taking referrals to the Youth Offending Team prevention service. • Youth Offending Team and Children's Social Care staff who will provide the prevention of sexually harmful behaviour assessments and interventions will need training to work with younger aged children in this area – the costs to this training can be covered from the Youth Offending Team pooled budget. • Pan Lancashire joint working arrangements with the Police, Children's Social Care and Youth Offending Team in managing young people who sexually harm will need reviewing and revising. 			
Is external consultation required	No			

What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	Some of the young people who have commissioned service may still require specialist services. Youth Offending Team can spot purchase specialist support to support this work at approx. £600 per child, this can be covered in the pooled budget.	
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?	Not required	

Reference – SC112

Service Name:	Review of the management structure across Education and Children's Services			
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23	2019/20			
Gross budget 2018/19	£103.316m			
Income 2018/19	£2.010m			
Net budget 2018/19	£101.306m			
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.481	-0.481	0.000	0.000	-0.962
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
-20.00*	0.00	0.00	0.00	-20.00
<i>* Estimated – actual figure to be determined following review</i>				
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	Agreement to review the management structure across Children's Social Care (CSC), including CSC Localities, Fostering, Adoption, Residential and Youth Offending Team (FARY), Safeguarding, Inspection & Audit (SIA) and Special Educational Needs & Disability (SEND).			
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	<p>The review will consider management tiers, roles and responsibilities and management spans. The review will identify how structures can be streamlined to improve efficiency, whilst providing focused leadership at all levels.</p> <p>To manage the impact on the service appropriate supervision ratios will be maintained, with a continued focus on improving the quality of front-line practice.</p> <p>Simultaneous activity linked to this saving will be that bids will be made to the Department for Education and other government departments for Innovation funding to support retention of management capacity where the need is greatest and to seek to offset the impact of this review in year one.</p>			
Actions needed to deliver the service change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full HR consultation process with staff. • Development of new structures. 			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of new structures.
Is external consultation required	No
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a risk of service disruption, loss of expertise and impact on staff morale. There is also a potential impact on the continuing improvement journey for Children's Services. • To mitigate against these risks a joint review will be undertaken, considering the management arrangements across CSC and SEND, engaging managers in the process of change. • Vacancies as they arise will be covered by temporary staff.
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?	Not required

Reference – SC113

Service Name:	Education and Children's Services Business Support			
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23	2019/20			
Gross budget 2018/19	£7.623m			
Income 2018/19	-£0.487m			
Net budget 2018/19	£7.136m			
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.410	-0.411	0.000	0.000	-0.821
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
-48.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	-48.67
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	Agree to redesign the business support service for Education and Children's Services.			
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	<p>The proposal is to redesign the business support service for Education and Children's Services. There are currently five separate business support functions supporting these services: School Improvement, Learning & Skills, Special Educational Needs & Disability (SEND), Fostering, Adoption, Residential & Youth Offending, and Safeguarding, Inspection & Audit.</p> <p>It is proposed that the new model operates on a 3 locality footprint with business support working across these services. The business support functions for School Improvement and Learning & Skills will be brought together. It is also proposed to regrade some posts to ensure consistency of grades and responsibilities across</p>			

	<p>the services. There will be a reduction of posts in the proposed structure as a result of streamlining the service. There is a potential impact on the service:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential reduction in the level of support provided to operational staff and managers. A more detailed review of the business support tasks undertaken will be required. • Introduction of new ways of working and redesign of the service will impact on staff at all levels until these are fully embedded. • The establishment, disestablishment, regrading and/or relocation of posts required for this redesign to meet service requirements will impact on staff within the service.
<p>Actions needed to deliver the service change</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further detailed planning to confirm the structure, including the management arrangements and staff roles and responsibilities. • Further engagement with operational managers to ensure changes in practice meet service needs and that there is a commitment to the changes required, including new and more efficient ways of working. • Job evaluation of a significant number of posts is required as either new roles or proposed changes to existing roles and responsibilities. • Formal consultation with staff. • Support and advice from HR, Programme Office and finance colleagues. • Some of the proposals require IT enhancements to achieve efficiencies. • Learning will take place from councils judged to be "outstanding" where they have used business support workers to reduce the work of social workers which may provide possibilities to offset these savings which a reduction in staff costs at the front line.
<p>Is external consultation required</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated</p>	<p>The following risks have been identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential impact on statutory service delivery following a reduction in business support resources. This could result in operational staff undertaking administrative tasks. Mitigation: review of business support tasks to prioritise the work of the service and close monitoring of workloads from implementation onwards. • Loss of expertise and knowledge and impact on staff retention if management of change is not well managed. Mitigation: regular communication with staff as part of the redesign and implementation process. Provision of

	<p>a comprehensive induction, training and support package to encourage staff retention and professional development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delays in the introduction of the IT enhancements required as detailed above.
<p>Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?</p>	<p>Not required</p>

Reference – SC122

Service Name:		Lancashire Safeguarding Children's Board		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23		2019/20		
Gross budget 2018/19		£12.629m		
Income 2018/19		£0.568m		
Net budget 2018/19		£12.061m		
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.045	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.045
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	Review and reduce the contribution of LCC funding contribution to the Lancashire Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB).			
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	<p>Changes in statutory guidance allow greater flexibility in how multi-agency safeguarding arrangements are configured. From September 2019, LSCBs will cease to exist, with the 3 statutory partners: local authority, police and health being responsible for the new arrangements. Discussions are taking place with Blackpool and Blackburn with Darwen regarding a pan Lancashire approach which will streamline Board structures and achieve financial savings.</p> <p>A further review of this target will be undertaken when the Department for Education (DFE) approves Lancashire's submission to change to the new safeguarding arrangements in June. It may be that further savings can be achieved linked to partnership collaboration and cooperation.</p>			
Actions needed to deliver the service change	Chief Officer agreement of the 3 statutory partners to progress a pan Lancashire approach in respect of future multi-agency safeguarding arrangements. Following this work will be required to implement the new structural arrangements.			

Is external consultation required	No	
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	<p>There are minimal risks as changes in statutory guidance mean that there is a statutory requirement to implement new multi-agency safeguarding arrangements. This therefore provides an opportunity to review our approach. However, the timescales are very tight in that the new arrangements must be in place by September 2019 and ideally in advance of this deadline. There are minimal risks in relation to the budget reduction of £38k, as these will be efficiencies that are generated from the new working arrangements.</p>	
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?	Not required	

Reference – SC123

Service Name: CSC		Demand Management Projects including an expansion of Family Group Conferencing		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23		2020/21		
Gross budget 2018/19		£103.316m		
Income 2018/19		£2.010m		
Net budget 2018/19		£101.306m		
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	-2.300	0.000	0.000	-2.300
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
Recurrent:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.420	0.000	0.000	0.420
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	<p>To agree to the development and delivery of a programme of targeted interventions for children and young people on the edge of care using approaches including Family Group Conferencing targeted on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children In Need • Child Protection • Pre-Proceedings <p>Agree to recurrent investment of £0.420m in order to support saving delivery. This is an estimate at this stage with the details of the investment to be developed as part of the implementation plan of the saving.</p>			
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	Safe reduction of numbers of looked after children and those subject to child protection plans and pre proceedings.			

<p>Actions needed to deliver the service change</p>	<p>Analysis of "what works" evidence base to select range of interventions</p> <p>Establish delivery team to pilot approaches / extend existing targeted provision</p> <p>Develop pathways</p> <p>Commence interventions</p> <p>Ongoing review and alignment with Lifechances Programme. This is a programme that LCC has successfully secured funding for and will reduce the no of children looked after through a delivery model based on payment by results.</p>
<p>Is external consultation required</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated</p>	<p>Risk that interventions will not achieve diversion from care. This will be mitigated through the use of interventions, including Family Group Conferencing, which have a strong evidence base and have been tested on a small scale within the Lancashire footprint before being adopted more widely.</p>
<p>Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?</p>	<p>Not required</p>

Reference – SC124

Service Name:		Children's Social Care		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23		2019/20		
Gross budget 2018/19		£103.316m		
Income 2018/19		£2.010m		
Net budget 2018/19		£101.306m		
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.137	-0.413	0.000	0.000	-0.550
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
-17.00*	0.000	0.000	0.000	-17.00
<i>* Estimated – actual figure to be determined following review</i>				
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	Agreement to review Family Support Worker posts across Children's Social Care and the Child and Family Wellbeing Service and identify opportunities for rationalisation.			
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	<p>A reduction in Family Support Workers, without mitigations that may be identified through the review, will reduce the level of support that the County Council is able to provide to vulnerable children and families.</p> <p>Simultaneous activity linked to this saving will be that bids will be made to the Department of Education and other government departments for Innovation funding to support retention of management capacity where the need is greatest and to seek to offset the impact of this review in year one.</p>			
Actions needed to deliver the service change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint work between Children's Social Care and the Child and Family Wellbeing Service to determine the most appropriate use of Family Support Worker capacity to ensure that we continue to deliver an effective Early Help service which prevents the needs of children, young people and families escalating to the level of them needing more costly statutory social care intervention. Engagement with partners to explore their capacity to provide support in this area of work • Development of options and mitigations 			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation with staff, service users and partners • Decision on future options • Work with the teams to prepare them for changes in expectations regarding their role • Development of new structures • Implementation of new structures
Is external consultation required	No
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Without mitigation, there is a risk that fewer children and families will receive support or that the demands on social workers will increase. Mitigation will be through a joint review across the Child and Family Wellbeing Service and Children's Social Care to identify how collective capacity can be focussed most appropriately to improve outcomes for children, young people and their families.
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?	Not required

Reference – SC134

Service Name:	Special Educational Needs and Disabilities - Independent Non Maintained Special Schools			
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23	2020/2021			
Gross budget 2018/19	£23.159m			
Income 2018/19	£6.603m			
Net budget 2018/19	£16.556m			
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	-0.087	-0.063	0.000	-0.150
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.25
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	Agree to review the current arrangements for commissioning Independent Non-Maintained Special School places and to improve contract management arrangements.			
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	<p>The review will provide an opportunity to ensure that the standard and quality of provision purchased by the County Council is maintained or improved. The review will also provide an opportunity to give longer term certainty to providers regarding the price that they can expect to receive, rather than negotiating price increases on a case by case basis each year.</p> <p>There will be no detrimental impact on children and young people.</p>			

Actions needed to deliver the service change	Review the current arrangements for commissioning of Independent Non-Maintained Special School places and strengthening capacity to undertake contract management.	
Is external consultation required	No	
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	Current Placements may be high cost and may be of variable quality. The review is expected to enable the Council to gain greater assurance to ensure that Placements are of high quality, meet individual children's needs and provide best value through clear pricing arrangements.	
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?	Not required	

Reference – SC136

Service Name:	School Improvement			
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23	2020/2021			
Gross budget 2018/19	£15.308m			
Income 2018/19	£2.622m High Needs £5.808m General fund			
Net budget 2018/19	£6.878m			
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	-0.450	0.000	0.000	-0.450
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	TBC	0.00	0.00	TBC
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	<p>Review use of education budget for Children Looked After and Care Leavers</p> <p>Reduce core team of advisers, following greater partnership development work with schools, academies and Teaching School Alliances.</p>			
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	<p>In 2017 there was a significant additional investment in the education budget for Children Looked After and Care Leavers. The budget has been wisely spent, presenting and an opportunity to review and reduce the budget to reflect existing levels of expenditure.</p> <p>Reducing the core team of advisers will rely on a willingness of senior leaders in schools to wish to undertake this role. There may be an impact on income generation (ie schools not buying support) if there is a reduction in the number of senior advisers and a possible</p>			

	impact on standards and provision in schools, if no school improvement is purchased.	
Actions needed to deliver the service change	<p>Review of education budgets for Children Looked After and Care Leavers</p> <p>Restructure of remaining areas of school improvement including required consultation with staff and trade unions.</p>	
Is external consultation required	No	
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	<p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The monitoring arrangements (performance, Head Teacher appointments etc) are dependent upon good relationships with a high level of buy back from schools which provides detailed information on school performance. If this were not sustained the offer would need to be revised. • A reduction in support for schools in disadvantaged areas, often those facing budgetary challenges, affects specific parts of Lancashire and particular communities disproportionately (eg Black and Minority Ethnic groups, Free School Meals pupils and their families) <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We will develop the concept of partnership development work with school leaders (2019 – 2020) to pave the way for this move. • We will advertise and interview potential candidates (as is current practice), then ensure proper induction arrangements. 	
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?	Not required	

Reference – SC312

Service Name:	Exchequer			
Gross budget 2018/19	£4.390m			
Income 2018/19	£1.944m			
Net budget 2018/19	£2.446m			
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-2.750	0.000	0.000	0.000	-2.750
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
6.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
An investment in additional financial assessment staff will be needed on a recurrent basis to ensure adequately trained staff are available to ensure financial reassessments are undertaken on a regular basis.				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.250	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.250
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	Authorisation to recruit additional staff to undertake financial reassessments on a regular basis and ensure the county council recovers the appropriate contributions due under its charging policies.			
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	None.			
Actions needed to deliver the service change	Recruit additional financial assessment staff to deliver additional financial re-assessments and ensure appropriate charges are levied.			
Is external consultation required	No			

What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	Financial assessment staff with the right skills cannot be recruited in the required timeframe. Workloads will be managed within the team to maximise the number of reassessments that can be undertaken.
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken? http://intranet.ad.lancscc.net/a-z/equality-analysis/	not required

Reference – SC316

Service Name:	Corporate Finance			
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23	2019/20			
Gross budget 2018/19	£23.432m			
Income 2018/19	£0.000m			
Net budget 2018/19	£23.432m			
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-2.300	0.100	0.300	0.000	-1.900
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	<p>The forecast Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) annual charge is determined by the cumulative borrowing used to finance the Capital Programme and the assumed asset life for the capital expenditure which has been financed by borrowing.</p> <p>The Capital Programme has been subject to a review which has involved the review of each asset type and has resulted in a re-phasing of the use of borrowing. A default estimated asset life of 25 years is currently used in the MRP forecasts to ensure any borrowing secured against an asset is written down over its expected life and in accordance with financial regulations. Estimates of asset</p>			

	lives will be determined for each asset class where possible, and these will be used in place of the default 25 years.	
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	None	
Actions needed to deliver the service change	The change can be made within existing policies although for very long term assets professional certification will be required	
Is external consultation required	No	
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	<p>The Capital Programme consists of assets with varying lives which are not necessarily known when estimating the MRP.</p> <p>The external auditor will be kept informed of our decisions and provided with evidence of compliance with the required regulations. Professional certification of asset life estimates will be used where appropriate.</p>	
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken? http://intranet.ad.lancscc.net/a-z/equality-analysis/	not required	

Reference – SC317

Service Name:	Corporate Finance			
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23	2019/20			
Gross budget 2018/19	£23.546m			
Income 2018/19	£7.940m			
Net budget 2018/19	£15.606m			
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-2.000	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000	-2.000
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	Set a £2m target to be achieved through increased investment return and/or reduced cost of borrowing.			
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	None			
Actions needed to deliver the service change	Refinance borrowing or secure investments to generate the required increase in the forecast recurrent net return.			
Is external consultation required	No			

<p>What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated</p>	<p>Fixed return investments offer lower yields. Higher yielding investments may involve investments with lower liquidity or greater volatility in returns.</p> <p>The overall investment and borrowing portfolio will be constructed to achieve balance between fixed and variable returns and will include assets which are sufficiently liquid.</p>
<p>Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken? http://intranet.ad.lancscc.net/a-z/equality-analysis/</p>	<p>not required</p>

Reference – SC358

<p>Service Name:</p>	<p>Child Protection Legal Services Legal Fees/Disbursements</p>			
<p>Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23</p>	<p>2019/20</p>			
<p>Gross budget 2018/19</p>	<p>£5.393m</p>			
<p>Income 2018/19</p>	<p>£0.000m</p>			
<p>Net budget 2018/19</p>	<p>£5.393m</p>			
<p>Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):</p>				
<p>2019/20 £m</p>	<p>2020/21 £m</p>	<p>2021/22 £m</p>	<p>2022/23 £m</p>	<p>Total £m</p>
<p>-0.393</p>	<p>-0.393</p>	<p>0.000</p>	<p>0.000</p>	<p>-0.786</p>
<p>FTE implications:</p>				
<p>2019/20</p>	<p>2020/21</p>	<p>2021/22</p>	<p>2022/23</p>	<p>Total</p>
<p>0.00</p>	<p>0.00</p>	<p>0.00</p>	<p>0.00</p>	<p>0.00</p>
<p>Investment Required (Invest to Save):</p>				
<p>2019/20 £m</p>	<p>2020/21 £m</p>	<p>2021/22 £m</p>	<p>2022/23 £m</p>	<p>Total £m</p>
<p>0.000</p>	<p>0.000</p>	<p>0.000</p>	<p>0.000</p>	<p>0.000</p>
<p>Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings</p>	<p>Work with Children's Social Care services to streamline practice by ensuring files and assessments are completed more quickly so that the number of case management hearings are reduced and final outcomes for children and families are speeded up.</p>			
<p>Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners</p>	<p>Children's social care practitioners would need to revise their working practices.</p> <p>It would help free up court time.</p>			

Actions needed to deliver the service change	Continued close working between Legal and Children's Services to implement the necessary changes in working practices. The proposed new pre-proceedings protocol will help improve current practice.	
Is external consultation required	No	
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	Resistance to change will be mitigated through changes to working practices and close collaboration and monitoring by senior managers. Saving is based on maximum possible reduction in court hearings – some additional hearings may be necessary.	
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?	Not required	

Reference – SC366

Service Name:	Child Protection Legal Services Reduction of 25 Public Law Outline cases			
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23	2020/21			
Gross budget 2018/19	£5.393m			
Income 2018/19	£0.000m			
Net budget 2018/19	£5.393m			
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	-0.321	0.000	0.000	-0.321
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	Children's services have put forward a proposal to reduce the number of Public Law Outline cases by 25. If the number of cases going before the court is reduced then the disbursement costs associated with the case are saved.			
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	Children's Social Care change in practice to put more emphasis on working more proactively with families at an earlier stage to avoid the need for this level of intervention. It would help free up court time.			

Actions needed to deliver the service change	Continued close working between Legal and Children's Services to change current working practices.
Is external consultation required	No
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	The number of cases continues to rise across the country and this national trend may continue so that whereas we manage to achieve our goals in terms of managing risk and keeping families together that may otherwise have been taken through the public law process, the savings are unachievable because of continuing increases. Findings from demand analysis work will inform next steps. Success will depend upon the work that CSC are undertaking in terms of reviewing risk and practice, including the work identified as part of development of the Corporate Parenting Strategy and the Children's Services Improvement Plan.
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?	Not required

Reference – SC368

Service Name:	Child Protection Legal Services Police Disclosure costs			
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23	2019/20			
Gross budget 2018/19	£5.393m			
Income 2018/19	£0.000m			
Net budget 2018/19	£5.393m			
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.021	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.021
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	In the last year, we spent in the region of £28k to obtain Police disclosure in child protection cases. The proposal is to recover as much of a proportion of this cost as possible from third parties listed in the case by the end of 2019/20. We estimate we would be able to receiver in the region of £21k in contributions from the other parties to the proceedings in the first year.			

Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	Improved efficiency.	
Actions needed to deliver the service change	<p>The local authority now obtains police disclosure on the majority of public law cases.</p> <p>The court directs an order for disclosure at the first case management hearing and the local authority will request provision within this order for the cost of obtaining the disclosure to be shared between the parties.</p> <p>It is likely the court will consider this to be a reasonable request on behalf of the local authority and grant this order.</p> <p>The mother, father and Children's guardian all require copies of the police disclosure and we are requesting the total cost will be shared between these parties and recovered by the local authority legal team.</p>	
Is external consultation required	No	
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	There may be a reluctance on the part of third parties to contribute to this especially if the party is not publicly funded. Work needs to be done to persuade the courts to adopt this as a standard order by ensuring it is viewed as beneficial to the process	
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?	Not required	

Reference – SC374

Service Name:		Democratic Services – Freeze Annual Uplift		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23		2019/20		
Gross budget 2018/19		£1.295m		
Income 2018/19		£0.000m		
Net budget 2018/19		£1.295m		
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.013	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.013
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	The annual uprating of the Basic Allowance and Special Responsibility Allowances in accordance with staff pay increases could be frozen for one or more years. This would also achieve a further saving in 2019/20 of £12,925 (based on a 1% increase).			

Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	No direct impact.	
Actions needed to deliver the service change	All decisions relating to allowances and expenses must be considered by the Independent Remuneration Panel and their recommendations taken into account by Full Council when determining the level of allowances.	
Is external consultation required	No	
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	<p>Fewer or lower quality candidates coming forward for election. Mitigation: It is unclear that the level of remuneration is a major factor in whether candidates stand for election. The quality of candidates is a matter for political groups. The Council will, in any scenario, have 84 councillors (as recently confirmed through the boundary review prior to the last election). Councillors less willing or able to devote as much time to council business Mitigation: An accompanying budget option seeks to reduce the number of meetings. Additionally, work is underway on rolling out a Casework Management System for Councillors, which should enable them to deal with casework more efficiently.</p>	
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?	Not required	

Reference – SC375

Service Name:	Democratic Services – Member Subsistence			
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23	2019/20			
Gross budget 2018/19	£0.005m			
Income 2018/19	£0.000m			
Net budget 2018/19	£0.005m			
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.005	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.005
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	Remove Councillors entitlement to claim expenses for expenditure on subsistence.			

Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	No direct impact	
Actions needed to deliver the service change	All decisions relating to allowances and expenses must be considered by the Independent Remuneration Panel and their recommendations taken into account by Full Council when determining the level of allowances.	
Is external consultation required	No	
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	<p>Fewer or lower quality candidates coming forward for election.</p> <p>Mitigation: It is unclear that the level of remuneration is a major factor in whether candidates stand for election. The quality of candidates is a matter for political groups. The Council will, in any scenario, have 84 councillors (as recently confirmed through the boundary review prior to the last election)</p> <p>Councillors less willing or able to devote as much time to council business</p> <p>Mitigation: An accompanying budget option seeks to reduce the number of meetings. Additionally, work is underway on rolling out a Casework Management System for Councillors, which should enable them to deal with casework more efficiently.</p>	
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?	Not required	

Reference – SC401

Service Name:	Facilities Management			
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23	2019/20			
Gross budget 2018/19	£28.932m			
Income 2018/19	£9.396m			
Net budget 2018/19	£19.536m			
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.040	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.040
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.030	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.030
<i>Year 1 – Capital investment in system, Health and Safety improvements, signage etc. Investment reduced to the absolute minimum to implement public charging only.</i>				
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	Decision to reinstate charges for public parking at weekends on Arthur St car park at County Hall.			

	Decision to introduce charges for short stay public parking for Registration Service and Records Archive Service at County Hall midweek for client appointments and weekends for public parking.
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	<p>The Lancashire County Council Parking Services team systems could be integrated with Facilities Management to manage enforcement and revenue collection. Further exploration is required.</p> <p>The Records Archive Service income may be affected if customers are not willing to pay for parking to access service and some users may complain and seek alternative travel or parking arrangements.</p> <p>The Registration Service may be affected by client complaints but the charge should have minimal impact on service delivery.</p>
Actions needed to deliver the service change	<p>Procure a mechanism to support parking charges.</p> <p>Apply for respective legal orders to allow for respective charges to be levied.</p> <p>Undertake minimum health and safety and security improvements on car parks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install signage to notify charging rates with terms and conditions
Is external consultation required	No
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	<p>As exists with all our parking facilities, there is a risks from potential litigation e.g. members of the public having accidents on our car parks or suffering stolen or damaged vehicles and making claims against Lancashire County Council. This will be mitigated by ensuring adequate signage with disclaimers, maintenance of existing CCTV, and regular inspections of car park conditions.</p> <p>Risk of loss of income to the Records Archive Service if customers are not willing to pay for parking to access service although users may seek alternative travel or parking arrangements.</p> <p>Archive service to manage the expectations of service users.</p> <p>Charging may help to mitigate against other users who are not accessing services e.g. shoppers and provide more regular availability for service users.</p>
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?	Yes - completed

Reference – SC501

Service Name:	Adult Social Care Community (Older People (OP) / Physical Disability (PD))			
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23	2019/20			
Gross budget 2018/19*	£113.311m			
Income 2018/19*	£48.052m			
Net budget 2018/19*	£65.259m			
<i>*The budget represents the total residential care budget for OP/PD</i>				
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.680	-1.670	-1.020	-0.020	-3.390
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
<i>*Further work is required to test the assumptions and supporting proposed savings above and to determine whether further investment is required. Target and stretch values represent potential best and worst case scenarios and will be refined following testing.</i>				
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	To approve the intention to reduce the number of admissions to residential care by Adult Social Care Community Teams			

<p>Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners</p>	<p>Interface with Commissioning where unmet need is identified and to commission new services that provide an alternative to long term residential care.</p> <p>Possible impact on residential care sector.</p>
<p>Actions needed to deliver the service change</p>	<p>Determine a baseline and performance targets that bring Lancashire in line with our comparative authorities. These will then be used to monitor and report performance.</p> <p>To identify authorities to benchmark against and look at best practice in high performing authorities.</p> <p>A county residential forum will add the necessary rigour and evidence in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision making – evidencing that the following options have been explored and that clear evidence is demonstrated within the assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Divert to step up beds/intermediate care ○ Extra care ○ Supported living ○ Night time support ○ Shared Lives ○ Respite • Considered equipment need/telecare and use of occupational therapists to explore alternatives that enable an individual's social care needs to be met outside of residential care. • Identified unmet need. • A clear feedback process to inform commissioning. • It will also improve practice and accuracy of recording and reporting. <p><u>Policy / Practice change</u> In order to maintain a person within their own home rather than facilitate admission to residential care there will need to be a review of the county's policy around the 'reasonable offer' which governs the personal budget that is offered to individuals to maintain them at home.</p> <p>There will need to be clear guidance for operational staff.</p>
<p>Is external consultation required</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>What are the risks associated with this</p>	<p>Increased demand and lack of alternative resource to meet social care need outside of residential care.</p>

<p>change and how will they be mitigated</p>	<p>Mitigation: to have a clear process to enable the service to inform commissioning what is needed and for the service to be involved in the commissioning of the required service.</p> <p>Increased spend on domiciliary care. Mitigation: The policy will make the message to staff clearer and make clear when an increase in spend is justifiable.</p> <p>Challenge from service users and their families who believe residential care is the best option. Mitigation: Better information from the start of the process and residential care not be offered without social care involvement.</p> <p>Challenge from partners such as Acute due to competing pressures leading to a discharge that does not meet with the ideal outcome.</p>
<p>Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?</p>	<p>Yes - completed</p>

Reference – SC505

Service Name:	Home care for older adults and people with physical disabilities – promoting single-handed care			
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23	2019/20			
Gross budget 2018/19	N/A			
Income 2018/19	N/A			
Net budget 2018/19	£16.620m			
<i>Current package of care costs for the cohort of service users effected by this proposal</i>				
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.307	-1.079	-0.818	-0.041	-2.245
FTE implications:				
Recurrent:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00
Temporary:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
6.00	0.00	-6.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
Recurrent:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.323	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.323
Temporary:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total

0.142	0.142	0.000	0.000	0.284
<p><i>The above figures include projected staffing costs, equipment costs and training costs. Investment is also required on a one-off basis in order to incentivise independent domiciliary care providers in order that we can progress this project and reach its full potential. Without the openness to change and work differently by providers, the savings and future avoided costs will not be realised. Incentivising the providers will be in the form of provision of training, backfill funding for training, and costs of additional review and risk assessment activity incurred for the provider with each of the 800+ existing services users in receipt of 2 carer packages of care.</i></p>				
<p>Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings</p>	<p>Approve that all existing double-handed care packages (i.e. care provided by more than one worker for each visit) will be reviewed with the aim of replacing visits with single-handed care and appropriate equipment where this would continue to be safe and meet the person's eligible needs and outcomes;</p> <p>Approve that all new double-handed care packages are for a time limited period only – normally for a maximum period of six weeks – during which time a planned assessment will be undertaken on the same basis as set in point 1 above</p> <p>Endorse the creation of a temporary dedicated single-handed care team on an invest to save basis to lead the delivery of the above activities the cost of which is included in the above investment figures.</p> <p>Endorse the creation of 3 permanent Grade 9 OTs to take on the new incoming work (analysis shows this averages at 56 new presentations each month) simultaneous to the review work to ensure the 'review list' doesn't increase, but also to avoid costs much earlier in the process. These posts are required on an ongoing basis as these assessments will always be needed, alongside coaching of internal and external staff, promoting culture change and thinking, and providing a critical expert capacity.</p>			
<p>Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners</p>	<p>It is expected that there will be three key positive benefits as set out below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Impact on service users – people will have a better experience of care because it will be more personalised and dignified. 2) Impact on the workforce – it will free-up much needed care worker capacity in a market that has staff recruitment and retention challenges. 3) Impact on the council's costs – double-handed care visits cost twice as much as single-handed care visits, hence the above projected budget reductions. <p>The other expected impacts are as follows:</p>			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home care providers – some providers will see this as a loss of business to them and against their own moving and handling policies and procedures. Other providers will see it as a positive as it will free-up their care worker capacity. • Reablement services – promoting single-handed care must also be embedded in reablement services in terms of both the council's own teams and external providers. Potential for impact on Reablement hours capacity should all new double-handed care commissions have a period of Reablement first. Will be monitored and action taken if necessary. • Community equipment – increased expenditure and activity on the provision of moving and handling equipment will occur. There will also be additional servicing and maintenance costs and related administration, including for ceiling track hoists supplied under the council's contract. • District councils – they will experience a modest increase in Disabled Facilities Grant requests from occupational therapists, particularly for ceiling track hoists. • NHS – there may need to be some single-handed care training for allied health professionals; clinical commissioning groups may also incur additional community equipment costs; and freeing-up care worker capacity will help to reduce delayed transfers of care.
<p>Actions needed to deliver the service change</p>	<p>The key required actions and steps if this proposal is to be taken forward are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Develop governance arrangements 2) Establish and recruit to single-handed care team 3) Develop and implement staff training plan 4) Produce new policy and procedures 5) Stakeholder communication and engagement 6) Produce benefits management framework 7) Commence reviews of existing cases 8) Develop pathways to embed in practice for new cases. <p>A change in culture and practice by Adult Services, the NHS and care providers will be essential – actions 3, 4, 5 and 8 in particular would help to achieve this.</p>
<p>Is external consultation required</p>	<p>No</p>

What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	Risk	Mitigation
	Lack of resources to deliver the project	Establish dedicated single-handed care team
	Unable to recruit occupational therapists	Recruit at grade 9 given the complexity of the work and line management responsibilities to the Social Care Support Officer, and use existing networks
	Lack of progress until recruitment takes place	Some limited work is already underway with a community Occupational Therapist specialist in Central Lancs linking to work with people coming through Reablement with double-handed care. To explore any capacity to expand this as more LCC Occupational Therapist are trained prior to recruitment to the temporary team. (will involve reducing capacity for other elements of work for a temporary period)
	Resistance from service users and their families	Develop case studies and promote positive impact
	Resistance from home care providers	Use co-production and new contractual conditions
	Resistance from other key partners	Implement communication and engagement plan
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?	Yes - completed	

Reference - SC507

Service Name:	Changes in Night Time Support rate for commissioned services			
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23	2019/20			
Gross budget 2018/19	£152.043m			
Income 2018/19	£12.668m			
Net budget 2018/19	£139.375m			
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-6.000	-0.900	0.000	0.000	-6.900
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

<p>Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings</p>	<p><i>Effective 1st April 2019</i></p> <p>To pay service providers a sleep-in fee that matches (and subsequently mirrors) the county council's in-house staff sleep-in terms and conditions. For 2019/20 this is set at £36.08 staff payment and equates to £47.43 provider payment (after allowing for national insurance and pension costs).</p> <p><i>For a transitional period 1st April 2019 to 30th September 2019</i></p> <p>To pay a top up of £11.73 (total payment of £59.16 with a payment to staff of £45 per shift) in order to phase the reduction and allow time for service providers to implement new staff terms and conditions.</p>
<p>Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners</p>	<p>This budget option relates to fees and does not require a change to the nature of services being delivered.</p>
<p>Actions needed to deliver the service change</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LancashireCounty Council to communicate with providers regarding the final decision immediately following Cabinet in December 2018. • Payment processing systems to be updated following: <i>Rates to change in April 2019 (incorporating transitional arrangements to ' top up ' the rates from 1st April to 30th September 2019).</i>
<p>Is external consultation required</p>	<p>No external consultation is required; existing contracts permit annual rate reviews without the need for consultation.</p> <p>However, during September 2018 the County Council held an informal meeting with 9 of our largest supported living providers to seek their views and potential implications of a reduction in sleep-in fees. Key points from this meeting are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The rate paid to providers should consider the impact on staff retention and the ability to deliver safe services and therefore allow them to pay staff at least £45 per night, which would equate to £59 per night to providers inclusive of on-costs.</i> • <i>We should await the outcome of whether Unison's Appeal has been granted before putting forwards a final position.</i> • <i>We should not implement any changes in the current financial year and April 2019 would be the</i>

	<p><i>earliest possible date they could complete a consultation period with affected staff.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>We should consider a phased reduction to allow provider employees affected by this change time to adjust to a lower take home pay.</i>
<p>What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated</p>	<p><i>Rationale for Change</i></p> <p>On 13th July 2018 the Court of Appeal issued its decision in Royal Mencap Society and Tomlinson-Blake ruling:</p> <p><i>"....carers who work sleep-in shifts at a client's residence and who are 'on call' are not entitled to the National Minimum Wage for periods whilst they are asleep."</i>¹</p> <p>In April 2016 Lancashire County Council changed the basis of its sleep-in fees to reflect all sleeping hours counting towards national living wage. As a result of this decision we may return to paying a flat rate fee.</p> <p><i>Supreme Court Appeal</i></p> <p>The Court of Appeal decision represents the current interpretation of the law. However, it may not be the final position in relation to sleep-in rates of pay and The Supreme Court could overturn the Court of Appeal decision.</p> <p>The decision as to whether the Supreme Court will grant Unison the right to Appeal the July ruling has not been announced² but is expected imminently. If leave to appeal is granted, it will be 2019 before the Supreme Court hears the case and a decision may not be reached before 2020.</p> <p>Should the Supreme Court overturn the Court of Appeal decision, there is a risk that the decision is backdated meaning providers are faced with significant financial liabilities.</p> <p><i>Mitigation</i></p> <p>Should this situation occur this is no mitigation and Lancashire County Council and the adult social care sector will be required to find a solution to prevent significant disruption to the market However this would be a national issue</p> <p><i>Recruitment & Retention</i></p> <p>A reduction in our night time sleep in fee will ultimately translate to a reduction in provider staff take home pay and potentially impact on providers' ability to recruit and retain staff.</p>

¹ <https://www.walkermorris.co.uk/publications/a-bright-line-decision-court-of-appeal-rules-in-mencap-sleep-in-shift-case/>

² As at 29th October 2018

	<p><i>Mitigation</i> Issues relating to recruitment and retention as a whole within the adult social care sector are reviewed via the Health and Social Care Partnership.</p> <p><i>Provider Financial Stability</i> Some providers may have changed their terms of employment with staff and therefore any change to sleep-in payments may be more difficult for these providers to implement and manage.</p> <p>If they cannot match changes to their staff terms and conditions with changes in LCC fees they face increased risk of financial instability.</p> <p><i>Mitigation</i> In response to feedback gained during information informal discussion with providers (see later) Lancashire County Council is proposing to phase the reduction in fees.</p>
<p>Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?</p>	<p><i>NOT REQUIRED:</i></p> <p>In taking this decision the County Council is reflecting on the July 2018 Court of Appeal decision in relation to payment for sleep-in services whereby:</p> <p><i>"care workers doing sleep-in shifts are only entitled to the NMW when they are required, because they need to undertake a specific activity, to actually be awake"</i></p> <p>We accept that sleep-ins are delivered to service users with protected characteristics and acknowledge the potential adverse impact on providers. However, given the county councils financial position we consider it appropriate to adjust our fee in line with current legal rulings.</p>

Reference - SC508

Service Name: Adult Services (Mental Health and LD&A Joint Budget Options)	Modernisation of Supported Housing			
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23	2019/20			
Gross budget 2018/19	£152.043m			
Income 2018/19	£12.668m			
Net budget 2018/19	£139.375m			
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.158	-1.131	-1.303	-1.303	-3.895
<i>Savings span a 5 year period over this current timeframe with a total potential saving of target £6.6m stretch £9.9m</i>				
FTE implications:				
Temporary:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
13.00	0.00	-13.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
Establish a separate team of Social Workers dedicated to the management of the transfer of adults with learning disabilities, autism or mental health needs into flat				

schemes from other service settings e.g. from residential care or shared housing settings..

- 1 Team Manager (Grade 10)
- 1 Senior Social Worker (Grade 9)
- 6 Social Workers (Grade 8)
- 3 Social Care Support Officers (Grade 6)

In addition, 2 Grade 12 posts (or Consultancy Equivalent) for 2 years to lead on the strategic development of the new Models of Support through development with Housing Associations & Developers and Strategic Housing Leads.

Temporary:

2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.529	0.529	0.000	0.000	1.058

Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings

In line with Lancashire's Care and Support Strategy 2018 – 2025, and the Council's recently approved Vision document, entitled "Care, Support and Wellbeing of Adults in Lancashire"

1. Approve the 'Vision' to modernise the provision of supported housing and offer more flat schemes with a recognition that many people's expectations are to live in their own self-contained accommodation with their own front door with good access to community facilities.
2. Approve the approach to decommission some 1,2 and 3 person tenancies for those people to move to flat schemes
3. Approve the establishment of a social work team, specific to this modernisation work
4. Approve the establishment of 2 Grade 12 posts/Consultancy Equivalent for 2 years as Strategic Leads for this work.
5. Approve an under occupancy policy to manage the significant voids in supported housing

Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners

- **Service** – the vast majority of supported housing is currently represented by shared households. This proposal will change the balance of provision by providing more flat scheme accommodation. The number of shared houses will reduce, particularly those for less than 4 people and single tenancies.

Alongside this, the proposal will look at how night support is delivered across all supported housing types, with a view to reducing or removing staff support in some settings and replacing with more flexible and innovative methods, e.g. telecare assistive technology, roving night support.

- **Citizens with disabilities or mental health needs** – The development of new flat scheme accommodation

	<p>will present opportunities for people to move out of their current setting to new purpose built flat schemes which would offer cost savings to the Council. This could be from residential care or from shared housing. Service users will have more choice about where they live. The following priority groups have been identified :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Individuals currently supported in unsuitable or high cost single tenancies b) Individuals currently supported in 1/2/3 person tenancies where there are higher support costs (compared to flat schemes) and/or compatibility issues between service users. c) Individuals in under occupied properties to reduce the replacement of housing benefit revenues due to vacancies and support void costs. Implementing the use of the under occupancy policy where appropriate. d) Individuals currently supported in residential care who may want to return to Lancashire if placed out of County or may be unaware of alternative models of support available e) Individuals with urgent risks & safeguarding issues f) New demand e.g. young people transitioning from children's services <p>In some settings (typically shared housing), overnight staff presence will reduce or be removed altogether if there is no identified need or where the needs can be met by other means, e.g. telecare, roving night support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • External Partners - to work with care and support providers and housing providers/developers to build a range of high quality Housing with Care and Support schemes across Lancashire and to work with current providers to identify more efficient and effective ways of delivering support.
<p>Actions needed to deliver the service change</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A strategic review of current flat schemes to identify gaps in provision across the county. • Identify service users in residential care and shared housing (in particular, 1, 2 and 3 person tenancies) to move to flat scheme accommodation • Produce a specification, listing key requirements for new flat schemes with regard to factors such as size and location. • Develop a Supported Housing approved list of care and support providers meeting a quality threshold. • Remodelling of some existing flat schemes and enabling them to realise their full potential, including changing how placements are commissioned with a much more transparent and equitable model.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change the way supported housing is commissioned, moving to a model whereby all service users contribute equally towards background support. Apply this model to all new and existing schemes • Having an open dialogue with district councils and housing developers to identify suitable sites for new build schemes • Establish a separate and distinct social work team to manage and facilitate service users moving to new flat schemes. This will involve service users moving from residential care and shared housing. • Develop a decommissioning plan for housing which is of poor quality or unsuitable to meet people's needs and where there are long standing vacancies, in line with the Under occupancy Policy • Only commission residential care as a last resort • Map current night support look for patterns and close proximity. Night time support is provided on an individual house basis but there is an opportunity to look more strategically at sharing night time support between a number of houses in close proximity – either with the same provider or with different providers. • Improve access to technology e.g. telecare, big button press system to alert workers and or other monitoring/reporting systems for night time support • Look to provider innovation around proposals for night time support. Providers have volunteered proposals on an ad hoc basis around reductions in support. This needs to be formally communicated to the provider market and introduce incentives for providers to come forward with proposals.
Is external consultation required	No

	Risk	Mitigation
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	1. It is intended that housing providers/social landlords will invest and build the flat schemes with no financial contribution from the Council, either for build costs or for payment of rent for vacancies. The risk therefore is that this is unacceptable for developers to proceed.	Research with other Councils and preliminary discussions with local housing providers has shown housing providers are fully prepared to accept the financial risks when working in partnership with the Council.
	2. People do not move from their current setting	In order to maximise the accommodation options for

	<p>into new flat schemes including resistance to change from service users, families, etc</p>	<p>people, this will require a partnership approach from service users, carers, service providers and statutory agencies and so will require a communication strategy that ensures the correct people are fully informed and enabled to have a voice during this period of change. Also, the impact to people who could potentially be identified as suitable for moving into flat schemes would need to be addressed. Advocacy services will be required for some service users and best interest decisions may need to be taken which would have implications for the length of time this would take.</p> <p>A tenant will not give notice on a tenancy until a suitable alternative has been identified and a timescale for moving agreed with all parties.</p>
	<p>3.National guidance, e.g. 'Building the Right Home' guidance in 2016 states that</p> <p><i>"Housing with 6 or more people can quickly become institutionalised and Commissioners should carefully consider the service design when creating schemes of multiple units within close proximity to ensure the service enables the tenants to have control over where they live and who provides their support"</i></p> <p>Size of schemes is also reflected in the national guidance 'Building the Right Support' issued in</p>	<p>Having ongoing discussions with CQC. Also, research with other Councils has shown that if the scheme is built with the correct ethos in line with national guidance then larger schemes are acceptable.</p>

	2015 and endorsed by the Care Quality Commission who work to these guidelines when dealing with registration requirements of supported housing schemes.	
	4. The anticipated savings are not realised due to unexpected costs	Being clear at the outset around the model of support for background and individual support and having signed agreements with providers around issues such as no financial responsibility for vacancies.
	5. If there are any mental capacity issues around a proposed move to a flat scheme, this could involve the Court of Protection and lengthen timescales which may then impact on keeping the vacancy open until the issues are resolved	Involving mediation/advocacy at an early stage may prevent the need for more formal proceedings
	6. Lack of staff resources to carry out assessments and facilitate moves to flat scheme accommodation	Recruitment of a specific social work team with a defined remit for this project
	7. Legal implications in relation to Housing Management Agreements (HMA) or Support Contracts - In some circumstances there may be legally binding obligations within an HMA or a Support Contract which prevent the Local Authority or Support Provider from ending the HMA early.	This should not prevent consideration being given to the suitability of an individual to remain in a tenancy if it does not meet their needs. The Terms of each HMA will be subject to review and where possible an HMA will be renegotiated with the Housing Provider to ensure that it is fit for purpose.
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?		Yes

Reference – SC511

Service Name: Learning Disability & Autism - Enablement	Enablement			
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23	2019/20			
Gross budget 2018/19	£152.043m			
Income 2018/19	£12.688m			
Net budget 2018/19 (Net budget 2017/18*)	£139.375m			
*Total LDA commissioned care within pooled fund budget				
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	-0.579	-0.785	-0.009	-1.373
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
Recurrent:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m

0.000	0.000	0.540	0.000	0.540
*Please note that this is an extension to the funding of current staff – therefore no FTE is included.				
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings		Funding for Enablement Service to continue to 2022/23. This service allows people to live more independently.		
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners		<p>This service will increase independence and mean less reliance on formal paid care and thus savings from reduction in packages of care.</p> <p>It may reduce income for some providers of services to this group, but it will also free up some workforce capacity.</p> <p>It will increase esteem and well-being of those benefitting from the service, but in the short run it may cause some anxieties among carers and family</p>		
Actions needed to deliver the service change		This is an extension of an existing fully staffed service to deliver further savings. Consultation and communication took place prior to the implementation of the service with providers as part of the learning disability passport to independence programme.		
Is external consultation required		No		
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated		<p>That the numbers and volumes of referrals are not sufficient or that the level of average package reduction is not as predicted.</p> <p>The mitigation is that demand projections for transition to adult services have been undertaken. That the current findings are that there opportunities to increase independence in adults and reduce packages of care by the enablement approach.</p>		
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?			No, one is not required, this is an extension of budget option ASC006 Cabinet approved in September 2017.	

Reference – SC512

Service Name: Learning Disability and Autism	Acceleration of Disability Service Supported Living Remodelling			
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23	2019/20			
Gross budget 2018/19	£152.043m			
Income 2018/19	£12.688m			
Net budget 2018/19	£139.375m			
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	-0.236	-0.242	0.000	-0.478
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
11.00	0.00	-11.00	0.000	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.432	0.432	0.000	0.000	0.864

Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	<p>Cabinet approved in September 2017 an option to remodel the in house Disability supported living service.</p> <p>The decision required is to bring forward the savings profiled to be achieved in 2021/22 so they are completed by April 2021 with additional funding to increase the resources for the remodelling social work team to undertake this review work.</p>
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	<p>Adults with learning disabilities will almost certainly continue to receive support to live in their own homes. However, undertaking individual reviews may lead to other housing and support options being identified and chosen by the individual or agreed through a 'best interest decision'.</p> <p>There will be reductions in the overall size of the social care workforce if packages of care reduce and providers of the services will have to restructure their workforce accordingly.</p>
Actions needed to deliver the service change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning Disability and Autism Remodelling Team allocation of staff to undertake assessment and review work following already agreed processes. • Work with HR to plan for the workforce changes
Is external consultation required	<p>No</p>
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The work to remodel tenancies will be at a faster pace and therefore the workforce reductions will occur earlier than planned and will be higher in the period than if spread out over the original 3 and half year remodelling programme. Staffing reductions will be mitigated by vacancy management. • Alternative housing options to align with the new vision for housing may not have developed at the faster pace needed to offer alternatives, where this is identified as being desirable. This will be mitigated by planning for the implementation of the housing and support strategy and phasing of the remodelling programme. • Any decisions regarding a change of accommodation may involve the Court of Protection who need to ensure decisions are made in the best interests of the people to be supported. This can delay progress, but can also ensure that decision making is subject to external checks which are helpful for protecting the interests of vulnerable people

Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?	Yes, one was completed for the option approved in 2017
--	--

Reference – SC513

Service Name: Disability Service	Lancashire Care Foundation Trust (LCFT) supported living scheme transfer to LCCs Disability Service			
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23	2019/20			
Gross budget 2018/19	£152.043m			
Income 2018/19	£12.668m			
Net budget 2018/19	£139.375m			
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	-1.000	0.000	0.000	-1.000
FTE implications:				
Recurrent:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
1.00	0.000	0.00	0.00	1.00
Temporary:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
1.00	-1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
Recurrent:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.052	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.052
Temporary:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.058	0.030	0.000	0.000	0.088
Permanent manager post in Preston Grade 10 Additional Management Support (Grade 11 for 18 months) to oversee the transfer and remodelling of LCFT transfer and remodelling of all LCC Supported living Schemes				
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	Approve the transfer of the Care and Support in Shared Households service from Lancashire Care Foundation Trust to Lancashire County Council's Adult Disability Service. Cabinet in November approved an additional saving of £0.499m that is included as part of this saving proposal.			

<p>Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners</p>	<p>The transfer represents an opportunity to progress the remodelling of the service, with a view to reducing the risk associated with vacancy liabilities for care and rent by implementing the recommendations made by the County Council's Remodelling Team.</p> <p>There is an expectation that Lancashire Care Foundation Trust would achieve some of the remodelling recommendations prior to transfer.</p> <p>Significant support from internal services to transfer current NHS staff to the county council.</p> <p>Further support relating to Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006(TUPE) and pension administration after transfer.</p> <p>Service users and families will have a change of provider and need to be consulted appropriately.</p> <p>Additional service to the existing in-house Disability Service which will have the experience and capacity to manage and will have the additional benefit of being able to include in a remodelling programme.</p>
<p>Actions needed to deliver the service change</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract ends 31st March 2019 with LCFT. The County Council has formally notified Lancashire Care Foundation Trust of its intention to transfer the service to the County Council's Disability Service. The county council has contracted for these services under the NHS Standard Contract 2017/2018 and 2018/2019. This contract comes to an end on 31 March 2019. The county council will be required to comply with any exit arrangements within the contract terms and with applicable TUPE employment and pension's legislation. • Changes to Lancashire County Council systems for payroll for different terms and conditions. • Review of housing management agreements with housing associations. • Registration with Care Quality Commission to establish new service in Preston and deregister with NHS. •
<p>Is external consultation required</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated</p>	<p>TUPE liabilities including pension could be greater than anticipated. Close cooperation from LCFT will be necessary</p> <p>Tight timescale to complete given the ending of the contract is in March 2019 alongside management of other multiple savings programmes concurrently, and so</p>

	<p>dedicated project management and other leadership capacity will be a priority</p> <p>Concerns of families/ service users may be significant</p> <p>Mitigation – full programme management and plan to be developed, joint working to deliver mobilisation plan with LCFT including communication strategy for families and people receiving a service.</p>
<p>Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?</p>	<p>Not required</p>

Reference – SC518

Service Name:	Adult Social Care – Reassessing Direct Payments			
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23	2019/20			
Gross budget 2018/19	£105.227m			
Income 2018/19	n/a			
Net budget 2018/19	£105.227m			
<i>The budget above represents the whole of Adults social care direct payments commissioned spend.</i>				
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-1.000	-1.000	-0.500	0.000	-2.500
FTE implications:				
Recurrent:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
Recurrent:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.059	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.059
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	Agree for the Direct Payment policy to be changed to reduce surplus weeks' money allowed as a contingency from 10 weeks to 4 weeks.			
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	<p>Service users who receive Direct Payment may feel the new arrangements offer them less flexibility.</p> <p>Direct Payment accounts will be monitored to ensure prompt clawback of surpluses, with referral to social care for reassessment where surpluses are likely to be recurrent.</p> <p>Agencies working to support Direct Payment recipient will need to be informed of these proposals so they can provide accurate advice.</p>			
Actions needed to deliver the service change	Increase the frequency of social work reassessment activity to identify where personal budget amounts are in excess of the proven requirements of service users.			
Is external consultation required	No			

<p>What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated</p>	<p>There may be reduced flexibility in personal budgets available to some service users for contingencies.</p> <p>A number of weeks' contingency budget will remain with the service user to meet routine volatility in support needs and associated costs. This number will be subject to review but it is likely to be 4 weeks.</p>
<p>Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken? http://intranet.ad.lancscc.net/az/equality-analysis/</p>	<p>Not required</p>

Reference – SC520

Service Name:	Adult Social Care – Promoting Direct Debit			
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23	2019/20			
Gross budget 2018/19	£432.620m			
Income 2018/19	£110.086m			
Net budget 2018/19	£322.533m			
<i>This budget represents the commissioned packages of care within Adult social care for all client groups</i>				
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.500	-0.500	0.000	0.000	-1.000
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
Temporary:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.040	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.040
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	Agree for the service to actively promote direct debit as the primary source of payment for adult social care.			
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	<p>For 56% of service users' direct debit is already the chosen method of payment. Achieving even greater take up will make a minor reduction in transaction costs, but more significant will be the improvements in income collection. This is because securing upfront payment commitments through the agreement of a direct debit mandate is likely to reduce the overall amount of debt that currently becomes uncollectable.</p> <p>This will require more attention in explaining the benefits of this method of payment, particularly for the individual and their family, at each relevant point in the care arrangement process.</p>			
Actions needed to deliver the service change	Improved and effective promotion of direct debit as the method of payment.			
Is external consultation required	No			

<p>What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated</p>	<p>There is a risk that the performance outcomes cannot adequately be delivered.</p> <p>The uptake of direct debits will be monitored to ensure that service users are consistently given the option to pay by direct debit at each stage.</p>
<p>Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken? http://intranet.ad.lancscc.net/az/equality-analysis/</p>	<p>Not required</p>

Reference – SC521

Service Name:		Adult Social Care – Residential Care Status		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23		2019/20		
Gross budget 2018/19		£432.620m		
Income 2018/19		£110.086m		
Net budget 2018/19		£322.533m		
<i>This budget represents the commissioned packages of care within Adult social care for all client groups</i>				
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.700	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.700
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	<p>Agree a change in the council's procedures to bring them into line with the Care Act's Care and Support Guidance, so that short term residential care is defined as up to 8 weeks.</p> <p>If a person is in residential care for longer than 8 weeks, unless there are exceptional circumstances, they would be deemed to be in long term care, and charged as they would be for a long term care placement.</p> <p>This does not affect those placements commissioned as "temporary" as defined by the Care Act. Temporary care is defined as up to 52 weeks. If a person is in residential care for longer than 52 weeks, unless there are exceptional circumstances, they would be deemed to be in long term care, and charged as they would be for a long term care placement.</p>			
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	<p>Currently, around 180 service users are with care commissioned as short term residential care, but have been in residential care for longer than 8 weeks. Being charged as a long term resident may result in an increase in charge but this will be dependent on the person's individual circumstances. An increased charge will not be the outcome in all circumstances</p>			

	<p>There are no service users currently with care commissioned as temporary residential care.</p> <p>There may be implications for the benefits and other allowances that individuals receive.</p>
Actions needed to deliver the service change	<p>A long term placement Care Package for the service user will be created at the point where a short term residential care placement exceeds 8 weeks, and the short term placement will be ceased.</p> <p>A long term placement Care Package for the service user will be created at the point where a temporary residential care placement exceeds 52 weeks, and the temporary placement will be ceased.</p> <p>Publicity material for public and partners and staff</p> <p>Staff training</p>
Is external consultation required	No
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	<p>Service users may choose to leave residential care, due to increased assessed charges. However all charges will be in compliance with the Care Act 2014 charging regulations.</p> <p>There may be increased pressures on home care services.</p>
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken? http://intranet.ad.lancscc.net/az/equality-analysis/	Yes

Reference – SC602

Service Name:		Children & Family Wellbeing (CFW)		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23		2019/20		
Gross budget 2018/19		£18.233m		
Income 2018/19		£3.660m		
Net budget 2018/19		£14.573m		
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.111	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.111
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	Approval to cease the Small Grant Scheme. The specific budget for this was previously removed (£111k) from the Children and Family Wellbeing service revenue budget in April 2015. The scheme has since been funded from in year underspends against other budgets within the service.			
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	<p>The review has identified a year on year decline in the number of applications received from both individuals and Voluntary, Community & Faith Sector (VCFS) organisations with the budget consistently underspent despite activity to promote the scheme. In 2017/18 only 41% of the available budget was spent. There is evidence of a further reduction in applications in the current financial year.</p> <p>This option will allow a funding saving year on year of £111k and save staff time and cost co-ordinating the scheme.</p> <p>The potential negative impact of ceasing the scheme is,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young People may feel unsupported/unable to acquire funding • VCFS would need to seek alternative funding sources • 			

Actions needed to deliver the service change	Finance adjustment (reduction) to budget. Communications to public and VCFS	
Is external consultation required	No	
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	<p>The risks associated with this option are considered to be minimal given the evidence of yearly decline in applications for the grant scheme.</p> <p>However, the decision has potential to be unpopular and young people may feel unsupported/unable to acquire funding and the Voluntary, Community and Faith sector would need to seek alternative funding sources.</p>	
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?	Yes	

Reference – SC605

Service Name:		Bus Network Education Resource		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23		2019/20		
Gross budget 2018/19		£0.028m		
Income 2018/19		£0.000m		
Net budget 2018/19		£0.028m		
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.028	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.028
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings		Approve removal of non-staff costs associated with the 2 PCSOs. The funding of the PCSOs has already been ceased recently.		
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners		<p>The likely impact of budget removal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spend on third party supplies and services in relation to crime and disorder on the bus network, further to cessation of PCSO funding, resulting in less communications activity to address anti-social behaviour. 		
Actions needed to deliver the service change		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree budget removal and cease expenditure 		
Is external consultation required		No		
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With the cessation of bus network specific resources, we will rely on the general resources of the bus operators and crime prevention activity of the constabulary. 		
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?				not required

Reference – SC616

Service Name:		Patient Safety and Safeguarding		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23		2020/21		
Gross budget 2018/19		£5.338m		
Income 2018/19		£0.587m		
Net budget 2018/19		£4.751m		
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.115	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.115
FTE implications: None				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	Remove additional funding support for the Healthwatch contract. The contract will be reduced to the value of the grant which, for 19/20, is estimated at £319k. This generates a saving of £115k from the current budget of £433k.			
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	There will be a reduced independent service for citizens of Lancashire. The Healthwatch service enables Lancashire citizens to have a voice in how services are run and also to be able to raise concerns about local services. The Healthwatch role is statutory.			
Actions needed to deliver the service change	Consultation with legal services, procurement and Healthwatch to develop next steps in relation to contract termination and re-tendering the service.			
Is external consultation required	No external consultation is required.			
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	The risks on removal of the contract would mean less resource to manage the service and subsequently a reputational risk may occur.			
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?	No			

Reference – SC801

Service Name:		Planning and Environment (environmental information charges)		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23		2021/22		
Gross budget 2018/19		£4.506m		
Income 2018/19		£2.880m		
Net budget 2018/19		£1.626m		
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.015	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.015
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	To agree to increase the charge for environmental information held by the Council.			
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	No impact on Lancashire County Council services. Cost increases for organisations wanting environmental information. 69% of charges are to the private sector, mainly to support their planning applications and as such the charges form only a small element of a developer's planning costs.			
Actions needed to deliver the service change	Increase charges from 2019/20			
Is external consultation required	No			
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	Those seeking environmental information may try and obtain it from elsewhere or attempt to submit planning applications to district councils without it, reducing income for the service.			
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?				Not required

Reference – SC805

Service Name:	Economic Development - Increase Income from Lancashire County Developments Limited (Lancashire Business Park)			
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23	2021/22			
Gross budget 2018/19	£6.066m			
Income 2018/19	£4.068m			
Net budget 2018/19	£1.998m			
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	0.000	-0.250	-0.500	-0.750
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000*	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
<i>* Additional income comes as the result of pursuing new build options at Lancashire Business Park but this will be financed by Lancashire County Developments Limited.</i>				
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	Agree to increase income from Lancashire Business Park. This will require approval from the Lancashire County Developments Limited Board.			
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	Minimal – potential operational inconvenience of other LBP tenants during construction phase.			
Actions needed to deliver the service change	<p>Lancashire Business Park is a key source of income/profit generation that supports the delivery of Lancashire County Council's economic development priorities.</p> <p>Progress options for the development of two vacant plots at Lancashire Business Park to provide new business accommodation units for rent. Initial Market Review and Property Strategy Report has been received from Lambert Smith Hampton indicating the size and combination of units to build, indicative rental values and development costs.</p> <p>Strong market demand for business accommodation proposed.</p>			

Is external consultation required	No
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	<p>New build might fail to attract tenants immediately, though evidence of strong and growing market demand.</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Initial detailed market review - Phased development of the two sites - Market from plan, once complete
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?	not required

Reference – SC811

Service Name:		Economic Development		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 or 2022/23		2020/21		
Gross budget 2018/19		£6.066m		
Income 2018/19		£4.068m		
Net budget 2018/19		£1.998m		
Budget Change and Profiling (discrete year):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.060	-0.100	-0.200	-0.300	-0.660
FTE implications:				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
0.00*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
* If current funding levels can be sustained from a wider base of contributors.				
Investment Required (Invest to Save):				
2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000*	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	Decrease LCC contributions to Marketing Lancashire, Lancashire Enterprise Partnership and Lancashire Growth Hub and ask the unitary and district councils to match LCCs contribution.			
Impact upon service, other LCC services, service users and external partners	The proposal would seek to secure 50% of the costs for these shared sub-regional services from Lancashire's unitary authorities and potentially district councils.			
Actions needed to deliver the service change	Agreement from our partners			
Is external consultation required	No, but agreement with local authorities is required.			
What are the risks associated with this change and how will they be mitigated	Other partners refuse to accept shared costs impacting on our sub regional/national profile.			
Is an Equality Analysis required and, if so, has one been undertaken?			not required	