

East Sussex County Council
Savings Plans 2016/17 to 2018/19

Department	Proposed Savings				% of 15/16 Rebased Gross Budget
	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	2018/19 £'000	Total £'000	
Adult Social Care Adult Social Care levy	10,049 (1,921)	10,000	20,000	40,049 (1,921)	17%
Business Services/Orbis	312	981	1,396	2,689	5%
Children's Services (excl. schools)	4,985	3,175	4,972	13,132	10%
Communities, Economy & Transport	3,117	999	894	5,010	5%
Governance Services	100	100	104	304	4%
Subtotal Departments	16,642	15,255	27,366	59,263	-
Treasury Management	3,000	0	0	3,000	10%
Capital Programme Management	0	2,000	0	2,000	n/a
Subtotal Centrally Held Budgets	3,000	2,000	0	5,000	-
TOTAL SAVINGS	19,642	17,255	27,366	64,263	-

Public Health savings to offset the proposed reduction in grant (and therefore nets nil); allocation still to be confirmed

4,813	0	0	4,813	20%
-------	---	---	-------	-----

GENERAL NOTE:

All savings proposals will be seeking a decision from Cabinet at the cabinet meeting to recommend to County Council the budget cash limit unless specifically referenced otherwise in the column of the savings schedule headed 'Amendments and Cabinet Decisions'.

Implementation of any saving proposal, that is not specifically referenced, would if necessary then be subject to the appropriate decision making process required to confirm and deliver the proposal.

Note 1: Implement

Requires a decision from Cabinet at the January cabinet meeting to agree the savings target and implement the savings proposal as appropriate consultations and impact assessments have been undertaken. These are also highlighted in yellow.

Note 2: Deleted

The savings proposal will be deleted.

The savings proposal will remain on the savings schedule, with the record of deleting the proposal, in order to maintain tracking for the overall RPPR process.

Note 3: Part Deleted

The savings proposal will be partially deleted.

The savings proposal will remain on the savings schedule, with the record of partial implementation of the savings proposal, in order to maintain tracking for the overall RPPR process.

Requires a decision from Cabinet at the cabinet meeting to agree the savings target and implement the savings proposal as appropriate consultations and impact assessments have been undertaken. These are also highlighted in yellow.

Summary of Equality Impact Assessment for RPP&R 2016/17

Equalities Implications

Following the introduction of the Equality Act 2010 ('the EA') a public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to –

- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the EA;
- (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic (as defined by the EA) and persons who do not share it;
- (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

The protected characteristics set out in the EA are as follows:

- Age
 - Disability
 - Gender Reassignment
 - Pregnancy/ maternity
 - Race
 - Religion or Belief
 - Sex
 - Sexual Orientation
- Marriage and civil partnership are also protected characteristics for the purposes of the duty to eliminate discrimination.

Prior to making a decision as to which savings proposals should be agreed in the budget, Members must have due regard to the Equality Duty contained in Section 149 of the EA.

Having "due regard" does not necessarily require the achievement of all the aims set out in section 149 of the EA. Instead it requires that Members' understand the consequences of the decision for those with the relevant protected characteristics and consider these alongside other relevant factors when making the decision to pursue one course of action rather than another, alternative, course of action that may have different consequences. The regard which is necessary will depend upon the circumstances of the decision in question, and should be proportionate. Even though not all decisions will be made about which saving proposals to pursue at this stage it is necessary for the Council to begin to understand the potential impacts.

This means that in setting the Budget, the three equality aims set out above must be considered as a relevant factor alongside financial constraints and all other relevant considerations. Members' must have in mind the equalities impacts, and in particular the negative impacts, that agreeing savings will have for those with protected characteristics. Despite maximising efficiency and exploiting new ways of working, the business planning process for 2016/17 and beyond requires difficult choices to be made both within and between portfolios and services.

It is open to the Council to formulate its budget proposals (having regard to the likely impact on protected characteristics, as set out in the table), and then, at the time of developing the policies, the Council will consider in greater detail the specific impact of the proposed policies that might be implemented within the budgetary framework. Assessing the impact of proposed changes to policies, procedures and practices is not just something the law requires, it is a positive opportunity for ESCC to ensure it makes better decisions based on robust evidence.

The EA does not require an equality impact assessment (EqIA) to be carried out; however, cases considering the public sector equality duty have held that an EIA is the best way to demonstrate that the equalities impacts have been identified and considered. As such, prior to implementation, an assessment of the likely impacts of proposals or policies on those with protected characteristics will be carried out at a formative stage, and before implementation. In this way, the EIA will form an integral part of the Council's policy setting. Proposals will only be implemented after due regard has been paid to the need to achieve the three aims set out in Section 149 of the EA.

It is open to the Council to formulate its budget proposals (having regard to the likely impact on protected characteristics, as set out in the table), and then, at the time of developing the policies, to consider in greater detail the specific impact of the proposed policies that might be implemented within the budgetary framework.

Where it is the case that decisions as to how achieve savings within the agreed budget limit will be taken in-year, a high level assessment of the equality impacts of the savings is set out within the table attached. Subsequently, specific executive decisions will be taken by the relevant portfolio holders and Directors, and shall be made based on a clear understanding of what the potential impacts of doing one thing rather than another will be for the communities in East Sussex. It will be open to Directors and Lead Members at the time of taking those decisions to spend more on one activity and less or none on another or, where necessary to go back to County Council and invite it to reconsider the allocation to different service areas.

Notwithstanding the above, in order to achieve full year savings, Cabinet are being asked to agree now to implement a number of savings, subject to the budget limit for that particular item being approved by Council. In those cases, a full equality impact assessment ('EqIA') has already been carried out following a period of consultation relating to those proposals. These proposals are highlighted in the table attached and set out in more detail in Appendix 3a and 3b. The full impact assessments relating to these proposals can be found online, with copies in the Members' room and are available for public inspection at County Hall on request. Members are required to read the EqIAs and have regard to the impacts identified therein when taking the decision to implement (or not) these savings proposals.

Findings on possible impact from an overall review of savings proposals

The tables attached show the potential impact of the initial, suggested reductions in budgets for each department and highlights that the budget reductions will broadly impact on the 'protected characteristics' of age and disability as people within these groups are those who are most likely to be accessing our services. It is possible that decisions will have a disproportionate impact due to geographic location, different communities such as disabled people, younger or older people, BME communities as well as the cumulative effect of any decisions made.

Members will need to ensure that the impacts on those with protected characteristics and the most vulnerable are considered when either revising or removing current services, or where services transfer to partner organisations. For those proposals which are to be considered in-year, additional work will be required to identify the impacts on those with protected characteristics, which will take place as policies are developed, following the setting of the revenue budget.

The public sector equality duty set out in the EA is a continuing one, and it will therefore be necessary to monitor the effects of decisions and policies, not only during their formulation, but also after implementation.

In preparing the budget and considering individual savings proposals, Members have, in addition to the Section 149 Public Sector Equality Duty, to consider whether the budget as a whole and the individual savings proposals identified will indirectly discriminate against persons with any of the protected characteristics. Indirect discrimination occurs where a practice, policy or rule of the County Council which otherwise seems neutral (i.e. it applies to everyone affected in the same way) nevertheless places people with one or more of the protected characteristics at a particular disadvantage.

Even where a particular disadvantage has occurred, the proposal will not amount to indirect discrimination if it can be demonstrated that there is an objective justification for the proposal; i.e. that the proposal is a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim. Where it can be demonstrated that a particular savings proposal is a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim, that proposal will not be indirectly discriminatory. However, if there is no legitimate aim, or if the means of achieving the aim are not proportionate, for a savings proposal which creates a particular disadvantage, that savings proposal would amount to indirect discrimination and would be unlawful under the Equality Act 2010.

The consideration of indirect discrimination has included an analysis of (a) whether there is any particular disadvantage as a result of each relevant proposal, (b) whether there is a legitimate aim and (c) whether the means of achieving the aim is proportionate. The legitimate aims that relate to the savings proposals are:

- the County Council must achieve savings to its budget;
- across the Council's budgets, all areas are facing a reduction in funding (and therefore, looking at the budget more broadly, all protected characteristics will be impacted by reductions in service); and
- the County Council must deliver its statutory services and therefore a significant proportion of the available funding must be used for those statutory services.

Where it has been identified that a proposal may have a particular disadvantage, consideration has to be given as to whether there may be a more proportionate means of achieving these aims. In respect of certain Adult Social Care savings, it is considered that a more proportionate means of achieving the aims identified above would be to use the 2% Adult Social Care precept to mitigate those savings, and this has influenced the final recommendations made. However, in all other respects, it is considered that both the overall budget, and the specific savings proposals identified in Appendices 3a and 3b are proportionate means to achieve its legitimate aims.

Adult Social Care			Gross budget	Savings £'000					Protected characteristics							
			2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	3 year total	Amendments and Cabinet Decisions (see Notes)	Age	Disability	Gender / Transgender	Ethnicity	Marriage / Civil Partnership	Pregnancy /Maternity	Religion / Belief	Sexual Orientation
Service description	Description of savings proposal	Impact assessment	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000									
Supporting People																
	Remove Supporting People funding in sheltered housing for long term services.	Impact will be the removal of the on-site support service and the communal hub which provide social activities; promote wellbeing; reduce social isolation and help older people to maintain their independence. STEPS (a commissioned service) will continue to provide a floating support service for people with the highest needs.		1,234				1,234	Implement (see Note 1) See Appendix 3a Para 1.6	-						
	Remove Supporting People funding for on-site support within Extra Care Schemes.	Impact will be a reduction in on-site support staff but care staff will remain in place. STEPS (a commissioned service) will continue to provide a floating support service for people with the highest needs.		103				103	Implement (see Note 1) See Appendix 3a Para 1.7	-						
	Partial removal of Supporting People funding from learning disability accommodation schemes.	Impact will be a reduction in long term housing and care services for people aged 18+on service users. On-site care provision will remain, limiting the impact on service users who have either significant or 1:1 care. STEPS (a commissioned service) will continue to provide a floating support service for people with the highest needs.		152				152	Delete (see Note 2) See Appendix 3a Para 1.8	-	-					
	Remove Supporting People funding for short term mental health housing support services for people aged 16+.	Impact will be a reduction in the level of accommodation/units of housing available and a loss of on-site support for people with mental health problems. The accommodation and support helps people with daily living skills required to achieve and maintain independent living. This proposal will reduce the number of housing units available for this type of support in Eastbourne, Hastings and Bexhill.		341				341	Delete (see Note 2) See Appendix 3a Para 1.1	-	-	-				
	Remove Supporting People funding for on-site support for single homeless people.	Impact will be a reduction in the level of accommodation/units of housing available and a loss of on-site support for single homeless people. The accommodation and support helps people with daily living skills required to achieve and maintain independent living. This proposal will reduce the number of housing units available for this type of support in Eastbourne, Hastings and Bexhill.	10,207	287				287	Delete (see Note 2) See Appendix 3a Para 1.2	-		-				
	Refocus Supporting People funding on high risk groups for young people.	The impact reducing this budget by around 50% will lead to a reduction in the number of accommodation units available to support young people at risk, including Care Leavers and homeless young people.		380				380	Delete (see Note 2) See Appendix 3a Para 1.3	-		-	-			
	Refuge Services: review and realign service provision.	Impact will be a reduction in the overall level of accommodation units available and a reduction in support provided. The impact will be relatively low local given the level of support which will remain available across East Sussex.		80				80	Implement (see Note 1) See Appendix 3a See Appendix 3a Para 1.9	-		-	-			
	Young Mothers: review and realign service provision.	Impact will be a reduction in the number of accommodation/housing units available and the level of on-site support for young pregnant women and new mums with complex needs.		50				50	Delete (see Note 2) See Appendix 3a Para 1.4	-		-				
	Home Works: review and realign service provision to target people with the highest needs.	Impact will be a reduction in the number of homeless people, or people at risk of homelessness who are supported by this service. The remaining service will target people with the highest needs. Prevention and early intervention support will be most affected.		835				835	Part Deleted (see Note 3) Implement See Appendix 3a Para 1.5	-						

Children's Services			Gross budget	Net budget	Savings £'000 per year				Protected characteristics									
Service description	Description of savings proposal	Impact assessment	2015/16	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	3 year total	Amendments and Cabinet Decisions (see Notes)	Age	Disability	Gender / Transgender	Ethnicity	Marriage / Civil Partnership	Pregnancy /Maternity	Religion /Belief	Sexual Orientation	NO significant relevance
			£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000		£'000								
Early Help	Withdraw from the current County Council funded universal open access/drop in activity sessions at children's centres; integration of health visiting and children's centres and streamlining of management; some reduction in years 2 and 3 in targeted one to one support for vulnerable families and young people.	Integration of health visiting, the Family Nurse Partnership Programme and children's centres provides the opportunity to look at how the national Healthy Child Programme 0-5 can be provided locally in the most cost effective way, but savings will mean the loss of some posts and changes in the mix of posts of different kinds. Open access activities are currently funded across the county. Ending these activities will reduce opportunities to build supportive connections between local families, promote positive parenting, support children to be ready for school and identify those families with emerging support needs e.g. low level mental health needs. Reduced opportunities to identify families with emerging support needs and reduced capacity for one to one support may impact on demand reduction for social care. The savings start in 16/17, but are being implemented over the 3 years to 18/19, and with significant management savings in 16/17.	21,483	17,501	1,914	577	1,838	4,329	Implement (see Note 1) See Appendix 3b	-	-	-	-				-	
	Withdraw from the current County Council funded universal open access/drop in activity sessions at youth clubs.	The proposal reduces 'places to go/things to do', the ability to identify emerging problems and provide information, advice and guidance, eg around sexual and mental health. Reduced opportunities to identify young people with emerging support needs and reduced capacity for one to one support may impact on demand reduction for social care.			157	0	0	157		-	-	-	-					
Children's Support Services (including Music, Watersports, DofE and Safeguarding qualify assurance)	Reduction of management and administrative posts, more agile working, reducing support to operational managers requiring managers to self serve. Enhancing digital offer and encouraging channel shift to reduce demand from the public and internal staff, reduction in training budget and income generation. Reviewing policies. Reduction in Safeguarding staffing based on on-going forecasted trend of reductions in LAC and CP plans. Greater use of digital technology for YP participation and CP and LAC reviews.	Review of Admissions policies may change the historical catchment areas for some schools but will also help to ensure efficient processing and policies should be clearer for parents. Reduction in support services and more self service has the potential to impact on operational management capacity and increase pressures on some managers and staff. Reduced opportunities for young people from low income families to learn a musical instrument. It is hoped that this can be mitigated by persuading schools to use pupil premium to part-fund music lessons. This is dependent on achieving the reductions in LAC and CP as the capacity of staffing is dependent on the number of meetings required. These changes will reduce our ability to reduce caseloads in line with recommended national levels for IRO's and could lead to poor case planning.	8,952	3,824	309	265	371	945		+/-	+/-		-					

Children's Services			Gross budget	Net budget	Savings £'000 per year				Protected characteristics									
			2015/16	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	3 year total	Amendments and Cabinet Decisions (see Notes)	Age	Disability	Gender / Transgender	Ethnicity	Marriage / Civil Partnership	Pregnancy /Maternity	Religion /Belief	Sexual Orientation	NO significant relevance
Service description	Description of savings proposal	Impact assessment	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000										
Home to School Transport	Review of post 16 discretionary transport and HTST policy, regular review of transport arrangements at pupil level to ensure most cost effective provision.	Regular reviews of transport provision at pupil level to ensure it is the most cost effective option may result in changes in the way children are transported in the year and longer journey times. Reduction in the number of pupils with less complex SEND who will receive travel assistance to get to college and the cessation of post 16 transport assistance for low income families. This is likely to increase the number of NEETs and could impact on the viability of some colleges and some courses.	11,046	10,918	173	488	566	1,227		-	-							
Home to School Transport	Review of unsafe routes	Review of unsafe routes could impact more on pupils in rural areas with a greater expectation on parents to accompany children to school or nearest bus stop. Savings TBC subject to further work which is currently in progress in CET.			0	TBC	TBC	0										
Locality Services	Reconfiguration of services and reduction in staffing at both practitioner and management levels and in ongoing support to families.	We will be reconfiguring services to provide social work expertise on the most complex families by effective joint working with the Police through the new MASH arrangement and effective Early Help hub that will redirect families that do not need social work involvement. Reduction in numbers of families who will be assessed and supported by social work teams with early help staff working with families with even more complex needs. The savings start in 16/17, but are being implemented over the 3 years to 18/19.	13,357	12,722	992	305	85	1,382		-	-	-	-					
Specialist Services	Reduction in staffing alongside income generation	Reduction in capacity to undertake specialist assessment and support which could result in a higher number of court ordered external assessments. Reduction could be mitigated by income generation from other funding streams and by accreditation by the Legal Aid Board so that assessment costs can be shared with other parties in legal proceedings. These plans may need to be reconsidered in light of future savings plans for DAAT. The savings start in 16/17, but are being implemented over the 3 years to 18/19.	4,915	2,029	138	275	0	413		-	-	-					-	
LAC	Reduction in LAC numbers and a continued focus on keeping children in more cost effective in-house placements. Reduction in staffing levels (including adoption services)	LAC modelling is showing decreasing numbers and costs for LAC. Keeping children in in-house provision rather than agency does result in more placement moves for children because effective matching is more limited, children may have to wait longer and sibling groups may be split. Also, reduction in staffing levels will mean reduced support for complex LAC in vulnerable in house foster placements, and young people at risk of being involved in Child Sexual Exploitation remaining at home. Reducing adoption services specifically follows a reduction in govt grant but also acknowledges decreasing numbers of children coming through for adoption. This may affect the capacity to recruit and approve adopters and provide support for adoptive placements leading to adoption disruption. The savings start in 16/17, but are being implemented over the 3 years to 18/19.	22,493	20,830	884	773	952	2,609		-	-	-	-					-

