

**Appendix 7**  
**East Sussex County Council Savings 2018/19**

Department	2017/18 Rebased Net Budget £'000s	2018/19 Savings Targets Oct 17 £'000s	2018/19 Revised Savings Target Jan 18 £'000s
Business Services/Orbis	21,282	1,396	1,396
Children's Services (excl. schools)	68,562	5,404	4,029
Communities, Economy & Transport	63,384	2,119	1,942
Governance Services	7,280	84	84
Centrally Held Budgets	35,835	0	n/a
<b>TOTAL ESCC (excluding ASC/ESBT)</b>	<b>196,343</b>	<b>9,003</b>	<b>7,451</b>
Adult Social Care Non-ESBT	39,793	2,960	2,191
East Sussex Better Together - ASC	128,815	9,906	7,409
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>364,951</b>	<b>21,869</b>	<b>17,051</b>





Adult Social Care: Non-ESBT 2018/19 Savings			Gross budget *	Net budget *	Savings Oct 17	Revised Savings	Protected characteristics									
Service description	Description of savings proposal	Impact assessment	2017/18	2017/18	2018/19	2018/19	Age	Disability	Gender / Transgender	Ethnicity	Marriage / Civil Partnership	Pregnancy /Maternity	Religion / Belief	Sexual Orientation	No significant	
			£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000										
Community Care	Review of Community Care funding	Impact on the levels of care and support funding available to meet eligible social care needs. Reduced choice for service users in the way care and support is delivered and reduced choice of services provided. Reductions in preventative support may result in individuals eligible care needs increasing more quickly. Impact on families and carers supporting service users due to reduced choice and possible changes in the level of care and the way care is provided. Impact of reduced staffing levels as a result of other savings will also increase waiting times for assessments and reviews of peoples needs, compounding the likelihood of increased anxiety and stress for people using services and their families.	33,525	23,872	677	0	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		
Community Care					677	0										
<b>TOTAL ASC NON-ESBT</b>					<b>2,960</b>	<b>2,191</b>										

\* Budgets shown reflect the areas against which savings have been proposed.





ESBT 2018/19 Savings			Gross budget *	Net budget *	Savings Oct 17	Revised Savings	Protected characteristics									
Service description	Description of savings proposal	Impact assessment	2017/18	2017/18	2018/19	2018/19	Age	Disability	Gender / Transgender	Ethnicity	Marriage / Civil Partnership	Pregnancy /Maternity	Religion / Belief	Sexual Orientation	No significant	
			£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000										
Community Care	Review of Community Care funding	Impact on the levels of care and support funding available to meet eligible social care needs. Reduced choice for service users in the way care and support is delivered and reduced choice of services provided. Reductions in preventative support may result in individuals eligible care needs increasing more quickly. Impact on families and carers supporting service users due to reduced choice and possible changes in the level of care and the way care is provided. Impact of reduced staffing levels as a result of other savings will also increase waiting times for assessments and reviews of peoples needs, compounding the likelihood of increased anxiety and stress for people using services and their families.	123,969	88,381	1,995	0	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		
<b>Community Care</b>					<b>1,995</b>	<b>0</b>										
<b>TOTAL ESBT</b>					<b>9,906</b>	<b>7,409</b>										

\* Budgets shown reflect the areas against which savings have been proposed.

Business Services / Orbis 2018/19 Savings			Gross budget	Net budget	Savings Oct 17	Revised Savings	Protected characteristics									
Service description	Description of savings proposal	Impact assessment	2017/18	2017/18	2018/19	2018/19	Age	Disability	Gender / Transgend	Ethnicity	Marriage / Civil Partnershi	Pregnancy /Maternity	Religion / Belief	Sexual Orientatio	No significant	
			£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000										
Business Services	Budgets managed by Orbis on behalf of ESCC: Cost effectiveness across functions, for example procurement savings from joint tenders with Orbis partners.	Reduced responsiveness and support.	33,185	6,013	286	286										y
Orbis is a Business Services partnership between East Sussex and Surrey County Councils and Brighton and Hove City Council. The Partnership is managed through a Joint Committee and therefore remains a wholly public sector operated arrangement.  Orbis has created single leadership and management of business services in order to delivered efficiencies and share best professional practice that enables the ongoing delivery of resilient professional support for the Partners.	Bringing all of the services within Orbis into single points of leadership so that services can be redesigned and integrated in order to operate coherently across the 3 partners.  The significant majority of proposals relate to savings in staffing as this is where the significant operating costs are. The savings are focussed on reducing management posts, the hierarchy and levels of management and areas of duplication.  Where there are areas of non-staff savings proposals these will focus on the ICT and Business Operations areas.  The savings proposals are shown net of some additional investment costs in IT in order to enable modern ways of working and develop technology that automates processes.	Key factors for delivery of the Orbis Business Plan by the end of 18/19 include: - Delivering a level of integration that is optimum for each service; - Recognising the different needs of each partner and getting the right balance between the most efficient common approach and differentiated approach tailored to each partners requirements - Investing in partnership and collaborative working and development of staff to operate effectively within a Partnership supporting 3 partners. - Creating and Orbis identity and culture whilst equally being part of the identities and cultures of the 3 partners - Investing and exploiting the benefits of technology and transitional / programme support to support, enable and deliver changes.	15,269 <sup>1</sup>	15,269 <sup>1</sup>	1,110	1,110										y
<b>TOTAL BSD/ORBIS</b>					<b>1,396</b>	<b>1,396</b>										

<sup>1</sup> ESCC contribution to the Orbis Partnership

## Appendix 7

Children's Services 2018/19 Savings			Gross budget *	Net budget *	Savings Oct 17	Revised Savings	Protected characteristics									
Service description	Description of savings proposal	Impact assessment	2017/18	2017/18	2018/19	2018/19	Age	Disability	Gender / Transgender	Ethnicity	Marriage / Civil Partnership	Pregnancy /Maternity	Religion / Belief	Sexual Orientation	No significant relevance	
			£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000										
Support Services, including Admissions, Buzz and Music service	Management, staff and efficiency savings across support functions and frontline services.	Reduced responsiveness and failing to meet required timescales. Reduced support for operational teams. Reduced ability to support departmental priorities or new initiatives. Staff working under increased pressure.	7,483	3,031	339	322	+/-	+/-		-						
Home to School Transport	Implementing agreed changes to discretionary HTST and review of unsafe routes.	Savings to Home to School Transport (HTST) as a result of policy changes implemented during 16/17 continue to accrue. Implement changes as a result of review of unsafe routes and whether footpaths and bridleways can be used as safe walking routes to school, therefore reducing HTST costs.	12,125	11,561	567	567	-	-								
Locality	Review of non-statutory social care services.	Reduced ability to manage demand and costs.	12,540	11,382	226	0	-	-	-							
SWIFT and YOT	Review of non-statutory social care services.	Reduced ability to manage demand and costs.	6,720	2,878	268	134	-	-	-							
LAC	Continued use of robust placement management.  Review Virtual School costs and commitments.	LAC modelling shows continued reduction in numbers, however impact of Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (where Government grant is insufficient to meet all costs) will need to be factored in.	26,027	22,569	267	0	-	-	-							
SLES	Reduce support for the Education Improvement Partnerships.  Reduce the performance monitoring of schools.	Support to build a sustainable school improvement system, based on school to school support, will be reduced. There will be little capacity or incentive for schools to take responsibility for the performance of the wider group of schools. The capacity to intervene, by schools or the LA, where there is underperformance, will be severely limited and highly inconsistent across the county. This is likely to impact on educational outcomes. Outcomes for pupils vulnerable to underachievement are likely to decline significantly as they are disproportionately affected by poor provision.  The LA will know its maintained schools less well. Our capacity to intervene will be significantly undermined unless there is serious high profile failing, or after annual outcomes are available. This will impact negatively on the proportion of settings and schools judged to be good or better.	31,465	3,803	664	614	-	-	-							
ISEND and ESBAS	Reduce direct support for schools to address attendance and exclusions, increase traded offer.	Some schools will be unprepared to pay for pupil support and the lack of early intervention will see more children and young people excluded and requiring costly specialist provision. LA performance in key indicators will further decline and may impact negatively on Ofsted inspections.	50,264	10,265	1,152	831	-	-	-						-	
Unallocated for 2018/19 - offset by full year impact of some 18/19 savings in 19/20					360	0	-	-		-					-	
<b>TOTAL CSD (excl. Schools)</b>					<b>3,843</b>	<b>2,468</b>										

\* Budgets shown reflect the areas against which savings have been proposed.

Early Help savings slipped to 2019/20, to be mitigated in 18/19 by a draw from reserves

1,561	1,561
<u>5,404</u>	<u>4,029</u>

Communities, Economy & Transport 2018/19 Savings			Gross budget *	Net budget *	Savings Oct 17	Revised Savings	Protected characteristics									
Service description	Description of savings proposal	Impact assessment	2017/18	2017/18	2018/19	2018/19	Age	Disability	Gender / Transgend	Ethnicity	Marriage / Civil Partnershi	Pregnancy /Maternity	Religion / Belief	Sexual Orientatio	No significant	
			£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000										
<b>Operations and Contract Management</b>																
Waste Disposal Service	Review of Current approach during 2017/18	Subject to public consultation, this proposal could include the introduction of charging for non-household waste (soil, hard core, asbestos, plasterboard and tyres) at household waste recycling sites; a review of the current use of household waste recycling sites by registered charities; and the possible closure of the household waste recycling sites at Forest Row and Wadhurst.	29,824	25,927	800	558	-	-								
Grass Cutting	Review of grass cutting policy	This proposal would reduce the number of grass verge cuts to two cuts across the county per year with ad-hoc cuts to maintain visibility and safety at junctions. A targeted consultation will be held with other councils to determine the level of appetite for councils to fund additional cuts in their areas.	823	823	400	400										y
<b>Economy</b>																
Review fees & charges across the Planning Service.	To charge for pre-application advice on major/significant County matter proposals , and review Ordinary Watercourse Consents fees.	Proponents of major schemes are unlikely to be resistant to making a pre-application charge, although they will expect a certain level of service in return, which they are probably already receiving. Proponents of smaller schemes, particularly waste uses, may be put off from having pre-application dialogue if charges are introduced. Hence, a threshold for schemes we do and do not charge for will need to be introduced. Certain District & Borough Council's may be reluctant to introduce ESCC as a party on their Planning Party Agreements (PPAs) - we will need to clearly demonstrate the benefits of doing so.  Potential that a substantial increase in OWC fees may put off people applying for OWC consent in the first place - this could lead to a greater need for enforcement. However, statutory consultation on major planning applications is assisting in identifying where OWC is required.	1,917	587	25	25										y
<b>Communities</b>																
Library and Information Service	Libraries Transformation Programme - internal review of the Library and Information Service	The staffing restructure and changing to how we manage book stock including a review of library opening hours is complete.	5,536	4,606	125	100	+/-	+/-	+/-							
Library and Information Service	Libraries Transformation Programme - development and implementation of the Libraries' Strategic Commissioning Strategy	The Strategic Commissioning Strategy outlines a series of proposals including a reduction in the number of libraries, improved outreach services and development of the home library service. The proposals identify £653k savings against an original target of £750k. The strategy is currently out for consultation. the results of the consultation will be considered in the new year and a final strategy, with recommendations, based upon the results of the consultation will come before Cabinet for consideration.	5,536	4,606	750	653	+/-	+/-	+/-							
The Keep	Improved staff utilisation across a range of functions, increased income generation and reduction in sinking fund	An Income Generation Strategy is currently being developed. The Governance Board has approved, in principle, the approach of the sinking fund.	1,143	0	19	19										y
<b>TOTAL CET</b>					<b>2,119</b>	<b>1,755</b>										

\* Budgets shown reflect the areas against which savings have been proposed.

Savings slipped to 2019/20, to be mitigated in 18/19 by a draw from reserves:

Libraries	25
Waste	162
	<u>1,942</u>

Governance Services 2018/19 Savings			Gross budget *	Net budget *	Savings Oct 17	Revised Savings	Protected characteristics									
Service description	Description of savings proposal	Impact assessment	2017/18	2017/18	2018/19	2018/19	Age	Disability	Gender / Transgen	Ethnicity	Marriage / Civil Partnersh	Pregnanc y /Maternity	Religion / Belief	Sexual Orientatio	No significant	
			£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000										
Communications	Cease production/ delivery of hard copies of Your County magazine	Your County to be available on line only - this would reduce our ability to reach all residents with key messages and is likely to impact on older people and more disadvantaged people without internet access.	1,170	1,013	54	54										y
3rd Sector	Cease corporate support for AiRs (18/19); Reduction in Generic infrastructure or Healthwatch	Reduced support for the VCS.	938	574	30	30										y
<b>TOTAL GS</b>					<b>84</b>	<b>84</b>										

\* Budgets shown reflect the areas against which savings have been proposed.

**Summary of Equality Impact Assessment for RPP&R 2018/19**

**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 2018/19 and beyond requires difficult choices to be made both within and between portfolios and services.

## Appendix 7

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 EqIA is the best way to demonstrate that the equalities impacts have been identified and considered. As such 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 EqIA 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.

### 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, or on different communities such as disabled people, younger or older people, BME communities as well as from 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. 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

## Appendix 7

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. It is considered that both the overall budget, and the specific savings proposals identified are a proportionate means to achieve the Council's legitimate aims set out above.