



**Chief Executive**

**John Metcalfe**

## **Revenue Budget Options**

Background information

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

### Contents

Foreword .....	3
Service Area: Amenities .....	4
Service Area: Adult Social Care .....	4
Service Area: Business Centre.....	21
Service Area: Children .....	32
Service Area: Corporate .....	39
Service Area: CSP.....	40
Service Area: Democratic Services .....	41
Service Area: Economy .....	42
Service Area: Fire and Rescue Service .....	43
Service Area: HR .....	45
Service Area: ICT.....	47
Service Area: Planning .....	49
Service Area: Property .....	50
Service Area: Transport.....	51
Service Area: Waste.....	52
Service Area: Parking .....	54
Service Area: Housing .....	57
Service Area: Events.....	60
Service area: Commercial services .....	60

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

### Foreword

The purpose of this report is to provide background information in the form of impact assessments in relation to the budget savings proposals that have been identified for 2016/17 and 2017/18. The impact assessments are grouped according to service area and have been provided by the relevant lead officer.

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

### Service Area: Amenities

1: Transfer the freehold of all public conveniences to town and parish councils – or close and dispose.

Reference:	1
Activity:	Amenities
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Contract Management
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£120,000 2016/17 £200,000 2017/18
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed?</i> <i>What does this service provide?</i>	Closure of public toilets on the Island.
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	All residents and visitors to the IOW.
Are there any alternative services that can provide support? If so what are they?	No internal service areas.
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	There is no statutory responsibility to provide public toilets so residents will have to seek alternative toilet provision such as retail outlets, café's and pubs.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	Public opinion is likely to be against the closure of public toilets and the Council is in the process of devolving as many of them as possible to Town and Parish Councils.

### Service Area: Adult Social Care

48: Closure of Adelaide Resource Centre (24 Beds)

Reference:	48 [Not Recommended]
Activity:	Closure of the Adelaide resource Centre (24 Beds)
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Adult Social Care (ASC)
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£200,000 FY 2016/17 £370,000 FY 2017/18
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being</i>	To close the Adelaide Resource Centre which offers a multitude of Day Opportunities; Respite Care and Rehabilitation Services for older people across the Isle of Wight

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

<p><i>removed?</i>  <i>What does this service provide?</i></p>	<p>The Adelaide specialises in short term support for people including rehabilitation and has over 500 admissions per year. This is a specialised provision and has a proven track record of supporting people to go back to living as independently as possible in their own homes rather than continuing to stay in residential care for the longer term.          Saving of staffing and ancillary costs associated with running this service. Full closure of all provision.</p>
<p>Who the proposed budget proposal affects  <i>(Who are the service users?)</i></p>	<p>All regular and ad hoc users of the Adelaide Resource Centre (approximately 500 admissions per annum)</p>
<p>Are there any alternative services that can provide support?           If so what are they?</p>	<p>There is no private sector provision on the IW for rehabilitation facilities as provided by this resource centre. Under the Care Act the Council has a duty to be the provider of last resort if no other services are available this particular aspect has proved extremely problematic with the current market place and there is not a high confidence that this can be adequately met in other services          An alternative provider may emerge but none are known at present</p>
<p>Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal?  <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i></p>	<p>As well as the rehabilitation and respite bed provision the Adelaide provides day care, bathing, laundry service etc. of which most of these services are charged for and bring in revenue as well as supporting those service users to remain independently at home rather than requiring residential support. The impact of all services delivered and their impact if removed will need to be considered. There is a potential that ceasing this service will result in a rise in residential placements that become longer term, which is already a significant budget pressure for the Island</p>
<p>Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation</p>	<p>There are also potential longer term impacts on budgets as the focus of this service is for short stays and to prevent short stays becoming long term residential stays. This service has enabled a significant number of clients and supported them to live independently at home rather than become long term residential placements which are already a significant budget pressure on the ASC budget.          Consideration also needs to be given to the impact on the reablement service (outreach/domiciliary service) which, following a previous savings initiative, is now managed through the managers of the Adelaide and Gouldings. Reprovision of a suitable management structure to comply with CQC requirements would need to be put in place for this part of the service which will further erode the potential savings.</p>

### 49: Closure of Gouldings Resource Centre (32 Beds)

Reference:	49 [Not Recommended]
Activity:	Closure of the Gouldings resource Centre (35 Beds)
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Adult Social Care (ASC)
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£50,000 FY 2016/17 £80,000 FY 2017/18
Detailed explanation of the	To close the Gouldings Resource Centre which offers a multitude of

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

<p>budget proposal <i>What services are being removed?</i> <i>What does this service provide?</i></p>	<p>Day Opportunities; Respite Care and Rehabilitation Services for older people across the Isle of Wight</p>
<p>Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i></p>	<p>The Gouldings specialises in short term support for people including rehabilitation and has over 650 admissions per year. This is a specialised provision and has a proven track record of supporting people to go back to living as independently as possible in their own homes rather than continuing to stay in residential care for the longer term. Saving of staffing and ancillary costs associated with running this service. Full closure of all provision.</p>
<p>Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?</p>	<p>There is no private sector provision on the IW for rehabilitation facilities as provided by this resource centre. Under the Care Act the Council has a duty to be the provider of last resort if no other services are available this particular aspect has proved extremely problematic with the current market place and there is not a high confidence that this can be adequately met in other services</p>
<p>Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i></p>	<p>As well as the rehabilitation and respite bed provision the Gouldings provides day care, bathing, laundry service etc. of which most of these services are charged for and bring in revenue as well as supporting those service users to remain independently at home rather than requiring residential support. The impact of all services delivered and their impact if removed will need to be considered. There is a potential that ceasing this service will result in a rise in residential placements that become longer term, which is already a significant budget pressure for the Island</p>
<p>Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation</p>	<p>The is also a risk of potential longer term impact on budgets as the focus of this service is for short stays and to prevent short stays becoming long term residential stays. This service has reabled a significant number of clients and supported them to live independently at home rather than become long term residential placements which are already a significant budget pressure on the ASC budget. Consideration also needs to be given to the impact on the reablement service (outreach/domiciliary service) which, following a previous savings initiative, is now managed through the managers of the Adelaide and Gouldings. Reprovision of a suitable management structure to comply with CQC requirements would need to be put in place for this part of the service which will further erode the potential savings.</p>

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

### 45: End support for Cross Solent Travel (patients)

Reference:	45 [Not Recommended]
Activity:	Cross Solent Travel
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Adult Social Care
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£60k
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	<p>Historically the PCT now CCG provided a discretionary scheme to reimburse patients receiving Radiotherapy, Chemotherapy planning/treatment or Renal Dialysis who are <b>not eligible to claim for their travel costs under the Healthcare Travel Cost Scheme (HTCS)</b></p> <p>These arrangements provided by the PCT were placed under threat in 2005 as the NHS proposed withdrawing the local discretionary scheme as part of that year's recovery plan. The original deadline for the PCT withdrawing all payments for new patients was 1<sup>st</sup> September 2005, however this was extended to 1<sup>st</sup> April 2006.</p> <p>Since 2006 the IW Council have agreed to pay foot passenger fares for mainland Radiotherapy, Chemotherapy planning/treatment or Renal Dialysis for patients who are not eligible to have their travel reimbursed under the Healthcare Travel Cost Scheme (HTCS).</p> <p>Approximately 250 users per year are supported through this scheme</p>
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	All patients receiving Radiotherapy, Chemotherapy planning/treatment or Renal Dialysis who are not eligible to have their travel reimbursed under the Healthcare Travel Cost Scheme (HTCS) and this will mean that these patients will be required to fund their individual travel arrangements and that of any carer if a carer is required to support them to make this journey.
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	<p><b>Current Services available to support patients/service users.</b></p> <p>Patients may be able to claim back travel costs if they are on low incomes under the NHS Low Income Scheme (LIS) or receiving other qualifying benefits that meet the HTCS eligibility criteria will continue to be fully supported or partly supported through the (HTCS) Healthcare Travel Costs Scheme.</p> <p><b>Discounted Cross Solent travel currently available for local residents and their carers/escort:</b></p> <p><b>Red Funnel:</b></p> <p>Red Funnel's scheme provides discounted foot passenger travel to eligible Isle of Wight residents who have an NHS medical appointment in Southampton. A special return passenger ferry fare of £9.20 per person is available for the patient and one person travelling with them. Where the patient is a child, the discounted fare is available for up to 2 adults travelling with the child. Please note the fare only applies to sailings from East or West Cowes after 8:45am (exceptions may be made for earlier appointments).</p> <p><b>Wightlink:</b></p>

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

	<p>Wightlink offers 50% ferry discounts exclusively for Isle of Wight residents travelling to the mainland for an NHS-funded hospital appointment. 50% Discounts apply to Standard, Economy and Foot passenger fares for IOW residents. 50% discount applies to IOW Residents; Economy and Standard fares. Discount only applies to patient + 1 (with the exception of children where two parents will be permitted to travel) travelling under an NHS funded appointment.</p> <p><b>Hover Travel:</b></p> <p>Offers a reduction in the cost of foot passenger travel on Hovertravel's passenger services for patients attending NHS appointments on the mainland. The scheme provide patients attending NHS appointments at mainland hospitals, and one person travelling with them, with a discounted return fare (valid for 90 days) of £9.00 per person between Ryde and Southsea and also provide a free connection (saving £2.40 per person) using the HoverBus from Southsea Esplanade to the bus terminus at The Hard, Portsmouth.</p>
<p>Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i></p>	<p>The trust is applying to the CCG to ask them to meet the costs but that decision has not yet been made.</p> <p>Vulnerability of Local residents</p> <p>Withdrawing current funding may have a significant impact on individual residents who need to travel to the mainland for related health care appointments and there is a possible risk that due to financial hardship some patients, who despite the concessions available to them for travel, still cannot afford travel to the mainland for hospital treatment and may forego essential medical treatment.</p> <p>"Transport can be a barrier to accessing care. The Social Exclusion Unit estimates that 1.4 million people miss turn down or simply choose not to seek health care because of transport problems." <i>White paper – 'Our health, our care, our say'</i></p>
<p>Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation</p>	<p>Reputation of the IWC</p> <p>There could be a high risk of reputational damage to the IWC due to the sensitive nature of withdrawing this funding.</p> <p>Additional risk</p> <p>There is a risk that patients forgoing necessary medical treatment could impact upon the provision of social care services due to poor health and the possible additional of social care support.</p>

### 46: Revision to sensory impairment contract

Reference:	46 [Not Recommended]
Activity:	Sensory Service
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Adult Social Care (ASC)
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£100,000 (part of the current contract value)
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed?</i>	Full review being undertaken to be completed by 29 Feb 2016. Service undertakes statutory duties for supporting service users with sensory and dual sensory loss on behalf of the local authority.



## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

<i>What does this service provide?</i>	Providing support, signposting, equipment and maintaining a sensory loss register for service users with sensory and dual sensory loss.
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	Service Users with sensory loss and dual sensory loss.
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	There is no other alternative provider. However, the assessment element of the contract is being looked at as part of the review. An option being considered would be to bring this service back in house, and undertake the assessment activity within social care workforce. The commissioning report will consider this option.
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	Options to provide a service that meets the local authority's statutory requirements whilst ensuring a saving is achieved will be considered during the full review of the Sensory Service.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	Reduction in specialist support available to support people with sensory loss. Reduction in support and preventative activity could impact on speech and language/audiology areas of the NHS Trust. Full assessment of the total contract to ensure that areas that are a statutory requirement continue to be provided under the contract.

### 2: End support to Recall Club (post diagnostic support)

Reference:	2 [Recommended]
Activity:	End ASC Support to Recall Club (post diagnostic support)
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Adult Social Care (ASC)
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£48K
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed?</i> <i>What does this service provide?</i>	Withdraw Adult Social Care staff support to Recall Club (Memory Therapy Groups/Service) Above cost equals three FTE posts who work in partnership with colleagues in the NHS to provide cognitive stimulation therapy groups for up to 24 weeks. There are 3 groups each week including a group for younger adults. All of the service users have had a recent diagnosis of dementia. Cognitive stimulation is part of NICE guidelines for the support and treatment of people with dementia. The Council staff help to run the groups, planning/designing the activities. Each group has 8-12 attendees.
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	Proposal is to delete the 3 posts
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	NHS/CCG have been made aware of the proposal and are in the process of redesigning this service area as part of an overall review. They will need to consider how this is delivered differently within their review.
Likely impact or consequence of the budget	Staff redundancy may impact on delivery of service directly – direct consequence. Indirectly - the groups support people to manage their

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	dementia – activities that prompt and stimulate their memory, provide social inclusion, peer support. Enable people to live well with dementia. CCG view is that there will be little impact due to the redesign being undertaken at present.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	Risk for service users is that the groups could cease to operate. As mentioned above, the Dementia Pathway is in the process of redesign so that the aims/scope of these groups are to change which in some way mitigates the risks that people with dementia manage their illness less well – impact on living independently, carers and their wellbeing. Note work is currently in progress to consider a Section 75 agreement to integrate the NHS/IWC Mental Health and Memory Services which would need to take cognisance of this proposal.

3: Alternative methods of service delivery (combined with reference 4 and see below)

4: End support for learning disability Wednesday Club (combined with reference 3)

Reference:	3 & 4 (need to be combined) [Recommended]
Activity:	Alternative Methods of Service Delivery (incl Weds Club) – Westminster House
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Adult Social Care
Value of the budget proposal (£):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Westminster House involves a total budget commitment of between £ 600-650K per annum.</li> <li>• The five stage plan for redesign and delivery of services will realise £256k in year one (2016/17)</li> <li>• Stage 1 of the proposal analyses the current provision for day care and respite services.</li> <li>• Stage 2 of the plan will implement the removal of day care provision at Westminster House = 80K</li> <li>• Stage 3 of the plan will be the closure of the Wednesday Club held at Westminster House = £6k</li> <li>• Stage 4 – £170k through review of need and reprovision of the respite care elements that can be provided through alternative methods of delivery (Direct Payment) and other providers and commissioned services.</li> </ul>
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LD Homes – Westminster House – respite unit.</li> <li>• Westminster House recent CQC Inspection Report, found that it ‘Requires Improvement’ for 4 out of 5 regulated activities.</li> <li>• A five stage plan is being developed to understand the effect of the reprovision of services currently delivered at Westminster House:</li> <li>• Stage 1: Review of all service users is currently underway, with the priority being to address the day care service provision.</li> <li>• Stage 2. Removal of day Care provision – this relates to only 5 regular users, with only 2 at any one time – over 7 days. Provides limited service to service users and the support can be better provided through other provision.</li> <li>• Stage 3. Closure of Wednesday Club – which is an evening meeting session for social interaction - used by approximately 15 service users.</li> <li>• Stage 4. Redesign and reprovision of LD respite care provision.</li> <li>• Occupancy levels at Westminster House are currently just over</li> </ul>

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

	<p>30% each month. But is currently fully staffed at high cost.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This service provision and staffing level is currently being reviewed to provide a streamlined service which will achieve a higher occupancy rate over fewer days to realise maximisation of staffing capacity which in turn will reduce the staffing budget associated with Westminster House.</li> <li>• Stage 5. Further analysis and reprovision of respite care options through direct payments and other service areas already in place.</li> </ul>
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Day Opportunities – 5 Adults with a learning disability.</li> <li>• Wednesday Club – 15 Adults with a learning disability.</li> <li>• Respite Services (40 irregular users overall), this service is generally to provide respite for families providing informal support.</li> <li>• Staff reduction, some to be achieved through current attendance and vacant management process, some redeployment may be required to other service areas, which will reduce the need for redundancy to minimal.</li> </ul>
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individual support via personal budget. Following a review – where appropriate, individuals will be able to employ a personal assistant to support them to participate in activities in the community.</li> <li>• Respite Services can be provided through other residential settings and community solutions dependent on the individual need.</li> </ul>
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on personal budgets for Day Closure – although due to the low number of service users involved this will be minimal.</li> <li>• Impact on personal budgets to replace respite care either in private residential or alternative arrangements to respite within the community.</li> </ul>
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal not accepted and savings not made:</li> <li>• Previous attempts to change the delivery options and better use other facilities and services already commissioned to provide services have been met with strong resistance in the local community but the outcomes of the CQC inspection must be addressed.</li> <li>• Full implementation plan being developed; which includes active engagement and inclusion with individuals affected, their carers and families.</li> </ul>

### 47: Review of the most complex care packages

Reference:	5 & 47 [Recommended]
Activity:	Review of 112 complex placements and 100 low cost packages.
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Adult Social Care
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£500 - £800K 2016/17
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed?</i> <i>What does this service provide?</i>	Review of highest cost placements as well as an identified cohort of low cost packages. Review of complex placements for some Providers. This may result in a reduction in the special prices paid for the complex placements.

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	All are service users within Adult Social Care with eligible needs.
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reviews/reassessments will ensure focus on the whole circle of support, the strengths of the individual, commissioned services.</li> <li>• These will be first investigated to ensure only those unresolved eligible needs are funded through ASC as a statutory responsibility within the Care Act. This approach to assessments now under the Care Act will in some cases reduce the level of statutory provision.</li> <li>• In addition, following each placement reviewed a commissioning analysis will be undertaken with the Providers, looking at background costs to determine the true cost of the provision/placement.</li> </ul>
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	Analysis of Providers costs and subsequent negotiations about the fees will lead to savings for the Council for these high cost placements. For low costs packages/placements, alternative options for provision apart for ASC will be put in place. To ensure social care funds only unresolved eligible needs.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	Reviews may lead to an increase in costs of care as well as reductions so overall the total projected savings may not be achieved. Mitigation ensures staff carry out reviews in line with Care Act – all options explored prior to agreement for ASC funding. Also experienced Commissioner is now in place to support this project in terms of the cost analysis and negotiations with our Providers.

### 6: Implementation of Shared Lives project

Reference:	6 [Recommended]
Activity:	Implementation of shared lives
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Adult Social Care (ASC)
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£130,000
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed?</i> <i>What does this service provide?</i>	Reprovision of establishment based services to a shared lives option. Based on 30 cases where reprovision to family based care will be undertaken with individual's whose needs and outcomes suit the shared lives delivery method. Assessment will be individually managed with the people who may be best suited to utilise this method of care provision.
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	This service can be offered across the board such as Older Persons and Learning Difficulty clients. Schemes have proved extremely successful for clients with Learning Difficulties and Older Persons, especially those with dementia and have proven to be a best outcome focused approach for the individual especially of those with 1 to1 needs whilst being a cost effective alternative to traditional residential placements.
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?	The implementation of this new service looks to offer alternatives to existing care provision such as residential placements for permanent care and some respite placements.

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

If so what are they?	
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	Improved outcomes and alternative choices for individuals requiring support and reduced cost of service provision compared to residential placements
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	This is a new service provision and relies on quick set up and delivery to ensure savings can be achieved. The service is already being set up and there is significant learning from other areas that have had this for some time. In addition we have membership to shared lives plus which has provided access to resources, such as advice and documentation, which is nationally recognised as best practice which significantly reduces the development and lead up time.

### 7: Wightcare – service efficiencies

Reference:	7 [Recommended]
Activity:	Wightcare – Service efficiencies
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Adult Social Care (ASC)
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£45,000
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	To find further efficiencies within the service delivery and reduce overall cost
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	Wightcare clients (approx. 2,300 people) This will not affect the delivery of the service, and will look at driving out further efficiencies, whilst maintaining the service.
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?	This will not impact the service and there are currently no alternatives available to deliver this service.
If so what are they?	
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	Improved efficiencies within the service
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	The work for this proposal has already been undertaken during late 2015 through a restructure and this is on target to achieve these savings.

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

### 8: ICES review and increase use of assisted technology

Reference:	8 [Recommended]
Activity:	ICES review and increase of use of assistive technology
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Adult Social Care (ASC)
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£28,000
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed?</i> <i>What does this service provide?</i>	Review of service provision across ICES (Integrated Community Equipment Store) and related services to realise efficiencies and improved promotion and use of Assistive Technology (AT). This activity will support individuals to maintain their independence for longer and compliment packages for social care. This will consist of new cases where assistive technology will be considered prior to packages of care and during reviews of existing packages.
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	New and existing clients of Adult Social Care from all service areas such as older persons and leaning difficulties clients.
Are there any alternative services that can provide support? If so what are they?	This initiative will be to promote the use of assistive technology to offer alternatives to individuals needing person to person support and offer more choice and promote independence.
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	Improved outcomes and independence for the individuals requiring support services and a reduction in dependency and cost of traditional care provision.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	There may be perceived negatively by some clients if current packages are reduced if need has been met through technology rather than person to person care. Some preparatory work has already been undertaken in identifying support to deliver this within existing resources and is on target to deliver the savings identified.

### 9: Operations staff review

Reference:	9 [Recommended]
Activity:	Operations staff review – COMPLETED
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	ASC
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£32,000
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed?</i> <i>What does this service</i>	Review of staffing across the operations team within ASC Short Term Services, and reduce posts.

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

<i>provide?</i>	
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	Staffing within this team
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	Some functions to be completed within other teams – this has been undertaken.
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	Reduction in posts within the team reducing overall costs
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	This work has already been undertaken in restructuring the functions and team in late 2015 resulting in the deletion of 0.5 FTE Manager post and 1 FTE support post (following the retirement of substantive post holders in December 2015) and is on target to deliver the savings identified

### 10: Short term services and learning disability review

Reference:	10 [Recommended]
Activity:	Short Term Services and LD review
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Adult Social Care
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£8,000
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed?</i> <i>What does this service provide?</i>	Application of standard rate across directly provided services to ensure consistent rates used in all services across this sector to rebalance some anomalies following the staff HAY pay review. Low level staffing impact.
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	Staffing within these teams
Are there any alternative services that can provide support? If so what are they?	N/A
Likely impact or consequence of the budget	Equity in staff pay grading across the services and reduction in costs

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	This work has already begun and is on target to achieve the identified savings.

### 11: Reeve Court – contract adjustments

Reference:	11 [Recommended]
Activity:	Reeve Court – Contract
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Adult Social Care
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£70,810
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	When the council took over the care and support of service users living at Reeve Court (previously known as White Lodge, it received Base Budget Funding of £354,050 to support 5 individuals as part of the revenue grant settlement in relation to the services provided at Reeve Court - £70,810 per person. This level of funding was not sufficient to meet the needs of the five individuals so CCG agreed top up funding for each person to cover the full cost of care, this was agreed and was actioned through a section 75 agreement. Since the commencement of the section 75 one of the original 5 individuals have died. The council proposes that the £70,810 that was provided for that individual remain in the base budget to offset increasing community care costs, the remaining £283,240 continue to be used to support the remaining 4 individuals which the CCG will continue to provide top up funding for which is currently in the region of £152,758
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	This will not affect any service users as the care will continue to be provided this is a decision with regard to funding between the LA and the CCG
Are there any alternative services that can provide support? If so what are they?	N/A
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	N/A
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	The CCG would like the £70,810 returned to their funding to offset the top up funding they are currently paying for the four individuals remaining. Risk is if the CCG decide to remove top up arrangements. Ongoing discussions continue with the CCG to meet



## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

	this requirement and mitigate the risk.
--	-----------------------------------------

### 12: Team around the person: end provider contract

Reference:	12 [Recommended]
Activity:	Team Around the Person - end provider contract
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Adult Social Care
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£25k
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Team Around the Person service (TAP) was piloted from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2013 – December 2014 by People Matter Isle of Wight Funding was resumed for a further year in April 2015 and is due to cease 31<sup>st</sup> March 2016.</li> <li>• Team Around the Person pilot was established to look at a new way of working with adults over 18 years with support needs who do not meet the national Eligibility criteria for Adult Social care support as defined in the Care Act 2014.</li> <li>• The project aims to meet with individuals to identify the outcomes they wish to achieve and work with them to establish a self-management action plan to support them to live the life they choose. The action plan, agreed with the individual and their support network, is designed in clear achievable steps. The individual is supported by the TAP co-ordinator as the lead professional, the service will refer individuals to partner organisations as required, for example CAB, Footprint Trust, Carers IOW and supporting People etc. However if no suitable agency can be accessed the co-ordinator will work directly with the individual to achieve their outcomes.</li> <li>• Since the inception of TAP there have only been 43 referrals into the service although they have come from a range of agencies including IOW College, schools, strengthening families, Early Help Team, Home Start, social care practitioners, substance misuse recovery team and occupational therapy.</li> </ul>
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Team Around the Person pilot was established to look at a new way of working with adults over 18 years with support needs who do not meet the national Eligibility criteria for Adult Social care support as defined in the Care Act 2014.</li> <li>• The service users are therefore vulnerable adults with a range of support needs that do not meet statutory service provision.</li> </ul>
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	<p>Since the inception of TAP other agencies have started to develop pathways to information, advice and support for island residents. The island's new care model, developed through My Life a Full Life is aimed at improving health and wellbeing, care and delivering quality outcomes for individuals both at home and in the community. At the centre of this model is the person and it focuses on outcomes, highlighting an individual's strengths rather than their needs. Recent developments include Isle Help, Local area Co-ordinators, Care Navigators and Health Trainers.</p>
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek</i>	Referral numbers are low, despite concerted efforts by People Matter to promote the service as a positive method of assistance for individuals who require support to achieve their outcomes but do not meet adult social care criteria. Removal of the TAP service would affect vulnerable adults across all disadvantaged groups. However

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

<i>assistance from?)</i>	individuals who would have used TAP would be referred to the initiatives described above to support them achieve their outcomes. We would also work with the provider to ensure that any individuals still requiring support when funding finishes would be appropriately supported.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	There is a risk that support available to vulnerable adults may be reduced however these risks are mitigated by the initiatives described above as alternative referral sources which were not available when the project started.

### 50: Reduce funding to stroke initiative

Reference:	50 [Not Recommended]
Activity:	Stroke Initiative – reduction in funding
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Adult Social Care
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£58,000
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	The council contracts with The Stroke association to provide an information and advice service for stroke survivors and carers and support with developing communication post stroke. The current cost of the service is £89,000. The council has invested in carers support, this alongside the advent of local area co-ordinators (LAC) and care navigators has meant that there is more information with regard to care and support in the public domain. The stroke service provides specialist information and strategies for developing and improving communications are also specialist areas not delivered elsewhere. The NHS Trust believe the service prevents readmissions to hospital as it supports individuals with lifestyle changes which could otherwise lead to further strokes and the communication developments supports carers to support their loved ones to stay at home longer so lessening impact on social care. The council are working with the stroke association to maintain a good level of support to stroke survivors and signposting people to elements that can be addressed by other commissioned services.
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	As described above we are looking to reduce rather than remove the service and maximise the use of other commissioned advice and information services already in place. Will affect stroke survivors and their families.
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	Yes – Local Area Coordinators Isle Help Carers IOW
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	There may be an increase in need for support from adult social care but this is thought to be minimal as the service will remain in place and will also utilise other commissioned services already actively in place.
Risks associated with the	Low level – may increase the need for support from health and

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	social care. The reduction of the general advice and information, whilst maintaining specialise stroke advice and communications, rather than removal of the service in total further reduced and mitigates risks associated.
-------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### 13: Additional income

Reference:	13 [Recommended]
Activity:	Additional Income
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Adult Social Care (ASC)
Value of the budget proposal (£):	90,000
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	Not a service – no service being removed: This is the implementation of the previously agreed Full Council decision to move to full financial assessment for Sitting and Respite Services provided by ASC.
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	Service users who currently use Sitting and Respite Services.
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	Services are being retained – however, it has been established through financial modelling that the indirect effect of this change in charging, is an increase in income for the council, for those service users who have been assessed to pay for services at a higher rate than the flat, unassessed rate they previously contributed.
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	Additional income for the council. Modelling to date has established that people are prepared to pay the assessed contribution charge, despite it being higher than previously.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	Individuals or their carers may decide not to continue to receive the sitting/respite service if they have to pay increased contribution, based in their ability to pay. To mitigate this, the council will take the assessed eligible care needs of carers into account in a separate carer's assessment. Carers are now entitled to a personal budget for any eligible care needs they may have.

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

### 51: Closure of the Mental Health Day Services

Reference:	51 [Not Recommended]
Activity:	Closure of the Mental Health Day Services
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Adult Social Care
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£240,000
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	To close the Mental Health Day Services. Parklands, West Wight Group, Riboleau and Ventnor Club Which currently provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group and individual support</li> <li>• Therapeutic crafts such as Art, Pottery</li> <li>• Outings and Walks</li> <li>• Relaxation</li> <li>• Wellbeing Days</li> </ul>
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	Activity levels have declined over time and service needs to be reviewed and redesigned to meet the current needs within the community setting. May be received negatively by a small number of people in the local community (45 users) being personally affected by the change and who use the day services.
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	Some of the Groups affected are now user led and the service helps facilitate this – they can now be empowered to take the lead. This could also potentially be undertaken through a voluntary sector role/provider.
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	May be perceived negatively by the 45 service users who attend the service currently. This was a late addition to the budget proposals some further analysis to the individual impact on the people who use the service will be required.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	

### 14: Reduce grant for carer's training

Reference:	14 [Recommended]
Activity:	Carers Training Budget
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Adult Services
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£10,000
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed?</i>	Ceasing dual funding of Training Events for family carers by the ceasing of the separate contract for this provision.

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

<i>What does this service provide?</i>	
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	Carers IW (provider) Individual carers who access training
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	We have incorporated training for carers within the Carers IW grant funding which commenced June 1 <sup>st</sup> 2015.
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	Training will be met through the grant funding provided to Carers IW so no actual impact on carers.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	None

### Service Area: Business Centre

#### 15: Revenues Team – Reduction in staffing levels

Reference:	15 [Recommended]
Activity:	Revenues Team
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Business Centre
Value of the budget proposal (£):	40k saving 16/17 cumulative 17/18 £75k
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed?</i> <i>What does this service provide?</i>	<p>The Revenues team main functions are</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identification and registration of council tax payers, coupled with the collection and enforcement of the charge. Council tax base equates to 70,229 properties equating to collectable debt of £78.3 million. Current in year collection rate is 94.6%. In addition, there is the registration of Non Domestic Rates payers for collection and enforcement of business rates. The tax base equates to 6641 properties with a collectable debt of £35.6 million. Current in year collection rate is 91.8%.</li> <li>2. Collection and administration of parking fines including responding to parking appeals and tribunal hearings. Assistance with developing the parking order. Annual income (to date) on Penalty Charge Notices is £494k, Parking Permits £265k.</li> <li>3. Reconciliation &amp; allocation of all income.</li> <li>4. Identifying properties that should be brought into rating- liaising with the Valuation Office Agency to maximise the tax base and increase government funding.</li> </ol>

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

	<p>The saving proposal being developed is centred around a reduction in staff as detailed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Early retirement accepted from 1 April 2016 for 1 post with contractual 22 hrs per week. Delivers £15k saving.</li> <li>2. Reduction of hours from 3 Revenues officers equates to £23k. The majority of these hours have been given up by staff returning from maternity leave.</li> <li>3. A flexible retirement application has been received from the Revenues team leader which is awaiting further consideration. If agreed, this will enable a service redesign of the team during 16/17. This service remodelling will involve closer working with both the election services team and the contact centre team; the creation of a court officer role and encourage more staff to work from home which has proved successful in improving productivity. This proposal will deliver £20k from April 17.</li> <li>4. Given the change in the back office parking system with the move to paperless permits there will be a reappraisal of staffing resource estimated to be at least a reduction of officer time – £17k.</li> </ol>
<p>Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i></p>	<p>Council tax payers may see a delay in receiving demands for payment and responses to written correspondence as a result of a change, which in turn may contribute to a reduced collection rate. This will impact on the council's revenue stream (including town and parish councils and the police &amp; crime commissioner) which in turn may impact on the council's financial management and provision of services if not collected timely. The additional revenue generated as a result of the changes to the Local Council Tax Support Scheme of £683k, will require targeted recovery requiring intervention from officers to collect. There may be delays in recovering this debt effectively.</p>
<p>Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The revenues team already work closely with the contact centre team who take the majority of telephone enquiries on behalf of the back office processing team, with only more in depth complex queries transferred to the team. A reduction in back office support will further limit the ability to provide specialist support to the contact centre for the complex queries.</li> <li>• There are a range of online transactions accessible via the council's website and the Citizen's access portal which enables council tax payers to access their account online and have the ability to make some changes themselves to discounts, direct debits etc. The system currently has faults requiring further essential work to improve the ability for a range of transactions to be completed via the portal if it is to successfully reduce contact via the contact centre and increase online transactions.</li> <li>• Access to the 'Citizen's access' portal can also be facilitated by the contact centre staff who in turn can make changes on behalf of the taxpayer. This facility introduced in March 15 assists the revenue team in resolving enquiries at the first point of contact and reducing some back office processing.</li> <li>• Development work planned for the council's website will make on line and self-serve options much more accessible.</li> <li>• The revenues team work closely with the empty properties officer based in the housing team with the visiting and reviewing of empty properties in order to increase new homes bonus grant and jointly monitor properties enabling a return to occupation.</li> </ul>

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The revenues team also work very closely with the Benefits team as there are a number of transactions such as setting up and closing accounts that the Benefits section process on behalf of the revenues team when assessing benefit claims. This enables timely billing and revenue collection to avoid passing revenues work to the team to deal with where possible so as to avoid delays in the revenue and benefits processes. Potential reductions in Benefits processing resource may hamper the ability to undertake some of the processing currently performed.</li> </ul>
<p>Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Service users will be directed to the website information where they are able to access a range of information on all aspects of the service. They also have online access to their own account.</li> <li>Payments can be made via the automated telephone line or through the online process.</li> <li>With less officer time available there is potential for the collection rates to fall as liability changes may be processed out of the 4 weekly collection cycle.</li> <li>Potential increase in correspondence received and complaints as a result of delays in responding.</li> </ul>
<p>Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of income – A 1% reduction in council tax collection would equate to approximately £650k loss of revenue</li> <li>As business rates retention is of greater focus for the council (by 2019/20 100% will be retained by local government as opposed to the current 50%) there is a potential risk that a drop in collection and timely issuing of bills, identifying and bringing new properties into rating will reduce income for the council when there is considerable uncertainty and movement in the economy.</li> <li>Greater emphasis on home working to improve productivity is planned together with a more joined up working with the contact centre to improve parameter setting on recovery runs to maximise collection but reduce the need to contact the service.</li> <li>An assumption that residents are able to complete a full array of transactions through self-service could reduce the need to provide front and back office transactions through increased automation.</li> <li>Failure to deliver the new parking system on time will impact on the ability to reduce resource in parking services.</li> </ul>

### 16: Benefits Team – Reduction in staffing levels

Reference:	16 [Recommended]
Activity:	Benefits Team
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Business Centre
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£50k saving 16/17 cumulative 17/18 £102k
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	<p>The benefits service enables residents on low income to seek financial assistance by making claims for housing benefit and council tax in order to assist with payment of their rent and / or council tax. Key work streams are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessing new applications for housing benefit, council tax support &amp; blue badges</li> <li>Reviewing and processing changes in circumstances (increase/</li> </ol>

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

	<p>decrease in income, changes to family make up, capital, change of address/accommodation) which affect the entitlement and eligibility of the claim. Given the seasonal nature of work on the Island there are frequent changes in income to be processed to ensure that the correct entitlement to benefits and therefore payment are issued in a timely manner to avoid overpayment and subsidy implications.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Collection of Housing Benefit overpayments which provides the local authority with an income as these monies do not go back to the Government.</li> <li>4. Application for and review of eligibility for a blue badge which includes referrals to the NHS clinic for walking assessment</li> <li>5. Considering discretionary housing payments for those residents who are experiencing exceptional financial hardship and who require short term assistance to avoid homelessness. In light of the recent full council decision to change the Local Council Tax Scheme this will now also involve a separate exceptional hardship scheme application/decision process to administer.</li> <li>6. Help centre function assisting residents with a range of council on line activities and enquiries; verifying evidence and performing the meet &amp; greet function at County Hall.</li> <li>7. Ensuring the subsidy claim is accurate thereby maximising the grant funding available to the council. Quality checking and exception reporting ensure that claims are processed correctly and any inaccuracies, incorrect coding etc. are fed back to the processing teams. This includes minimising the admin delay and local authority errors to remain below the lower threshold to avoid subsidy loss implications.</li> </ol> <p>In order for the service to deliver the proposed savings the team will need to make the following changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reduce the budget for agency staff and consultancy fees by £20k and plan to find a further non staffing budget line savings of £25k, which will protect the back office processing teams and avoid the need to find staffing savings from the benefit processing teams.</li> <li>2. Staff reduction in hours already planned £10k</li> <li>3. Review the help centre provision. With the implementation of more online activities and self-help there is a planned reduction in help centre staffing by 1 FTE - £25k</li> <li>4. Integrate the blue badge team with the benefits applications team and delete 1 full time equivalent post - £22k</li> </ol>
<p>Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i></p>	<p>The current Housing Benefit/Local Council Tax Scheme caseload is 15,194 claims, which are split across the following types of household.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Working age unemployed (35%)</li> <li>2. Working age employed (25%)</li> <li>3. Pensioners (40%)</li> </ol> <p>The benefits team deal with approximately 7000 new claims and 80,000+ changes each year. During 2015 1,213 blue badge applications were received and 1,369 renewals were processed. There is a rolling caseload of approximately 200 per month blue badge applications which are provided to people with short and long term disabilities.</p>
<p>Are there any alternative services that can provide</p>	<p>Isle Help can provide advice and advocacy support to claimants. But they cannot challenge and then also advise on the benefit service</p>



## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

<p>support?</p> <p>If so what are they?</p>	<p>due to a conflict of interest. Homelessness support officers have received basic benefits training so are able to provide general entitlement advice but given the complexity of the benefits legislation refer entitlement enquiries to the benefits team.</p>
<p>Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal?</p> <p><i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i></p>	<p>There are limited avenues for claimants to access for advice. Calculation and payment of housing benefit and local council tax support can only be sought from the benefits service. The majority of visitors to the help centre are there to deliver documents in support of claims and therefore if the plans currently being developed with the IT team to deliver self-serve scanning are implemented there can be a planned reduction of staff in this area. Benefits cannot be paid until all required evidence is provided to support a claim and any delays with this coming through will delay assessment and payment.</p> <p>Processing claims and changes promptly ensures that claimants receive the financial support that they are entitled to which in turn helps reduce the potential for rent arrears, homelessness and the accumulation of debts. This also means that the Council Tax is billed timely and correctly to ensure the council's revenue stream is maintained and avoiding unnecessary recovery action and chasing.</p> <p>Any reduction in back office processing will affect the ability of the team to maintain the current performance of processing changes to benefit within 6 days and new applications within 16 days. It is likely that a reduction of 1 full time equivalent post in the processing teams will see 2 days added to changes and 5 days to new applications. There is a risk of an admin subsidy loss for delayed administration associated with processing change of circumstances that generate overpayments.</p> <p>There could be an increase in customer contacts in writing, telephone and visit to chase up on progress of their claims and impact on other departments due to implications of non-payment of Housing Benefit and council tax.</p>
<p>Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation</p>	<p>The reduction in staffing are predicated with the take up of more self-serve transactions. Should these not be implemented the teams will not be able to support claimants as before and vulnerable claimants will need to seek greater support from their support workers. Subsidy implications already outlined above may cost more to the council than the savings if backlogs and delays in processing materialise. Council tax revenue impacted through delays of processing and inability to do a number of the council tax processing actions within the benefits section as currently done.</p> <p>Increased Housing eviction threats or action taken due to non-payment of rent as a result of delayed Housing Benefit payments, impacting on private and social housing sector. Increased complaints and challenges that create their own work for officers. Additional pressure on support services (children's/Adults if rent etc not paid) requiring intervention and extra support.</p>

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

### 17: Contact Centre – Reduction in staffing levels

Reference:	17 [Recommended]
Activity:	Contact Centre
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Business Centre
Value of the budget proposal (£):	50k saving 16/17 Cumulative 17/18 £95k
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	<p>The contact centre is now pivotal to all the activities encompassed in the business centre providing a first point of contact resolution to resident's telephone enquiries and undertaking routine processing activities to reduce the need for customers to chase and repeat calls.</p> <p>The contact centre currently receives 541,000+ calls per year being an average of 45,000 calls per month. The top 5 services are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Council tax 71,000+</li> <li>2. Housing Benefit 48,000</li> <li>3. Community Services 33,790</li> <li>4. Waste services 19,435</li> <li>5. Housing 15,973</li> </ol> <p>The 24/7 Wightcare call handling function is also being managed within the contact centre which supports vulnerable residents with an emergency line to seek support.</p> <p>In addition to taking calls the team also process tasks to reduce the impact on the back office teams:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Monitoring of complaints &amp; Local Government Ombudsman dedicated liaison.</li> <li>2. Council tax &amp; housing benefit changes</li> <li>3. Logging service requests on Flare for Environmental Health</li> <li>4. Creating and issuing concessionary bus passes</li> <li>5. Administration of waste receptacles including collation of delivery lists to the contractor. Responding to waste &amp; recycling emails</li> <li>6. Monitoring &amp; responding to enquiries through the Council's face book and twitter accounts</li> <li>7. Email activity and data analysis for Leisure</li> <li>8. Administration of CRM and provision of training for council employees</li> <li>9. Processing invoices for creditor payments</li> <li>10. Processing 'Tell Us Once' notifications</li> <li>11. Responding to general enquiries received via the council's help centre email address</li> <li>12. Vendor set ups – ensuring compliance to procurement process.</li> </ol> <p>The saving proposal being developed is centred around a reduction in staff as detailed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Planned reduction in staffing of 62 hours per week, delivering £37k saving for 1 April.</li> <li>2. A service redesign planned to develop greater integration with the revenues and help centre teams with deliver further savings for 17/18.</li> </ol>
Who the proposed budget proposal affects	The reduction in staffing levels will affect the speed of answer of telephone calls being received. The current performance for calls being responded to is approximately 90 seconds so residents will be

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

<i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	expected to wait longer for a response. There will be a knock on effect to back office processing with the possibility of repeat calls chasing changes in tax and benefit liabilities.
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	The contact centre is the focus of telephone contact for the majority of council services but there are external agencies such as Isle help who may be able to assist. Further development of web enabled self- service and information sources would potentially reduce the number of people who need to contact the council by telephone.
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	The contact centre main customer is council tax payers who are progressing payment of their account. There are a range of online activities available to council tax payers so that they can gain information and make payment via the automated telephone line or online, but at the moment they choose to call. All council tax payers have access to their account but like the comfort and confirmation of talking to a person. Longer waiting times are likely to encourage channel shift but there may be some customers who revert to visiting the help centre functions.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	Given the contact centre are playing a key role in debt collection there may be drop in collection of council income. If residents cannot get through on the telephone they may revert back to visiting the help centres which have already changed their way of working and are promoting self-service or turn to putting their enquiry in writing creating added pressures on the back office.

### 18: Facilities Management – Reduction in staffing levels and minor budget adjustments

Reference:	18 [Recommended]
Activity:	Facilities Management
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Business Centre
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£15k saving 16/17 cumulative 17/18 £20k
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	<p>The Facilities management team provide:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Post room duties for County Hall</li> <li>2. Carry out general maintenance and minor works within County Hall</li> <li>3. Undertake the courier run M/W/F to despatch post to a number of council buildings</li> <li>4. Maintain the stores at Somerton &amp; Westridge and generate income for the council</li> <li>5. Undertake removal work for service areas, schools, parish councils to generate income</li> <li>6. Provide security arrangements for the help centre function in County Hall.</li> </ol> <p>The proposal to reduce costs will involve:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reducing admin support within the stores by 18 hrs per week at scale 2 - £9,800</li> <li>2. Reduce the minor works budget in recognition of the reduction in contractor support now required given the team have now taken on small maintenance jobs</li> </ol>
Who the proposed budget proposal affects	Service users are the teams housed within County Hall. These customers should not see a reduction in service. The admin support role is based at Somerton and these duties can be amalgamated

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

<i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	with the store manager role to provide for a more effective billing process for stores jobs.
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	The business centre payments could support with the raising of invoices if required. Bank staff could be used on a flexible basis to support for removal jobs if there was insufficient resource available.
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	Limited impact – there may be a delay in removal jobs being invoiced and therefore income being collected.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	There is a potential for delays in invoices being raised but assistance can be sought from the wider business centre team.

### 19: Fleet Management – Reduction in staffing levels

Reference:	19 [Recommended]
Activity:	Fleet Administration
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Business Centre
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£15k saving 16/17 Cumulative 17/18 £25k
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	<p>The council has a fleet of some 120+ vehicles and so the fleet administration team ensure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Vehicles are taxed, insured, and are serviced to ensure that they are roadworthy</li> <li>2. The fleet manager ensures that we remain compliant with VOSA regulations and that we operate within our licence ( Operators licence which he holds the CPC qualification for)</li> <li>3. Administer the fuel card account ensuring fuel costs are apportioned to individual vehicles and services.</li> <li>4. Raising orders for servicing, repairs etc and making sure suppliers are paid promptly.</li> <li>5. Assisting the finance team in maintaining costs per vehicle</li> </ol> <p>The savings proposal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Explores the potential flexible retirement of one post – a reduction of 15 hours per week will deliver a full year saving of £16k. Potential redundancy from April 17 delivering further savings dependant on the final solution secured for operational activities.</li> </ol>
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	The savings proposal should not affect service users as they will still be able to access the expertise and receive support from the fleet administrator.
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?	In preparation for the Fleet Manager's potential retirement we are exploring the potential of working in partnership with Hampshire Fire Brigade and also looking to consider the feasibility of the Facilities Manager taking on the Fleet manger role.

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

If so what are they?	
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	Limited initial impact as there is time to develop the best solution.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	Low risk as there is time to transfer knowledge or develop a new delivery model for this service.

### 20: Payments Team – Reduction in staffing levels

Reference:	20 [Recommended]
Activity:	Payments Team
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Business Centre
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£40k saving 16/17 cumulative 17/18 £72k
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	<p>The payments team perform the following functions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Creditor payments – making payment of the 38,000+ invoices received by the council for goods &amp; services received equating to £129 million expenditure.</li> <li>2. Supporting services by raising orders for goods and services required. Orders range from covering payment of care provisions for adults and children through to reactive maintenance and sundry supplies. Value £35 million to date this year.</li> <li>3. Collection of sundry debt - £36 million debt raised to date this year, £42 million 2014/15</li> <li>4. Administration of the council's payroll function</li> <li>5. Administration of the Local government and Fire pensions administration function and employer function for NHS and Teachers</li> </ol> <p>In order for the service to deliver the proposed savings the team will need to make the following changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Planned reduction in staffing of 20hrs per week in recognition of the change in payment system and processes for adult social care – saving 20 hrs which equates to £12k per annum.</li> <li>2. Utilisation of income from administration of the employee salary sacrifice child care scheme – 20k</li> <li>3. Further redesign of the team as new processes are introduced across the council bringing greater automation which reduces the need for the SAP ordering function. Anticipated to generate additional £40k in staffing reductions.</li> </ol>
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	The team are providing the ordering, invoicing and collection function across the council so any reduction in resource will affect the team's ability to raise orders for services required in a timely fashion. Equally suppliers expecting payment for goods and services supplied may have to wait longer to receive their money than currently.
Are there any alternative services that can provide	The payments team already receive support from other areas of the business centre to enable them to meet their performance

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

support? If so what are they?	indicators. Both the contact centre and operational support teams provide support at busy times but given they too will need to reduce resource in their respective areas to contribute to the savings target this will cause additional pressure on the payments team.
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	The team are currently making 98% of payments in 30 days and 95% within 20 days. It is likely that most payments will move to payment within 30 days. Failure to make payment within the 30 day period may attract a late payment fine which is linked to a compensation rate (under £1,000, under £10,000 and higher) plus interest at 8% above the Bank of England base rate (currently .5%)
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	Local businesses rely on prompt payment by the council so any delay may affect their cash flow and ability to trade. Late payment fines could be quite substantial. For example, 766 invoices (2%) incurring the up to £10,000 fine of £70 would equate to £53,620.00 plus simple interest on the value at 8.5% per day overdue.

### 21: Revenues and Benefits – Reduction in support staff

Reference:	21 [Recommended]
Activity:	Revenues & Benefits Operational Support
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Business Centre
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£16k saving 16/17 cumulative 17/18 £24k
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	<p>The Revenues &amp; Benefits operational support team:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Receive and open all the post for the revenues benefits service. This equates to some 500,000 documents per year being correspondence in relation to accounts, invoices, applications for benefit and blue badges, appeals together with supporting proofs which need to be scanned and indexed into the Civica case management system for processing.</li> <li>2. Despatch of mail in relation to bills, invoices and recovery notices</li> <li>3. Preparation and management of visits for council tax visiting officers</li> <li>4. Registering new applications for Housing Benefit and Local Council Tax Support</li> <li>5. Checking of council invoices for compliance and liaising with suppliers</li> <li>6. Receipt, recording, reconciliation of utility bills for payment.</li> <li>7. IT support of the Northgate (Revenues &amp; Benefits system) and Civica document management system – patch upgrades and configuration changes.</li> </ol> <p>In order to deliver the savings the proposal is to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Restructure the team to delete one post – equates to a £24k saving.</li> </ol>
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	The service users are the council tax, NNDR, parking services, payments and benefit teams but any reduction in support by the operational team will impact on processing times and may delay responses to council tax payers, business rate payers, benefit claimants, suppliers or those who are appealing their penalty charge notice.

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	Staff from other areas of the business could be called upon to assist but that would have a negative impact on another service area.
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	It is likely that the reduction of one post from the team will reduce the team's ability to scan and index all its benefit post within 2 days which will have a knock on effect to processing times. There is the potential for collection rates to drop as tax payers wait longer for a response to correspondence and billing / recovery cycles are not as accurate as they should be to facilitate collection. There is also the potential for payment to suppliers being impacted due to delays in scanning and indexing invoices.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	Backlogs of work can build when no response to correspondence is received. Taxpayers/ benefit claimants will send follow up letters which will then increase the overall documents being received. Liability court hearings can become more problematic and the council's reputation can be damaged if the court feels that enforcement action has been taken unnecessarily. Late payment charges could be incurred if there is a delay in paying invoices for goods or services.

### 22: Vacant posts – delete

Reference:	22 [Recommended]
Activity:	Vacant posts
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Business Centre
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£27k saving 16/17 Cumulative 17/18 £27k
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	The business centre saving was £300k for 15/16. There were however a number of savings initiatives which did not deliver savings for 15/16 but have generated savings for 16/17. It has been agreed by the finance team that any savings over and above the £300k can be apportioned against this 16/17 target. At present the 16/17 figure is £318k and it is expected to increase to £322k by the end of the financial year, therefore £22k can be transferred to offset this target. The remainder of the saving will be found from non-staffing budget lines that sit within the business centre budget. An example is the closing down of the Exchequer Head of Service cost centre and budget provision, which alone will deliver £2,700 in saving.
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	No impact
Are there any alternative services that can provide support? If so what are they?	N/A
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service</i>	None

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

<i>users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	None

### Service Area: Children

#### Reference 23: Create a single commissioning team in Early Help

Reference:	23 [Recommended]
Activity:	Early Help Commissioning Team
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Children and Family Services
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£40,000
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	Creating a single commissioning team in early help would bring together 3 separate teams to better co-ordinate grant and commissioned activity. The proposal involves the deletion of one post initially with the potential to further streamline the team in future years.
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	This proposal directly affects 3 FTE members of staff in the early help team
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	Three options were considered: <b>Option A:</b> Retain the current and separate functions and not realise any cost savings. The risk with Option A is that children's social care would be unable to continue contribute to the savings required by the Isle of Wight Council <b>Option B:</b> The second option is to realise savings through the proposed integration of the existing commissioning functions that sit within the early help service. This will achieve a more co-ordinated approach to service delivery, better alignment of resources and generate cost savings in 2016/17 and potentially future years. Option B involves the commissioning of short breaks grants to an external provider with the risk that a suitable provider cannot be sourced. <b>Option C:</b> The third option is create a merged function but retain all of the existing posts, and not realise any cost savings. The risk to Option C is that there will be a duplication of roles and no cost savings realised
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	The stage 1 equality impact assessment did not identify any positive or negative impacts that required progression to stage 2.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any	No significant risks identified.



## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

actions that could be taken in mitigation	
-------------------------------------------	--

### Reference 43: Reduce grants for short breaks

Reference:	43 [Recommended]
Activity:	Short Breaks Grants
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Early Help Team, Children and Family Services
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£10,000
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	Section 25 of the Children and Young Persons Act 2008 amended Schedule 2, Part 1 of the 1989 children Act and created a duty for local authorities to 'assist individuals who provide care for disabled children by giving them breaks from caring'. The short breaks grants fund a range of activities including after-school, evenings and weekend activities and overnight stays for all children aged 0-19 years who have a disability and/or additional needs. This allows their parents or carers to take a 'short break' from caring. The grants programme runs specialist activities specifically for children and young people with moderate or complex needs and supports children to attend mainstream activities, play schemes clubs and groups. Local organisations are invited to apply for up to £10,000 twice a year to run these activities and can also apply twice a year for up to £500 for capital equipment or adaptations to make their activities accessible.
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	Disabled children and young people aged 0-19 years
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	A range of facilities are also provided by the Council for families with disabled children to use. These include the beach hut at Shanklin, the lodge at Nodes Point and a caravan at Lower Hyde plus hoists, and Landeez wheelchairs to enhance accessibility on the Isle of Wight. In addition respite and support are provided for families through Beaulieu House and the Disabled Children's Intervention Team. The on-going provision of these facilities and services would ensure the Council can evidence that it is meeting its statutory duty.
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	A possible consequence is that some disabled children will not be able to access the respite provision and accessible activities provided through the myriad of providers currently funded. Users could seek support from local voluntary groups where they exist and if they are suitably accessible
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	This could result in planned outcomes for children not being able to be met

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

### 44: School improvement

Reference:	44 [Recommended]
Activity:	School Improvement
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Children's Services : Education and Inclusion
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£56,200
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction in number of days available to schools from inspector / advisers paid for by the IoW Council</li> <li>• During the lifetime of the partnership, the number of inadequate schools has reduced significantly and therefore the budget can be reduced accordingly without compromising the school improvement strategy.</li> </ul>
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The budget reductions should not have an adverse impact on standards as the remaining budget should be sufficient to discharge the Local Authority's statutory duties effectively</li> </ul>
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The budget saving is a genuine saving and therefore alternative replacements are not thought to be needed.</li> <li>• It should be noted that schools are responsible for their own school improvement and there are a number of independent providers of school improvement that schools commission on the Isle of Wight. In addition, improved networks now exist for school to school improvement.</li> </ul>
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	None
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a risk that the Local Authority would not be able to respond should a large number of schools be judged by Ofsted to be inadequate. The improved datasets and quality of provision would suggest that this is unlikely.</li> <li>• Legislation currently being enacted would mean that academy sponsors would be working with failing schools rather than the Local Authority in future. To mitigate the risk senior officers would work with the Regional Schools' Commissioner and the school to identify a suitable sponsor with the resource to undertake this work.</li> </ul>

### 54: Closure of Branstone Farm

Reference:	54 [Not Recommended]
Activity:	Branstone Farm
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Children's Services
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£68,000 in a full financial year
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal is the transfer of Branstone Farm as a Local Authority run service to a third sector provider with no subsidy from the Council. If this can't be achieved then closure should be</li> </ul>

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

<p><i>removed?</i> <i>What does this service provide?</i></p>	<p>considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Branstone Farm provides an alternative to mainstream education for some of our most vulnerable students who are at risk of or who have been, permanently excluded from mainstream schools.</li> <li>• Branstone Farm is not a statutory service, but it plays an important role in enabling the Local Authority to meet its statutory responsibility to provide full time education for students who have been excluded.</li> <li>• In constructing curriculum packages that deliver students' entitlement to full time education, Branstone farm provides the Commissioner for Alternative Provision, with a facility that can deliver up to 15 hours of provision per week to each student in a timely fashion.</li> <li>• The majority of students accessing Branstone are in Y11 often attending after other curriculum options have failed and any options remaining, being of high cost.</li> <li>• Branstone also provides an enrichment opportunity for primary aged groups of pupils who undertake farm visits in the spring and summer terms as part of nature and environment focussed curriculum projects or as part of activity weeks. Visits provide students with an understanding of farming, how meat is sourced, how to look after the countryside and how to grow vegetables and plants. This is a source of income generation which has yet to be fully developed and realised</li> <li>• In the last year, Branstone Farm has been developing its links with other community groups to expand the provision and service it can provide. One such important development has been formed with the East Wight Landscape Partnership, who are looking to manage their operations from Branstone and to provide the opportunity for the development of Forest schools and land-based /horticultural apprenticeships.</li> <li>• The community importance of Branstone is that it is the last farm on the island producing the pork found in local outlets such as Hamilton's.</li> </ul>
<p>Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Children and young people who are at risk of or who have been permanently excluded from a mainstream school and who require a more practical or vocational curriculum.</li> <li>• Schools who wish to provide curriculum options or enrichment activities for specific groups of students.</li> </ul>
<p>Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are a small number of independent island based providers of alternative provision, two or three of whom are animal focussed, (almost solely focussed on horses) or whose main activity is on outdoor adventure type activities.</li> <li>• As such the alternatives do not provide the variety of provision that is available at Branstone or deliver the land based and animal care accreditations that students can secure by attendance at Branstone.</li> </ul>
<p>Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are few children accessing Branstone Farm, who have not exhausted a school's provision and broken down other alternative educational placements.</li> <li>• If a third sector provider cannot be found to take on the running of the farm then closure of Branstone Farm would make it more challenging to find alternative provision for some of the Island's most vulnerable students.</li> </ul>

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As Branstone is something of a final preventative curriculum service, there is a risk that any provision that has to be purchased from alternative providers will be of high cost and so reduce the size of the potential savings being identified. Those costs would fall onto the high needs block rather than the Local Authority's budget though.</li> </ul>
<p>Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the short term, if closure was agreed, then were it to be delayed until after June 2016 this would enable the Y11 students currently on courses at Branstone, who it would be very difficult to find other provision for, to complete their accreditations.</li> <li>In the medium term, having only recently secured a full staffing complement, consideration could be given to supporting Branstone Farm for the 2016/17 to assess whether it could further reduce its costs and be self-financing so that what is a unique facility is not lost. This has been the direction of travel for the past two years ago and it would require significant officer time in the short term to realise the potential.</li> <li>Branstone Farm's potential has not yet been realised because until recently its staffing has restricted the range of provision it has been able to offer, as well as limiting the number of young people who could attend each session.</li> <li>A fulltime education officer was appointed in November 2015 and is enabling the Commissioner for Alternative Provision to support ten young people in Years 11 and 10 whose behaviour was too challenging for staff in schools to manage.</li> <li>Additionally an increased number of requests have been received from schools for short term placements for students in other year groups.</li> <li>With a staff re-structure and increased use of volunteers who could be trained to support students, staffing costs could be reduced by £8,000 in 2016/17.</li> <li>With two trained volunteers the number of students that could access the farm in any session could be increased and so generate an additional £9,000 in 2016/17.</li> <li>The greater potential for community events and groups to be hosted at the Farm, out of school hours and during school holidays, through the partnerships that are developing particularly with the East Wight Landscape partnership could generate an additional £6,000 annually.</li> <li>Prior to any of the above the Council should explore the possibility of another organisation taking on the running of Branstone Farm who would be able to provide both the educational element and wider community use.</li> </ul>

### 55: Reduce the number of early help co-ordinators

Reference:	55 [Not Recommended]
Activity:	Early Help Team
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Children and Family Services
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£30,000 (2016/17)
Detailed explanation of the	The early help co-ordinators support and quality assure the early

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	help assessment, planning and review processes and ensure the agreed standards are met and maintained and the step up and step down processes work effectively. This is a key part of a child's journey through the social care system. The co-ordinators manage the processes for cases at the threshold for early help to avoid the need for intervention from social work teams.
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	This proposal directly affects 1 FTE member of staff, the lead professionals supported by them and the front line staff who attend training on early help assessments (CAF).
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	The remaining 2 early help co-ordinators could cover the work.
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	The quality and standards achieved to date and recognised by Ofsted in their inspection report of children's services could slip if the co-ordinators are reduced to 2 FTE.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	The risks are to the lifting of the improvement direction by the DfE as Ofsted may judge that this has an adverse impact on safeguarding the welfare of children on the Island. There is also a risk to the delivery of the 0-19 service in that the co-ordinators support and advise Barnardo's staff on thresholds and quality of assessments and ensure families receive support in a timely manner.

### 56: Cease grant funding for Youth Offer contract

Reference:	56 [Not Recommended]
Activity:	Youth Offer Provision
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Children and Family Services
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£165,000 (2016/17)
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	Local authorities have a statutory duty under section 507(b) of the Education Act 2006 to secure as far as is practicable sufficient services and activities to improve the wellbeing of young people. This duty also requires local authorities to take into account young people's views and publicise information about what is available. In October 2014 thirteen voluntary and community groups were commissioned by the Council to deliver a range of activities, support and interventions for children aged 11-19 (up to 25 years for specified additional needs) across the Island.
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	This proposal directly affects 13 voluntary and community organisations, and at least 1,500 children who have accessed the provision to date
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?	The Council provides youth related activities through its leisure centres and libraries. It has also recently transferred the youth offer bus to Community Action Isle of Wight to enable a mobile provision

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

If so what are they?	of youth activities across the Island.
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	It is likely that the majority of the 13 providers would cease operating quite quickly.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	The immediate risk is that the absence of any positive activities could result in the children coming to the notice of local policing teams and to children's social care and this could lead them to committing low level crime, using substances (including legal highs) and drinking alcohol. This in turn potentially exposes them to being sexually exploited or entering the youth justice system.

### 57: Cease the Targeted Youth Service team

Reference:	57 [Not Recommended]
Activity:	Targeted Youth Service
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Children and Family Services
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£62,000 (2016/17)
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	The Targeted Youth Service (TYS) is a team of 4 helping vulnerable children early, to address their difficulties as soon as possible and to prevent their problems escalating. It is targeted at children who without help are at risk of further problems such as substance misuse, youth offending, teenage pregnancy and homelessness. The team offers 1-2-1 support, and a time limited bespoke intervention tailored to the individual's needs and achieving agreed outcomes. The team also support children at risk of homelessness, aiming to prevent family breakdown and provide information, guidance and support. In addition the undertake return Interviews for children not open to social care have been missing from home.
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	This proposal directly affects 4 FTE targeted youth support staff and children aged primarily 12 to 17 years who receive support.
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	The type of support and intervention provided by the team makes a significant contribution to reducing teenage conception and pregnancy, and improving lifestyle choices (such as ceasing drinking or taking drugs). This sort of specialist work for adults is currently funded through public health. It seems logical to also fund this type of work for children through public health and thus prevent future high end social care and health spend in the short term and when these children become adults
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	Ceasing the targeted youth service could lead to these vulnerable children needing support through a child protection plan or becoming looked after by the local authority. Most of those that the team work with are on the edge of or already engaging in risky behaviour (such as anti-social behaviour, underage sexual activity, taking drugs, and drinking alcohol). In 2014/15 the team worked with 167 children, the majority aged 12 to 17 years

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	The immediate risk is that the absence of any support could result in the children coming to the notice of local policing teams and to children's social care and this could lead them to committing low level crime, using substances (including legal highs) and drinking alcohol. This in turn potentially exposes them to being sexually exploited or entering the youth justice system.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### Service Area: Corporate

#### 24: Learning and Development

Reference:	24 [Recommended]
Activity:	Learning & Development
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Children's Services and provision of services to schools.
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£100,000
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	The Learning & Development service currently operate a service level agreement with schools that choose to purchase the provision of learning activities for teaching and non-teaching staff. The current level of income received does not fully recover the costs of service provision and so it will be necessary to review the service offer, so that there is no cost to the council in its delivery. The SLA expires in August 2016. New arrangements will be put in place from September 2016.
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	Schools that purchase training provision from the council's learning and development service.
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	<i>To be explored as part of the review of required outcomes.</i>
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	No negative impact identified at this stage.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	Alternative arrangements will be secured to ensure continuation of services to schools; therefore low level risk.

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

### Service Area: Community Safety

#### 25: Realignment and reduction of community safety activity

Reference:	25 [Recommended]
Activity:	Realignment and Reduction of Community Safety activity
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Community Safety/Regulatory Services
Value of the budget proposal (£):	60,000
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	<p>The service provides front line community safety services by way of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uniformed community patrols</li> <li>• Dealing with antisocial behaviour by way of acceptable behaviour orders, injunctions (used to be ASBOS)</li> <li>• Joint work with the police in dealing with crime and disorder relating to antisocial behaviour (adults and children), accredited to do some police functions (like asking for name/address issuing of fixed penalty notices etc.</li> <li>• Gatekeeping (local schools i.e. identifying problem individuals/working in partnership to resolve issues) and first stage liaison/warning with families relating to disorder/antisocial behaviour</li> <li>• Activity with homeless and other on street antisocial behaviour (drinking etc).</li> <li>• Working with the community including parish councils and housing associations.</li> <li>• Qualified mediators in neighbour disputes.</li> <li>• Supporting the community safety partnership and delivery of certain statutory functions such as annual strategic review, development of partnership plans, conducting domestic homicide reviews.</li> <li>• Delivery of statutory prevent duty (counter terrorism) including training, coordination of channel referrals and production of the prevent strategy for the island.</li> </ul> <p>The proposed budget reduction will require the structure/posts in the service to be redesigned. Services will also need to be prioritised to hot spot areas and statutory functions only. The FTE reduction in the team will be by 2 FTE (leaving 1 senior officer and 1 front line officer). The impact will be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No community patrols.</li> <li>• Anti-social behaviour will only be dealt with in priority areas and where it is deemed necessary</li> <li>• Unlikely to deal with any homeless/street issues</li> <li>• Gatekeeping only in priority schools/areas</li> <li>• No community working/projects etc</li> </ul>
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents</li> <li>• Parish/Town Councils</li> <li>• Housing Associations</li> <li>• Schools</li> </ul>
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?	<p>Depending on the issue possibly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adult/children's services</li> <li>• Housing/supporting people</li> </ul>



## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

If so what are they?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental Health</li> <li>• Trading Standards</li> <li>• Education</li> <li>• Public Health Local Area Coordinators</li> </ul>
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	Potentially police (if they have resources to deal with the issue). Housing providers (only if resident is a tenant)
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	<p>FTE resources are limited that there is not much capacity to deal with urgent issues and still deliver statutory functions. Counter terrorism is a UK priority at the moment. The community safety partnership has not delivered statutory functions with the last domestic homicide review taking 3 years to conclude (should be done within 6 months). There is a corporate risk to the authority from action/criticism from the Home Office. There are also possibilities of judicial review or civil action</p> <p>The most vulnerable in our community will have reduced protection and issues of antisocial behaviour are likely to escalate. These types of problems are much easier to deal with at an early stage rather than a bigger (and more expensive problem) at a later date.</p> <p>There are many examples of suicides of victims of antisocial behaviour where authorities have not taken action. This is a risk with the reduction of this service that this may happen on the Isle of Wight with the reduction of front line officers.</p>

### Service Area: Democratic Services

#### 26: Staff savings – Democratic Services

Reference:	26 [Recommended]
Activity:	Staff Savings – Democratic Services
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Democratic Services
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£30,000
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	During a period of secondment for a team member to the organisational change team, a fixed term contract was entered into to provide cover within the democratic services team. It is the intention that this contract will not be renewed to allow for a saving to be made.
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	Elected members and committee administration
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?	It is possible to consider an overall re-structure of the democratic services function to secure the saving. However, to cease the fixed term contract is considered to be the most cost effective option as it will not incur any redundancy costs to the local authority.
If so what are they?	
Likely impact or consequence of the budget	There will be reduced capacity for support to committees and will therefore require a change in the way in which support to some

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	meetings is provided.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	There is a risk that the change in meeting support does not materialise which will put team capacity under significant pressure.

### Service Area: Economy

#### 27: Cancel membership of the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire

Reference:	27 [Recommended]
Activity:	Cancel membership for the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH)
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Economy
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£26,000
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	This is the membership fee for this organisation
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	Members of the public not directly affected. Mainly affects councillors/officer engagement with other local authorities in the area
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	Organisation. There could also be opportunities through devolution for combining local authority activity
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	No impact to members of the public or council services
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	No significant impacts have been identified from being a member of PUSH

#### 66: Reduction in economic development activity, support and staffing

Reference:	66 [Not Recommended]
Activity:	Reduction in Economic Development Activity
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Economy

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

Value of the budget proposal (£):	£100,000
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	Staff saving of minimum of 3 days per week to will save approximately £20,000. Reduction to projects budget of £87,000. Plus other savings to staff budgets.
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	Support to small businesses in the main
Are there any alternative services that can provide support? If so what are they?	Chamber of Commerce Solent LEP Federation of Small Businesses
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	Opportunities for inward investment, business growth and business retention will be restricted. Small businesses may be able to seek limited assistance from the organisations listed above.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	Reputational given that this is a key corporate objective, particularly given the proposed move to Business Rates retention and therefore with direct impacts on council budgets

### Service Area: Fire and Rescue Service

#### 29: Income from Hampshire Fire & Rescue Services' Strategic Partnership Arrangements

Reference:	29 Recommended]
Activity:	<b>Income</b> from HFRS Strategic Partnership Arrangements
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	FRS
Value of the budget proposal (£):	2016/17 £50,000 2017/18 £50,000
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	Additional income generation through the strategic partnership between IWFRS and HFRS.
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	N/A
Are there any alternative services that can provide support? If so what are they?	N/A

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	N/A
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	If the funds are not generated as suggested there could be an issue funding the Airwave digital replacement programme.

### 30: Reduction in Road Safety Programme

Reference:	30 [Recommended]
Activity:	Reduction in the Road Safety Programme
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	FRS
Value of the budget proposal (£):	2016/17 £52,000 2017/18 £52,000
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	Loss of 1 post –£36,000 and an additional £16,000 to be found through income generation and efficiencies in service  Ceasing minibus training Ceasing training crossing patrol services
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	Road users, primarily motorcyclists using our highways
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	IWFRS will provide alternative services through a remodelled structure that will support priority Road Safety activities
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	Not delivering Road Safety training to key road user risk groups
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	Ceasing 'LIFE' within Community Safety A potential increase in those killed or seriously injured

### 31: Reduction in back office support staff and activity

Reference:	31 [Recommended]
Activity:	Reduction in back office support staff and activity
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	FRS
Value of the budget proposal (£):	2016/17 £50,000 2017/18 £50,000

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	The loss of 2 posts which will result in a reduction in administration and technical support role
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	Public and partners will see a reduction of information through the website and social media. Technical support to operational risk information. ICT intermediary support for ECM and local drives affecting all FRS staff. Circulation of national bulletins, information notices. This will affect operational information channels. Affects IWFRS workforce in facilitating access to Area and Group Managers calendars for service planning.
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	An increase in media and comms support to FRS. HFRS support for computer aided design at a potential cost to IWC. HFRS secretariat support to the Area Manager and Group Manager. Shared services.
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	Shared Services /ICT/Media and communications ICT solution to access of HFRS calendars and ICT. Shared services FOI responses
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	The savings generated will allow for community safety remodelling activity.

### Service Area: Human Resources

#### 32: Restructure of HR Support and advice as a whole

Reference:	32 [Recommended]
Activity:	Restructure of HR support and advice as a whole
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Resources
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£40k in 2016/17 and a cumulative saving of £120k by 2017/18.
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	The HR service consists of two distinct teams that will be affected by these proposals. The first act as strategic business partners to client departments through the provision of professional/expert advice and guidance for dealing with matters of performance management and service improvement, organisational re-structures, terms and conditions changes, policies and procedures and training for line managers in conducting their people management responsibilities. In addition they provide advice and guidance to line managers in the handling of informal case work including matters relating to absence management, capability, grievance and disciplinary matters and which aims to avoid the need for cases to move into the formal arena and potentially beyond to Employment Tribunals. The nature

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

	<p>of casework however, often means that the ability to undertake the higher level “organisational change/development” is somewhat hindered. This is largely due to some service areas still relying heavily on them to assist with aspects of case work that is essentially the role of the line manager.</p> <p>The team currently consists of 1 full time senior business partner and 3 full time equivalent business partners.</p> <p>Under this proposal, it is planned to separate out the strategic business partner activities from that of advisory case work duties and recreate lower level graded posts for the purposes of case work support to services. This will generate a salary saving in the first instance but consideration will also be given to re-establishing clear expectations of managers dealing with the performance of their staff. The second team are a group of staff who undertake the routine transactions that result from contractual changes. They input salary changes and new starter details and all other transfer posts/duties that require the council’s business system to be updated. All recruitment activities associated with vacant posts including issuing of contracts of employment, DBS checking and Council Vehicle Driver Authorisations (CVDA’s) are also undertaken. This team also provide lower level or routine advice to line managers on policies and procedures as required in relation to these activities.</p> <p>Consideration is currently being given to the review of existing processes that are in place for matters such as authorisation to recruit and other information requirements for contractual changes with a view to reducing the level of bureaucracy and therefore level of staffing required to operate them. In addition, an ICT project is underway to improve the potential for one time information input and therefore self-service options for managers that will avoid the need for manual entry by the HR support team. This is a slightly longer term piece of work but will inevitably reduce the current level of staffing requirements.</p> <p>The HR teams are currently seeking potential business opportunities that will generate income for the council. Currently the majority of this work is focussed on securing school related contracts. Should HR be successful in gaining contracts then these posts will be needed in order to service the contracts and hence generate the additional income.</p>
<p>Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i></p>	<p>Mainly line managers and internal client groups. There will be greater expectations placed on managers to be accountable for conducting their people management responsibilities with less support and to directly input information required to process employment related changes.</p>
<p>Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?</p>	<p>The intention would be that ICT systems would be sufficiently robust to enable line managers to enter data themselves by 2017/18 so that a number of staff can be reduced to make the anticipated savings by then. This will be reliant on sufficient capacity being made available to deliver an appropriate solution to facilitate this to happen.</p>
<p>Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i></p>	<p>Reduced numbers of staff will mean that line managers will need to be more self-sufficient and take responsibility for the ownership and control of staff related data entry and the performance management of staff.</p>
<p>Risks associated with the</p>	<p>ICT systems are not currently in place to enable managers to input</p>

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	data themselves. Managers do not input salary details accurately and any changes on time. Any staffing reductions should not take place before such systems are in place and also before we find out if we have been successful with school business/income bids.
-------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### Service Area: ICT

#### 33: Contract renegotiations

Reference:	33 [Recommended]
Activity:	Contract Renegotiations
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	ICT as the central team. However, software packages are used across all departments.
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£40,000
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	The current ICT Contracts budget is £922k. This covers software applications used by services, such as Regulatory services, Fire service, Social Care, Legal services as well as corporate applications. A number of current software contracts will be combined to reduce overall costs. Other contracts will also be reviewed and renegotiated where possible to do so. The proposed reduction is across the overall budget.
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	Contracts cover software and hardware used by all services however any renegotiations are not expected to affect users.
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?	n/a
If so what are they?	
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	Reduced cost to the council. No impact on users.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	Some contracts funded from the central contracts budget increase in line with inflation and the increases are not budgeted for. This can put additional pressure on the budget. Such contracts will be identified and an appropriate accounting mechanism identified to ensure that this will be taken into account of in budget management. The reduction is reliant on the ability to renegotiate better costs with suppliers.

#### 34: General Budget reductions

General budget reductions of £20,000 have already been achieved for 2016/17.

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

### 35: Review of the Back Office Software solution

Reference:	35 [Recommended]
Activity:	Review of Back Office Software System
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	The ICT Service currently provides technical support for the council's business system software that is utilised by all departments.
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£190,000
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	The current main back office software package (SAP) is an expensive system in relation to license costs and additionally in the level of staffing that is required to maintain the system. The software was purchased and implemented in 2008/9 as a result of an urgent need to replace the existing council's business system which was no longer resilient or fit for purpose. However, the organisation has changed significantly since the original purchase and will continue to do so as it moves more towards being an enabling council. The software is used to support the HR, Payroll, Finance and Purchasing functions of the council and the back office transactions that derive from them. It is proposed to review the current software and potentially replace with more appropriate solutions that allow greater flexibility on user licences and which takes advantage of current technology solutions. The savings from the proposal are therefore a <i>combination</i> of a reduction in license costs and a reduction in support staff of the package.
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	All services internal to the council are users of the software package. Vendors who transact with the authority also indirectly use the software.
Are there any alternative services that can provide support? If so what are they?	There are alternative solutions on the software market which are available through tendering or framework processes.
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	If the software were to be replaced there would be a significant project required to migrate from the existing platform. When the project complete there would be staffing reductions expected to be 2 full time equivalents in the IT department as a minimum.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	The proposed timescale is to deliver the saving in 17/18. Any migration to another solution would be a significant project and would need to start in 16/17 to realise benefits in a timely manner. It would also require dedicated staffing resource to be assigned to it and therefore necessary for there to be acknowledgement that this will be a key project that may prevent other work being undertaken. Will require a more detailed business case to be developed to demonstrate the potential cost/benefit for the council.



## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

### Service Area: Planning

#### 65: Cease all enforcement activities

Reference:	65 [Not Recommended]
Activity:	Cease all enforcement activities
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Planning Services Enforcement section
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£40,000
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	The proposal would see a reduction of 1 full time equivalent post. The service currently provides 95% of enforcement related activities within planning services.
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	The service deals with perceived planning enforcement complaints that are reported by members of the public, and town and parish councils and the local community generally. Complaints to the service relate to all areas of the Island.
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	Some level of condition compliance matters is be dealt with by planning case officers but this amounts to approx. 5% total of the enforcement related activity that the service currently undertakes. Additional activity could not be undertaken by case officers without negatively impacting upon the determination of planning applications.
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	The key impact with be reputational impact for the council. Communities may seek advice from private consultants and could undertake an element of negotiation on issues themselves, but cannot undertake formal enforcement action.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	The service could be funded by contributions from other parties. There is a risk that paying for the service could result in a two tier system. The service to be provided would need to cover the whole of the Island and relate to the council's enforcement policy.

#### 37: Reduction in planning policy activity following the adoption of the Area Action Plans and the West Wight Coastal Strategy

Reference:	37 [Recommended]
Activity:	Reduction in planning policy activity following the adoption of the AAPs and the West Wight Coastal Strategy
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Planning Services – Planning Policy Team
Value of the budget proposal (£):	17/18 £150,000 with further savings in 18/19 of up to £40,000.
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service</i>	Removal of the staffing budget the policy team. The service currently writes all planning policy related documents for the IWC.

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

<i>provide?</i>	
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	The service is used mainly by planning services and the IWC. There is some community support for town and parish plans and neighbourhood plans. In addition the coastal strategies are used as project identifiers and as a baseline for bids for government grant in aid funding.
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	Production of policy documents could be commissioned, provided that the council had in place an agreed local development scheme that set out which policy documents in would be providing. Town and Parish Councils could seek advice on the production of local plans from planning consultants. The council would retain the decision making element of adoption and approval of documents. Production of project documentation for bids for grant in aid could be commissioned.
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	See discussion above.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	Delivery of planning policy documents would need to be managed to ensure delivery on time and within budget.

### Service Area: Property

#### 38: Property rationalisation

Reference:	38 [Recommended]
Activity:	Property Rationalisation
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Property
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£65,000
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed?</i> <i>What does this service provide?</i>	Disposal of Bugle House about to be signed.
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	This affects some members of staff, who have been relocated as a result.
Are there any alternative services that can provide support? If so what are they?	N/A
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal?	Further rationalisation of property portfolio will lead to increased requirements for flexible working and hot-desking arrangements.

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

<i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	

### Service Area: Transport

#### 39: Remove free travel for concessionary bus pass holders on the floating bridge

Reference:	39 [Recommended] – See appendix 1 to this report
Activity:	Remove free travel for concessionary bus pass holders on the floating bridge.
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Transport <i>Place</i>
Value of the budget proposal (£):	60,000
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	<p>The 2015/16 Medium Term Financial Plan set out that the net income for the floating bridge foot passengers for 2016/17; as the number of passengers (and vehicles) is anticipated to remain static it is necessary to increase the charges to realise this figure. Two options are presented which are:-</p> <p><u>Option A</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Based on a £0.70p return for card holders and £1.00 pay as you go</li> <li>• Continued free travel for those under 19</li> <li>• Continued free travel for holders of concessionary bus passes</li> </ul> <p><u>Option B</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Based on a £0.70p return for card holders and £1.00 pay as you go</li> <li>• Continued free travel for those under 19</li> <li>• Holders of concessionary bus passes to be charged as paying adults</li> </ul>
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	The service is used by the general public, the proposals affect all users except those under 19 years of age
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	Some limited monies may be able to be obtained through sponsorship, although the research has shown this is limited and not guaranteed on an annual basis. There are options these are expressed above.
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	Reduced numbers travelling.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken	Reduced numbers travelling although this is built into the sensitivity analysis of the financial projections. There is a risk that those with bus passes will use the free bus service rather than pay for the

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

in mitigation	floating bridge
---------------	-----------------

### Discretionary Concessionary Travel Provision

Reference:	Appendix C to main report
Activity:	Discretionary Concessionary Travel Provision
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Contract Management.
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£100k Half Year saving – Year 2016/17 £200k Full year saving - Year 2017/18
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	The proposal to remove the discretionary travel schemes and additional elements: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. New Islander Cards for island residents with severe and enduring mental health problems.</li> <li>2. New Islander cards for travelling companions of island residents who have been either issued with a New Islander Cards (as above) or a disabled English National Concessionary Travel Scheme (ENCTS) pass.</li> <li>3. Free travel at any time for island residents and travelling companions who have been issued with either a New Islander Card or Disabled ENCTS pass.</li> </ol>
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	Residents on the island who hold a New Islander Card or a Disabled ENCTS pass
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	No alternative services currently available.
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	This would restrict travel concessions to the statutory minimum level of the English National Concessionary Travel Scheme. This is determined as anytime Saturday, Sunday or bank holidays and between 09:30 to 23:00 on any other day.  A small number of Island residents issued with a New Islander card may be eligible for a Disabled or age related ENCTS pass. Therefore these would transfer to the statutory provision.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	Public and stakeholders opinion are likely to be against the removal of this provision. To reduce/mitigate these it would be appropriate to publicise clearly the Council's intentions and from as early as possible.

### Service Area: Waste

#### 40: Waste Contract – income generation

Reference:	40 Recommended]
Activity:	Waste Contract – Income Generation
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Waste Contract with Amey (IW) plc
Value of the budget proposal (£):	2017/18 - £100,000
Detailed explanation of the	The waste contract includes a mechanism whereby the Authority will

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	receive a share of net profit after Amey operational costs have been deducted. Income at this time can only be generated in 2016/17 and 2017/18 through the introduction and operation of a Trade Waste service collecting commercial waste. This is planned to commence in April 2016 and is subject to take up in the market place. The upgrade at Lynnbottom Recycling Centre that is programmed for completion at the end of June 2016 will see a commercial waste and recycling area that will generate an income. The Forest Park Mechanical Treatment Plant is programmed to be completed in January 2018, at which time it will be able to start taking in third party income from commercial gate fees. This will increase the associated income potential to the council. The Forest Park Advance thermal Treatment Plant refurbishment is programmed to be completed in July 2018, at which time further third party gate fees will be chargeable to commercial waste producers.
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	Commercial waste producers Competitors in commercial waste collection Local Authority waste producers and collectors (e.g. beach cleansing).
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?	n/a
If so what are they?	
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	Improved service and choice for commercial waste producers on the island. Reduction in Fly-tip of commercial waste Reduction of Trade waste abuse at the household waste recycling centre
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	Income from Trade Waste Collections is subject to commercial waste producer's choice of waste provider. Programmed completion dates are subject to achievement of satisfactory planning permission

41: Waste Contract – capital finance savings £450,000 - Achieved

42: Contract Specification Changes to Major Contracts

Reference:	42 [Recommended]
Activity:	Negotiated changes to contract specifications primarily in the highways PFI contract and the Waste contract to secure annual contract savings or increased income.
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Waste and Highways PFI
Value of the budget proposal (£):	170,000
Detailed explanation of the	The waste contract includes a mechanism whereby the Authority will

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

<p>budget proposal <i>What services are being removed?</i> <i>What does this service provide?</i></p>	<p>receive a share of net profit; the following changes are being considered  <u>New Bin/Sack Replacement Policy:</u>  Options for consideration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Charging a delivery fee for replacement/additional bins</li> <li>• Charging an administration fee for arranging replacement bins/sacks</li> <li>• Charge for all replacement bins/sacks after new roll out covering the capital cost of replacements.</li> <li>• Require evidence of damage beyond useful repair or crime reference number</li> </ul> <u>Holiday Home Waste Collection Policy</u>  to ensure all businesses and including domestic properties being used in the course of a business for the provision of self-catering accommodation are correctly arranging for a commercial collection of their wastes. Under UK legislation set in 2012 all businesses that produce waste must make separate arrangements and pay for a 'trade' waste collection.  <u>Agreed changes to the PFI contract following the adjudication process – still commercial in confidence as being negotiated</u></p>
<p>Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i></p>	<p>Self-catering businesses Competitors in commercial waste collection</p>
<p>Are there any alternative services that can provide support? If so what are they?</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i></p>	<p>Income generation through Trade Waste Services</p>
<p>Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation</p>	<p>Businesses may choose to use a more competitive external collection service if the council did not fix its pricing competitively for the service.</p>

### Service Area: Parking

#### 36: Surrender lease on Sea Street Car Park

Reference:	36 Recommended]
Activity:	Surrender lease on the long stay car park in Sea Street Newport
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Parking <i>Place</i>
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£30,000 2016/17 £50,000 2017/18
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed?</i>	The lease for the car park in question is due for renewal in July 2016 it has 96 spaces. Over the years the income had rarely met the cost of the lease. It is suggested that we give notice on this lease and consider the provision of parking elsewhere.

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

<i>What does this service provide?</i>	
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	This will affect those parking in the long stay car park currently. It will affect the working population in the Newport area. The short stay car park opposite in sea street has 60 spaces which may be able to provide some alternatives.
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	Parking is now available in Newport harbour which has 78 spaces. This has recently been put in the car park order and is currently underutilised. Consideration could also be given for changing the status of the short stay car park to long stay.
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	No likely impact if relevant mitigation is considered
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	That the site in question is re-let to another car park operator which has an impact on income streams

### 62: Extend chargeable hours until 2000hrs

Reference:	62 [Not Recommended]
Activity:	To extend the chargeable period on all on street and off street parking until 20.00 hours 7 days a week
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Parking <i>Place</i>
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£20,000 16/17 £50,000 17/18
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	To amend the current car parking order to extend the chargeable period from 18.00 to 20.00, subject to the relevant process this would include all car parks and on -street current chargeable areas
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	Island motorists and visitors to the island
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	There are private car park operators although these are very limited on the island. This decision may also have an effect on current free on street residential areas if people choose not to pay to park.
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	Complaints from the general public and complaints from those business that depend on the night-time economy

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	This process cannot be agreed by members without the introduction of a new car park order and the relevant consultation. At this stage we can only propose that an order is considered and a decision reached after this process.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### 63: Additional on street pay and display

Reference:	63 [Not Recommended]
Activity:	To extend on street charges to include Upper St James St, Crocker Street in Newport and High Street(Union Street) Ryde, High Shanklin and Sandown 7 days a week
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Parking <i>Place</i>
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£20,000 16/17 £70,000 17/18
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	To amend the current car parking order to extend the chargeable period to include these areas.
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	Island motorists, visitors and local businesses
Are there any alternative services that can provide support? If so what are they?	This may encourage users to make more use of our car parks. This decision may also have an effect on current free on- street residential areas if people choose not to pay to park.
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	Complaints from the general public and businesses that feel that they depend on free parking. The alternative to this argument is that charging will result in a higher turnover of cars and have a positive effect on businesses
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	This process cannot be agreed by members without the introduction of a new car park order and the relevant consultation. At this stage we can only propose that an order is considered and a decision reached after this process.

### 64: Remove free parking for Blue Badge Holders

Reference:	64 [Not Recommended]
Activity:	Remove Blue Badge concession
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Parking <i>Place</i>
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£30,000
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	Under the Blue Badge scheme the national concession applies only to on street parking. On the Island this has been extended to include parking within our car parks, which we have no legal obligation to do. According to the councils 'Disability Needs Summary – November 2008' the number of badge holders on the Island was 7,564. Other Authorities are considering removing similar



## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

	concessions
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	Holders of Blue Badges using off street car parking
Are there any alternative services that can provide support? If so what are they?	Users could park on street including on yellow lines (for up to 2 hours)
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	Resistance to the charging mechanism leading to more cars will park on street and may obstruct the highways.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	Reputational in that the scheme would be different to other authorities although many are thought to be considering the same proposals.

### Service Area: Housing

#### 52: Supporting People (1)

Reference:	52 [Not Recommended]
Activity:	Supporting People (1)
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Housing Services, housing support services floating support provision.
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£1,000,000
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	<p>The following services would be removed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing floating support which provides outreach support to vulnerable Island residents to help them maintain their access to housing.</li> <li>• Grant to Age UK for delivery of the Handyperson service, which supports vulnerable households.</li> <li>• The budget proposal would also include:</li> <li>• An element of staff savings from a reduced contract management requirement.</li> <li>• Contract management efficiency savings through reduced contract letting requirements.</li> </ul>
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	Service users include vulnerable residents and households and providers of outreach support and services.
Are there any alternative services that can provide support? If so what are they?	Some level of support can be provided by the voluntary sector. Support can be provided via Adult Social Care Services provided that eligibility criteria are met.
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek</i>	If low level housing support cannot be accessed clients are likely to seek support from statutory services. There is likely to be an increase in demand for support and an associated budget pressure in the adult social care budget. Additional implications are an associated increase in costs in healthcare services.

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

<i>assistance from?)</i>	
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	Review all current client cases to ensure that clients are signposted to appropriate alternative support.

### 53: Supporting People (2)

Reference:	53 [Not Recommended]
Activity:	Supporting People (2)
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Housing Services, housing support services accommodation provision.
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£1,000,000
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	<p>The following services would be removed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing accommodation support which provides accommodation support to vulnerable Island residents to help them maintain their access to housing.</li> <li>• The budget proposal would also include:</li> <li>• An element of staff savings from a reduced contract management requirement.</li> <li>• Contract management efficiency savings through reduced contract letting requirements.</li> </ul>
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	Service users include vulnerable residents and households and providers of accommodation support and services.
Are there any alternative services that can provide support? If so what are they?	Some accommodation will remain in place and provided via registered providers, but this will be a limited supply and in high demand.
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	Demand for accommodation is likely to outweigh provision that remains. Those most vulnerable are likely to be impacted the greatest and there will be an associated increase in the number of clients presenting to the council as homeless. This will impact upon the council in respect of its statutory homelessness duties.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	Some level of risk can be mitigated by reviewing all current client placements. There remains however potential safeguarding risks that can only be mitigated by referral to statutory services.

### 60: Reduce the scope of the empty property and housing enabling work (1)

Reference:	60 [Not Recommended]
Activity:	Reduce the scope of the empty property and housing enabling work (1)
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Housing Services – Enabling and renewal team.
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£12,000 16/17 £25,000 17/18 (cumulative)
Detailed explanation of the	Budget for commissioning work for housing needs.

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	Reduction in staff to undertake work on bringing empty properties back into use and recovering debt in relation to empty properties.
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	Service users in the main include other council services including Housing and Council Tax (revenues).
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	The council has powers under the housing act that it can use to recover debt and bring properties back into use. Legal Services could provide support for this.
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	Likely to directly impact upon the re-use of empty properties and recovery of council tax debt. Indirect impacts will result from not bringing empty properties back into the housing market. Service users could seek support from legal services. Debt could be written off, but this is not of benefit to the council. If proposed changes to the New Homes Bonus are introduced the council may not be able to evidence its activity around debt recovery and re-use of properties which could impact upon the NHB receipts that it receives.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	There is a risk of loss of income due, but this could be mitigated by increased legal support.

### 61: Cease all work in respect of empty properties and housing enabling

Reference:	61 [Not Recommended]
Activity:	Cease all work in respect of empty properties and housing enabling
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Housing Services – Enabling and renewal team.
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£50,000 16/17 £75,000 17/18 (cumulative) These savings are in addition to budget saving reference 60
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	Removal of all staff support for empty property and housing renewal activities.
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	Service users in the main include other council services including Housing and Council Tax (revenues). Registered providers use this service as a point of contact with the council.
Are there any alternative services that can provide support?  If so what are they?	The council has powers under the housing act that it can use to recover debt and bring properties back into use. Legal Services could provide support for this. Registered providers could make greater use of planning services as a point of contact to discuss opportunities for delivery of affordable housing.
Likely impact or	In addition to those set out in reference 60, there would be an

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	ongoing need to review the Island's housing needs survey on 3-5 yearly basis. This could be commissioned on an ad-hoc basis.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	In addition to that discussed in reference 60 there is a risk that delivery of affordable housing would be impacted. This risk could be mitigated by better use of the planning service working with registered providers.

### Service Area: Events

#### 28: IW Festival - Cease Halberry Lane Traffic Management Scheme

Reference:	28 [Recommended]
Activity:	Cease Halberry Lane traffic management scheme
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Economy
Value of the budget proposal (£):	£15,000 2016/17 £15,000 2017/18
Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed? What does this service provide?</i>	The council provides a range of support for key festivals including the Isle of Wight Festival, the Bestival and Cowes Week which are not statutory but have reputational risks attached. Further savings could be identified across major festival support activities and work is ongoing to investigate this.
Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i>	Principally residents in the areas involved
Are there any alternative services that can provide support? If so what are they?	Much of the resource spent on events relates to highways matters which could be left to PFI contractual arrangements
Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i>	The Isle of Wight Festival of 2012 highlights the consequences of the failure to manage traffic flows in relation to wet weather conditions.
Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation	Major impact to reputation. There has been some investment to mitigate the risks that occurred at the IOW festival 2012

### Service area: Commercial services

Reference:	Agreed Service Change in 2015
Activity:	Cessation of Road Crossing Patrols
Service area to which the budget proposal relates to:	Commercial Services
Value of the budget proposal (£):	2016/17    £32,000

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

<p>Detailed explanation of the budget proposal <i>What services are being removed?</i> <i>What does this service provide?</i></p>	<p>The service ensures the safety of children and their parents/carers crossing designated roads at a designated point between specified times whilst taking into account other road users in the discharging of these duties.</p>
<p>Who the proposed budget proposal affects <i>(Who are the service users?)</i></p>	<p>The service users are the children and their parents/carers who cross the road to school at the designated crossing points. In a survey undertaken Sept-Dec 2014, it was established that, across the Island, in a 30 minute window, 3304 pedestrians crossed the road with a Road Crossing Patrol Officer, whilst 7123 vehicles passed a crossing point in the same 30 minute window. The survey also established that 18 of the 24 locations met the guidelines for Road Crossing Patrol provision as set down by Road Safety GB.</p>
<p>Are there any alternative services that can provide support? If so what are they?</p>	<p>There are no alternative IWC services that can provide support.</p>
<p>Likely impact or consequence of the budget proposal? <i>(Where else are the service users likely to seek assistance from?)</i></p>	<p>It is likely that the service users will look to the schools to provide the Road Crossing Patrol service, and it is unknown whether the schools would be prepared to take on the service. Schools cannot fund the service from their Direct Schools Grant (DSG)</p>
<p>Risks associated with the budget proposal and any actions that could be taken in mitigation</p>	<p>If the Council was unable to establish a third party to take on the service, the service would have to cease to deliver the savings. The following risks would result from the cessation of the service at any of the locations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The risk would be reputational to the Council should an accident to a child occur at a road crossing point, which previously was staffed by a Road Crossing Patrol Officer. The law states that it is the responsibility of the parent to ensure that a child is accompanied as necessary on the walking journey to school.</li> <li>• There is some mitigation at 50% of the locations (24); the designated crossing point is at a zebra crossing. Further mitigation in terms of highways works could have further cost implications.</li> </ul>

**Floating Bridge – update on the introduction of pedestrian charges in 2015 and proposals for charges from 1 April 2016**

**1. Background**

Full Council on 25 February 2015 agreed to implement pedestrian charges on the Floating Bridge. The intention was to introduce ticketing machines on both sides of the river to ensure effective management of the charges; the charges were to be £0.40p for those that had obtained a pre-purchased card and £0.70p for anyone paying by cash at the machines. Free travel was to be provided for those under 19 years of age and holders of a Concessionary Bus pass.

**2. Implementation of charges**

The nature of the agreed fee structure necessitated the development and procurement of a bespoke ticketing solution; due to the timescales associated with this it was decided to only implement the £0.40p return fee in the interim period, and that this would be administered through toll collectors equipped with touch screen handheld units stationed at both Cowes and East Cowes. These were duly recruited and the charges were introduced on 27 July 2015. The handhelds were also configured to give free travel for those under 19 years of age and holders of a Concessionary Bus pass.

The implementation of the charges has enabled officers to calculate the predominant side for the commencement of return journeys as well as ascertaining the percentage of users in the respective concessionary categories. Based on the information collected in the first four months of charges 44% of return journeys commence from West Cowes. In relation to concessionary use 20.9% of the foot passengers are aged under 19 years of age whilst 10.8% are concessionary bus pass holders.

Despite concern that the introduction of foot passenger charges would slow down the operation of the bridge this has not been the case; whilst it is accepted that there has been a slight increase in the overall crossing times this has been as a direct result of the necessary segregation of vehicles and foot passengers when boarding and disembarking the bridge.

**3. Ticketing solution**

Following the preparation of an outline statement of requirements for the ticketing solution officers have undertaken a soft market test to establish which companies can deliver a complete solution and work is underway to have this in place for 1 April 2016.

The first phase will see four fixed machines being installed at both Cowes and East Cowes which will enable foot passengers to purchase 'pay as you go' tickets.

The second phase will see the new pre-paid cards becoming available for foot passengers; at this point the two tier pricing set out in this report will be introduced. The static ticket machines will then be configured to issue top up vouchers for the pre-paid cards. This will enable the number of toll collectors to be reduced from 2 to 1 as they will only be required to scan either pre-paid cards or tickets with unique barcodes issued by the machines.

The third phase will see the pre-paid cards and facility to purchase a 'pay as you go' ticket' from the static machines extended to vehicles.

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

The fourth and final phase will be implemented when the replacement floating bridge is commissioned in December 2016; at this point foot passengers will be able to board the bridge and self-scan their tickets. This may remove the requirement for any toll collectors to be employed.

Whilst the capital cost of the necessary equipment (£83k) will be met from the replacement floating bridge project budget the annual system support cost (£30k) will need to be met from the revenue budget. Subsequently the gross foot passenger income will need to be a minimum of £180k to meet the current savings in the medium term financial plan

### 4. Finance

The previous report to Full Council detailed the likely level of income that could be expected; based on a 20 percent reduction in use due to resistance to the charges. It estimated that an annual income of £109,182 would be generated.

The table below shows the numbers and types of foot passengers as well as the income since the charges were introduced.

Month	Foot passenger type			Total	Income total	Income Per day
	Paying	Under 19	CBPH			
July	6,458 (74.1%)	1,289 (14.8%)	971 (11.1%)	8,718	2,583.20	516.64
August	42,346 (72.5%)	9,739 (16.7%)	6,325 (10.8%)	58,410	16,938.20	546.39
September	26,834 (64.4%)	10,037 (24.1%)	4,799 (11.5%)	41,670	10,733.60	357.79
October	21,745 (65.5%)	7,800 (23.5%)	3,660 (11%)	33,205	8,697.80	289.28
November	18,797 (66.9%)	6,801 (24.2%)	2,511 (8.9%)	28,109	7,518.60	250.62
<b>Total</b>	<b>116,180 (68.3%)</b>	<b>35,666 (20.9%)</b>	<b>18,266 (10.8%)</b>	<b>170,112</b>	<b>£46,471.40</b>	

As the charges were not introduced until 27 July has been necessary to extrapolate these figures to work out the income likely to have been received for a full year: the following assumptions have been used:-

December to March (as November) figure - £250.00 per day = £30,250

April to July (as September) figure - £357.00 per day = £43,554

This gives an estimate annual income of £120,275.40 which is approximately 10% in excess of the original estimate presented to Full Council in 2015.

As stated it was necessary to recruit a number of toll collectors to administer the charges at both Cowes and East Cowes with one member of staff being employed on both sides of the river. This was necessary to allow officers the time to procure an automated solution This also assisted in mitigating any potential impact on the speed of operation of the bridge and they also able to help users with any queries regarding the charges or indeed any aspect of the service. The cost incurred from 27 July to the end of November was £32,373.15.

In relation to staff calculating costs for the remainder of the year the following assumptions have been used:-

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

December to March (two members of staff) = £31,483.32

April to July (one member of staff) = £11,741.73

From August to the commissioning of the new bridge (scheduled for December 2016) one member of staff will be required; however once the new bridge comes into service no toll collectors will be required as the scanning of tickets for foot passengers will become self-service.

### 5. Proposed new charging model

Option A		Concessions for under 19s and Concessionary bus pass holder remain (Income £)							
		Nil	10%	12.50%	15%	17.50%	20%	22.50%	25%
Returns	%	292,246	263,021	255,715	248,409	241,102	233,796	226,490	219,184
Card holders	90	184,114	165,703	161,100	156,497	151,894	147,291	142,689	138,086
Pay as you go	10	29,224	26,302	25,571	24,840	24,110	23,379	22,649	21,918
<b>Total</b>		<b>213,339</b>	<b>192,005</b>	<b>186,672</b>	<b>181,338</b>	<b>176,005</b>	<b>170,671</b>	<b>165,338</b>	<b>160,004</b>
Card holders	80	163,657	147,291	143,200	139,109	135,017	130,926	126,834	122,743
Pay as you go	20	58,449	52,604	51,143	49,681	48,220	46,759	45,298	43,836
<b>Total</b>		<b>222,106</b>	<b>199,896</b>	<b>194,343</b>	<b>188,790</b>	<b>183,238</b>	<b>177,685</b>	<b>172,132</b>	<b>166,580</b>
Card holders	70	143,200	128,880	125,300	121,720	118,140	114,560	110,980	107,400
Pay as you go	30	87,673	78,906	76,714	74,522	72,330	70,139	67,947	65,755
<b>Total</b>		<b>230,874</b>	<b>207,786</b>	<b>202,015</b>	<b>196,243</b>	<b>190,471</b>	<b>184,699</b>	<b>178,927</b>	<b>173,155</b>

Option B		Concessions only for under 19s (Income £)							
		Nil	10%	12.50%	15%	17.50%	20%	22.50%	25%
Returns	%	338,781	304,902	296,433	287,963	279,494	271,024	262,555	254,085
Card holders	90	213,432	192,088	186,753	181,417	176,081	170,745	165,409	160,074
Pay as you go	10	33,878	30,490	29,643	28,796	27,949	27,102	26,255	25,408
<b>Total</b>		<b>247,310</b>	<b>222,579</b>	<b>216,396</b>	<b>210,213</b>	<b>204,030</b>	<b>197,848</b>	<b>191,665</b>	<b>185,482</b>
Card holders	80	189,717	170,745	166,002	161,259	156,516	151,773	147,030	142,288
Pay as you go	20	67,756	60,980	59,286	57,592	55,898	54,204	52,511	50,817



## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

<b>Total</b>		<b>257,473</b>	<b>231,726</b>	<b>225,289</b>	<b>218,852</b>	<b>212,415</b>	<b>205,978</b>	<b>199,542</b>	<b>193,105</b>
Card holders	70	166,002	149,402	145,252	141,102	136,952	132,802	128,652	124,502
Pay as you go	30	101,634	91,470	88,930	86,389	83,848	81,307	78,766	76,225
<b>Total</b>		<b>267,636</b>	<b>240,873</b>	<b>234,182</b>	<b>227,491</b>	<b>220,800</b>	<b>214,109</b>	<b>207,418</b>	<b>200,727</b>

### Foot passengers

The 2015/16 Medium Term Financial Plan set out that the net income for the floating bridge foot passengers for 2016/17 and beyond is £160,000; as the number of passengers (and vehicles) is anticipated to remain static it is necessary to increase the charges to realise this figure. Two options are presented which are:-

#### Option A

- Based on a £0.70p return for card holders and £1.00 pay as you go
- Continued free travel for those under 19
- Continued free travel for holders of concessionary bus passes

#### Option B

- Based on a £0.70p return for card holders and £1.00 pay as you go
- Continued free travel for those under 19
- Holders of concessionary bus passes to be charged as paying adults

The proposed income level is based on the estimated annual number of passenger journeys which has been extrapolated from the usage between July and November 2015; assuming that the numbers for November are applied to December through to March and that the numbers for September are applied to April to July this gives a figure of 440,5140 return journeys. Out of this total 292,246 are paying customers; 101,729 are under 19 and 46,535 are concessionary bus pass holders.

A sensitivity analysis of both options is shown below:-

The assumption is that 70 percent of journeys will be undertaken by cardholders at a discounted rate of £0.70p whilst 30 percent will be undertaken at the full rate of £1.00 and that due to the resistance to the price increase there will be a 20 percent reduction in use by foot passengers.

**Option A is the basis of what is currently allowed for in the Medium Term Financial Plan**

**Option B provided the additional income proposed in the 2016/17 savings options**

### Vehicles

The proposed changes to vehicle charges will not be introduced until January 2017 after the new bridge has been commissioned; the fee structure will provide regular users who have pre-paid cards with discounted rates for travel.

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

Category	Existing	From 01.04.16	From 01.01.17	Discount for card holders	Comments
		Pay as you go	Card-holder		
<b>Vehicles - singles</b>					
Car, van, motorcycle and sidecar, caravan	2.20	2.60	2.00	23%	20 trips would equate to £40.00
Book of 20 vouchers	39.60	Disc	Disc	N/A	
<b>Lorry</b>	7.50	9.00	7.00	22%	20 trips would equate to £140.00
Book of 20 vouchers	136.80	Disc	Disc	N/A	
<b>Motorcycle</b>	1.30	1.70	1.20	19%	20 trips would equate to £24.00
Book of 20 vouchers	23.50	Disc	Disc	N/A	
<b>Large vans, mini-buses and pick-ups</b>	3.00	3.30	2.70	18%	20 trips would equate to £54.00
Book of 20 vouchers	54.00	Disc	Disc	N/A	

### 6. Marketing Income

As previously identified there are several opportunities for generating income from advertising on the Cowes floating bridge and it is prudent to review this in light of the replacement bridge due to come in to service in December 2016.

#### **Position with the existing floating bridge**

**External Hull:** Currently branded HEMPLE. The company supplies the paint free of charge in return for the opportunity of advertising. Value of paint is £15,000

**Ferry internal spaces:** Advertising space is in the form of several poster frames situated within the passenger accommodation and this currently sold by local charity that have an agreement with the Council. Whilst the six month income can exceed £4,000 the financial basis is a 50/50 split with the Council after the costs of frames has been deducted from Council's share.

**Land side:** No opportunities currently exist. Whilst an advertising map is attached to the waiting room no income is received for this.

#### **Short term considerations**

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

**External Hull:** Given the relatively imminent replacement of the bridge there are no current plans to repaint the hull. The overall cost to remove from service and repaint could quite easily run to £85,000k, notwithstanding any unforeseen additional costs (possibly sheeting the vessel or environmental disposal of waste material etc.)

**Ferry internal spaces:** It would not be financially viable to withdraw from the current arrangement.

**Land side:** Whilst banner advertising locations could be created on railings and gangways on either slipway it would be necessary to seek the views of Planning.

### Long term considerations

**External Hull:** Design of new ferry will create opportunities for external branded advertising on the north and south facing hulls, this could be either painted or in the form of vinyl or mesh. The cost of future repainting or changing the vinyl will need building into refit costs or part of any advertising package. In the first year, painting could potentially be included in the build price.

**Internal spaces:** The new design includes the creation of internal advertising space on bulk heads as well as the introduction of video screen advertising.

**Land side:** Subject to the receipt of the necessary permission the following opportunities could be created:

- West Cowes side - light boxes on bus shelter, banners on railings, gangway and pontoon, office building.
- East Cowes side - 48 Sheet poster on wall, poster sites on the waiting room. Banners on railings and TV screen on main wall.

### Revenue Generation

In order to ascertain potential revenue from advertising opportunities some soft market testing has been done. In addition to this an internal costing exercise was undertaken based on rates paid by the authority for advertising.

### Soft Market testing

Several companies were approached, with details on potential opportunities, along with passenger numbers. They were asked to offer an annual revenue figure and if tendered, would they consider the opportunity.

Company	Location	Interest	Comments
Company A	Island based	Yes	No Value offered
Company B	Island based	Maybe	Don't think the revenue opportunities from advertising would be that great however without knowing what the current set up achieves this is difficult to gauge.
Company C	Mainland	No	No Value offered
Company D	Island based	No	A view on figures previously quoted was, it was not only at the maximal end of the range, it also

## Revenue Budget Options Impact Assessment

			represented gross revenues after several years when the opportunity had been established. (On information supplied potential advertising sites, and traffic volume) It would also probably be sensible to reduce the estimate for interior sponsorship revenue by as much as 75%.
Company E	Island based	TBA	No response
Company F	Mainland	TBA	No response
Company G	Mainland	TBA	Late addition - awaiting response (company looks after Gosport Ferry)

### Internal costing exercise

In order not to influence future tendering opportunities, specific details are not shown; however, the potential annual revenue that might be generated from the floating bridge is estimated to be £42,000. This figure does not allow for any management or agency fees.

Additionally, opportunities might be created shore side and generate a further £34,470 per annum; however this excludes infrastructure and set up costs.

The total revenue that might be generated on an annual basis could be £76,470.

This is currently not provided for in any budget estimates as it relates to the opportunities with the replacement bridge