

## MEDIUM-TERM FINANCIAL PLAN SAVING PROPOSAL TEMPLATE

DIRECTORATE:	HOUSING & REGENERATION
--------------	------------------------

SERVICE AREA:	HOUSING (NON HRA) – General Fund Housing
---------------	--

### 1. GENERAL INFORMATION

SAVING PROPOSAL:	<p>Reduction of Community Environmental Warden (CEW) service that is currently concentrated in specific neighbourhood areas.</p> <p>There are currently 7 FTE CEW's budgeted (1 vacant) who are funded over 3 service areas (Cleansing, General Fund Housing and Housing Revenue Account). The proposal is to remove the enhanced General Fund service to the community within these areas they currently operate.</p>
------------------	--

BUDGET AREA:	General Fund Housing (cc 5993 P818)
--------------	-------------------------------------

TOTAL BUDGET FOR THIS AREA:	£1,289,212 (net of recharges)	% OF TOTAL BUDGET IN SAVINGS PROPOSAL:	3.5%
-----------------------------	-------------------------------	--	------

TOTAL SAVING:	£45675
---------------	--------

#### PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE SAVING WILL BE ACHIEVED:

PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE SAVING WILL BE ACHIEVED:	<p>The CEW's currently offer a specific service to the following areas:          Graig Y Rhacca          Blackwood          Risca          Gilfach          Pontlottyn          Caerphilly          Lansbury Park</p> <p>The staff are on Cleansing payroll and recharged out as below:          The budget (£291k) is funded as follows</p> <table style="margin-left: 20px;"> <tr> <td>37% Cleansing fixed contribution (£108k)</td> <td style="font-size: 1.2em;">}</td> <td>37% Cleansing</td> </tr> <tr> <td>16% General Fund Housing (£45k)</td> <td style="font-size: 1.2em;">}</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>47% HRA (137k)</td> <td style="font-size: 1.2em;">}</td> <td>63% Housing</td> </tr> </table> <p>The CEW's carry out waste management duties over and above the normal Councils remit. They dispose of approx. ½ ton waste per site which includes general house &amp; garden clearance. This would include HRA properties hence the recharge to the HRA which is funded from tenants rent.</p> <p>To meet the MTFP target for General Fund Housing It is proposed to delete this service that is offered to Non HRA residents as it is seen to be over and above what is covered for general tenants within the</p>	37% Cleansing fixed contribution (£108k)	}	37% Cleansing	16% General Fund Housing (£45k)	}		47% HRA (137k)	}	63% Housing
37% Cleansing fixed contribution (£108k)	}	37% Cleansing								
16% General Fund Housing (£45k)	}									
47% HRA (137k)	}	63% Housing								

borough.

The saving would be £45k for General Fund Housing which represents 16% of the total cost. £45k is equivalent to 1 FTE salary for a community warden. However, This does not necessarily mean the removal of one post would achieve the saving because of how the recharge is calculated. One post deletion could result in a saving of about £10k to General Fund Housing but this depends on the Cleansing contribution (fixed) and the HRA contribution (75%) remaining the same, which of course may not be the case if the service is affected.

To illustrate:

There is already a vacant post within this structure which could generate a saving of £10k, if this post was removed from the structure, but, this assumes the Cleansing & HRA contribution remains the same. (ie Cleansing remains fixed at £108k (no saving) and HRA remains at 75% of the balance which would be £106k (£30k saving))

If the Cleansing contribution reduced accordingly then the saving for General Fund Housing would reduce to £6k (Cleansing £93k (15k saving) and HRA 75% £118k (£18k saving))

There would be an impact on those members of the public who currently benefit from this service but not everyone has access to this service unless they live in these areas and general waste management is already offered to council residents.

There would be an impact on the staff involved in this service which could create options for retirement, redundancy or redeployment bearing in mind the "employer" is Cleansing Services not Housing.

## 2. PUBLIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD **IMPACT UPON THE PUBLIC:**

CONSIDER THE 5 WAYS OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, *LONG-TERM* IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS AND *PREVENTATIVE SERVICES*. RECOGNISING THAT SAVINGS MAY SECURE FUTURE PROVISION, OR MAY BE NEEDED TO SECURE PROVISION IN ANOTHER AREA.

**Long-term guidance:** *Consider the importance of balancing short-term needs with the need to safeguard the ability to meet long-term needs.*

This is a non statutory service that provides additional support with cleansing duties in some areas of the borough. The proposal would require further consultation with all service areas with the intention to review the arrangement in order that it is delivered consistently across the county borough. This would therefore assist in supporting the long term needs of our residents.

**Prevention guidance:** *Consider whether the proposed saving is affecting a preventative area that reduces future burdens and supports well-being.*

There is some concern that fly tipping in certain areas could increase in the short-term, although it is proposed that local residents need to take some responsibility for their own communities and therefore before being implemented the proposal would need to be communicated. Perhaps neighbourhood watch schemes could be established so residents operate as a group rather than in isolation.

It is proposed that this proposal be implemented as a pilot scheme initially to ensure it operates successfully with no increase in fly tipping, however fly tipping is not the responsibility of Housing and therefore the areas currently covered should receive the same level of service as the rest of the county borough.

DOES THE PROPOSAL HAVE THE POTENTIAL TO IMPACT MORE GREATLY ON PEOPLE WITH PROTECTED CHARACTERISTICS? (PLEASE TICK) (AGE, DISABILITY, GENDER REASSIGNMENT, MARRIAGE or CIVIL PARTNERSHIP, PREGNANCY AND MATERNITY, RACE, RELIGION or BELIEF, SEX, SEXUAL ORIENTATION)	YES	NO
		✓
<b>NB * IF YES, PLEASE COMPLETE AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA) SCREENING. THIS WILL DETERMINE WHETHER A FULL EIA IS NEEDED. FOR FURTHER ADVICE AND GUIDANCE PLEASE SEE THE <a href="#">POLICY PORTAL</a>. SCREENING FORMS AND ANY EIAs WILL NEED TO BE APPENDED TO ALL DECISION REPORTS RELATED TO THE PROPOSED SAVING.</b>		

PLEASE DETAIL ANY CONSULTATION THAT HAS BEEN UNDERTAKEN IN CONSIDERING THIS PROPOSAL. SUMMARISE ANY FEEDBACK RECEIVED.

CONSIDER THE 5 WAY OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, *INVOLVEMENT*.

**Involvement guidance:** *Consider whether you have involved people who have an interest in the service area, including service users and potential service users.*

No consultation has yet taken place, but clearly the withdrawal of an existing service will not be well received by any community. We obviously need to prioritise the services we deliver with limited funded and this proposal would make a saving and provide services to other parts of the borough who currently do not receive it.

The proposal will be consulted upon as part of the 2020/21 Medium Term Financial Plan.

IS FURTHER CONSULTATION REQUIRED BEFORE THIS PROPOSAL CAN BE IMPLEMENTED? (PLEASE TICK) PLEASE SEEK GUIDANCE FROM CORPORATE POLICY, WHO CAN ADVISE ON THE GUNNING PRINCIPLES, IN PLANNING ANY CONSULTATION.	YES	NO
	✓	

TAKING ACCOUNT OF THE ABOVE AND THE IMPACT RATING DEFINITIONS, PLEASE INDICATE THE PUBLIC IMPACT RATING APPLICABLE TO THIS SAVING PROPOSAL (PLEASE TICK):

NIL IMPACT	MINOR IMPACT	MODERATE IMPACT	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	CRITICAL IMPACT
		✓		

### 3. ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD **IMPACT UPON THE ORGANISATION AND FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION**:

As this service is managed through Cleansing Services, changes would need to be made with the way the existing wardens operate and consideration of how this impacts on its future service provision. Whilst this proposal is a potential saving for General Fund Housing it may not be the same for Cleansing Service, however with the current arrangement, some communities are receiving an increased level of service to others.

**PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT UPON MEMBERS OF STAFF:**

Any reduction in the service will have staff implications in Cleansing Services. Limited interest was made in the recent workforce development exercise. There could be an opportunity to cross match with other cleansing staff but voluntary severance costs would need to be considered.

**NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STAFF IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED:** 7

**NUMBER OF POSTS IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED:** 7

**NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING:** 7

PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED:	HOW MANY POSTS?
POST(S) ALREADY VACANT:	1
VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE:	?
RETIREMENT:	?
REDEPLOYMENT:	?
REDUNDANCY:	?

**PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL BE IMPLEMENTED:** Discussions need to be held with relevant services now to ensure implementation for 2020/21

WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT ON ANOTHER DIRECTORATE, SERVICE AREA OR TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL? (PLEASE TICK)	YES	NO
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT ON ANOTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PARTNER, OR VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER? (PLEASE TICK)	YES	NO
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**IF YES, PLEASE CONSIDER THE 5 WAYS OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR INTEGRATION. DESCRIBE BELOW:**

- THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND
- HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT

**Integration guidance:** Consider how the proposal will impact on other service areas, or partners, and their ability to meet their objectives.

Cleansing Services employ the CEW's directly therefore the savings in this proposal will affect how this service operates going forward. Issues to consider will be the financial impact (Cleansings contribution to current service, costs associated with severance, and additional demand on current service if this proposal is agreed)

There is an option to integrate more efficiently and possibly avoid potential redundancies if the CEW role changed to provide services directly beneficial to council tenants (in the more problematic estates such as Graig Y Rhacca, Lansbury Park, Ty Sign and Phillipstown) providing more of a supporting role for tenants (e.g. assisting with tenancy enforcement issues, garden conditions, communal area checks, ASB and parking issues). This could either be a direct HRA cost (transfer of staff) or a review of the current set-up managed by Cleansing Services. However, consideration needs to be taken in view of the fact that HRA will be downsizing following the achievement of WHQS (est June 2020) and providing alternative roles for existing HRA staff which could compliment any new arrangement.

HAVE ANY OPTIONS BEEN CONSIDERED TO MITIGATE ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT?  
PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF ANY MITIGATION.

IN ADDITION, CONSIDER THE 5 WAY OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, *COLLABORATION*.

**Collaboration guidance:** *Acting in collaboration with any other service or partner to meet objectives.*

Review of current structure.

TAKING ACCOUNT OF THE ABOVE AND THE IMPACT RATING DEFINITIONS, PLEASE INDICATE THE ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT RATING APPLICABLE TO THIS SAVING PROPOSAL (PLEASE TICK):

NIL IMPACT	MINOR IMPACT	MODERATE IMPACT	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	CRITICAL IMPACT
	✓			

**3. LINKS TO POLICY AND CORPORATE OBJECTIVES**

DOES THE SAVINGS PROPOSAL LINK TO ANY OF THE FOLLOWING?  
IF SO, PLEASE SPECIFY AND STATE WHAT THE IMPLICATION MAY BE.

POLICY AREA	WHAT IS THE LINK?	WHAT WILL BE THE IMPACT?
CORPORATE PLAN and WELL-BEING OBJECTIVES (please state which objectives)		
STATUTORY DUTIES		
WELSH GOVERNMENT GUIDANCE or STRATEGY		

**4. RISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES**

HAVE ANY RISKS BEEN IDENTIFIED IN CONNECTION	YES	NO
--	-----	----

WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK)	✓	
<p>IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW:</p> <p>PLEASE CONSIDER RISK TO SERVICE USERS, LOSS OF PREVENTATIVE SERVICE AND FUTURE IMPACTS, FINANCIAL RISK, RISK TO STATUTORY PERFORMANCE etc.</p>		
<p>Reduction in the service could cause concerns regarding the cleanliness of the areas, especially in the more problematic areas such as Lansbury Park and Graig Y Rhacca.</p> <p>Cleansing Services could argue there is no saving to their budget if they have to divert another cleansing team into areas where the wardens have been reduced although this service should be funded from council fund (not HRA) either way.</p> <p>Likelihood of introducing charges to residents on the estates for any additional work over and above the normal council funded service.</p>		
<p>PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITIVITIES WILL BE MITIGATED?</p> <p><b>NOT ALL RISKS CAN BE MITIGATED. SOME MAY NEED TO BE TOLERATED IN THE CONTEXT OF BUDGET PRESSURES.</b></p>		
<p>Passing costs onto the residents may create a more considerate approach to the area they live in.</p>		

**5. OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION**

<p>PLEASE USE THIS SECTION TO PROVIDE ANY OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION WHICH YOU FEEL HAS NOT BEEN CAPTURED.</p>
<p>As this proposal affects 3 service areas, further consultation is needed to ensure all views are included.</p>

**HEAD OF SERVICE: SHAUN COUZENS**

**DATE OF COMPLETION: 13 SEP 2019**