

**Business Plan: People & Democracy**

**Service: Locality Support – Parish Liaison**

**Background to Proposal:** *(including drivers for change)*

The Council's approach to locality management has been developing over the last 2½ years with an increasing emphasis on a joined up approach both internally and externally. The parish liaison function is not fully integrated with the locality model and many of the activities associated with this function are carried out separately from the Local Committees. This current approach does not represent a good use of resources nor does it encourage parish councils to take an active interest in the work of Local Committees.

**Details of Service Provision Change or Efficiency Proposal**

**Current Position**

The parish liaison function offers a wide range of support from administering parish clusters, producing a quarterly parish newsletter and facilitating the timely flow of information between the parishes and the District Council.

**What will be achieved?**

To provide advice and support to the parish councils in a different way. The proposal will refresh and strengthen relations between the District Council and the parishes. It will encourage parishes to get involved with Local Committees by seeking to fully integrate parish liaison with the locality model in the following ways:-

- a) Replacing the support for parish clusters and the Parish Clerk network with support for a Parish Chairmen & Clerks Network. Essentially the network would comprise of online support aimed at exchanging information and developing and sharing best practice. A workshop would be held annually for development and networking purposes.
- b) Co-opting Parish Council representatives onto each of the Local Committees, using the current parish cluster boundaries. This would result in 6 representatives for Halstead, 4 for Braintree and 2 for Witham.
- c) Withdrawing the Parish Update and replacing this with regular features in Contact and developing the Going Local pages on the Council's website to ensure the timely flow of relevant information on local areas.

**Implications for Staff**

1 full time post would be affected by this proposal and if approved would result in a reduction of 1 post as the support for the new network and maintaining Going Local web pages would be provided by existing resources within the service – this would require some changes to the job profiles of the Locality & Rural Co-Ordinator and Member Services Officers.

**Implications for Customers**

The main customer group is the parish and town councils. There are mixed views as to the value of the parish clusters but it is likely that any decision to replace this will generate some negative response from the parishes. Parishes would also lose the benefit of email and telephone advice that they currently receive from the Parish Liaison Officer. Consultation with the parishes is underway.

**Implications for other stakeholders**

There is anecdotal evidence that the County Council value the cluster meetings; they are always represented at each meeting to discuss highway issues. Discussions would need to take place with the County Council regarding their localism agenda, how this relates to our Local Committees and how (if at all) the Highways Panel could be used to bridge the gap between the County and the parishes on highway issues.

*(include structure charts current & proposed if proposal involves restructuring)*

**Method of Implementation:** *(if staff are affected include how posts in the new structure will be filled or redundancies mitigated)*

There are constitutional issues to consider insofar as the co-option element is concerned and this would require Member input at the Local Government Reform Sub-Group and Council. Discussions will also need to take place with the County Council and representatives from the parish councils.

**Finances:**

<b>Year:</b>	2009/10 £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000
<b>Expenditure Reduction:</b>		28.8	28.8	28.8
<b>Income Increase:</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Investment or One- off Costs Required</b> <i>(e.g. purchase of ITC equipment/early retirement costs)</i>				

**Timescales:** *(include key stage & milestones dates within the change process)*

Discussions with the County Council and representatives from the parish councils – after the Cabinet Workshop in October.  
Report to the Local Government Reform Sub-Group with a final decision being made by Council in relation to the constitutional issues arising from this proposal.

**Risks:**

1. Barriers to achieving proposed Change

Lack of interest/support from the County Council and the parishes.

The information on the Going Local pages would require input from several frontline services and it would need to be collated, organised and managed so that it is relevant to a particular locality. Changes may need to be made to existing record management structures to enable this to happen.

2. Consequences if proposed change not achieved.

Will not realise any financial savings.

**Appendix B**

Parish Councils will not participate at Local Committees whilst the Parish Clusters still operate.

**Consultation:** *(to be completed after the 4 week consultation period)*

1. What format has the consultation taken, including who was consulted, how and when?  
*(To include a summary of the consultation process with TU's, staff and other key stakeholders)*
  
2. Summary of views received and outcomes impacting on proposed change.

**Communications:** *(How & when will this be communicated to staff and stakeholders?)*

<b>Copy issued to:</b>	
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Management Board:</b>	
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Cabinet:</b>	
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Full Council:</b>	

<b>Prepared by:</b>	Sharon Lowe Assistant Chief Executive	<b>Approved by:</b>	
---------------------	--	---------------------	--

<b>Business Plan:</b>	<b>Enterprise, Culture &amp; Leisure</b>
-----------------------	--

<b>Service:</b>	<b>Economic Development</b>
-----------------	-----------------------------

**Background to Proposal:** *(including drivers for change)*

The annual budgeted expenditure on economic development is £147,630.

The Council has a duty to safeguard the economic well being of the District and delivery of the District's Economic Development Strategy Action Plan is now a high priority for Members.

The recession has been a key driver for Members to put in place projects and financial resources which are now supporting local economic recovery. The service has a detailed work programme for the next 2 years which is supporting local economic recovery through a range of projects and interventions funded through the LABGI grant, and the County Council's Performance Reward Grant.

The service has also recently benefitted from the permanent appointment of a Regeneration & Economic Development Officer who is fully funded by Essex County Council. This post has already made an impact on the service's work by providing high level 'economic intelligence' reports to Members, the Partnership Board, County Council and EEDA. Further work on developing partnership opportunities with other 'Heart of Essex' councils is now underway.

The Braintree District Council/Business Development Services (BDC/BDS) partnership has again attracted national interest and was recently awarded the 2009 APSE award for best Partnership Working Initiative. BDS is now seeking to merge their operation with that of Braintree Enterprise Acorn Units (BEAU) to form a new business support company for the Braintree district. BDS and Braintree Enterprise Acorn Units (BEAU) have now identified joint working as a real opportunity to develop the business support service in the Braintree district, and to increasing the start up unit offer by developing land to the rear of the existing BEAU site in Springwood Drive, Braintree.

Discussions are continuing with the Chairman of BDS, and it is anticipated that proposals for the Council to develop a partnership arrangement with the merged operation will be presented to Members for consideration later this year. It is anticipated that Council will be asked to support the new operation, and this may take the form of an annual grant (yet to be determined) as an alternative to the current arrangement of providing Council staff which are currently 'seconded' to BDS.

However, Members do need to be mindful of expenditure and any long term commitment to economic development and regeneration initiatives, and the proposals set out in this review seek to maximise existing resources, and to develop partnership arrangements which will further enhance the District's reputation for business start up and survival, and business support services.

This proposal provides an opportunity to work in partnership with the private sector (BEAU/BDS) to deliver a range of business support services, including business start ups, through a service level agreement (SLA). The proposal also recognises the value and importance of the new Regeneration and Economic Development Officer post, which is fully funded on a permanent basis by ECC. A new post (0.8fte) is being proposed for District Promotions, which will work at a strategic level to develop new partnerships with local operators, and regionally with East of England Tourism. It is not proposed to continue with the production of the District's Tourist Guide annual publication, and funding from the Guide will be used to develop our world wide web presence.

**Details of Service Provision Change or Efficiency Proposal**

**Current Position**

Administrative support for the work of BDS is currently provided by 2 Council employed staff (1.8 fte) who are based at the Corner House, Market Place, Braintree. Apart from supporting the work of BDS, staff also respond to inward investment enquiries on behalf of the Council, and organise meetings and

events associated with the work of the Braintree Business Council, and Economic Development & Transportation Partnership Board.

The Economic Development Coordinator also represents the Council at county and regional economic events. The Corner House Receptionist provides administrative support for the BDS/Corner House operation. It is proposed that Members agree an annual grant to the new BDS/BEAU operation, at a level yet to be agreed but equivalent to the support currently provided through the Economic Development Co-ordinator role and all employment costs associated with the Receptionist post, and that the post of Corner House Receptionist is deleted from the establishment. The Economic Development Co-coordinator role (0.8 fte) will be based at Causeway House.

It is proposed to consolidate the work of the existing posts of District Promotions Manager and Tourism Manager into a new post of District Promotions Officer (0.8 fte). This new post will work within the Economic Development unit. The post will be responsible for preparing a medium term District Promotions Strategy for the district, and will seek engagement from the private sector in terms of leisure operators, help to drive Members' ambitions for a quality hotel and accommodation, and raise the profile of the district in the lead up to London 2012. The post will have responsibilities for maintaining the tourism web site and for informing Members of opportunities for growth and development of the tourist offer in the Braintree district. Funding from the production of the tourist guide will be reallocated to developing the District's presence on the web.

The new Town Centre Development Manager post (12 month temporary contract) will provide Members with a valuable resource to help drive medium term ambitions associated with the 3 town centres. In general terms the aim of the post is to increase footfall in all town centres, and it is hoped that funding will be available to extend the post beyond the 12 months. It is proposed that the Town Centre Development Manager will have day to day management responsibility for the street markets in Braintree and Witham. This post will be funded from an external grant (LABGI).

Members recently agreed to transfer responsibility for street markets to the Economic Development unit. Detailed financial and management arrangements associated with the transfer will be completed by the end of November 2009. It is not proposed to change existing staffing arrangements, which are shown on the proposed organisational structure. No savings or efficiencies have been identified from the transfer of Street Markets to Economic Development.

### **What will be achieved?**

The award of an annual grant to the merged BDS/BEAU business support operation will remove any long term liability for the Council in terms of staffing arrangements at the Corner House. This arrangement will also present Members with an opportunity to review the performance of the business support operation on an annual basis against key criteria, which will form the basis of a service level agreement with the Council. Members may also wish to consider funding the new operation on a results/output basis.

Consolidation of the roles of Tourism Manager and District Promotions Manager to a new post of District Promotions Officer based in the Economic Development Unit will provide a resource to prepare and develop the District's Promotions Strategy, and to facilitate partnership working between leisure operators and other private sector stakeholders. This new role will also be responsible for the Council's presence, in terms of the district's tourist offer, on the world wide web and to seek 'branding' opportunities for local and regional events which can promote the work of the authority.

It is proposed that inward investment enquiries will be processed by the Regeneration & Economic Development Officer, and the Economic Development Co-ordinator. Both posts will be based at Causeway House. The Head of Service will also continue to play a major role in attracting inward investment to the district.

*A further decision on the longer term staffing structure and financial resources for Economic Development activities will need to be taken as soon as the merged (BDS & BEAU) business support operation is in place. It is anticipated that this review will need to take place no later than the autumn of 2010.*

**Implications for Staff**

The current proposal places 2 posts at risk but creates a new opportunity for a District Promotions Officer (0.8 fte). It is hoped that staff affected by the proposed changes will wish to be considered for the new post. The Business Review process may also present opportunities for existing staff to be considered for posts outside the service area.

**Implications for Customers**

It is anticipated that response times with our inward investment enquiry activity will significantly improve as a result of the revised structure. Direct linkages to the economic development unit at County Hall will continue to improve the quality and speed of response, and this situation is likely to improve as our joint understanding of investor needs becomes clearer.

Research on the use of the world wide web clearly shows that more and more people are using the www to provide options for day visits and short breaks. Increasing the quality and level of presence of the Braintree offer on the web will attract a greater number of 'hits' for Braintree. The District's accommodation offer will also benefit from improvements to the web site.

**Implications for other stakeholders**

Support for the work of the Business Council and Partnership Boards will continue as present. Back office support in preparing agendas and coordinating meetings for the Partnership Boards will be the role of the Regeneration & Economic Development Officer. The Economic Development Co-ordinator will provide support for the work of the local Chambers of Commerce and the Braintree District Business Council. Linkages to the merged DBS/BEAU operation will in the first instance be made through the Head of Service. It is proposed to engage the Regeneration Officer in monitoring the performance of the new business support operation, as and when a service level agreement is put in place.

*(include structure charts current & proposed if proposal involves restructuring)*

**Method of Implementation:** *(if staff are affected include how posts in the new structure will be filled or redundancies mitigated)*

1 new post of District Promotions Officer (0.8fte) is being proposed in the new structure. This will be available for job share. It is anticipated that members of the existing team may wish to be considered for this post. Any posts which are not filled internally will be offered externally. Existing staff, whose posts are identified as redundant as a result of the Business Plan review process, and whose applications for the new posts are not successful will be offered support through the Council's Change Management programme.

**Finances:**

<b>Year:</b>	2009/10 £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000
<b>Expenditure Reduction:</b>				
<b>Salaries:</b>	0	42.8	42.8	42.8
<b>Revenue:</b>	0	3.5	3.5	3.5
<b>Income Increase:</b>	0	0	0	0

## Appendix B

<b>Investment or One- off Costs Required</b> (e.g. purchase of ITC equipment/early retirement costs)	0	0	0	0
--	---	---	---	---

**Timescales:** (include key stage & milestones dates within the change process)

Changes to the organisation structure and working practices will need to be in place by April 2010. Recruitment for the 1 new post will need to commence at the beginning of February, at the very latest.

**Risks:**

**3. Barriers to achieving proposed change**

- Members reluctance to support the proposals;
- Members requirement for an increase in direct support for local economic recovery;
- BDS/BEAU reluctance to accept an annual grant, as an alternative to the existing staffing arrangement, to support their new business support operation.

**4. Consequences if proposed change not achieved**

- Continued risks (employer responsibility and financial) associated with the permanent secondment of staff to the BDS/Corner House operation;
- The district's presence on the world wide web will deteriorate;
- There will be little to no promotion of the District as a visitor attraction/destination during the lead up to London 2012;
- Potential improvements in the quality and promptness of responses to inward investment enquiries will be lost.

**Consultation:** (to be completed after the 4 week consultation period)

3. What format has the consultation taken, including who was consulted, how and when?  
(To include a summary of the consultation process with TU's, staff and other key stakeholders)
  
4. Summary of views received and outcomes impacting on proposed change.

**Communications:** (How & when will this be communicated to staff and stakeholders?)

Discussions with service unit managers on outline proposals for change have already taken place. Staff, whose posts may be affected by these proposals, have been informed by their manager that a review is taking place and that some posts may be placed at risk. Stakeholders have not as yet been consulted.

<b>Copy issued to:</b>	
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Management Board:</b>	
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Cabinet:</b>	
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Full Council:</b>	

**Appendix B**

--	--

<b>Prepared by:</b>	Russell G Everard Head of Service	<b>Approved by:</b>	
---------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------	--

**Business Plan: Enterprise, Culture & Leisure**

**Service: Cultural Services**

**Background to Proposal:** *(including drivers for change)*

**Museum Services:**

The current annual budget expenditure on Museum Services is £206,490. The Museum Trust has accumulated a debt of £116,549 to the Council, which has the potential for placing the Trust in insolvency. An options report on the future of Council's relationship with the Museum Trust is now being considered by Members. Discussions are taking place with Colchester and Ipswich Museums with a view to a partnership arrangement for the Museum Trust and Museum Service, which it is hoped will secure a long term future for the Warner Textile Archive. In the meantime, short term measures need to be taken to address the projected overspend of £30k, which will be paid to the Trust in the form of a grant to maintain their business during 2010/11.

**Tourism:**

The annually budget expenditure on the Tourism service is £72,940 (this includes an annual contribution from Witham Town Council to support the operation of the Witham office). Research suggests that more people are now using the internet and other communication media to find travel operators, entertainment and information on short breaks and holiday destinations. This trend is likely to continue as internet and mobile phone technology develops in the coming years.

It is proposed to close the tourism service. The space created at the Town Hall Centre will be utilised for hiring as serviced meeting accommodation.

**Town Hall Centre:**

The annual budget expenditure on the Town Hall Centre is £56,390. The Town Hall Centre has seen a steady growth in income from lettings over the past 3 years. Room lettings this year have increased by 20% compared to 2008, and this trend appears to be continuing year on year. There is little alternative serviced meeting room provision in Braintree town, and the opportunity now exists to extend the room hire offer for corporate events, weddings and civil ceremonies. It is anticipated that the Town Hall Centre will be a feature of the new Council development to the rear of that building, and it is considered that this is the most appropriate time to improve the overall presentation of the building.

**Details of Service Provision Change or Efficiency Proposal**

**Current Position**

**Museum Services:**

The Museum Services Manager post also supports the work of the Museum Trust. It is proposed that this arrangement continues whilst the present options for the Council's relationship with the Museum Trust are being considered by Members. However, the duties contained in the post will need to be reviewed to include management responsibility for the Town Hall Centre. It is also proposed that 50.5 hours are deleted from posts at the Museum, and other smaller revenue savings are made from that budget to offset the grant award, which the Museum Trust requires to maintain their business for the 2010/11 financial year. It is not anticipated that any further grants will be made to the Trust beyond 2010/11. Discussions have now commenced with potential partners which could see the Warner Textile Archive, and potentially the Museum Service, transfer to a new organisation in 2011/12.

**Tourism:**

It is proposed to close the Braintree TIC office within the Town Hall Centre. A non staffed information point offering a limited range of leaflets will be provided in the reception area of Causeway House.

**Town Hall Centre:**

Revenue from room lettings at the Town Hall Centre have increased by 20% compared to the same period in 2008. Release of the space currently occupied by the Tourism service will generate some

£20k additional pa in rental income, and will provide the THC with more quality space to improve its offer for weddings and civil ceremonies.

A Business Case to support a £57k investment programme in new furniture, internal decoration and internet connections has been prepared for consideration by the Asset Management Group. It is estimated that the investment programme will enable the service to reduce the cost of service from £56k to £16k from April 2012. Changes to the job roles of some staff are proposed, along with the transfer of the facilities management/premises repair responsibility to the Asset Management team at Causeway House.

The team based at the Town Hall Centre will be able to focus on delivering and developing the room hire and civil ceremony offer. This will require some new skill sets for the posts of Town Hall Centre Administrator and the Administration Assistant. It is assumed that officers based at the Town Hall Centre and Museum Service will continue to work together to provide support for delivering events and covering duties during holiday periods and sickness absence.

Total additional income from the space offered by transfer of the Tourist office to the Museum and improvements to the Art Gallery and other rooms is currently estimated at £40k. A further £7.6k income is anticipated from weddings and banquet hire. It is possible that the Town Hall Centre could achieve a breakeven position before 2013 if the proposed capital works, mentioned above, are undertaken during early 2010.

### **What will be achieved?**

#### **Museum Services:**

Staff restructuring and organisational changes will reduce the overall cost of service.

#### **Tourism:**

Limited information will be available from the Reception area at Causeway House.

#### **Town Hall Centre:**

The Town Hall Centre service cost will reduce to £16k pa by 2012/13. A breakeven position is possible within 3 years if investment in improvements is made in 2010.

#### **Implications for Staff**

11 posts are being placed at risk as a result of these proposals. There are 5 new posts which will be open to applications from all staff affected by the change proposals. All posts associated with the Tourism service will be placed at risk as a result of these proposals.

#### **Implications for Customers**

Improvements to the Town Hall Centre will without doubt be welcomed by the room hirers. The Museum Trust will be able to continue to provide access for the general public to view the WTA collection and the Braintree District Museum. The Museum will have reduced opening hours.

#### **Implications for other stakeholders**

There are significant financial implications connected to the long term future of the Warner Textile Archive and the Council's relationship with the Museum Trust. These issues will be the subject of a detailed report which will be considered by Cabinet in December 2009. The Museum Trust will need to be consulted throughout the Business Review process as the review will impact on their own business activity.

*(include structure charts current & proposed if proposal involves restructuring)*

#### **Method of Implementation:** *(if staff are affected include how posts in the new structure will be filled or redundancies mitigated)*

5 new posts are being proposed (4 in the merged Museum & Town Hall Centre service and 1 in Economic Development). There will be opportunities for job share and new working arrangements in the Museum and Town Hall Centre, where appropriate.

## Appendix B

<b>Finances:</b>				
<b>Year:</b>	2009/10 £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000
<b>Expenditure Reduction:</b>				
<b>Salaries:</b>				
<b>Town Hall Centre/     Museum</b>		27.7	27.7	27.7
<b>Tourism</b>		29.99	29.99	29.99
<b>Revenue:</b>				
<b>Income Increase:</b>				
<b>Town Hall Centre room hire</b>		10	25	40
<b>Investment or One- off Costs Required</b> (e.g. purchase of ITC equipment/early retirement costs)				
<b>Timescales:</b> (include key stage & milestones dates within the change process)				
<p>Changes to the organisation structure will need to be in place by April 2010. Recruitment for the new posts will need to commence at the beginning of February 2010, at the very latest. The new structure and service provision would be effective from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2010.</p>				

<b>Risks:</b>
<p><b>5. Barriers to achieving proposed Change</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members reluctance to support the proposed changes;</li> <li>• Regional/national accreditation for the TIC service in Braintree and Witham may be lost;</li> <li>• Capital funding may not be available for improvements (room and building presentation) at the Town Hall Centre.</li> </ul> <p><b>6. Consequences if proposed change not achieved.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ongoing revenue savings will not be achieved;</li> <li>• The Town Hall Centre may not achieve a financial break even position in 2010/11;</li> <li>• Efficiencies arising from new management arrangements for the Town Hall Centre and Museum Service will be lost.</li> </ul>

<b>Consultation:</b> <i>(to be completed after the 4 week consultation period)</i>	
5.	What format has the consultation taken, including who was consulted, how and when? <i>(To include a summary of the consultation process with TU's, staff and other key stakeholders)</i>
6.	Summary of views received and outcomes impacting on proposed change.

<b>Communications:</b> <i>(How &amp; when will this be communicated to staff and stakeholders?)</i>
Discussions with service unit managers on outline proposals for organisational change have already taken place. Staff, whose posts may be affected by these proposals, have been informed by their manager that a review is taking place and that some posts may be placed at risk. Stakeholders have not as yet been consulted about these proposals.

<b>Copy issued to:</b>	
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Management Board:</b>	
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Cabinet:</b>	
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Full Council:</b>	

<b>Prepared by:</b>	Russell G Everard Head of Service	<b>Approved by:</b>	
---------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------	--

**Business Plan: District Development**

**Service: Landscape Services**

**Background to Proposal:** *(including drivers for change)*

There is an opportunity to review the management and structure of Landscape Services to delete the Landscape and Countryside Manager and Community Landscape Officer posts.

**Details of Service Provision Change or Efficiency Proposal**

**Current Position**

Landscape Services is currently a separate Service Unit with a designated manager.

**What will be achieved?**

Deletion of Landscape and Countryside Manager post and Community Landscape Officer post

**Implications for Staff**

The existing Service Unit Manager would be made redundant.

The post of Community Landscape officer is currently vacant and would be deleted. The work is currently being covered by a temporary appointment (Amanda Turberville) which would be terminated on 31.3.10

There are a number of options for the future management of Landscape Services. These include:

- an existing manager within Development Services taking additional responsibility for Landscape Services
- combining Landscape Services with the Parks and Open Spaces Team. This would link with proposals being put forward by the Head of Operations
- creating a Corporate Technical Support Unit to include the Landscape Team

There would be a need to identify a team leader from the existing staff

Backfilling at a more junior level would be required to maintain capacity to deal with casework

Services provided to the community by the Community Landscape officer would need to cease to avoid impacting on the remaining staff.

**Implications for Customers**

None in terms of overall management provided that capacity is maintained by backfilling.

The deletion of the Community Landscape Officer post would mean that assistance to Parish Councils, Community Groups and voluntary organisations on countryside management and landscape projects would cease. The focus of the team would be to deliver the statutory services i.e. landscape and biodiversity advice on planning applications, administration of tpos and dealing with applications to carry out work to protected trees and fulfilling the Council's duties on biodiversity. There would be little scope for discretionary work.

The main areas of work that would be affected by the deletion of the Community Landscape Officer post are :

- working with volunteers and supporting community groups to improve the natural environment; this includes continuing the work of the River Colne Countryside Project in this District (although following the withdrawal of Colchester BC this is discontinued as a discrete project), extending countryside management across the District, working with voluntary groups to improve open spaces (these include the Friends of Bocking Blackwater, Friends of Bradford Meadows, Friends of Hedingham River Walk, Halstead Conservation Group, MENCAP and NACRO) and working with Parish and Town Councils on environmental and biodiversity improvements (for example advice to Witham Town Council on Witham River Walk)
- assisting with the production and implementation of management plans for strategic open spaces
- assisting with the process of open space transfers under section 106 agreements

**Implications for other stakeholders**

None

*(include structure charts current & proposed if proposal involves restructuring)*

**Method of Implementation:** *(if staff are affected include how posts in the new structure will be filled or redundancies mitigated)*

The redundancy of the Service Unit Manager post would be mitigated by backfilling to maintain capacity to deal with casework. Additional responsibilities for the Senior Tree and Landscape Officer would need to be recognised by a job evaluation.

The proposal therefore involves:

- Deletion of the Service Unit Manager post
- Deletion of the Landscape Officer (Community) post
- A job evaluation for the Senior Tree and Landscape Officer
- Creation of a new Landscape Officer post at Grade 3

<b>Finances:</b>				
<b>Year:</b>	2009/10 £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000
<b>Expenditure Reduction:</b>	0	47.6	47.6	47.6
<b>Income Increase:</b>	0			
<b>Investment or One- off Costs Required</b> <i>(e.g. purchase of ITC equipment/early retirement costs)</i>	0	Costs of redundancy to be determined		
<b>Timescales:</b> <i>(include key stage &amp; milestones dates within the change process)</i>				
Could be implemented after 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2010.				

**Risks:**

7. Barriers to achieving proposed Change

## Appendix B

Terms of redundancy need to be established  
Need to identify suitable alternative management and reporting arrangements  
Reaction to loss of countryside management service by Parish Councils, Community Groups and voluntary organisations

8. Consequences if proposed change not achieved.

Savings not achieved

### **Consultation:** *(to be completed after the 4 week consultation period)*

7. What format has the consultation taken, including who was consulted, how and when?  
*(To include a summary of the consultation process with TU's, staff and other key stakeholders)*
8. Summary of views received and outcomes impacting on proposed change.

### **Communications:** *(How & when will this be communicated to staff and stakeholders?)*

To be communicated after consideration by CMB and Cabinet Workshop by individual discussion with officers initially and subsequently at team meetings.

<b>Copy issued to:</b>	
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Management Board:</b>	
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Cabinet:</b>	
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Full Council:</b>	
<b>Prepared by:</b> Paul Munson	<b>Approved by:</b>

**Business Plan: Housing Service**

**Service: Welfare Rights**

**Background to Proposal:** *(including drivers for change)*

**Current Welfare Rights Service**

	<u>Post No</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Hours</u>
Welfare Rights Manager	3105	0.6	22.5
Welfare Rights Officer	6141	0.73	27
Welfare Rights Officer	T0626	1	37

As part of the 2009/2010 budget setting process it was agreed that the Welfare Managers post should be deleted from 31<sup>st</sup> March 2010 saving £40,990.

Since then the full time Welfare Rights Officer post has become vacant, leaving the Council with potentially 1 part time Welfare Rights Officer. The Welfare Rights Manager is still currently in post.

In addition last the year Greenfields have took on an additional member of staff who can deal with their tenants who made up around 40% of the Councils welfare rights customers.

We also increased our funding to the Citizens advice bureau by £15,000 this year to a total of £141,940.

**Details of Service Provision Change or Efficiency Proposal**

**What will be achieved**

It is proposed that the service ceases from 31<sup>st</sup> March 2011 and that other staff (e.g. the Benefits section, Contact centre etc) are provided with additional training about other agencies where people can go to get help and advice.

The vacant post will not be filled, but the two other posts will now cease on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2011.

The website and literature we produce will be updated to ensure we provide clear information on where to get help and advice.

Our research indicates this service is not usually provided by District Councils. It is probably not the obvious place to go if you need financial advice.

Our research also indicates that our current contribution to the Citizens Advice Bureau compares well with neighbouring authorities.

**Implications for staff**

2 members of staff within the welfare rights team will be at risk of redundancy  
Other staff will receive additional training

**Implications for customers**

Customers will no longer be able to access this service from the Council but will be directed to other services.

**Implications for other stakeholders**

## Appendix B

Potential increased workload for other agencies such as the Citizens Advice Bureau.

*(include structure charts current & proposed if proposal involves restructuring)*

**Method of Implementation:** *(if staff are affected include how posts in the new structure will be filled or redundancies mitigated)*

Discussions are being held with the CAB to see how the Council can assist them with their workload.

Greenfields Community Housing have been notified of the proposed changes.

Current customers will be written to explaining the proposed changes.

Identify all existing incomplete cases and ensure that there are arrangements in place to ensure these can be concluded.

Staff training will be given and the website will be updated as detailed above.

The 2 members of staff are aware of consultation and know it may put them at risk of redundancy.

### Finances:

Year:	2009/10 £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000
<b>Expenditure Reduction:</b>				
Vacant Post & Welfare Rights Officer		25.2	47.6	47.6
Welfare Rights Manager			40.99	40.99
<b>Income Increase:</b>				
N/A				
<b>Investment or One- off Costs Required</b> <i>(e.g. purchase of ITC equipment/early retirement costs)</i>				
<i>(If staff cannot be redeployed- one off redundancy costs)</i>				
<b>Timescales:</b> <i>(include key stage &amp; milestones dates within the change process)</i>				
Decision by Council on 14 <sup>th</sup> December and implementation by 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2011				

### Risks:

9. Barriers to achieving proposed Change

Customer reaction to the service ceasing

10. Consequences if proposed change not achieved.

**Appendix B**

Savings not made
------------------

<p><b>Consultation:</b> <i>(to be completed after the 4 week consultation period)</i></p> <p>9. What format has the consultation taken, including who was consulted, how and when?  <i>(To include a summary of the consultation process with TU's, staff and other key stakeholders)</i></p> <p>10. Summary of views received and outcomes impacting on proposed change.</p>
---

<p><b>Communications:</b> <i>(How &amp; when will this be communicated to staff and stakeholders?)</i></p>
--

<b>Copy issued to:</b>	
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Management Board:</b>	
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Cabinet:</b>	
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Full Council:</b>	

<b>Prepared by:</b>		<b>Approved by:</b>	
---------------------	--	---------------------	--

**Business Plan: Community Services**

**Service: Community Halls**

**Background to Proposal:** *(including drivers for change)*

A Community Halls review has been conducted which looked at ways to reduce costs by either transferring assets to a third party or closure.

During the review, work has been ongoing in transferring halls to community groups where possible which will reduce the liability of the remaining assets. In addition, staff resources have been reduced by natural wastage. In the Halstead Senior Citizens Centre work is being undertaken to discontinue with the provision of meals in house and instead be supplied by "Meals on Wheels". This will save on Cooks salaries wef 1<sup>st</sup> April 2010.

**Proposal:**

**To transfer to a third party or close all managed halls using a staged approach by 31<sup>st</sup> March 11 or at the earliest opportunity.**

**Details of Service Provision Change or Efficiency Proposal**

**Current Position**

BDC has 8 managed halls including Halstead Senior Citizens Centre which have all have been reviewed and the current position is as follows:-

HSCC – A separate feasibility study has been completed and discussed at Leadership on 28<sup>th</sup> Sept. Decision was to defer the report until other BDC developments are assessed.

Goldingham Hall – Advanced negotiations with third party operator to take on lease from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2010.

Glebe – Third party interest and this is being pursued.

Forest Road – There is just one playgroup and one regular hirer – It is under performing and closure is proposed.

Dengie Close – Third party interest and this is being pursued

Silver End VH – Third party interest and this is being pursued. However, due to existing tenants this hall cannot be closed.

Institute – Potential transfer to Braintree and Bocking Community Centre as part of the 3 Towns one Vision Regeneration Project.

Witham PH – Commenced negotiations with WTC who have appointed an independent consultant on their behalf to advise and produce a robust business plan. Potential for a third party to take on lease.

**Public Toilets:**

Transfer all village public toilets to parishes – ongoing negotiations

Halstead Public toilets – HTC has been given notice that BDC will no longer be able to provide cleaning wef 1<sup>st</sup> April 2010

Braintree public toilets – BLC requested for toilet opening hours to be extended for a trial period. This is being evaluated and a report to BLC will be presented in November. The extension of opening hours has resulted in increased vandalism and costs. Resources are only available for cleaning them once a day.

NB: The management of toilets will transfer to the Head of Operations by 31<sup>st</sup> March 10.

**What will be achieved?**

If all the halls are transferred to third parties then there will be a 100% saving on staff costs. However, as stated above, the management of leased assets will still require resources. It is considered this is best managed by Asset Management.

**Implications for Staff**

All posts will be made redundant when the halls are either transferred or closed. This will be conducted in accordance with HR Policy.

**Implications for Customers**

If transfer takes place there will be no impact or disruption to hirers or users  
 If a hall is closed, as in the case of Forest Road, the two hirers will need to be relocated.

**Implications for other stakeholders**

Tenants will remain tenants  
 Licensed users (e.g CAB ) may need to be relocated should the asset be re-developed in the future.

*(include structure charts current & proposed if proposal involves restructuring)*

**Method of Implementation:** *(if staff are affected include how posts in the new structure will be filled or redundancies mitigated)*

In accordance with HR Policy

**Finances:**

<b>Year:</b>	2009/10 £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000
<b>Expenditure Reduction:</b>		30	60	120
<b>Income Increase:</b>				
<b>Investment or One- off Costs Required</b> <i>(e.g. purchase of ITC equipment/early retirement costs)</i>	Redundancy costs will need to be calculated as appropriate			

**Timescales:** *(include key stage & milestones dates within the change process)*

This will be managed by a staged approach realising costs savings over the next 3 years, or sooner, depending on negotiations with third parties.

**Risks:**

- 11. Barriers to achieving proposed Change  
 Third party negotiations breaking down
  
- 12. Consequences if proposed change not achieved.  
 Costs will remain  
 Redundant building – potential vandalism, costs, impact on the surrounding environment

**Consultation:** *(to be completed after the 4 week consultation period)*

- 11. What format has the consultation taken, including who was consulted, how and when?  
*(To include a summary of the consultation process with TU's, staff and other key stakeholders)*

Staff have been informed of the changes and potential for redundancy.  
 Consultation has taken place with HTC, WTC and other PCs

**Appendix B**

12. Summary of views received and outcomes impacting on proposed change.

None

**Communications:** *(How & when will this be communicated to staff and stakeholders?)*

Staff will be communicated with on a regular basis through individual and team meetings  
Stakeholders through project communication meetings.

<b>Copy issued to:</b>	Chris Fleetham, Director Cllr Wendy Schmitt Cllr Liz Edey
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Management Board:</b>	
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Cabinet:</b>	
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Full Council:</b>	

<b>Prepared by:</b>	Charmaine Dean	<b>Approved by:</b>	Chris Fleetham
---------------------	----------------	---------------------	----------------

<b>Business Plan: Community Services</b>
--

<b>Service: Concessionary Fares</b>
-------------------------------------

<b>Background to Proposal:</b>
--------------------------------

There is a statutory obligation to issue all over 60's and those who are registered disabled a fare paid bus pass which can be used on locally scheduled bus services anywhere in England. We currently offer an alternative which is discretionary - £40 of travel tokens per year at a cost of £15, each concession is subsidised by £25 per head. Travel tokens can be used in most local taxis, buses and trains. It is estimated that by March 2010 there will be 2,500 token holders (20,000 bus pass holders).

**A review has been conducted and a number of options evaluated. The following proposal is recommended:-**

**To issue tokens to only those who are disabled and those in rural areas poorly served by public transport**

This proposal will have minimal impact and continue to meet the needs of our residents who are disabled and those who live in rural areas where there is limited public transport.

<b>Details of Service Provision Change or Efficiency Proposal</b>
---

<b>Current Position:</b>
--------------------------

There is a current annual token issue of 2,500. This is a discretionary service that BDC offers to all residents of the district as an alternative to issuing a bus pass. £40 worth of tokens per annum is given to residents for a cost of £15 which the Council subsidises by £25.

<b>3 Options were evaluated :-</b>
------------------------------------

- a) To withdraw tokens**
- b) To increase the charge**
- c) To offer the tokens to only those who are disabled or live in rural parts of the district where there is poor or no public transport.**

**The Option that will have minimal effect on the residents and provide a significant saving is Option c) and this is recommended.**

The number of token holders with a disability is 63 (that we know of -holders could be disabled and over 60 but we do not have this information). An estimation has been made that an additional 25% are disabled or have mobility difficulties.

\*Rural parishes have been defined as those ECC identified in their recent review as having a "failing" bus service or those who have a very limited bus service. There are currently 90 token holders who live in these areas\*

Savings achieved by only issuing tokens to those defined as living in rural areas AND those with a disability: Estimated 403 people at a cost of £10,075 resulting in an estimated saving of £52,425 minus temporary cover costs for two weeks at approx £900 leaves an **estimated £51,525 saving.**

**Implications for Staff:** - There would be an initial element of additional work in checking eligibility, short term temporary cover would be necessary initially – probably two weeks. Impact would then be low on a day-to-day basis.

**Implications for Customers:** There would be no implication to these identified customers. All other

## Appendix B

customers will be able to acquire a free bus pass.

**Implications for other stakeholders:** Local taxi drivers could potentially see their income decrease as the majority of travel tokens are used in this area.

*(include structure charts current & proposed if proposal involves restructuring)*

**Method of Implementation:** *(if staff are affected include how posts in the new structure will be filled or redundancies mitigated)*

Currently every current token holder is written to at the beginning of the year to invite them to renew their concession from April. This would be the stage when we would inform of any changes.

Token holders would be given a set time (to be agreed) to use any existing tokens and taxi drivers etc would be given a set time (to be agreed) to present tokens for reimbursement.

### Finances:

Year:	2009/10 £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000
<b>Expenditure Reduction</b>		51.5	51.5	51.5
<b>Income Increase:</b>				
<b>Investment or One- off Costs</b>				

**Timescales:** *(include key stage & milestones dates within the change process)*

Run a series of notices on the B & W Times Council page as soon as possible

Place the information on the Internet

If changes are to be implemented write to all current token holders during February and March to inform - give options relating to alternatives including a bus pass and Community Transport scheme

### Risks:

A number of token holders who live in Urban areas or on a regular bus route are unable to access public transport as they find it very difficult to walk to the bus stop and carry their shopping but they do not have a disability. Community Transport would be an option.

**Consultation:** *(to be completed after the 4 week consultation period)*

13. What format has the consultation taken, including who was consulted, how and when?  
*(To include a summary of the consultation process with Tub's, staff and other key stakeholders)*

Braintree Pensioners Action Group (BPAG) conducted their own consultation. Although the majority of those who completed the questionnaire did not choose tokens this Group have made it clear they will oppose any decision to withdraw or increase charges of tokens.

**Communications:** *(How & when will this be communicated to staff and stakeholders?)*

Run a series of notices on the council page as soon as a decision is made

Place the information on the Internet as soon as a decision is made

Write to all current token holders during February and March to inform them tokens are no longer a concession and invite them to claim their bus pass

Write to taxi companies as soon as a decision is made, giving them until (to be agreed) to claim any reimbursement

## Appendix B

\*Alphamstone, Lamarsh, Ashen, Bardfield Saling, Belchamp Otten, Belchamp St Paul, Belchamp Walter, Birdbrook, Borley, Bures, Colne Engaine, Fairstead, Terling, Faulkbourne, White Notley, Foxearth, Liston, Great Henny & Little Henny, Middleton, Twinstead, Gt. Maplestead, Gt Saling, Greenstead Green, Little Yeldham, Ovington, Tilbury Juxta Clare, Pentlow, Ridgewell, Stambourne, Stisted, Toppesfield

**Recommendation:**

**To issue tokens to only those who are disabled and those in rural areas poorly served by public transport**

<b>Copy issued to:</b>	Chris Fleetham Director Cllr Wendy Schmitt Cllr Liz Edey
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Management Board:</b>	
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Cabinet:</b>	
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Full Council:</b>	

<b>Prepared by:</b>	Tracey Corcoran	<b>Approved by:</b>	Charmaine Dean
---------------------	-----------------	---------------------	----------------

<b>Business Plan:</b>	<b>ENVIRONMENT</b>
-----------------------	--------------------

<b>Service:</b>	<b>Environmental Health</b>
-----------------	-----------------------------

**Background to Proposal:** *(including drivers for change)*

As part of reducing costs it is proposed to consider withdraw the Environmental Standby Service. Saving **£4,100**

**Details of Service Provision Change or Efficiency Proposal**

**Current Position**

The Environmental Health Out of Hours Service comprises two parts:

i) **A standby service** from 18:00hrs – 00:00 Monday – Thursday, 18:00 – 21:00 hours Friday, 08:00 – 21:00 hours Saturday and 08:00 – 00:00 hours Sunday and Bank Holidays.

The standby service provides for one nominated officer to be available for contact during the specified times on a dedicated mobile 'phone to respond to emergencies. It also provides an emergency point of contact for HSE, HPA, Drinking Water Inspectorate and other emergency health requirements. The annual cost of this service is currently £4,187 in staff payments.

ii) **A duty officer service** from 21:00 hours – 02:00 Friday and Saturday.

The duty officer service provides for an Environmental Health Officer and support officer drawn from Environmental Health Technical or administrative staff to be available in the office for call out during the times specified. This element of the service provides:-

- i) Call out with prompt response (subject to volume of calls) for all noise complaints
- ii) Immediate response to all emergency Environmental Health calls
- iii) Proactive inspection capability of night time food premises and other establishments subject to Environmental control.
- iv) Routine monitoring and evidence gathering from known premises subject to complaints or ongoing investigation
- v) Active monitoring and enforcement of licensed premises, door supervisors and Licensing Act Legislation
- vi) Early response to non-emergency food alerts.
- vii) Reactive litter patrols at notorious night-time litter spots.
- viii) Night time dog patrols and assistance with stray dogs.

The annual cost of this part of the service is approximately £35,000 in staff payments. The OOH function operates solely with volunteer staff who are committed to providing a valuable service for the benefit of the residents of the district. The service has been honed to provide maximum benefit at minimal cost in a programmed manner agreeable with the staff.

The selection of times reflects the opportunity to deal with opening hours for the night time economy and when the majority of domestic complaints are likely to be made.

Numerous successes have been achieved in prosecuting perpetrators or witnessing evidence through the OOH service. Last year the service dealt with 148 reactive service requests and undertook 113 proactive visits.

**What will be achieved?**

By withdrawing the Standby Service savings can be achieved.

**Implications for Staff**

By withdrawing the Standby service an additional workload will be placed on the Environmental Health Service who will have to deal with the emergency calls that sometimes come in out of hours. Additional overtime payments will need to be made to cover the ad hoc out of hours arrangements which will be required to resolve persistent issues

The FDO's will be left to answer irate calls from residents who will not have access to a reactive service in times of high distress.

**Implications for Customers**

Customer dissatisfaction at loss in service levels. Customers who use this service are usually extremely fraught and require reassurance and guidance from officers and a simple discussion over the phone often goes a long way to allay their anxiety. Noise complaints mainly originate from disturbance during the night time hours and the expectation is that officers will observe and resolve the issue by approaching the offender there and then, if the service is withdrawn, then residents will be expected to endure the nuisance and will be expected to wait till the next working day for any action to be taken.

**Implications for other stakeholders**

The service also impacts on other activities of the council e.g. Anti social behaviour and encouraging the night time economy. Facilitating improvements or investigating out of hours complaints on behalf of other departmental activities. The police often rely on our service especially at weekends to relieve their over stretched resources.

*(include structure charts current & proposed if proposal involves restructuring)*

**Method of Implementation:** *(if staff are affected include how posts in the new structure will be filled or redundancies mitigated)*

As of April 1<sup>st</sup> 2010 cease the Standby Service operated by Environmental Health - **£4,100** taken out of the salaries budget.

**Finances:**

Year:	2009/10 £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000
<b>Expenditure Reduction:</b> Withdraw the standby service		4.1	4.1	4.1
<b>Income Increase:</b>				
<b>Investment or One- off Costs Required</b> <i>(e.g. purchase of ITC equipment/early retirement costs)</i>				

**Timescales:** *(include key stage & milestones dates within the change process)*

- Proposal to go before Cabinet on 7th December for implementation approval;

## Appendix B

- 8th December - Head of Service feeds back to team the decision of Cabinet
- In February 2010 publicise that the service will cease in April 2010.

### Risks:

13. Barriers to achieving proposed Change

Loss of customer expectation.

Need to create a call down list to deal with EH emergencies, and the reluctance of staff to volunteer.

14. Consequences if proposed change not achieved.

Continue OOH service without the savings being achieved.

### Consultation: *(to be completed after the 4 week consultation period)*

14. What format has the consultation taken, including who was consulted, how and when?

*(To include a summary of the consultation process with TU's, staff and other key stakeholders)*

- Meeting with cllr Walters to discuss the proposals 04/11/09
- a. Officers who operate the out of hour's service were asked to view the proposal and provide feed back and any alternatives. Meeting held 09/11/09 see feed back below

15. Summary of views received and outcomes impacting on proposed change.

Consultation with the officers providing the OOH service concluded an overall opinion that if operating hours were reduced they would withdraw from the service. A critical mass of officers is required for the viability of service provision which would not be reached if a few staff withdrew their services. Reducing the service would undermine the morale of the staff and the valuable service they provide to the community.

The service has recently been benchmarked against other Essex authorities which shows that Braintree provides a balanced cost effective service reflective of the needs of the district.

As an options officers suggest that a saving can be made by removing the Standby Service;

OPTION	SAVING	IMPACT
Remove phone standby service	£4100	No weekday/weekend emergency contact for essential services

### Communications: *(How & when will this be communicated to staff and stakeholders?)*

- 8th December - Head of Service feeds back to team the decision of Cabinet
- In February 2010 publicise that the service will cease in April 2010. Use of web site and Council paper in local paper.

<b>Copy issued to:</b>	
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Management Board:</b>	
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Cabinet:</b>	
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Full Council:</b>	

<b>Prepared by:</b>	<b>Lee Crabb</b>	<b>Approved by:</b>	
---------------------	------------------	---------------------	--

<b>Business Plan:</b>	<b>ENVIRONMENT</b>
-----------------------	--------------------

<b>Service:</b>	<b>Environmental Health</b>
-----------------	-----------------------------

**Background to Proposal:** *(including drivers for change)*

As part of reducing costs it is proposed to withdraw from the agreement to part fund SEAMS, (Community mediation service). Saving. **£6,000**

**Details of Service Provision Change or Efficiency Proposal**

**Current Position**

Historically the council has joint funded a community mediation service, along with other local councils. Currently the scheme is joint funded between BDC, Colchester BC, Colchester HA and Greenfields HA – (£6000 each organisation). The service is free service to all residents in the area of Braintree and Colchester Council's. The service offers a non judgemental and impartial assistance through mediation to help anyone experiencing a neighbour dispute.

Last year SEAMS dealt with 55 cases of which 19 were referred by Braintree Council.

**What will be achieved?**

Cease funding the mediation service from the council's budget and advise that the mediation service seeks alternative funding from other more suitable sources. This will save £6000 from the revenue budget.

**Implications for Staff**

Additional workload for staff of the Environmental Health & Community Safety Departments (19 additional cases) which otherwise would have been diverted to the mediation service.

**Implications for Customers**

Customer dissatisfaction as the services (if the mediation service is with drawn) will not be able to offer an alternative to deal with issues beyond their statutory remit.

**Implications for other stakeholders**

A community mediation service is a valuable asset that not only improves health, well being, quality of life, the environment and community safety for the local population but it also provides government departments and the police an alternative approach to resolving local issues.

If BDC do not support SEAMS it is likely to cease to operate.

In issues of dispute where enforcement action is taken the Courts take a kinder view when mediation has been used to attempt to resolve the dispute.

Alternative sources of funding could be achieved through the Local Strategic Partnership. Or the council could take advantage of the choice to pay for cases referred to the service on a individual case by case basis.

*(include structure charts current & proposed if proposal involves restructuring)*

<b>Method of Implementation:</b> <i>(if staff are affected include how posts in the new structure will be filled or redundancies)</i>
---

## Appendix B

*mitigated)*

Notify Chairman of SEAMs that the Council will cease funding in April 2010 and encourage the service to seek alternative funding from other local sources.

Finances:				
Year:	2009/10 £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000
<b>Expenditure Reduction:</b>		<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Income Increase:</b>				
<b>Investment or One- off Costs Required</b> <i>(e.g. purchase of ITC equipment/early retirement costs)</i>				
Timescales: <i>(include key stage &amp; milestones dates within the change process)</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal to go before Cabinet on 7th December for implementation approval;</li> <li>• 8th December - Notify the chairman of SEAMs as soon as possible of the decision to cease funding. (Funding is due April 2010). And to seek alternative funding.</li> </ul>				

Risks:
<p>15. Barriers to achieving proposed Change</p> <p>Alternative funding is not forthcoming and SEAMS folds throughout the area.</p> <p>16. Consequences if proposed change not achieved.</p> <p>Continue as before, with no saving.</p>

Consultation: <i>(to be completed after the 4 week consultation period)</i>
<p>16. What format has the consultation taken, including who was consulted, how and when? <i>(To include a summary of the consultation process with TU's, staff and other key stakeholders)</i></p> <p>a. 02/11/09 Notified Chairman of SEAMs</p> <p>17. Summary of views received and outcomes impacting on proposed change.</p> <p><b>17/11/09 Telephone conversation with the chair of SEAM's there will be a board meeting next week (Week beginning 23/11/09) and the future of the service will be discussed in light of the proposal to withdraw our funding. His personal comment was that if BDC withdrew funding then it was likely that the service would cease within 6 – 9 months. They have tried CHIP fund but as the service operates outside the district in Colchester then they were unsuccessful, but they would now be approaching the LSP for funding. The funding (£24,000 in total) pays for two part time admin staff (salaried 15 hrs per week) and providing accommodation and running costs - the as the mediators are volunteers and only paid expenses.</b></p>

**Appendix B**

--

<b>Communications:</b> <i>(How &amp; when will this be communicated to staff and stakeholders?)</i>
---

<b>Copy issued to:</b>	
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Management Board:</b>	
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Cabinet:</b>	
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Full Council:</b>	

<b>Prepared by:</b> Lee Crabb	<b>Approved by:</b>
-------------------------------	---------------------

<b>Business Plan:</b> OPERATIONS
----------------------------------

<b>Service:</b> COMMUNITY WARDENS
-----------------------------------

**Background to Proposal:** *(including drivers for change)*

This is a discretionary service which costs in excess of £230,000 p.a. From a public perspective, it is difficult to quantify the added value and benefit of the Community Warden Service, unless they have had personal experience of the service.

#### Details of Service Provision Change or Efficiency Proposal

**Current Position:** Currently we have 8 posts, 3 of which cover urban areas and the remainder cover the rural areas. The Wardens are managed by a full-time Supervisor who is also responsible for other services.

**Proposal:**

Withdraw the service

**What will be achieved?**

Cashable saving of £230k

**Implications for Staff.** Compulsory redundancy of 6.5 FTE.

**Implications for Customers.** There is no doubt that some residents and stakeholders value the service and it plays a significant part in partnership working, particularly with the Police, town and parish councils, that actively promotes and enhances the Council's reputation and image. Some customers would inevitably see the loss of the Wardens as a reduction in service and it may increase their perception of fear of crime. The Wardens currently play a major contribution in helping to keep the District clean and tidy and the withdrawal of this service will undoubtedly reduce our performance in this area.

**Implications for other stakeholders.** Reduction in partnership working and the ability of the Council to influence and contribute to addressing local issues.

*(include structure charts current & proposed if proposal involves restructuring)*

**Method of Implementation:** *(if staff are affected include how posts in the new structure will be filled or redundancies mitigated)*

In accordance with the Council's Management of Change process.

#### Finances:

Year:	2009/10 £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000
<b>Expenditure Reduction:</b>		230	230	230

## Appendix B

<b>Investment or One- off Costs Required</b> (e.g. purchase of ITC equipment/early retirement costs)				
--	--	--	--	--

**Timescales:** (include key stage & milestones dates within the change process)

It is proposed that any change in service would take effect from 1 April 2010.

**Risks:**

**Barrier to achieving proposed change.** Worst case scenario: The loss of the service without redirecting some resources to street cleaning would impact on our ability to deal proactively and respond promptly and efficiently to enviro-crime. The Council would not be able to maintain acceptable standards of cleanliness without additional resources in this area; customer satisfaction would fall and we would be unable to meet our statutory performance targets.

**Consequences if proposed change not achieved.** Savings not achieved.

**Consultation:** (to be completed after the 4 week consultation period)

**What format has the consultation taken, including who was consulted, how and when?**  
(To include a summary of the consultation process with TU's, staff and other key stakeholders)

**Summary of views received and outcomes impacting on proposed change.**

**Communications:** (How & when will this be communicated to staff and stakeholders?)

Prior to implementation of any changes (wef 1.4.10) the Council would need to carry out an extensive public communication exercise with all stakeholders.

<b>Copy issued to:</b>	
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Management Board:</b>	
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Cabinet:</b>	
<b>Date Submitted for approval to Full Council:</b>	
<b>Prepared by:</b>	<b>Approved by:</b>