

**Highland Council
16 February 2017**

Revenue Budget 2017/18

Details of Budget Savings

Budget Template

Service	Finance			Ref.	FIN/1
Activity Heading	Revenues and Business Support				
Savings Name	Second Homes Discount				
Current Budget (£m)	£116.327m	Current Staffing (FTE)	N/A		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

At present Councils are able to award a discount of 10% - 50% in respect of properties that meet the definition of Second Homes. A "second home" is a dwelling which is no one's sole or main residence, but which is furnished and in respect of which, during any period of 12 months, the person who is liable to pay the council tax that is chargeable can produce evidence to establish that it is lived in other than as a sole or main residence for at least 25 days during that period.

At present Highland Council awards the minimum 10% discount. Legislation requires current Second Home Council Tax (the 40% charged) to be used for housing purposes, and with the exception of the current year where dispensation was given, the income raised is credited to the Landbank Fund.

Recent changes in legislation will allow the Council to remove the discount currently given (the 10%), and to use the income for general purposes. This is what is proposed by this "savings proposal" that will generate additional income.

Presently there are 4,129 properties that fall into this category, and a significant proportion are holiday homes, including owned by people outwith the Highlands. To help demonstrate the impact of this proposal, the table below shows the annual/weekly increase if there was no 10% CT second homes discount during 16/17.

Band	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
No of 2 nd homes	512	597	891	737	749	330	247	66
Current Charge (16/17) with Discount	697.80	814.10	930.40	1,046.70	1,279.30	1,511.90	1,744.50	2,093.40
Charge with no Discount	775.33	904.56	1,033.78	1,163.00	1,421.44	1,679.89	1,938.33	2,326.00
Increase per annum	77.53	90.46	103.38	116.30	142.14	167.99	193.83	232.6
Increase per week	1.49	1.74	1.99	2.24	2.73	3.23	3.73	4.47

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.500	0
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.500	0

Service Impact

No impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

N/A

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

N/A

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	YES
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	The additional charge targets a specific client group who currently receive a 10% discount on their current council tax
Mitigating action	None planned. This proposal removes a benefit currently offered to a small group of customers
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	YES
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken; no equalities impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.

Budget Template

Service	Finance			Ref.	FIN/2
Activity Heading	Corporate Finance				
Savings Name	Insurance Services				
Current Budget (£m)	£2.066m	Current Staffing (FTE)	N/A		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

This proposal follows a review of the Insurance Fund and historical claims history. At present the Council meets certain self-insured limits before passing the cost and risk onto our insurers.

Following the review, and on discussion with the Council's insurers, it is proposed to increase the level of self-insurance and thereby reduce the cost of premium paid to external insurers. This does mean that the Council will have to meet a higher cost of any claim, but based on historical and current claims, and the potential for mitigating factors, this higher risk is manageable.

One example would be an increased risk for property where the self-insured element would increase from £0.1m to £0.5m. There have been no recent claims in this banding, but in the event of a major incident e.g. fire, the Council would have to meet the additional cost of £0.4m.

The Council also recharges insurance costs to the tenants of its commercial properties. A review of these charges has shown they are significantly below the market rate for such insurance cover. As such it is proposed to increase the insurance recharges to tenants in commercial properties by up to 100%. Even with increases of those levels the charges will still be significantly below the prevailing market rates.

There is sufficient balance in the Insurance Fund to address any immediate higher cost of risk. The position is monitored constantly, and action can be taken should the situation change.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.579	0
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.579	0

Service Impact

No impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

N/A

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

N/A

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	NO
If no, state why	This proposal reflects the Council's approach to risk and places greater responsibility on services to manage risks. However this is a financial risk and does not impact on service delivery.
If YES, state why	

Mitigating action	N/A	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)		NO
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)		NO
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken; no equalities impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.		

Budget Template

Service	Finance			Ref.	FIN/3
Activity Heading	Revenues & Business Support				
Savings Name	Debt control, charging, and business rates incentivisation				
Current Budget (£m)	£300m	Current Staffing (FTE)	N/A		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

The Service is responsible for collecting Council Tax and Non Domestic Business Rates (NDR) on behalf of the Council, and Sundry Debt on behalf of all services (the value of which can vary significantly year on year). The Council also collects rates for the 2 Business Improvement Districts (BIDS). This proposal comprises: more proactive debt control / management; passing the cost (the handling fee) of debit card payments for Council Tax, NDR and Sundry Debtors to the payers; recovering the costs of collection associated with BIDS; and assumptions of additional income arising from the Business Rates Incentivisation Scheme (BRIS).

With more proactive debt management and pursuit of outstanding amounts, further cashable savings can be achieved through reducing the level of provision for bad or doubtful debts. This is supported by higher in year collection levels currently being achieved. The work will also include a review of how income is generated, including higher take up of direct debits.

The cost (the handling fee) of debit card payments (0.352% of the payment value) for Council Tax, NDR and Sundry Debtors are currently met by the Council. This costs £43k per annum. The proposal is that the payer meets such costs from April 17. Credit card transaction fees are already met by the customer. Customers may choose to pay by Direct Debit, the most efficient method of collection. Customers who pay by debit card, and therefore already have a bank account, can choose to pay by Direct Debit instead which the Council also offers a variety of payment dates to choose from offering advantages to both payer and Council. This means that there are other options for customers to avoid paying this charge.

The Council currently meets the 27.5k collection costs per annum to collect the BIDS levies. There are 2 BIDS; Inverness City and Inverness & Loch Ness Tourism. This proposal is to recover these costs from April 2017. The 2 BIDS levies total in excess of £400k per annum. This is a recommendation from the Redesign Board that proposes that full cost recovery of this service should be made.

Business Rates Incentivisation Scheme has been reviewed and is only capable of generating a small element of additional income (of which the Council can retain 50%), by exceeding the income target set by the Scottish Government. Whilst targets are awaited for 2016/17 rather than 2017/18, the Council has consistently exceeded the target and it is felt that a small assumption can be made that this position will continue into 2017/18. A budget provision is therefore proposed for the first time.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.200	0
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.200	0

Service Impact
No impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

N/A

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

N/A

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)	
1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	YES/NO
If no, state why	Debt Management: The saving proposed will impact on all customers who owe money to the Council. It will be supported by welfare advice for those struggling to pay council tax debt
If YES, state why	Debit Card Payments: This has the potential to impact on lower income groups who currently chose to pay by debit card as a way on managing their finances. However, evidence suggests that in the main, these groups tend to opt for credit card payments, which already incur a payment fee.
Mitigating action	Alternative payment methods remain including cash payments at Paypoint outlets. Affordable payment plans are available for those struggling to pay council tax debt.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	NO
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken; no equalities impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.	

Budget Template

Service	Finance			Ref. FIN/5
Activity Heading	Corporate Finance			
Savings Name	Procurement			
Current Budget (£m)	£1.346m	Current Staffing (FTE)	N/A	

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

This forms part of the new shared service with Aberdeen City and Aberdeenshire Councils. The current budget stated is the gross savings target that formed part of the business case, representing 0.5% of the total spend on non payroll costs.

Within the existing agreed savings from December 2014 and February 2016 the Council already has a savings target in place for Procurement. This proposal increases the savings target to match the total approved by the approved Business Case (Resources Committee August 2016).

A paper is being prepared outlining a range of target areas, predominantly for "off-contract" expenditure outwith the Highland area. From evidence and experience from the partner councils this additional saving is believed to be achievable and may indeed be capable of being increased in future years.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.740	0
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.740	0

Service Impact
No impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

N/A

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

N/A

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)		NO
If no, state why	This relates to expenditure on goods and services, predominantly from outwith the Highland area	
If YES, state why		
Mitigating action		
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)		NO
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)		NO

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken; no equalities impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.

Budget Template

Service	Finance			Ref. FIN/6
Activity Heading	Corporate Finance			
Savings Name	Treasury Management - Investment			
Current Budget (£m)	£56.288m	Current Staffing (FTE)	N/A	

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

The Council can achieve a greater return from short term cash investments through investing cash for longer periods to achieve a higher return. Previous practice has been to invest surplus cash for short periods (on call or minimum fixed periods)

Returns for investments up to a year offer a higher rate than shorter term investments, and any temporary cash requirement can be managed through temporary borrowing.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.100	0
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.100	0

Service Impact
No impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

N/A

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

N/A

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	NO
If no, state why	This has no service impact. It solely relates to the investment of current cash balances.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	NO
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken; no equalities impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.

Budget Template

Service	Finance			Ref.	FIN/7
Activity Heading	Service - Wide				
Savings Name	Delete Current Vacant Posts and Vacancy Management				
Current Budget (£m)	£16.955m	Current Staffing (FTE)	527.2		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

The Service is currently forecasting a significant saving in financial year 2016/17 due to proactive work to deliver a range of efficiencies across the service, but principally within Revenues & Business Support, through the introduction of new ways of working.

Whilst the Service has reduced cost, the recent performance reports to Resources Committee in November 2016 and February 2017 showed improved performance (collection, benefits processing, and invoice processing) and reduced sickness absence.

Over the past year the Service has taken a proactive decision to hold posts vacant and this is reflected in the forecast underspend. So there is confidence that this saving can largely be achieved through deleting vacant posts and the non-filling of vacancies. However to minimise the financial risk a small number of staff will be allowed to leave under the Employee Early Release Scheme. There will be a need to hold any further posts that fall vacant to achieve the full balance of saving required.

The Service has a range of statutory requirements to ensure the ongoing financial management of the Council. It does have to review priorities to ensure that core functions and responsibilities are maintained, and this will require a more focussed and risk based approach.

The staff numbers affected are an estimate based on an average cost. Every effort will be made to minimise this, and as stated above, there is confidence that this can be largely achieved through existing current vacancy management and the non-filling of already vacant posts.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.556	23.0
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.556	23.0

Service Impact

Slight impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

None

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

There will be no significant changes, but there will be some reductions in service. This may involve reduced accounting support to services where there is no material financial risk; reduced internal audit where there is an over reliance on core systems which carry little risk; and increased processing times for benefit applications.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)	
1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	YES
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	Potential delay in processing benefit claims could lead to a delay in award and impact on rent and council tax collection
Mitigating action	Continue to improve methods of working to offset impact, as successfully undertaken over recent years
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	YES
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken; no equalities impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.	

Budget Template

Service	Corporate Development Service			Ref. CD/1
Activity Heading	Customer Services			
Savings Name	Review of Service Centre Operations			
Current Budget (£m)	£0.578m	Current Staffing (FTE)	25.5	

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

The Service Centre based at Alness handles telephone calls for the Council and deals with 1,000 calls per day and circa £20k per day of telephone payments operating between 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday and on Saturday mornings. Outside of these hours, an emergency service is provided by Aberdeen City Council. The Service Centre increasingly is also dealing with more email and on-line enquiries as customers choose other ways to contact the Council.

It is proposed to reduce the budget of the Service Centre by 10% which is equivalent to circa 2 FTE. This will be achieved by undertaking a lean review of the operations of the Centre to look for further efficiencies in the way it manages calls and enquiries. The impact may mean customers being asked to undertake more self-service such as using more on-line web services and the Automated Payments Telephone Line and/or it may require a reduction in the opening hours.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.057	2
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.057	2

Service Impact
Moderate impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

The change in service will depend on the outcome of the lean review but an example would be that the opening hours of the Service Centre may need to reduce and so the service would be available for fewer hours.

On-line web services and the Automated Payments Telephone Line will remain unaffected and available 24x7.

The emergency out of hours service provided by Aberdeen City Council will remain unaffected.

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

Customers will be asked, where feasible, to undertake more self-service including on-line web services and making payments using the Automated Payment Telephone Line rather than speaking to a Customer Services Assistant.

In addition to its Business As Usual activities, the Service Centre also provides adhoc Helpline services for Local and National Elections, Referendums, Council wide staffing initiatives, i.e. EERS support, Council Business Continuity events, i.e. loss of a major Council office, etc. A reduction in staffing levels will reduce the Service Centres capacity and flexibility to support these types of adhoc Helpline services.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	NO
--	-----------

If no, state why	The change will impact on all customers and should not disadvantage any particular group as mitigation is in place.	
If YES, state why		
Mitigating action	Telephone or face to face contact still remains for groups, such as elderly or disabled, who may struggle with automated or online services.	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)		NO
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)		NO
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken; mitigation identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.		

Budget Template

Service	Corporate Development Service			Ref.	CD/2
Activity Heading	Customer Services & Corporate Improvement Team				
Savings Name	Merger of Digital Teams				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.639m	Current Staffing (FTE)	16		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

It is proposed to review three teams - Customer Service Management, Digital Services and Digital First. Work is underway to look at how this can be achieved whilst continuing to deliver the services necessary for the council to continue to develop its website and social media presence and to continue on its journey to become a more digital council. This will include bringing the work of the Digital First Team into business as usual to ensure the council continues to develop on-line services and to improve uptake of digital services.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.060	2
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.060	2

Service Impact

Slight impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

None.

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

There could be a change in the service structure to better support the council's digital work and to improve effectiveness and efficiency.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	NO
If no, state why	Only slight impact on service delivery.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	NO
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken; no equalities impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.

Budget Template

Service	Corporate Development Service			Ref.	CD/3
Activity Heading	People & Transformation				
Savings Name	HR Services and Organisational Development				
Current Budget (£m)	£1.127m	Current Staffing (FTE)	16.2		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

The Service provides support to all Senior Management Teams, Directors and Committees in respect of HR Services and Organisational Development. This includes the team of HR Business Partners that are aligned to Services to work at the strategic level with senior teams to advise on and support change in service delivery structures. The HR Business Partners also undertake Organisational Development project work including: Equal Pay; Employee Early Release Scheme; Redundancy Schemes; TUPE; Leadership Development; Member and Elections Training.

It is proposed to reduce the budget by 10% and specifically review the structure and role of the HR Business Partners to ensure that the team is operating effectively and efficiently and is delivering the services required to support the Council through significant change as a result of this budget and Council Re-design. There is one Business Partner vacancy in the team, along with 0.4 FTE of an HR Assistant post which will need to be deleted.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.112	2.0
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.112	2.0

Service Impact
Significant impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

It is not envisaged that any aspect of the service will stop.

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

The reduction in Business Partners from 6 to 4 will dictate a change in the capacity to deliver against the following:

- Strategic HR support to Services
- Workforce Planning
- Organisational Development Projects (Recruitment, EERS, Redeployment, Attendance Management, Equal Pay)
- Senior Leadership, Members and Elections Training
- HR Equalities Programmes

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)	
1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	NO
If no, state why	This provides an internal service and it is considered that this service will continue.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	YES
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken; no equalities impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.	

Budget Template

Service	Corporate Development Service			Ref. CD/4
Activity Heading	Corporate Governance			
Savings Name	Legal, Democratic & Trading Standards			
Current Budget (£m)	£1.7m	Current Staffing (FTE)	57.89	

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

Savings will be made both from non-staffing budgets across Legal, Democratic Services and Trading Standards and by increasing income by means of reviewing and increasing some non-statutory charges.

It is not proposed to reduce staffing further given the significant reduction in Legal Services (4.4FTE – 25%) and Trading Standards (6 FTE- 33%) in 2016/17.

- Trading Standards is now operating at the statutory level of service and to reduce staffing further would result in the Council not being able to fulfil its statutory obligations. Savings will be found in ceasing participation in the 'Heavy Test Unit' and in reviewing both accommodation and subscription costs.
- Legal Services are similarly at a low level of staffing when compared with other similar councils and as Highland Council already spends more on external legal services than most other councils it would not be effective to reduce internal resource further, given the demand for legal services has not diminished. Modest savings will be found from within existing budgets.
- Democratic Services has removed posts over the last three financial years to meet savings targets and this means that a further reduction can only be achieved if there is a significant reduction in the level of Council and related business which currently stands at some 300 formal meetings per annum.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.062	0
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.062	0

Service Impact
Slight impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

None

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

None

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)		NO
If no, state why	No change to service.	
If YES, state why		
Mitigating action		
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)		NO

3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken; no equalities impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.	

Budget Template

Service	Chief Executive's Office			Ref.	CEO/1
Activity Heading	Members budget				
Savings Name	Reduction to 74 members				
Current Budget (£m)	£1.764m	Current Staffing (FTE)	2.5		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

The reduction in Councillors from 80 to 74 from May 2017 means that it will be possible to reduce the budgets for salaries, superannuation and national insurance. The reductions are as follows:

£101,358 salaries (6 X £16,893)

+

£ 26,536 Superann and NI

= £127,884 total

General Fund savings = 80% x £127,894 = £102,315

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.093	0
2018/19	0.010	0
2019/20		
Total	0.103	0

Service Impact
No impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

n/a

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

n/a

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	NO
If no, state why	The number of councillors is set nationally and is not a matter over which the Council has discretion.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	YES
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken; no equalities impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.

Budget Template

Service	Chief Executive's Office			Ref.	CEO/2
Activity Heading	Policy and Reform				
Savings Name	Various non-staffing budget reductions				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.430m	Current Staffing (FTE)	N/A		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

It is proposed to remove or reduce a number of non-staffing budgets from across the range of Policy And Reform budget headings. This comprises of:

Payments to 3rd sector

1. Reduce the budget for support to third sector organisations by **£38k**. These are non-aligned or grant budgets with no ongoing commitments affected. The majority of this budget was formally used as annual grant support for CVS organisations which ceased in 2012. This leaves a remaining budget of just under £18k to support the implementation of the Community Empowerment Act, including the development of participatory budgeting, building the capacity of local groups and supporting the local community partnerships the Council leads. This does not impact upon the grants to Disability Access Organisations.
2. Remove the budget of **£3.8k** for support for Community Council training and election publicity. More training can be provided on line and the administrative support grant can be used by Community Councils for travel expenses to access training where needed. Grants to Community Councils currently range from £761 to £3101.

Payments to suppliers

1. **£10k** - remove subsidy for transport for P7 children to attend Inverness Safe Highlander events. This will equalise the situation across Highland. Other Safe Highlanders events provide transport through payments from pupils/schools/sponsorship/ward grant. HLH are supporting in each area and sharing best practice. Schools impacted have already been informed of this change in approach and comes in conjunction with an increase in the number of event locations.
2. **£2k** - reduction in consultancy budget (from £5.7k to £3.7k). This would retain a small amount to cover the costs of any research or consultation which cannot be undertaken in-house.
3. **£2.5k** - remove policy subscriptions to equalities networks and publications. The only subscription to be maintained will be the £3k subscription to Browse Aloud, which is web-based support software which adds speech, reading, and translation to websites facilitating access and participation for people with Dyslexia, Low Literacy, English as a Second Language, and those with mild visual impairments.

Contribution to the Leader Programme

1. **£30k** - remove funding contribution to LEADER team in Development and Infrastructure. This was used to assist the administration of the previous LEADER programme however Scottish Government funding covers the administration of the new programme and therefore this funding is not required.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.086	0
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.086	0

Service Impact
Moderate impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

- Financial support to run Community Council training events and the production of elections material.
- Subsidy for transport for Inverness Safe Highlander event. This will not prevent the event proceeding in the same way as equivalent events are held in other parts of Highland.
- Funding to support administration of the LEADER programme. This is no longer required for the new LEADER programme.

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

Reduction in the third sector support budget will mean that any activity in this area will be limited and more focused in its scope. It will reduce our ability to support the same range of activity and particularly developmental work with third sector groups wanting to do more. A reduced budget will remain to support this activity

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)		NO
If no, state why	Funding remains within the third sector budget to support groups to participate which is a duty under the Community Empowerment Act. It does not impact upon funding to the Access Panels. The other reductions in funding do not impact upon specific protected groups and mainly relate to administrative support activity. There are no specific rural or poverty impacts as a result of these proposals.	
If YES, state why		
Mitigating action		
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)		N/A
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)		NO
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken; no impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.		

Budget Template

Service	Chief Executive's Office			Ref.	CEO/3
Activity Heading	Across the CEX Office team				
Savings Name	Reduce Staffing				
Current Budget (£m)	£1.048m	Current Staffing (FTE)	19		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

1. Delete vacant post and supporting budget from Corporate Communications
2. Delete Emergency Planning manager post and supporting budget

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.078	2
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.078	2

Service Impact

Slight impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

None – vacant post within corporate communications and the duties of the emergency planning post will be absorbed within the remaining team.

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

Manageable impacts from reduced capacity in both Corporate Communications and Emergency Planning teams.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	NO
If no, state why	There is no direct customer impact on the deletion of either post.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	NO
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken; no equalities impact. Full equalities impact assessment not required.

Budget Template

Service	Chief Executive's Office			Ref.	CEO/4
Activity Heading	Members budget				
Savings Name	Reduce spend on non-staffing budgets inc advertising responsibility allowances				
Current Budget (£m)	£1.764m	Current Staffing (FTE)	2.5		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

Delete Advertising Budget	£7,632
Delete Miscellaneous Property Costs Budget	£247
Delete Hire of Halls Budget	£381
Reduce Training Budget	£4,136
Reduce Office Equipment and Repairs	£500
Reduce stationary Budget	£220
Total	£13,116
	+
Reduce Special Responsibility Allowances	£55,000
	<u>£68,116</u>

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.068	0
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.068	0

Service Impact

Slight impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

No services will stop, but some will be delivered differently – see below.

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?**Advertising**

Instead of paying to place surgery adverts in local newspapers, the Council's website will be revised to have surgery dates and locations on each member's page and a link to councillor surgeries on the front page of the website to make it easy for people to navigate to the correct part of the site. Members will also be able to use their own and local social media pages to promote their surgeries. A template will be devised so that members are able to have posters printed and displayed locally. If members wished it, a final advert could be placed in their local newspapers advising of the change in arrangements and directing people to where the information will be made available in future.

An average of 15-18 members advertise their surgeries using newspaper adverts which means that over 60 members currently use other methods to publicise their surgeries. Even with less than a quarter of members using newspaper adverts, the advertising budget overspends every year, so removing the budget and finding other ways to publicise surgeries will make a saving *and* remove a budget pressure.

Special Responsibility Allowances (SRAs)

The Highland Council has a total allowable quantum for SRAs of £493,769. However, current arrangements for senior councillors have led to the budget already being underspent by £30,000. A further £25,000 is being sought to make a total recurring saving of £55,000 (11% of the total quantum). This would either require a reduction in the actual number of senior councillors attracting an enhanced salary or a reduction in the level of enhancement for some or all senior councillor positions. It is proposed that the incoming Council should determine how the new SRA quantum should be distributed.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	YES
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	Members of the public who read local newspapers to know when their councillors' surgeries will be held will no longer be able to use this as a source of information.
Mitigating action	By finding new and different ways to publicise members' surgeries it should be possible to reach an even wider group of people than those who read local newspapers. If members wished it, a final advert could be placed in their local newspapers advising of the change in arrangements and directing people to where the information will be made available in future.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	NO
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken; no impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref.	CS/1
Activity Heading	Street Cleaning				
Savings Name	Reduction in Street Cleaning Resources				
Current Budget (£m)	£3.029m	Current Staffing (FTE)	79		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

The Council has a duty under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 to keep its streets free from litter. The Code of Practice on Litter and Refuse 2006 provides standards to which Councils should clean their streets, and a measurement system that allows Councils to monitor their performance both internally and nationally. This measurement system, the Local Environmental Audit Management System, suggests that a score of 67 or above is acceptable. The latest audit of the cleanliness of the Council's streets undertaken by Keep Scotland Beautiful in August 2016 identified that the Council's current score is 88.1

The indicator currently being used nationally by the Local Government Benchmarking Framework is the percentage of streets that are in an acceptable condition. Over the last 6 years the Council has consistently been ranked in the top 5 Councils in Scotland in terms of street cleanliness. There was a dip last year but the latest validation audit by Keep Scotland Beautiful indicates that the Council's performance has improved significantly since then.

It is recognised that Street Cleaning makes a significant contribution to the attractive appearance of the Highlands for visitors, businesses and residents. It is proposed that existing standards are maintained in areas of high footfall such as City and Town Centres, and around tourist attractions and educational establishments. The savings will be realised by reducing street cleaning activity in residential areas and low usage routes throughout the Highlands

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.220	8
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.220	8

Service Impact

Moderate impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

The reduction in staff numbers from 79 to 71 will not have a major impact on the Council's ability to deliver its statutory requirement to keep streets, including the Trunk Roads, clean.

It is proposed that existing standards are maintained in areas of high footfall such as City and Town Centres, and around tourist attractions and educational establishments. The savings will be realised by reducing street cleaning activity in residential areas and low usage routes throughout the Highlands

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

There will be a reduction in street cleanliness leading to lower cleanliness score in our annual audits.

The effects of this saving can be mitigated through the development of a more strategic approach to tackling litter through increased engagement and enforcement, and the development of infrastructure to minimise the amount of litter created. Mitigation can also be provided through improvements in efficiency and productivity through increased mechanisation and use of technology

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	NO
If no, state why	The effects of this saving can be mitigated through the development of a more strategic approach to tackling litter through increased engagement and enforcement, and the development of infrastructure to minimise the amount of litter created. Mitigation can

	also be provided through improvements in efficiency and productivity through increased mechanisation and use of technology. No equalities, poverty, or rural impacts identified.	
If YES, state why		
Mitigating action	As above	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)		NO
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)		NO
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken; no equalities impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.		

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref.	CS/2
Activity Heading	Grounds Maintenance				
Savings Name	5% Reduction in Grass Cutting				
Current Budget (£m)	£2.3m	Current Staffing (FTE)	130		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

At the Community Services Committee on 3 November 2016, it was agreed that the grass cutting service would be delivered in-house across the Highlands. This was identified as providing the best option to the Council based on current budget provision and specification.

This proposal is for the amount of grass cutting carried out by the Council to be reduced by 5%, realising a saving of £115,000 and a reduction in 5 FTE. This saving will primarily be achieved by identifying, in consultation with Elected Members and communities:

1. Areas where grass cutting can be reduced or stopped, e.g. steep bankings (health and safety), and areas regarded as low amenity,
2. More efficient and effective ways of maintaining our grass open spaces, e.g. replacing strimming of edges with herbicide application; introduction of more efficient machinery; improved use of resources; removal and grassing over of unsightly shrub beds to increase productivity

It is proposed that the remaining grassed areas are re-zoned so that we continue to prioritise Town Centres, Cemeteries and Sports Facilities. The grass cutting specification for parks and residential areas will remain substantially unchanged, except for the proposals in points 1 and 2 above

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.115	5
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.115	5

Service Impact
Slight impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

Grass cutting on:

1. bankings which are identified as unsafe to cut will stop. This will include bankings in residential areas and on some main roads. This will be mitigated by cutting a strip of around 4 feet / 120 cm around the top and bottom of these bankings, which can act as nature strips/corridors
2. areas regarded as low amenity by either communities, Elected Members or officers. We would regard low amenity areas as those which suffer from flooding or poor drainage, or are remote from residential areas and have low usage

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

Whilst the removal of shrub beds may appear to be a low priority corporately, this can lead to an increase in complaints and enquiries. A detailed programme of proposals will be prepared

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	YES
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	Proposal may impact on how communities feel about their neighbourhoods
Mitigating action	Programme of consultation on proposals with Elected Members and communities. Focus will be on low amenity areas and won't impact upon areas of play.

2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	YES
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken; no equalities impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.	

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref.	CS/3
Activity Heading	Stores and Depots				
Savings Name	Rationalisation of Stores and Depots				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.176m	Current Staffing (FTE)	7		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

As part of the depot rationalisation project, the Service is merging the building maintenance depot in Inverness (Harbour Road) with the roads and amenities depot (Diriebught Road) in Inverness. This will enable us to merge the 2 stores functions. A review of the posts within the combined store will lead to 1 FTE reduction.

The saving is dependent on the project for the depot move being delivered on time.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.035	1
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.035	1

Service Impact

No impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

None

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

None

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	NO
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	NO
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken; no equalities impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref. CS/5
Activity Heading	Harbours and Ferries			
Savings Name	Increase in Harbour Dues			
Current Budget (£m)	£0.426m	Current Staffing (FTE)	N/A	

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

Increase harbour dues at 2 sites by 10% in year 1 to generate an additional £42,000.

For 2016/17 Sconser budget shows an income target of £214,400, increase by 10%.

For 2016/17 Raasay budget shows an income target of £212,000, increase by 10%.

Uig budget shows an income target of £868,000. Limited scope to increase this in the short term due to ongoing negotiations with Transport Scotland over the Uig redevelopment. (Estimated value circa £23m).

The proposed increases will have to be approved by Transport Scotland. As with Uig, they will require a financial appraisal to be undertaken to ascertain if the increases are required and how they will be spent at the Sconser and Raasay locations.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.042	0
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.042	0

Service Impact

Slight impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

None

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

Although the routes are subject to Road Equivalent Tariff (RET), the increases may lead to an increase in fares in future years.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	YES
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	Although route is subject to RET, the increases may lead to an increase in fares in future years, any equality impact would depend on whether this would affect concessionary fares. There is also potential for rural and poverty impacts on local communities if fares were to increase.
Mitigating action	None.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	NO
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken – potential impact but full equality impact assessment not required.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref.	CS/6
Activity Heading	Harbours and Ferries				
Savings Name	Increased Margin on Marine Fuel Sales				
Current Budget (£m)	(£0.420m) income	Current Staffing (FTE)	N/A		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

We sell on average 22 million litres of marine fuel each year. A mark up of 3p per litre would generate a surplus of £660,000 (would equate to a 6% margin - currently 3.8%). Current year profit estimated to be £420,000 so increase would be £240,000 in year 1.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.240	0
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.240	0

Service Impact

Slight impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

None

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

See risk section below

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	YES
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible increase in complaints from customers over high fuel prices. • Customer pressure to allow other competitive fuel suppliers into the Council Harbours and complaints to Monopolies Commission if refused. • Risk of potential drop in fuel sales by volume as customers switch to purchase fuel from other suppliers. • Risk of significant loss of Harbour Dues from fishing if major customers choose to land in alternative Ports and Harbours. • Smaller Scottish fishing vessels may find it more challenging to trade profitably as their overheads increase. • Risk of possible loss of ancillary jobs in fragile communities if vessels avoid Highland Council Harbours, subsequent damage to local economies from lack of custom (shops, restaurants, etc.). • Risk that higher dues and fuel prices could deter leisure vessels calling in and refuelling in Council harbours. <p>Poverty and rural impact risks highlighted above in terms of possible loss of ancillary jobs and impact on local economies, and if commercial users go elsewhere.</p>
Mitigating action	None.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	NO

3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken; no equalities impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.	

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref.	CS/8
Activity Heading	Stores and Depots				
Savings Name	Work with Third Parties and Partners				
Current Budget (£m)	(£0.334m) income	Current Staffing (FTE)	N/A		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

Income generation through carrying out work with third parties and partners.

There are a number of partner agencies who have garages/workshops in Highland and there are opportunities to share facilities and staff. Early engagement has started with Police and BEAR and other partners, including NHS Highland, who are keen to discuss options. This initiative also aligns itself with the stores and depots rationalisation project.

In addition to partners there is an opportunity to carry out work for the lease company that provides Highland Council with its light fleet. This would cover inspection and repair work.

In order for the Council to generate an income there may be a requirement to upgrade some of the workshop facilities and review staffing levels. Back office procedures would need to be developed e.g. booking and invoicing processes.

The most significant risk to this opportunity is if partners change their strategic direction or their timescales are not aligned with ours.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.060	0
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.060	0

Service Impact
No impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

None

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

None.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)		NO
If no, state why	This initiative will continue to deliver a maintenance service that is demand led and does not have customer, equalities, poverty or rural implications.	
If YES, state why		
Mitigating action		
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)		NO

3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken; no equalities impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.	

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref. CS/9
Activity Heading	Stores and Deports			
Savings Name	Increase Fees for Work of Bio Hazard Team			
Current Budget (£m)	(£0.085m) income	Current Staffing (FTE)	N/A	

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

Increase charges for the services of the Bio-Hazard team by 10%.

The Bio Hazard team is part of the Logistics section and undertakes bio-hazard work when called upon to do so. The current income is budgeted to be £85,000 for 2016/17. Increasing the charge by 10% would generate an additional £8,500 in 2017/18.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.008	0
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.008	0

Service Impact

No impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

None

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

None

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)		NO
If no, state why	This is fee increase to the HRA and external service users and has no customer, equalities, poverty or rural implications.	
If YES, state why		
Mitigating action		
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)		NO
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)		NO
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken; no equalities impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.		

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		Ref.	CS/10
Activity Heading	Recycling			
Savings Name	Introduction of Charge for Garden Waste Collection			
Current Budget (£m)	£0	Current Staffing (FTE)	21	

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

This proposal involves the introduction of a charge of £30 per participating household for the collection of garden waste. This service is currently free of charge to 67,000 households throughout the Highlands

Initial modelling has taken place which has identified that £600,000 net additional income could be generated based on a 30% uptake of the service within existing households. A similar scheme was introduced by Angus Council in July 2016, and we have obtained information on its implementation

It is proposed that, if agreed, a minimum 3 month mobilisation period will be required. This will allow development of back office systems to collect customer information, payment details and optimisation of collection routes. Web page development will also be required to publicise the service changes and allow payment online

The £30 per household charge has been identified to be at the lower end of charges where they have been introduced, and we are aware that the average per household charge in England is £42. The relatively low price can contribute to the success of the scheme, as can a mid-season (i.e. July) implementation date due to the demand for the service at this time

It is also proposed that the charge is for a fixed period, for example from 1 July - 30 June, and that we do not introduce a pro rata payment based on a customer's start date

Experience of other Councils is that there is no significant increase in waste diverted to the residual waste stream, although many of them have smaller residual bins (140 litre) which reduces available capacity for green waste to be disposed of in this way. In addition, other Councils have not experienced a noticeable increase in fly tipping.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.600	0
2018/19		0
2019/20		0
Total	0.600	0

Service Impact

No impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

Free garden waste collection will stop. However, residents will still be able to dispose of garden waste free of charge at Household Waste Recycling Centres

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

None.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	YES
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	The changes will only be implemented where the Garden Waste Collection scheme already takes place. This may impact upon those on low incomes.
Mitigating action	The charge of £30 a year is relatively low and should not adversely affect low income households

2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	NO
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken; no equalities impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.	

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref. <table border="1"><tr><td>CS/11</td></tr></table>	CS/11
CS/11					
Activity Heading	Refuse Collection				
Savings Name	Increased Charges Associated with Commercial Waste Collection				
Current Budget (£m)	£2.6m	Current Staffing (FTE)	N/A		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

The Council provides commercial waste collection services to approximately 4,500 businesses throughout the Highlands. These services include residual waste, recycling and food waste collections. The size of business varies from bed and breakfast establishments to national supermarkets

As well as collecting waste from our own customers, Community Services also collects waste in the Highlands on behalf of private sector waste management companies. The logistics of these companies do not cover their nationwide customers in the Highlands, for example, supermarket chains, and the Council is therefore sub-contracted by them to collect waste.

This proposal is for:

1. Commercial waste collection charges to be increased by 10% throughout the Highlands
2. For a 30% premium to be charged where the Council provides a waste collection service on behalf of a private sector waste management company, and
3. That a £30 administration fee is introduced to cover the Council's costs when amending a customer's waste collection contract with the Council

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.260	0
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.260	0

Service Impact

No impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

None

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

Will need to consider how this will affect the 461 Council premises that are serviced by Community Services.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	YES
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	The change will impact on the Council's commercial waste collection customers
Mitigating action	Consultation will take place with our commercial waste customers, and payment systems will be updated to provide easier payment methods
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	YES

3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken; no equalities impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.	

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref. CS/12
Activity Heading	Bulky Uplifts			
Savings Name	Increase in Charges for Bulky Waste Collections			
Current Budget (£m)	(£0.077m) income	Current Staffing (FTE)	N/A	

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

The Council provides a Bulky Uplift collection service to all households in the Highlands. The charge for this service is £18.20 for 3 items and £36.40 for 6 items. The income budget for this Financial Year is £70,700, and the estimated cost of providing the service is £121,000 per annum. The resources used to provide this service are also used for bin deliveries and clearing fly tipping, and further work is required in calculating the exact cost of delivering this service

It is proposed that the charge for the service is increased to £30 per uplift for 3 items to generate an additional £60,000 of income to allow for close to full cost recovery.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.060	0
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.060	0

Service Impact

No impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

None

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

None

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	YES
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	The charge will be applied consistently across the Highlands in terms of demographics and geography however it may impact on individuals on lower incomes who would struggle to pay the increased charges. It may also impact on older people and disabled people who would otherwise struggle to make alternative arrangements.
Mitigating action	Signposting to community/third sector groups providing an alternative recycling services
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	NO
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken; potential negative impact, mitigation identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref.	CS/13
Activity Heading	Flood Alleviation				
Savings Name	Reduce Flood Alleviation Budget				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.157m	Current Staffing (FTE)	N/A		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

Reduce £100,000 from the Flood Alleviation Budget. The necessary maintenance and improvement works are identified through watercourse inspections. (Balance of £57,000 retained to support maintenance of Inverness Flood alleviation Scheme).

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.100	0
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.100	0

Service Impact

Slight impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

There will be no dedicated revenue budget for Flood Alleviation Works. Works identified through watercourse inspections will require to be funded through Area Roads budgets, or if significant, through the capital programme. The capital programme already includes identified funding for the following:

- Flood Prevention Schemes £3.375m
- Minor Flood Works £3.2m
- Potential Vulnerable Area - Flood Mitigation £7.5m

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

There may be less funding available for other roads maintenance functions to accommodate works required through watercourse inspections.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	YES
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	Properties within flood risk areas will be at increased risk of flooding.
Mitigating action	Minor maintenance/cleaning of watercourses could be funded through the Area Roads Budgets, Other more involved repairs will involve capital funding
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	NO
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken; no equalities impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref.	CS/14
Activity Heading	Fleet				
Savings Name	Reduction in Vehicle Idling to Save Fuel Costs				
Current Budget (£m)	£2.75m	Current Staffing (FTE)	N/A		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

For year 2015/16 Council vehicles used 2,791,173 litres of fuel at a cost of £2.62 million. It is anticipated that fuel consumption for year 2016/17 will be similar however fuel costs have increased over the period and as a result it is estimated that overall expenditure will be nearer £2.75 million for the year.

All large HGV's within the Council fleet are fitted with telematics which enables us to monitor aspects of vehicle usage. This includes driver behaviour, vehicle journeys and engine idling. There will always be instances where engines need to idle to complete certain tasks e.g. discharging loads and refuse collection, but reports being generated from the telematics system indicate there is significant idling taking place when there is no operational need.

The system reports that £100,000 is spent on fuel whilst engines are left idling. The Service has a target to reduce the cost of unnecessary idling by 50% to generate a saving of £50,000 in fuel costs.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.050	0
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.050	0

Service Impact

No impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

None

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

None

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	NO
If no, state why	The saving will be as a result of driver behaviour and operational changes.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	NO
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken; no equalities impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref.	CS/15
Activity Heading	Environmental & Amenity Services				
Savings Name	Treatment of Residual Waste - Alternative Medium Term Arrangements				
Current Budget (£m)	£4.0m	Current Staffing (FTE)	N/A		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

The Council currently landfills approximately 71,000 tonnes of residual waste through:

1. Its own landfill sites at Seater and Grainish, and
2. Contractual arrangements with SUEZ (formerly SITA) in Inverness and Locheil Logistics in Lochaber

The contracts with SUEZ and Locheil Logistics are scheduled to end in September 2017, with an option to extend both contracts for 2 years available

SUEZ are proposing that they build a waste processing plant in Inverness that will create Refuse Derived Fuel from the residual waste that the Council delivers to them. In return, for a 2-year extension, they have offered a discount of £3 per tonne on the current contract price. SUEZ currently disposes of approximately 32,000 tonnes of refuse on behalf of the Council and the savings will equate to approximately £96,000 for the two years of the contract extension.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.096	0
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.096	0

Service Impact

No impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

None

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

None

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	NO
If no, state why	There will be no change to the Council's current waste management practices
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	None needed
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	NO
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken; no equalities impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref.	CS/16
Activity Heading	Environmental & Amenity Services				
Savings Name	Introduction of Charges for Providing Wheeled Bins at Residential Properties				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.117m	Current Staffing (FTE)	N/A		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

Community Services spend approximately £117,000 per annum on new and replacement bins for residential properties. The following arrangements are currently in place for providing bins:

1. Residual (green) bin – purchased by property owner where new property
2. Blue and brown bin – provided free of charge by Council

It is proposed that, by charging for all new or replacement wheelie bins, up to £33,000 additional income can be generated. The only exception to this will be where the Council has lost or damaged a bin.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.033	0
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.033	0

Service Impact

No impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

None

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

None

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	YES
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	The proposed charge will be made to all residents across the Highlands. No rural or equalities impact identified however individuals on low incomes may be impacted.
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	YES
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken; no equalities impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref.	CS/17
Activity Heading	Environmental & Amenity Services				
Savings Name	Introduction of New and Increase In Existing Charges for Environmental Health Services				
Current Budget (£m)	N/A	Current Staffing (FTE)	N/A		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

Environmental Health generates income through a number of sources, including administration of miscellaneous licensing, monitoring private water supplies, providing export certificates for food businesses and acting as a contractor for shellfish sampling on behalf of Food Standards Scotland.

Informal benchmarking has taken place with other local authorities within the UK, which has identified that the fees charged by Highland Council for food export certificates are lower than many authorities and do not reflect the resources required to meet demand of approximately 1800 certificates per year.

In relation to private water supplies, the Council has not applied charges for some aspects of this work however the Regulations make provision for LA's to charge a person for reasonable expenses

It is therefore proposed that the following schedule of fee increases is implemented to generate an additional £93,000 of income.

Table 1, proposals for increasing existing or introducing new charges for Environmental Health

Proposal	Additional Income
Increase in charge for export certificates from £20 to £60	£72,000 (based on 1,800 requests per annum)
Introduce administration fee of £15 for preparatory work in relation to a risk assessment of private water supplies. This is permitted by Regulation.	£11,000 (based on 700 requests per annum)
Introduce fee of £50 for carrying out initial risk assessments a private water supply. Apply for all newly identified Type A supplies. For Type B £50 for assessment as part of house sale, £25 otherwise. This is permitted by Regulation. Also introduce a fee of £50 for reviewing a Type A risk assessment of a private water supply. This is permitted by Regulation.	£10,000 (based on 200 per annum)
Total	£93,000

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.093	0
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.093	0

Service Impact

No impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

None

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

As per Table 1 above

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	YES
--	------------

If no, state why	
If YES, state why	These proposals will affect food exporting businesses, and premises with private water supplies which are more likely to be in rural areas.
Mitigating action	Consult food exporting business and consider tiered introduction in 2017/18.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	NO
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken – no equalities impact identified, full equality impact assessment not required	

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref.	CS/21
Activity Heading	Public Transport – Concessionary Fares				
Savings Name	Rail Concessions				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.120m	Current Staffing (FTE)	N/A		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

The Council funds half fare travel on trains within the Highland boundaries for Highland residents who are entitled to free bus travel (i.e. aged 60 or over, or disabled). We also participate in the National Blind Travel Scheme which allows free rail travel across Scotland for blind and visually impaired people.

The proposal **will not** affect:

- blind and visually impaired people (as per the National Blind Travel Scheme); and
- people who require a companion when travelling due to disability (Identified by "+1" on the entitlement card).

Half fare rail concessions for all other entitled Highland residents will cease.

Ability to take the full saving in 2017-18 depends on when renegotiation of the agreement with ScotRail can be completed.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.120	0
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.120	0

Service Impact
Significant impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

Half fare rail concessions for the majority of currently entitled Highland residents will cease.

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

None

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	YES
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	Loss of entitlement to half fare travel affecting people aged over 60, and disabled people. There is a clear impact on older people and disabled people, however it is not possible to quantify the extent of the impact and mitigation is identified below.
Mitigating action	Free travel remains available by bus. Also, residents of the areas served by the Far North, Kyle and West Highland lines can purchase Highland Railcards for £9 per year, which gives them the same discount on these routes only. The Highland Railcard is funded by ScotRail.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	NO

3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	YES
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken; potential negative impact identified and a full equalities impact assessment undertaken.	

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref. C&L/2
Activity Heading	Commissioned Adult Services			
Savings Name	Reduced budget for Adult Social Care			
Current Budget (£m)	£91.82m	Current Staffing (FTE)	NHSH	

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

Under the terms of the Local Government Finance Settlement, announced by the Scottish Government in December 2016, local authorities are being allowed to reduce their contribution to Adult Care by a maximum sum of £80m below the funding provided in 2016/17. The Highland share of this sum is £3.48m. Although largely reflective of the Integrated Joint Board (IJB) model, it also applies to the Lead Agency Model.

In order to support the continuing shift in the balance of care and the development of community-based services, it is proposed that the saving is significantly below the level permitted by the Scottish Government, at £1.4m or around 1.6%. This is in line with the overall objectives of NHS Highland and Highland Council, and there should be continuing close liaison between the organisations as we take this forward.

This cash reduction is more than offset by a cash uplift for Adult Care as Health Boards have been required by the Scottish Government to allocate specific resources for this policy objective. The sum for Highland is estimated at £4.6m. This money is largely required to deliver the full year cost of funding the Living Wage for all providers, which now includes sleepovers, and does not therefore address wider cost and demand pressures within the service.

It should be noted that the real terms impact is higher than 1.6%, as inflation and cost pressures need to be taken into account. In the Lead Agency model, these pressures fall on NHS Highland, as does the need to identify balancing savings. The NHS believes that it needs to fund pressures totalling £10.6m, which as well as the Living Wage includes pay and price inflation, apprenticeship levy, and ongoing cost of care packages (both increasing demand for new packages, as well as higher care demands of existing packages).

Total available funding will therefore reduce by around £7.1m in real terms when all the above changes are factored in.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	1.174 *	TBC
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	1.174	TBC**

Service Impact

Significant impact on service

* note that a £1.174m cash saving to THC will require savings of around £7.1m in NHSH once cost pressures are factored in.

** note there will be an impact on staff in NHSH and the independent sector – to be quantified

Which aspects of the service will stop?

No specific services will stop

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

NHS Highland has indicated that it would meet any reduction in the Council's funding by reducing high cost Learning Disability and Physical Disability care packages. Based on current estimates around 90 LD/PD clients would be affected (with the care package having to be capped at around 300% of the national care home rate). This decision will require to be discussed with individuals and their families and may be subject to challenge.

The NHS has indicated that all existing packages will require to be reviewed, and that reductions will be required in some, together with delays in assessments and/or delayed discharge from hospital.

Any reduction in funding will impact on the ability to shift the balance of care away from hospital based services, and could result in clients not receiving the appropriate level of care.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)		YES
If no, state why		
If YES, state why	The proposal will directly impact upon a number of individuals with a learning disability and/or physical disability who are in receipt of care packages. This may result in their needs not being fully met in the most appropriate way, and having reduced choice and control over their preferred options for social care, with little ability to consider care at home options. It may disproportionately impact upon those in remote and rural areas given the need to potentially receive care in a care home setting rather than in a home environment, given the availability of care home spaces close to some of these communities. This will disproportionately impact on people who require a social care funded package as they do not have the means to finance any part of the care package themselves.	
Mitigating action	<p>NHS Highland will need to review all cases to prioritise resources. Working alongside families to review care packages could provide opportunities to promote access to other services and support and to explore suitable alternatives.</p> <p>The Council Redesign Board has indicated that it wishes to undertake a review of Adult Care in conjunction with NHSH, and further consideration will be given to minimising the impact of budget reductions. Both organisations will work together to plan and scrutinise the building of community services.</p>	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)		NO
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)		NO

Equalities Summary

NHS Highland has undertaken a Person Centred Planning Assessment which incorporates an equalities impact assessment. A summary of the potential negative impacts detailed in this assessment are highlighted above.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/3
Activity Heading	Commissioned HLH Services				
Savings Name	Reduced budget for HLH services				
Current Budget (£m)	£14.359m	Current Staffing (FTE)	HLH		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

The Council has agreed a funding formula with the Board of High Life Highland whereby changes to the annual Management Fee are based on the same percentage reduction faced by the Council from the Scottish Government. In addition, HLH is then responsible for funding all additional costs [£0.581m in 2017/18] such as annual staff pay increases, pensions, increased VAT and the apprentice levy.

A total management fee reduction of £0.260m is proposed. This reflects a 2% saving on the management fee and is slightly lower than the overall grant funding reduction faced by the Council.

£0.148m of this is already accounted for in the Council's advance planning, meaning a cash reduction of £0.112m. This, together with the advance planning figure and the additional costs described above, result in the overall savings target for HLH for 2017/18 being £0.841m, equivalent to 6.6% of the management fee.

There is a separate arrangement for the funding of independent museums, administered by HLH on behalf of the Council, which is not affected by this saving.

The detail of savings measures to address the £0.841m target are for the HLH Board to determine. The Chief Executive indicates that HLH will progress increases in income, efficiencies, removal of management posts and service reductions that will be required, as summarised below.

Income

High Life scheme growth, targeted price increases, fund raising, additional earned income and decreasing cost of sales/operating deficit.

Efficiencies

Rationalisation of posts, management reductions (see below) and co-management of services.

Service Reductions

Minimise front line effect wherever possible

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.112	HLH
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.112	HLH

Service Impact
Moderate impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

N/A

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

Removal of a Head of Service post, library and business support posts.

Adult learning - continuation of focus on Literacies and ESOL

Reduction from 3 to 2 Community Language Assistants

The service level agreements (SLAs), where HLH buys back services from the Council HLH will be reviewed with the leads in each of the Council services, to agree any amendments to current levels of service to reflect their budget savings targets

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)	
1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	NO
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	There are no equalities or rural impacts identified and poverty impacts are avoided by minimal increase in price of membership and targeted increases of fees – concessions remain in place.
Mitigating action	Concessions remain in place.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	NO
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken – no equalities impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.	

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/4
Activity Heading	Family Teams				
Savings Name	Reduction in staffing				
Current Budget (£m)	£16.385m	Current Staffing (FTE)	395		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

The Family Teams provide front-line health and social care services to children and families, covering Early Years, School Years and Care & Protection. There are some linked specialist services for children with a disability and for youth offending.

The proposal is to achieve the saving through a re-design of the management structure, reducing the number of Practice Leads, as below, while re-establishing a level of equity in the distribution of these posts across the authority. It is anticipated that these changes can be achieved through redeployment and vacancy management.

In addition, it is intended that new responsibilities within the Children & Young People Act (Scotland) 2014 should be absorbed by the Family Teams.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.250	2.7
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.250	2.7

Service Impact
Slight impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

There will be less management time available to support functions such as service development and improvement, collaborative planning with other agencies, chairing children's planning meetings and dealing with queries and complaints.

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

There will be reduced capacity for staff supervision and support. Some managers will have increased travel time.

There may be an impact on some District Manager posts due to staff reductions at Practice Lead level. There may be a reliance on more senior management posts, such as the Children's Services Managers, to dedicate more time to operational issues. There may be a need to review Job descriptions to take account of this impact.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	YES
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	The Family Teams provide the full range of health and social care support to children and families. These changes will impact mainly on the capacity of managers to support staff in the delivery of universal, targeted and statutory services. It will impact across several areas in Highland but many of the families in receipt of services will have a high level of need.

Mitigating action	New job descriptions will be produced if required and staff briefed on the new structure. Priority will be given to delivery of services to families with the highest level of need. The focus on management posts protects front-line staff who are customer-facing. Staff will be redeployed where possible, retaining skills and experience in the service. There are currently 4FTE vacancies in Practice Lead posts.	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	YES	
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO	
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken; mitigation identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.		

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref. <table border="1"><tr><td>C&L/6</td></tr></table>	C&L/6
C&L/6					
Activity Heading	Childcare and Early Learning				
Savings Name	Reduction in Early Years Budgets				
Current Budget (£m)	£15.8m	Current Staffing (FTE)	N/A		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

Rationalisation of funding to a number of Partner Centres that currently deliver early learning and childcare. Currently of the 57 partner providers, 27 provide full day care and 30 provide sessional time only (not wraparound care) thereby not addressing local and national priorities for flexibility. The priority is to review those that only provide sessional time, where there is other capacity to deliver the provision locally.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.300	0
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.300	0

Service Impact

Impact will be on voluntary and third sector partners who are not delivering a flexible service. The impact on local authority will be an increased number of children in LA settings.
Significant impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

Delivery of Early learning and Childcare within some partner centres may be affected and it will be for the provider to decide what service they will offer if funding is withdrawn. They could opt to close their group or stay open and offer provision to under 3 year olds.

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

The impact will be on the partner centres who do not offer flexible day care. The impact on local authority provision is likely to be the increased numbers of children accessing already established LA nurseries.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	YES
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	YES – impact on staff in the vol/3 rd sector organisations affected. Could impact in rural economy where centres close in rural areas. Staff in the main are female and so it will impact disproportionately by gender.
Mitigating action	Some staff may be able to be employed by the local authority to meet staffing compliment for the increased number of children attending LA nurseries as a consequence. Private nurseries may be able to market provision to different age groups.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	NO
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken – low or non-direct equality impact anticipated. Full equalities impact assessment not required.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/8
Activity Heading	Hostels				
Savings Name	Integration of Staffin Respite Centre and additional income				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.208m	Current Staffing	3.03		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

1. Integrate the Staffin Respite Centre into the Elgin Residence, Portree High School. Savings will be achieved from management (£30,000), grocery and utility costs (£15,000) and relief staffing (£20,000). There will be reduced savings in Year One, to allow time for implementation.
2. Additional income from Hostels (trials in Year One) from holiday lets (£50,000). This is the subject of a redesign mini-review.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.100	1.0
2018/19	0.015	0
2019/20		
Total	0.115	1.0

Service Impact
Moderate impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

None

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

There may be some reduced access to respite provision at some times.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	YES
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	Families will have a shorter distance to travel to access the respite care Young people will have access to greater range of facilities: swimming pool, shops, and library. Generally, levels of respite will be unaffected. There is a risk of reduced opportunities for respite for children with high level needs, such requests are infrequent and alternative solutions would be found in discussion with families.
Mitigating action	Operating hours will be based on customer usage patterns. Should there be impact on respite provision, alternative solutions would be sought.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	NO
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	YES

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken; potential positive impact, and mitigation identified where there is some potential negative impact. Full equalities impact assessment not required.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/10
Activity Heading	Resources Teams and Property Costs				
Savings Name	Reduction in Service Information and Support Team				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.4m	Current Staffing (FTE)	17.8		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

Review of workload and responsibilities within the Service Information and Support Team, including staff reduction.

This team is responsible for training and support in relation to the SEEMIS schools management information system, the Carefirst social care system, support of other Care and Learning information processes and projects, and Customer Services.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.041	1.08
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.041	1.08

Service Impact

Moderate impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

Reduction in support for projects and ongoing process improvement. This may prevent progress with projects which could otherwise lead to service improvements and efficiency savings across the Service.

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

A review of support provided to system users within the Service may also have to be considered.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)		NO
If no, state why	The saving proposal would impact only on internal Council staff who receive support from the team. It is not envisaged there would be any direct external customer impact.	
If YES, state why		
Mitigating action		
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)		N/A
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)		NO

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken; no equalities impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure			Ref.	D&I/1
Activity Heading	Environment				
Savings Name	Reduction of Ranger Service and Access Team and Restructuring of Environmental Projects Team				
Current Budget (£m)	£1.753m	Current Staffing (FTE)	34.4		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

1. The proposed saving includes a reduction of the Ranger Service with a gross saving of £64k and the loss of 2 FTE from the current total of 12 FTE. It is proposed to consult on the transfer of the remaining team of 10 Rangers to Highlife Highland who could take over the management of day to day activities and assist in the development of a more commercial approach. The Ranger Service currently provides many events, guided walks and school visits which aim to help raise awareness and encourage appreciation of the scenery, wildlife and heritage of the Highlands. This wide range of events and activities is aimed at local communities and visitors alike. The Countryside Rangers also have responsibilities for; the promotion of the Scottish Outdoor Access Code; contributing to the Highland Council's Biodiversity duties; promoting Eco-school status for all schools in the Highland Council area; and are involved in the management of a large number of countryside sites throughout the Highland Council Area.
2. Reduce the resources put into the Access team to make a saving of £130k. There are a number of statutory requirements regarding Access, including:
 - The duty to uphold access rights by commenting on planning applications(165 average pa), resolving disputes, responding to enquiries/ complaints (234 average p.a.), checking routes (average 377km p.a), liaison with organisations, processing exemptions, enforcement of legislation.
 - Production of a Core Path Plan, review & amendment and powers to maintain.
 - Establish a Local Access Forum and consult on core path plan and access rights (32 issues p.a)
 - Publicise the Outdoor Access Code
 - Public Rights of Way- kept free from obstruction.
3. Deliver the Town and Countryside Environmental Capital Projects by restructuring and relocating the Projects Team to the Project Design Unit or Property team (Capital Programme funded). By moving the team to locate within the teams delivering the wider capital programme, there will be a saving on the revenue budget of £177k. The team will continue to deliver the environmental capital projects work but will be funded through the capital programme. The team will also be involved in the wider delivery of capital and property related projects.

The changes identified above will deliver an overall saving of £371k.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.371	2
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.371	2

Service Impact
Slight impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

The Highland Ranger Service will reduce in overall size and geographical reach so some activities will have to be reviewed.

The Access team will have to pare back their activities to focus on statutory tasks, including reviewing the number of local access fora and significantly reducing the number of access projects that are financially supported by the team.

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

Reducing the size and geographical reach of the Ranger Service from 12 to 10 will have an impact on the Council's engagement with Highland Communities in respect of tourism, school visits (Environment Curriculum for Excellence), ranger events, facilities management, community projects, biodiversity projects, local conservation projects particularly in deprived areas e.g. Merkinch, the summer events programme, health and wellbeing. Youth work & award schemes, job placements, voluntary work, assisting statutory outdoor access delivery, promoting the Outdoor Access Code, promotion of Gaelic in the landscape, awareness of sustainability initiatives, biological recording. It will require a realignment of priorities, geographic coverage and a changed plan for the following year – that said – a wide range of activity will be maintained, and the possible move to Highlife Highland may offer up other opportunities to deliver the Service in a different way.

The reduction in the access budget would have the following impact:

1. Upholding access rights – the same number of enquiries & complaints and exemption applications are likely to be received but the ability to process them will be reduced and require a prioritisation on how they are managed. The number and frequency of route checking could be reduced to only those affected by complaints & enquiries.
2. The significant reduction of project budget will affect our ability to put in place physical access solutions and reduce the length of core path maintained. The knock on impact is that paths in poor condition increase the number of complaints received.
3. Local Access Fora - there are currently 5 Fora meeting twice a year. It was already planned to reduce this to 4 Fora,. It is of great advantage that each Forum discusses issues in locations it is familiar with. They would not be confident of providing useful advice without this familiarity; a further reduction in number of Fora increases this risk, but could be managed.
4. Publicising the Outdoor Access Code- this is done informally in all contacts and formally on any publications. Again would be reduced as the effect of the above changes, but this is not a statutory role, and is well covered by many other organisations and the Ranger Service.
5. Public Rights of Way- many enquiries are received and an assessment is made. Often coincides with 1. above. These enquiries will have to be managed as resources allow, and investigations need to be undertaken to assess whether there may be different ways of spreading the load across the Service.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	YES
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	School pupils Tourists and local people Disadvantaged areas Additional needs Wider Community There is potential impact in rural areas and deprived communities as identified above. In particular as the service encourages people to visit and access the countryside there is a potential knock-on effect in the rural economy.
Mitigating action	More targeted activities Greater emphasis on income generation
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	YES
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken – potential impact, but mitigation identified. Full equality assessment not required

Budget Template

Service	Development and Infrastructure			Ref.	D&I/2
Activity Heading	Economy and Regeneration				
Savings Name	Revise European Business Gateway and Tourism Services				
Current Budget (£m)	£1.243m	Current Staffing (FTE)	18.5		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

To provide for the scale of the savings proposed has required all aspects of service and staffing to be reviewed and reorganised including some deletion of activity.

Staffing: Delete one of two Graduate Development posts and two local area Business Gateway 1:1 advisers. Remaining staff, on top of existing functions, will need to take on additional adviser, sectoral and inward investment related functions.

Delete Cruise Liners promotional activity; Highland tourism marketing; membership of EU networks; and sponsorship of major sporting events.

Reduce Destination Management Organisation support by 50%; lobbying, business collaboration and inward investment activity by 61%; individual business growth support by 25% with associated pulldown of European funds.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.305	2
2018/19	0.135	1
2019/20		
Total	0.440	3

Service Impact

Significant impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

Council promotional activity associated with Cruise Liners – stop welcome plaques, Cruise Scotland membership and promotional attendance at trade fair.

Council financial contribution to Highland tourism marketing – no purchase of Highland specific marketing activity from Visit Scotland. Council £60k investment secured an average rate of £55 for every £1 spent.

EU networks – withdrawal from partner organisations used to lobby/promote Highland interests in Europe

Major Events – national funding packages require local match, hence potential loss of events to Highland and significant economic impact.

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

Business Gateway – the 1:1 business local area advisor team will reduce from 7 to 5 advisers, resulting in risk of 70 less start-up businesses and 150 less existing business securing advice.

Council unable to match secured European funding, with risk that 120 business unable to access specialist advisory services and graduate placement grants, risk that 54fte jobs will not be created and loss of £177k ERDF.

Reduced funding (£50k to £25k) to Destination Management Organisations will reduce their ability to lead on the local development of the tourism industry and sustain its growth across Highland (15.6% growth over three years).

The Council supports a wide range of lobbying, business collaboration and inward investment activity including All Energy 2017 (a joint initiative with HIE and local energy business supply chain), Scottish Cities Alliance (collaboration with Scottish cities and Scot Govt. to secure economic investment and infrastructure), school Youth Enterprise Scotland/SCDI Young Engineers etc. This wide range of activity will need to be reduced by 61%.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)	
1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	YES
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	Yes. There will be a reduction in the number of local area Business Gateway advisers with a more centralised service being provided this is likely to impact on the ability to deliver services in rural areas. This will result in the Council taking a less proactive approach in assisting start up and growing businesses across Highland.
Mitigating action	Increased use of one to many workshops and digital services with more focused, albeit reduced, 1:1 adviser provision.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	YES
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken – low or non-direct equality impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.	

Budget Template

Service	Development and Infrastructure			Ref.	D&I/3
Activity Heading	Employability Service				
Savings Name	Reduction in Employability Team and Grants to Third Parties				
Current Budget (£m)	£1.620m	Current Staffing (FTE)	11.78		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

The Employability Service provides services that both support individuals prepare for and access work but also services that support employers to create jobs. The scale of the savings proposed has required both aspects of service provision to be reviewed and reorganised including deletion of activity.

Reduce the Recruitment and Employability Adviser team (from 8.78 to 4 advisers plus 1 project officer). This team provides 1:1 advice to unemployed clients to help them prepare for and access work and they work locally to co-ordinate Council activity with partners and local third sector providers.

Reduction in work club, employment and skills project funding.

Reduction in number of Council/European funded job creation grants to private sector.

Deletion of grants to third sector organisations providing deprived area community and employability related activity/projects.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.610	4.78
2018/19	0.270	
2019/20		
Total	0.880	4.78

Service Impact

Significant impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

Grant support for a range of community and employability projects will be stopped or significantly reduced if other external funding cannot be secured. Approx. 1000 clients benefit from projects supported in 2015/16.

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

The reduced Recruitment Incentive for business and the Youth Trainee scheme will result in risk of 89 less jobs created and £219k less European funds utilised.

The advisory support offered will result in risk of 100 clients per annum not securing 1:1 client centred support to enable them to progress towards and into sustained work; 100 businesses per annum not securing recruitment advice to help them correctly identify and recruit the right staff (80 jobs created in 2015/16).

The change in work club support will result in a 50% reduction in grant support to third sector organisations who run work clubs and 78% reduction in employment and skills projects, for example, in 2015/16 £25k for Modern Apprenticeship project; £30k Shared Apprenticeship Scheme, £25k for Science Academy.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	YES
If no, state why	

If YES, state why	The target client groups to benefit from the Employability adviser support are individuals who are excluded from the labour market and who face particular barriers to overcome the disadvantage they face in preparing for and sustaining employment. It is small/micro businesses who need employment advice to recruit staff for the first time. This will result in a significant reduction of service to vulnerable client groups particularly in rural and deprived areas. Reduction in number of advisers is likely to impact more on rural areas. Equality groups (in particular disabled people, but also young people, women and ethnic minorities) are potentially affected. Poverty impacts are potentially high – a reduction in service will affect the life chances of people seeking employment and routes out of poverty.	
Mitigating action	Maintenance of minimum staff to manage ESF support for third sector providers, thereby pulling down ESF resources and securing some 1:1 support beyond the minimum delivered by DWP/SDS.	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	YES	
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	YES	
Equalities Summary Full equality impact assessment undertaken and significant impact on groups identified in particular disabled people, but also young people, women and ethnic minorities, and significant socio-economic impact identified.		

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure			Ref.	D&I/4
Activity Heading	Energy & Sustainability				
Income Name	Generate Additional Scottish Energy Efficiency Income (SEEPS) by coordinating Highland Wide Programmes of Energy Improvement Work				
Current Budget (£m)	External Fee Income Generation	Current Staffing (FTE)	2		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

This income generation proposal assumes the Energy Team will bid successfully for additional external funding from the Scottish Governments Energy Efficiency Programme to deliver further external/internal insulation programmes across the Highland Area. The £250k would be generated as additional fee income for managing and delivering the proposed increased programme of work for 2017/18.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.250	0
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.250	0

Service Impact

No impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

None.

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

Additional work will be delivered by the Councils Energy Team.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	YES
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	Additional Government budget allocation will allow us to increase the number of domestic homes across Highland that will receive internal/external insulation works. This in turn will assist in the reduction of Energy required to heat homes.
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	N/A
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken; no equalities impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure			Ref. <table border="1"><tr><td>D&I/5</td></tr></table>	D&I/5
D&I/5					
Activity Heading	Property Asset Management				
Savings Name	Reduce the number of Property Assets held on the Property Office Accommodation Account				
Current Budget (£m)	N/A	Current Staffing (FTE)	N/A		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

The proposal requires the Corporate Property Asset Management team to identify both General Fund and leased office accommodation that can be rationalised (by selling/transfer or lease termination) to reduce the number of offices owned or leased by the Council. The savings target should be achieved by the sale/disposal/transfer of potential surplus assets resulting in a reduction/removal of the running costs of targeted facilities.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.150	0
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.150	0

Service Impact

Slight impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

Services will continue but from a reduced built estate.

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

Council Services will be required to use less office space, adopt more flexible ways of working and/or relocate to other available Council/Agency facilities.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	YES
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	Closer working between co-located Council Services/Agencies should help to bring more efficient ways of working and potentially improve the level of service delivered to our customers. (E.g.: the DWP and Police Services working from shared Council facilities).
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	YES
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken; no equalities impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.

Budget Template

Service	Development and Infrastructure			Ref.	D&I/6
Activity Heading	Flood Risk Management				
Savings Name	Reduce the Revenue Budget for Flood Risk				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.270m	Current Staffing (FTE)	7		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

The current £270k budget for Flood Risk Management is required to meet a number of statutory and non-statutory duties that all reduce the risk of flooding to communities. These include: watercourse inspections, assessments and clearance works; severe weather pre-inspections; development of local Flood Risk Management Plans; awareness raising activities; development control and planning advice; flood incident investigations and developing community resilience. Development and delivery of flood schemes is not funded by this budget, but from capital. A reduced budget of £170k would impact on the current quality of service that is provided in some of these areas.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.100	0
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.100	0

Service Impact

Significant impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

If implemented, a review of the priority/ duty/ impact of each aspect of the service will have to be undertaken. It is expected that fewer severe weather pre-inspections will be carried out. Specialist (flood risk and drainage) interrogation of new planning applications is likely to become more targeted/ risk based. Post flood investigations and general advice to the public on flood risk concerns would continue, but with limitations on the extent of investigations and solutions.

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

The proposed budget saving can be achieved with no loss of FTE as a redeployment of staff to the delivery of flood schemes in the capital programme will result.

The following objectives within the current programme are likely to be affected by the budget cut:
 Promote and assist Community Resilience (Flood Action Groups) in 'at risk' communities (H2245_DISa0444);
 Raise Awareness within communities of flood risk and watercourse maintenance (H2246_DISa0445); Carry out watercourse assessments and undertake maintenance works that substantially reduce flood risk and report annually (H1131_DISa0328); Prepare and implement a Local Flood Risk Management Plan and report annually (H1132_DISa0329)

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	YES
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	With a focus on fulfilling statutory duties such as watercourse inspections, clearance works and developing Local Flood Risk Management Plans, the public may not receive the support/ professional advice or resolution to flooding incidents that they currently benefit from as this is not a statutory function.
Mitigating action	Raise awareness of community resilience/ self-help.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	YES
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken; no equalities impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.

Budget Template

Service	Development and Infrastructure			Ref. D&I/7
Activity Heading	Service Wide			
Savings Name	Various			
Current Budget (£m)	N/A	Current Staffing (FTE)	N/A	

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

1. P & BS Fee Income- increase 100k - Scottish Government is currently consulting on a potential increases in Planning and Building Warrant fees. Although the outcome will not be known for a number of months it is expected that these will be accepted and lead to an increase in fees. It is also proposed to increase pre-application advice fees for both local and major developments. Other opportunities for income generation will also continue to be looked at over the course of 17/18.

2. Property Principal PM(HC10) 53k - Vacancy not recruiting
3. Property Efficiencies 145k - Various non staffing central budget reductions
4. Director / Business Team 131k - Various non staffing central budget reductions
5. Deletion of Vacant Posts 240k - Vacant posts to be deleted across the Service

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.669	7
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.669	7

Service Impact
Slight impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

N/A

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

N/A

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	NO
If no, state why	Service wide savings from central budgets and efficiencies.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	NO
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken; no equalities impact identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.

Budget Template

Service	Council Wide		Ref.	CORP/1
Activity Heading	Other fees and charges			
Savings Name	General increase in selected Council fees and charges			
Current Budget (£m)	£3.496m	Current Staffing (FTE)	0	

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

The Council levies fees and charges for a wide variety of items. Increases to some of those fees and charges are subject to service specific proposals and other charges are limited by statute or for other reasons considered not suitable for increase. This template proposes a uniform increase (with one exception) to certain fees and charges as detailed in the table below.

Service	Charge Description	2017/18 Increase %
Care & Learning	Income From Training Courses	10%
Care & Learning	School Lettings	10%
Care & Learning	Music Tuition	10%
Care & Learning	Childcare Fees / Charges	5%*
Community Services	Monthly Parking Ticket Income	10%
Community Services	Parking Card Income	10%
Community Services	Residents Parking Income	10%
Community Services	Special Collects/Uplifts Waste	10%
Community Services	Waste - Tipping Fees	10%
Community Services	Pier / Harbour Dues	10%
Community Services	Admission Charges	10%
Community Services	Subject Access Fees	10%
Community Services	Hire Of Equipment Income	10%
Community Services	Hire Of Plant Income	10%
Community Services	Hire Of Vehicles Income	10%
Community Services	Animals License Fees	10%
Community Services	Other Civic Govt Licenses	10%
Community Services	Fish Export Certificate	10%
Community Services	Other Sales	10%
Community Services	Other Sales Material	10%
Corporate Development	All Civil Marriage/Civil Partnership Charges	10%
Corporate Development	Marry Outwith Work Weekend & P/H	10%
Development & Infrastructure	Planning Fees Advertising	10%
Development & Infrastructure	Photocopies Sale	10%

*The reduced percentage increase in the childcare fees is in response to market testing undertaken by the C&L service in conjunction with the Council's Commercial Manager.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.334	0
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.334	0

Service Impact

No impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

None

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

None

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	YES
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	There will be an impact on the specific groups of customers paying these charges. Some may fall on individuals and families and some on businesses.
Mitigating action	Where parking charges apply, blue badge holders are exempt. For music tuition, exemptions can apply for those on low incomes or qualifying benefits. The recommended increase in childcare fees is in response to market testing undertaken by the C&L service in conjunction with the Council's Commercial Manager.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	NO
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	NO

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken; mitigation identified. Full equalities impact assessment not required.

Budget Template

Service	Corporate			Ref.	CORP/2
Activity Heading	Cross Service				
Savings Name	Service Redesign				
Current Budget (£m)	N/A	Current Staffing (FTE)	N/A		

Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

The Redesign work of the Board commenced in May 2016 and has been reported to members throughout last year, with final reports due in March 2017. This has examined all services of the Council, taking evidence from a number of outside bodies, partners, staff and our Citizens' Panel. It has instigated a number of major and minor reviews.

The review process has indicated the potential for savings alongside service redesign. Some are contained within separate service savings proposed (primarily in Community Services around waste, street cleaning). Additional potential savings are identified from reviews in Care and Learning and Community Services and from developing a more commercial and efficient approach to business. In the context of the Revenue Budget savings proposals for 2017/18, some £5m has been considered by the Redesign Board (principally in Care & Learning and Community Services), These will be set out in final reports this month which will include future work streams to be taken forward during 2017/18 with the capacity to deliver additional savings later in the year and rolling forward into 2018/19.

This additional saving for 2017/18 takes account of the opportunity to deliver some additional savings in 2017/18 ahead of opportunities to achieve further savings in 2018/19. The main elements are additional income, through increasing charges for pre-application planning services, some potential savings in Waste & Street Lighting, and scope for Management Savings arising from restructuring Services and the number of senior management posts associated with this. Any redesign proposals that require a policy change or affect the senior management structure would be recommended to Council from the Redesign Board. Some may be proposed for the new Council to consider.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2017/18	0.500	TBC
2018/19		
2019/20		
Total	0.500	TBC

Service Impact

No impact on service

Which aspects of the service will stop?

N/A

Which other aspects of the service will change significantly and how?

Most of the saving will come from changing operational practice with any impact likely to be minor. Where changes require a change in policy this will be reported to Members along with an impact assessment. No staffing impact is shown so as not to prejudice the potential outcome of any service restructuring. Numbers are likely to be small. Part of the saving is predicated by additional income and improved commissioning rather than reduced cost.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities, Rural & Poverty Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	NO
If no, state why	This has no identifiable service impact as, in the main, these proposed savings come from changing operational practice. Re-design reviews have all included screenings for equalities, rural and poverty impacts.

If YES, state why		
Mitigating action		
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)		NO
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)		NO
<p>Equalities Summary Where changes require a change in policy this will be reported to Members along with an impact assessment.</p>		