



Cabinet

23 October 2013

Report Title	Implement Reduced-Cost Delivery Models for the Council's Residential Children's Homes	
Classification	Open	
Cabinet Member with Lead Responsibility	Val Gibson Children and Families	
Accountable Strategic Director	Sarah Norman	
Originating service	Community	
Accountable officer(s)	John Welsby	.
	Tel	01902 551449
	Email	john.welsby@wolverhampton.gov.uk

1.0 Description of Savings Proposal

Single Status has increased the costs of in-house provision external provider costs have stayed at a similar level making the unit cost differential wider than previously. Proposals are to implement a reduced cost delivery model for the services currently provided at Upper Pendeford and Red Gables together with the re-commissioning of The Wergs, currently provided by an external provider, with a savings target of £306,000. This would also enable a review of current central management costs allowing the deletion of one post (Deputy Head of Looked-after Children at £66,000).

2.0 Table Setting out Financial Proposal

2.1 Total base budget savings

	Year 2014-2015 £000	Year 2015-2016 £000	Year 2016-2017 £000	Year 2017-2018 £000	Year 2018-2019 £000	5 year total £000's
Total base budget savings	186	186	0	0	0	372

2.2 Staffing Implication

	Year 2014-2015 £000	Year 2015-2016 £000	Year 2016-2017 £000	Year 2017-2018 £000	Year 2018-2019 £000	5 year total £000's

Full Time Equivalent (FTE)	38	0	0	0	0	38
----------------------------------	----	---	---	---	---	----

3.0 Communications Strategy Implications

3.1 A Communications Strategy and Action Plan will be prepared to take the necessary mitigating actions to support this proposal.

4.0 Corporate Landlord Implication

4.1 The Corporate Landlord implications of this proposal represent some risk. This proposal requires a review of Children’s Residential Homes. This may affect two Council assets (Upper Pendeford and Red Gables) together with the re-commissioning of The Wergs. This could impact on how the Council’s buildings are managed and maintained in the future. This can be supported and mitigated by the Corporate Landlord strategic pathway and effective use of the Asset Management Plan.

5.0 Customer Implications

5.1 The implications for customers of this proposal represent some risk but this will be mitigated through good communication with customers and proactive planning and good quality assurance arrangements. These proposals will result in a reduced service available to the public. However, the impact will be mitigated through the development of volunteers.

6.0 Economic Implications

6.1 **No Implications Recorded.**

7.0 Environmental Implications

7.1 There would be Environmental Implications should the proposal involve the closure of existing premises. These can all be dealt with through the asset management & planning processes. These include issues such as biodiversity, open space, energy efficiency, energy management, traffic congestion & air pollution. They relate to either the possible change of use, alteration or demolition & redevelopment of premises.

8.0 Equality Implications

8.1 An equalities analysis screening has been completed, a full analysis is not required.

9.0 Financial Implications

9.1 The Financial Implications in terms of savings and investments are as described in the proposal above.

10.0 Health Implications

10.1 The Health Implications of this proposal are minimal

11.0 Legal Implications

11.1 The Legal Implications of this proposal represent some risk mitigated by securing robust legal guidelines, consultation and equality analysis and HR processes.

12.0 Policy Implications

12.1 The policy implications on agreed council policy will be minimal. Reducing costs would support the delivery of the corporate priority 'Delivering a Confident Capable Council'.

13.0 Procurement Implications

13.1 There may be procurement implications associated with delivering this proposal. These will be cleared when a delivery model is chosen.

14.0 Staffing Implications

14.1 The HR Implications of this proposal represent a considerable risk because a number of staff may be at risk of TUPE transfer or redundancy. However, it is intended to avoid the need for compulsory redundancies as far as possible by maximising opportunities for voluntary redundancy, re-deployment and the deletion of vacant posts in accordance with established HR procedures.

15.0 Trade Union Implications

15.1 **No Implications Recorded.**