



2013/14 Budget Consultation – Summary of Submissions and Responses

Contact Officer: Paul Bates, GM Marketing & Communications
Paul.bates@lbbd.gov.uk

Appendix XX

Responses to Budget Challenge Consultation

1. General Comments on Budget Issues – not related to individual savings proposals

Source	Generic Comments by Respondee	Summary of Response
Staff Member	Staffing levels at the One Stop Shop	<p>Delays have now been reduced following management intervention on renewal of CPZ forms.</p> <p>Greater levels of automation will be introduced – the CEx has asked that PDQ machines be used in the One Stop Shops to reduce delays.</p>
Staff Member	Heating in the Town Hall and Council buildings.	<p>Asset management team are monitoring this and actively working to reduce heating out of hours where it is not needed and at weekends.</p> <p>Some of the heating systems in large buildings such as the Civic are such that by turning them down and up again as the weather dictates would end up costing the Council more. These are often older systems that are not necessarily easy or efficient to quickly adapt to changes in the weather.</p> <p>Where we can do this – we are and this is programmed in as part of our savings in capital spend.</p>
Staff Member	Charge for drive-ways and dropped kerbs	Not an option for charging at the current time.

Staff Member	Use online forms for renewing parking permits	A project is ongoing within the Parking service at the moment which will look at automating this and driving this online.
Staff Member	Move the capital delivery team to Pondfield House to free up space at Roycraft House	<p>We have not been specifically looking at the co-location of these services.</p> <p>The capital delivery team provides services to all council directorates and is based within the Resources directorate. There are no current proposals to co-locate this team with the housing repairs service.</p> <p>We are however looking at the overall housing requirement in respect of asset management as we continue to develop our business plan for the future. It will be vital that repairs and capital delivery work closely to ensure we deliver a timely, effective and well integrated capital and revenue service.</p>
Staff Member	Expand home and remote working and expand hot-desking Improve home working technology	The current council IT systems does enable a significant amount of potential home working to take place. The Citrix remote working solution allows most users to access their applications, e-mails and data from any pc, including PCs at home. The licensing and infrastructure allows up to 1000 users to work from home using this approach, with those users with laptops (circa

		<p>500) also being licensed to work from home. The network connectivity was also upgraded during the Olympics to enable up to 1000 users to connect into the council network from home.</p> <p>The telephony solution will allow users' extensions to be diverted to mobiles or home numbers to facilitate this. Teleconferencing facilities are also currently available, although underused.</p> <p>In order to facilitate more home working, the HR policies to enable this will need to be explored in more detail, as well as the management approach to delegate and monitor work done remotely. Not all staff will be able to work from home due to their job roles, but those that can will need to be supported by an effective management framework.</p> <p>ICT is also exploring additional technologies that will facilitate improved mobility and home working for staff, including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- A desktop IT solution, which enables the user to use an LBBB 'desktop' on any PC anywhere which looks exactly like the desktop solution used in the office. (subject to business case);
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Further implementation of teleconference phones in meeting rooms, with additional licensing for more teleconferencing capability (subject to business case); - Instant messaging and online video conferencing for all council users to support improved collaboration; - Improved Wifi in council buildings to enable flexible and mobile working with council and personal devices (subject to business case); - BYOD (Bring your own device) solution enabling council systems to be accessed on personal devices (i.e. SmartPhone, tablets, iPads, laptops) – subject to council policy.
<p>Staff Members</p> <p>-Via CEx Feedback Forum 1 and 2</p>	<p>Enforce a council-wide pay cut for all staff of 1% Insist some staff go part-time and/or 3 day week.</p>	<p>Highly unlikely to get Trade Union or workforce agreement to such a measure, so would require imposition, which would damage industrial relations at a time when staff morale is key as the Council manages change.</p>
<p>Staff Member</p>	<p>Require all staff to take 3 days unpaid leave each year</p>	<p>As above.</p> <p>Additionally, such a measure would not necessarily deliver savings long-term. Staff would have to deliver services to residents who need them regardless of the requirement to have 3 days unpaid leave. This would place</p>

		pressures on a reducing workforce.
Staff Member	Managers should be engaging teams more proactively in money saving ideas	Managers are being actively encouraged to do this – and indeed the ‘Budget Challenge’ process is giving staff (and residents and other stakeholders) the opportunity to feed in suggestions and have them quickly responded to by senior managers.
Staff Member	Use alternative fuels in our agricultural vehicles (such as red diesel)	<p>This is already being auctioned and this comment has helped encourage the Council in this area.</p> <p>Red diesel is being used from the end of October 2012 to help save money and increase environmentally friendly running of vehicles.</p> <p>Based on a current white diesel rate of £1.14 per litre and a red diesel rate of £0.66 per litre the saving on a yearly usage of 98717 litres is £47,385.00. With sixth months of the year remaining this has the potential to deliver a saving of £23,693 in financial year 2012/13.</p>
Staff Member	Withdraw mobile phones from staff working in parks etc. and revert back to use of walkie-talkies.	Not deemed appropriate nor would achieve significant savings in terms of working practices (there may be a saving on reducing phone costs but costs would increase elsewhere).
Staff Member	Withdraw safety kit and give plain overalls instead.	This would be a move which could impact on individual officers’ health and safety and is not advised.

Staff Member	Use local companies to sponsor parks so they can pay for maintenance.	The Marketing & Communications team are shortly taking a brand new income generation strategy to Members. While sponsorship of parks is not a current aspect of the project, a wider income generation programme of sponsorship of our fleet of vehicles, lamp-post banners, bus shelters and larger poster sites will bring in more income than previous years and will help towards the Council's bottom line.
Staff Member	Withdraw use of council sports pitches and increase charges for those we have to retain.	Not being considered.
Staff Member	Introduce a nominal charge for individual requests to remove grass and glass.	
Staff Member	Privatise the pest control service	Not being considered at this time.
Staff Member	Remove spot-lights in the revolving doors at the Civic Centre	Lighting the revolving door space and floor area is essential to maintain safety for the various people using this entrance. Asset management team would have reservations about turning these off unless sensors are put in place to ensure sufficient lighting levels are retained at all times. The under desk lighting can be turned off but it will result in lowering the lighting level directly in front of the desk and also remove the back lighting from the Council Crest and hence make it less prominent.

Staff Member	Remove spot-lights at the Town Hall (Barking) reception area.	<p>The reason for the lighting on either side of the green bridge as opposed to in the centre is due to it being made of glass. The lights are fibre optics. Asset management believes these have degraded over time.</p> <p>A test was carried out on the wall behind the reception, turning it completely off resulted in a very dark area. The wall is lit by T5 fluorescent tubes, which are already fairly energy efficient but more tubes could be taken out to reduce the amount of lighting. However, please note that the wall had been designed to use all the tubes currently in use and partially lighting it will cause a patchy effect and hence will not be very aesthetically pleasing.</p> <p>The under desk lighting is the same for the Town Hall as for the Civic.</p>
Staff Member	<p>What is the position regarding leases of Council buildings?</p> <p>What is the position regarding Stour Road?</p>	<p>The essence of the proposal is to review the use of the following buildings –</p> <p>Bridge House – lease expires March 2014</p> <p>Crown House – lease expires June 2014</p> <p>Maritime House – lease expires July 2015</p>

		<p>2 Stour Road – to be vacated/ closed by 04/14</p> <p>90 Stour Road – to be vacated/closed by 04/14</p> <p>At the current time Stour Road acts as the Council’s emergency Contact Centre should Roycraft House be in any way compromised. The most recent example of Stour Road having to be used in this way was earlier this month after a flood in Roycraft House.</p> <p>To continue to operate, the Contact Centre does require a practical business continuity site.</p> <p>Should the proposal to close Stour Road be accepted, the identification of an alternative suitable venue will be essential.</p>
Staff Member	Prevent staff from charging personal mobile phones and devices on their desks at work.	<p>Many of the phones being charged in the offices will be Council mobiles and when not charging a phone the units use close to 0w.</p> <p>The electrical charging rate of a mobile from a socket ranges between circa 300mA – 1800mA making the average about 1 amp. In terms of power use 1 amp equates to circa 230 Watts so charging a 1000mA phone for 1 hour would use 0.23kWh of electricity.</p> <p>The current day tariff for electricity at the Town Hall is £0.05976 per kWh so the cost of</p>

		<p>charging (for example) one mobile phone for 1 hour would be circa 1.4p. Of course it does all add up so 100 similar phones being charged for 2 hours would cost approximately £2.80 and if this happens for 260 working days of the year it will cost us circa £728.00</p> <p>Unfortunately, trying to differentiate between Council mobiles and personal mobiles will prove difficult and the savings would be minimal so although the intentions of the idea are good the Council does not currently think this is viable in this instance.</p>
Staff Member – via CEx Feedback Forum 1	Comment on the need for transparency in budget setting and critique that not all senior managers are briefing their teams as well as they might.	<p>A special Briefing for managers has now been produced on how to run meetings with staff, training on how to have difficult conversations with staff has been signposted and support from HR Business Partners promoted more widely.</p> <p>A “Supporting Staff in Tough Times” leaflet has been produced. This outlines all the training, re-training, support, external help and advice that staff can access as they go through varying stages of the ‘at risk’ process.</p>
Staff Member – via CEx Feedback	When and how can we tell service users about budget proposals which could impact on them?	This will depend on the individual service – some service users will need to be informed

Forum 1		<p>earlier than others.</p> <p>Managers and officers should not be causing undue alarm and distress for service users – senior managers have stressed this point.</p>
Staff Member – via CEx Feedback Forum 1	<p>Welcomed the ‘Budget Challenge’ consultation as being much better than last year: but wanted to know how quickly ideas are responded to and how.</p>	<p>The budget@lbbd.gov.uk email is totally confidential (only 1 member of staff knows who sent individual savings alternatives or questions).</p> <p>Any questions, queries or alternative suggestions are anonymised and sent through to the relevant senior manager for a response. Response times will vary depending on the complexity of the comment or question.</p> <p>This can be done via email or by phone if the staff member concerned does not have access to email. Phone comments are completely confidential.</p>
Staff Member – via CEx Feedback Forum 1	<p>Why was a GM post deleted in Environment and then filled using an agency member of staff some time later?</p>	<p>The Chief Executive endeavoured to look into this with the relevant Divisional Director.</p> <p>On occasion, if there is a very pressing business or service need, it will be necessary to bring in external help for a limited period. This only happens if there is no one with the</p>

		<p>relevant skills in the Council's employ.</p> <p>The Chief Executive will be looking into senior management structures in the New Year in any event.</p>
<p>Staff Member – via CEx Feedback Forum 1</p>	<p>How much Council Tax is uncollected and could we not reduce the amount we have to save by increasing collection levels.</p>	<p>Historically our collection levels have been lower than they should be, but they are now on a steady increase.</p> <p>For the last full financial year for which we have rates of collection, 94% of CT is being collected.</p> <p>It is the case that the more CT is collected, the better our funding position will be. That's why the Council has tasked Elevate with making improvements in this area.</p>
<p>Staff Member – via CEx Feedback Forum 1</p>	<p>When does the 'Budget Challenge' consultation period end?</p>	<p>The consultation on our budget proposals finishes on November 30th.</p> <p>It's important to differentiate between that consultation on our budget proposals for 2013/14 and the consultation process which will take place with staff who are potentially impacted by budget proposals should they be agreed by Cabinet. These are two distinct consultations.</p>

<p>Staff Member - via CEx Feedback Forum 1</p>	<p>How will staff be told of the decisions Members make?</p>	<p>There will be appropriate internal and external communications throughout the budget consultation process.</p> <p>Once Members reach decisions, these will be communicated across the authority.</p> <p>Managers will have a key role to play in briefing teams properly and they will be getting the information they need to enable them to do this.</p>
<p>Staff Member via CEx Feedback Forum 2</p>	<p>The levels of cuts could lead to BNP sympathies.</p>	<p>The CEx response did not address matters of party politics, but acknowledged the impact of cuts.</p>
<p>Staff member – via CEx Feedback Forum 2</p>	<p>The Census shows we have a rapidly growing population – are we lobbying for more cash?</p>	<p>Yes. The Deputy Leader liaises with CLG and the Treasury regularly (as the new funding on school places shows).</p> <p>A new letter to Eric Pickles is being drafted w/c 3 December asking for funding to be reviewed in light of Census 2011 data.</p>
<p>Staff Member – via CEx Feedback Forum 2</p>	<p>Why not increase Council Tax? I would be prepared to pay more.</p>	<p>Members have made a manifesto commitment.</p> <p>Increasing CT would hit the poorest more – especially as a result of the changes to CT being introduced by the Govt.</p>
<p>Staff Member</p>	<p>Why share services with Thurrock? Why not neighbouring</p>	<p>We already share a legal service and a CEx,</p>

<p>– via CEx Feedback Forum 2</p>	<p>boroughs?</p>	<p>so there is logic in trying to extend this further. Members will review the proposals at Council Assembly in Thurrock and LBBB.</p>
<p>Resident – via email Via Leader’s Question Time</p>	<p>Reduce the number of councillors.</p>	<p>The Leader wrote to the Boundary Commission for England last year asking for advice on whether LBBB could do this as part of a review into our local democracy. BCfE responded and confirmed their view that B&D was not over-represented in terms of councillors and that there should be no change (in contrast with LB of Tower Hamlets where a review is being imposed by BCfE).</p>
<p>Resident – via email</p>	<p>Reduce expenditure on translation costs.</p>	<p>The Council has significantly reduced costs on translation over the last two years. The amount spent has reduced markedly to just 2k in the last financial year. At the Deputy Leader’s Question Time held on 22 November, Cllr. Gill made clear the Council’s view that new residents to the borough should and could learn English. Not only is this right in terms of cohesion, but the job prospects of the individual would be significantly enhanced.</p>
<p>Resident – Via email</p>	<p>One female resident was concerned about potential cuts to older people’s services, such as swimming.</p>	<p>No proposals exist – the budget for older people’s services is being transferred to the Public Health grant to protect services which Members see as a top priority.</p>
<p>Resident –</p>	<p>Concerned that schools and early intervention groups must</p>	<p>Resident plans to attend LQT and wishes to</p>

<p>via email</p> <p>Also raised at Leader's Question Time</p>	<p>work alongside each other to minimise the risk of ASB. Concerned that cut-backs might lead to an increase in ASB across the borough if children have less and less to do.</p>	<p>put her question there, rather than get a written response.</p> <p>Cllr. Smith raised the need for the Council to take difficult decisions on ASB – services such as this would be better placed being provided by the Police.</p>
<p>Resident – via Facebook</p>	<p>Ban parking everywhere!</p>	<p>Not appropriate – residents and visitors to the borough do need to park their cars.</p> <p>The Council does review CPZs as and when to promote responsible parking.</p>
<p>Resident – via email</p>	<p>Introduce CPZs to increase income, especially in Chadwell Heath, which is used as a car park for commuters.</p>	<p>The Council would never introduce CPZs as a means of increasing income.</p> <p>Parking officers will review parking at Chadwell Heath and assess whether a further consultation is required.</p>
<p>Resident – via letter</p> <p>Also raised at Leader's Question Time</p>	<p>Scrap consultants working in the Chief Executive's department</p>	<p>The CEx Unit will be reducing costs very significantly by sharing services where we can and by reducing head-count.</p> <p>Consultant numbers have reduced very significantly over the last 2/3 years – Cllr. Smith pointed out that where specific projects need to be completed, consultants will occasionally be engaged, but this is very much an exception.</p>

<p>Resident – via letter</p> <p>Also raised at Leader’s Question Time</p>	<p>Reduce salaries for senior managers, especially the CEx</p>	<p>LBBB has the lowest salary of any CEx in London and indeed, we are the only Council in the capital that shares a CEx with a non-London borough.</p> <p>Salaries of senior managers have been frozen, while their numbers have been cut.</p> <p>More proposals on cutting senior managers will be brought before Members in the New Year, including as part of a potential shared management model with other authorities.</p>
<p>Resident – via letter</p> <p>Also raised at Leader’s Question Time</p>	<p>Agrees with proposal to reduce Council headcount by c400 (as reported in the ‘B&D Post’)</p>	<p>The Council will be reducing the numbers of staff working for it – as many other authorities do.</p> <p>We will have to continue to deliver services for people in the borough however, so the balance must be struck between reducing the numbers of employees where we can and making sure our front-line services are as good as possible.</p> <p>The CEx has made clear that he is keen for staff to develop their ‘transferable skills’ as a means for potentially displaced staff to increase their future career prospects – either inside or outside the organisation.</p>
<p>Resident – via Deputy Leader’s Question Time</p>	<p>Reduce the number of pot-holes and speed-bumps</p>	<p>The Council (Cllr. McCarthy) has recently launched a high-profile campaign called ‘Save Our Streets’ calling on central Govt to invest more money in the borough’s roads.</p>

		£5 million will be spent in the coming months, but this will not be enough, hence the pressure which Cllr. McCarthy and ward councillors hope to bring to bear.
Resident – via Leader and Deputy Leader’s Question Time	Reduce the number of senior managers	As above
Resident – via Deputy Leader’s Question Time	Translation costs	As above
Resident – via Deputy Leader’s Question Time	Why do we make payments to election staff (e.g. the ERO)?	<p>The CEx explained that the payments are made as a result of the individual Electoral Registration Officer bearing responsibility and risk for the good conduct of an election.</p> <p>If there are errors, the impact and risk does not fall on the authority, but falls upon the ERO personally.</p> <p>The rates are governed by electoral law. Some EROs take them, others do not.</p>
Resident – via Deputy Leader’s Question Time	Why do we have so many Council buildings? Let’s close the Town Hall and the Civic Centre and have one building. This would save costs.	The Council is looking at reducing the amount of buildings it uses. Staff are being moved increasingly into a smaller number of buildings. As leases expire, the authority will look at the arrangements.

		The Council owns both buildings referred to – disposal would take time.
Resident – via Leader’s and Deputy Leader’s Question Time	Reduce the number of elected councillors – why so many?	See response above. The Leader has written to the Boundary Commission on this matter and they have responded by stating that LBBB does not have too many and that therefore reductions are not appropriate. The number of councillors is not set locally – only the Boundary Commission may judge this matter.
Leader’s Question Time	Concerns raised about immigration levels and the impact on local services.	Cllr. Smith discussed the pressures on B&D, not just from immigration from overseas, but also from other local authorities re-locating their housing needs populations into cheaper parts of the capital, such as B&D.
Leader’s Question Time	Why can’t we share more services as a council?	Cllr. Smith discussed the shared opportunities with Thurrock following on from the success of sharing a legal services function and CEx. Proposals now underway to share the Youth Offending Team with LB of Havering. Will look at sharing services where it can improve service delivery and achieve savings.
Leader’s Question Time	What is the future of the Adult College Music Centre? – it would be a real shame if this was to close.	Cllr. Smith indicated that there are no proposals on the music centre at this time.

		<p>However, he could not rule out this being looked at in future years, but he was clear this was a well used and well regarded service.</p>
<p>Leader's Question Time</p>	<p>Barking Riverside – what is happening here?</p>	<p>Cllr. Smith outlined the issues with delays stemming from Bellway's relative slow progress on site.</p> <p>Cllr. Smith believes Barking Riverside is a great opportunity area.</p> <p>He would look into what section 106 arrangements are in place.</p>
<p>Leader's Question Time</p>	<p>Why is the Council in so much debt? What are our reserves? Why are savings requirements so much worse here than in neighbouring boroughs such as Havering and Redbridge?</p>	<p>Cllr. Smith pointed out that the Council is not in debt as many other authorities.</p> <p>Our reserves are £14-15 million – but these can't just be used one off without these reserves being eroded. Using reserves to reduce debt is not wise.</p> <p>B&D is being hit harder than many of the 'leafy' boroughs – Cllr. Smith considers this to be a political decision.</p>
<p>Trade Union Response (UNISON, Unite, GMB)</p>	<p>The recognised staff trade unions have written to Graham Farrant (letter dated 29 November) outlining a number of concerns with regard to staff reductions.</p>	<p>A response will be formulated by the CEx and discussed through the EJCC.</p>

Part Two – Consultation Responses on Specific Budget Proposals (sent to ‘Budget Challenge only)

ACS SAV 01	Community Cohesion and Equalities Team	
Consultee & Channel	Comments	Summary of Response/Action
Resident – via comment on evaluation form for Deputy Leader’s Question Time	Does not see the need for the cohesion team – believes that if young people are given enough to do and jobs, there is no need for a ‘cohesion team’	<p>Safer & Stronger Select Committee supported this proposal.</p> <p>Member of the public was contacted and asked if she would like a follow up, but declined as she had attended DLQT.</p>
ACS SAV 04	Reduction in services to drug & alcohol users	No responses logged via ‘Budget Challenge’
ACS SAV 05	Youth Offending	
Consultee & Channel	Comments	Summary of Response/Action
Resident – via letter	Concerned that if youth offending service is cut, there will be a wider impact on the community.	<p>Safer & Stronger Select Committee approved of the proposal set out in the pro forma.</p> <p>Members noted the potential joint arrangements with Havering.</p> <p>Cllr. Smith positively commented on LBBD YOS Team – and mentioned the LBHa arrangement.</p>
ACS SAV 06	Withdraw or reduce the domestic violence service	
Consultee & Channel	Comments	Summary of Response/Action
Stakeholder attending scrutiny committee	Raised a concern at the Scrutiny committee about the expiry of their contract	Safer & Strong Select Committee agreed the proposal as set out in the pro forma (i.e. retaining much of the

Resident via letter	<p>should the proposal be agreed.</p> <p>Requested that the Council consider cutting the service.</p>	<p>service with costs met by the Public Health grant).</p> <p>A service will be retained via alternative funding streams (PH grant).</p>
ACS SAV 07	Voluntary Sector Grants	
Consultee & Channel	Comments	Summary of Response/Action
<p>B&D CVS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Via Deputy Leader's QT 	<p>B&D CVS lobbied councillors on this saving proposal, including via a special meeting of the CVS where the CEx spoke.</p> <p>The CEO of B&D CVS also asked the Deputy Leader to look again at this at the Deputy Leader's Question Time.</p>	<p>Safer & Stronger Select Committee recommended that the proposed saving be reduced from £120k to £110k.</p> <p>Discussions are ongoing with the CVS about the future shape of support.</p>
Resident – via letter	Resident recommended cutting all grants to local organisations arguing that the money should be prioritised elsewhere.	Resident stated she attended Safer & Stronger Select Cttee and heard responses at this meeting.
Barking & Dagenham Disability Equality Forum	Letter sent by email – the DEF is concerned that withdrawal of its funding will result in events such as Int'l Day of Disabled People being detrimentally impacted locally.	<p>Letter sent by Anne Bristow on 4 December. Response makes clear the requirement for savings on the council by virtue of Govt spending cuts.</p> <p>Places on record the council's positive view of the DEF.</p>
RAMFEL – via letter to Anne Bristow on 30 November	<p>RAMFEL concerns deletion of post(s) serving the BME community.</p> <p>RAMFEL considers that the LBBD CEX</p>	Response to be formulated by ACS.

<p>B&D CVS – via letter to Cllr. Gill on 13 November and also to Anne Bristow on 30 November (copied to Safer & Strong Select Committee members)</p>	<p>skewed the Budget Challenge consultation by stating publicly that the Citizen Advice Bureau and CVS would receive funding.</p> <p>RAMFEL believes cutting funding for equalities fora will impact on cohesion.</p> <p>Argues that the voluntary sector is being unfairly targeted for cuts.</p> <p>Argues that savings accrued from London Councils grants were meant to be ring-fenced for the local CVS, but this has not occurred.</p> <p>A strong CVS is necessary for capacity building of other voluntary sector organisations and their ability to support local people in tough times.</p> <p>Cuts will impact on the ability of CVS to lever in external funding.</p> <p>Proposed cuts will impact on the support CVS can give to local residents and the support that could be gained to the Council in securing savings elsewhere.</p> <p>Proposal would make engagement with 'heard to reach' groups more difficult.</p>	<p>Response sent (undated) from Cllr. Gill.</p> <p>Response notes that B&D CVS has supported LBBD's call for reduced requirement on the Council for the London Councils Grants scheme – this is welcomed.</p> <p>Response notes the previous changes to commissioning budgets in 2012.</p> <p>Response states that ACS/SAV/07 cannot be withdrawn as the spending cannot be sustained owing to HMG budget cuts.</p>
--	---	---

<p>B&D Faith Forum – via letter to Anne Bristow on 30 November (sent by Paula Watson)</p>	<p>Proposed cuts make a tiny dent on the larger savings requirement.</p> <p>Recognises the budget situation and suggests a cut in grant to the Forum, rather than outright withdrawal of all funding.</p>	<p>Response sent on 04 December, points out the severe budgetary constraint faced by the authority and specifically highlights B&D Faith Forum’s work.</p>
<p>Sickle Cell/Thalassaemia Support Group BDH (sent by Ms. Shoetan, 29 November)</p>	<p>Concerns about savings proposals generally in terms of impact on the voluntary sector.</p>	<p>Response sent on 04 December, states that the authority is not making savings by choice. Points out that the new Health & Wellbeing strategy recognises the need to support those with sickle cell disease.</p>
<p>B&D Citizen’s Advice Bureau (letter sent on 29 October by Dennis Riley, Chair of B&DCAB). Letter was sent to Cllr. Mullane, as Chair of the SSSC.</p>	<p>Wide-ranging concerns about savings proposals on voluntary sector grants.</p> <p>The letter from B&D CAB outlines that while the cuts to voluntary sector organisations are relatively modest when set against the totality of cuts, the impact will be significant.</p> <p>The letter argues that the Council should not be cutting grants to voluntary sector bodies at a time when service pressures are increasing owing to the Government’s welfare reform, legal aid reform and deficit reduction policies – as a corollary, this will result in increased need.</p>	<p>Response sent by Cllr. Mullane on 29 November.</p> <p>Letter states:-</p> <p>The approach that we are taking in making the savings is to decommission some services in order to retain as much as we can of the frontline advice provision. This does not mean that the services that we will no longer fund are not valued. It is simply that we cannot afford to carry on providing the full range of services. For this reason, although it is proposed that the advice commission does receive a reduced level of funding, the level of reduction is significantly less than that experienced by most other voluntary sector</p>

		<p>commissions. The amount provided for a Generalist Advice Service over the past three years has been £196,500 per year. It was proposed that this be reduced to £185,000 and that the new service should include the Hate Incident/Crime Reporting and Case Work service. It is hoped that this will enable hate incident reporting to benefit from the multiple locations, and reach of the generalist advice service.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">/2</p> <p>At the Safer & Stronger Community Select Committee, a recommendation was made to invest the reduction of £10,000 in our contribution to London Councils in the advice services commission. If agreed at Cabinet on the 19th December, it will mean that the contract value of the new commission would be £195,000 for a Generalist Advice and Hate Incident/Crime Reporting and Case Work service.</p> <p>We are looking again at the services to be provided and it seems that there will be some benefit to be gained from bringing together into one commission an even wider range of advice services. With the Community Legal Advice Centre losing such a large part of its funding, other than the Council funding, this approach would enable more flexibility for the delivery of a viable, borough wide service than more, smaller contracts would offer. The tendering process will allow for individual organisations or consortia to</p>
--	--	---

<p>Harmony House – via letter from Maria Kearns, CEx of HH to Corporate Director (21 November)</p>	<p>Letter accepts the council’s difficult funding position.</p> <p>Calls for a cross-sector grants and commissioning group to be established locally.</p> <p>Possible consideration should be given to a trading arm, possibly in the form of a Community Interest Company.</p> <p>Proposals within ACS/SAV/07 will lead to the closure of Silvernet (Elders Forum) and the Hate Crime Service, as well as impacts on commissioned services for Scrattons Farm estate (the project is supporting residents to take on management of the community hall from LBBDD).</p> <p>Total loss from Harmony House will be 87k and 4 posts will need to be deleted.</p>	<p>demonstrate their approach to delivering the required outcomes.</p>
<p>ACS SAV 09</p>	<p>Libraries</p>	
<p>Consultee & Channel</p>	<p>Comments</p>	<p>Summary of Responses/Action</p>
<p>Residents – via numerous channels - Letter</p>	<p>One resident has copied her (handwritten) letter to Sec of State and raised concerns about the heritage of the borough’s</p>	<p>Consultation is now ongoing with residents and with staff about the future shape of the libraries.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Twitter - Facebook - Deputy Leader's QT - Leader's QT <p>Staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Libraries staff have set out a number of issues about the forward direction of libraries via email to budget@lbbd.gov.uk - Libraries staff attended the CEx Feedback Forums 	<p>libraries being lost. Particular praise in one letter re: Valence Library being 'first class'.</p> <p>Significant debate at both DLQT and LQT.</p>	<p>Individual consultation meetings are taking place throughout November and December 2012 in individual libraries.</p> <p>Cllr. Gill addressed this issue in both his Deputy Leader's Question Time and on the Twitter Budget Challenge discussion (#BDBudgetChallenge) held on 22 Nov.</p> <p>Cllr. Smith made clear the consultation on libraries is ongoing and that he would not be keen to see library sites close only to have to look at re-opening them if the economic situation became more favourable.</p>
ACS SAV 10	Substitute savings in commissioning	
Consultee & Channel	Comments	Summary of Responses/Action
<p>Only one comment on this saving proposal came through to the Budget Challenge, this was from a resident via email.</p>	<p>Resident believes that not everyone with mental health needs is ready or well enough to work. They require ongoing support in their recovery. What support will be made available to these people if you scrap the service that is currently supporting them, as DWP's concentrate on employment and do not offer vocational and social support which is currently being offered</p>	<p>Divisional Director responded as follows:-</p> <p>The Council does not have a statutory responsibility to provide vocational or support services to people with mental health needs and there are a wide range of other services which exist. However this is not a proposal that the Council would be considering if we were not subject to the austerity measures.</p> <p>When this proposal was discussed at HASSC, the recommendation from Councillors was that the saving</p>

		<p>achieved should be reduced and re-modelled. If the saving is agreed, then staff in the Council's Job Shops and the 15 community employment outreach services will receive specialist training in supporting people with mental health needs. There are also other supported employment services such as those run by the Shaw Trust for people with mental health needs.</p> <p>DABD has recently been awarded £300,000 to develop volunteering opportunities for disabled people. The current specialist employment service does not currently offer social support – the proposal includes an allocation to support a user led organization to develop social support services of their choice.</p>
ACS SAV 20	Deletion of the Arts Team	
<p>Jo Richardson Community School</p> <p>Carole Pluckrose - via letter to Cllr. Mullane</p> <p>Staff members in the YOS</p>	<p>Widespread concerns about loss of ARC Theatre scheme and impact on local children's arts education.</p> <p>As above</p> <p>Comments from two staff in the YOS arguing that the work done by ARC has been especially beneficial for vulnerable young girls and/or young parents.</p>	<p>The Select Committee agreed the saving proposal as set out.</p>
ACS SAV 21	Deletion of the Events Team	No comments logged into Budget Challenge
ACS SAV 32	Summer's Sorted	No comments logged into Budget Challenge
ACS SAV 22	Broadway Theatre	This proposal was withdrawn for 13/14.
ACS SAV 23	Heritage Education Service	No comments logged into Budget Challenge,

		although the Select Committee did ask for a self-financing model to be investigated.
ACS SAV 25	Neighbourhood Crime Reduction Team	
ACS SAV 26	Anti-social behaviour team	
ACS SAV 27	CCTV reductions	
Consultee & Channel	Comments	Summary of Responses/Action
<p>Residents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Facebook - Twitter - Deputy Leader QT - Email - Leader's QT 	<p>A number of comments from concerned residents about the impact of reductions in the services on ASB/CCTV.</p> <p>Concern that crime would spread across the community as a result of the proposal being enacted.</p> <p>Praise for the team – inc. from a female resident on Facebook who complimented the team for assisting her.</p> <p>Resident via Facebook asking what residents would do without the service.</p>	<p>The Select Committee asked for further work to be done on these proposals.</p> <p>The Select Committee also recommended Cabinet not to enact the CCTV cuts.</p>
<p>Staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Via Budget Challenge email 	<p>Various concerns expressed by staff about proposals to reduce the CCTV service. Includes:-</p>	<p>Divisional Director response to staff member:-</p> <p>The savings proposed of £153,000 are those budgets</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Carellne - Lone Worker System - Noise Nuisance Team - Out of Hours service - CCTV in parking enforcement - Increasing income generation - Alleged lack of briefing of staff 	<p>within the CCTV Service which are met from the General Fund. It is indeed right that the service generates income from other sources, including Schools, Parking and Housing Revenue Account budgets and that there are functions undertaken within the CCTV service which will have to continue, should monitoring of cameras cease.</p> <p>At the same time work is ongoing within the department to consider options for continuing with monitoring through further income generation and reshaping services and, as these are developed, these options will be put before Cabinet.</p> <p>It is unfortunate that staff members feel there was insufficient discussion with managers about proposals. All staff are being given the opportunity to comment and work has been ongoing since the early proposal was put forward to look at alternative ways of making the savings. In terms of consultation on the proposals a formal process is in place which began on Thursday 15th November.</p>
ACS SAV 30	Cease funding of the parks police	
Consultee & Channel	Comments	Summary of Responses/Action
B&D Police <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Letter to Cllr. Smith, Cllr. Alexander and Graham Farrant, with 	Sets out Police position on value of partnership working, takes account of the harsh financial situation in which the Council finds itself and looks to future	

copy to Anne Bristow and Helen Jenner	partnership approaches.	
Leader's QT	Why close this service when it does such a good job for our excellent parks?	Cllr. Smith responded by asking whether the service should not in fact be provided by other agencies (specifically the police).
CHS SAV 01 and 22	Early Years – Changes to the delivery format of phase 3 Children's Centres and Change Focus for a number of Children's Centres so they become education only hubs	
Consultee & Channel	Comments	Summary of Responses/Action
Residents - Via Twitter	Two residents asked Cllr. Gill about the future of Children's Centres in his #BDBudgetChallenge Q&A online. One young mother asked how she would be able to go out to work if she could not be secure that the Centres are available.	Cllr. Gill responded on need to consult and look at how the provision can be improved. Takes account of the growing population of younger people in the borough.
CHS SAV 02	IYS – Reduction in staff & Commissioning	No comments logged into Budget Challenge
CHS SAV 03	Borough apprenticeships	No comments logged into Budget Challenge
CHS SAV 04	Efficiencies - school improvement	No comments logged into Budget Challenge
CHS SAV 05	School Estates Team	No comments logged into Budget Challenge
CHS SAV 06	Reduction of 100k in education inclusion	No comments logged into Budget Challenge
CHS SAV 07	Reduce capacity in performance, inspection support & commissioning team	No comments logged into Budget Challenge
CHS SAV 11	Reduction in use of independent social	No comments logged into Budget Challenge

	workers (adoption)	
CHS SAV 12	Reduce court costs in complex needs	No comments logged into Budget Challenge
CHS SAV 13	Reduce staff supporting Common Assessment Framework	No comments logged into Budget Challenge
CHS SAV 15	Reduce service in school estate mgt to statutory minimum	No comments logged into Budget Challenge
CHS SAV 16	Reductions to central attendance team	No comments logged into Budget Challenge
CHS SAV 17	Inclusion services - reductions in SEN (funding to be derived from DSG complex special needs pot)	No comments logged into Budget Challenge
CHS SAV 18	School improvement – reductions in central SEN, only fund from DSG	No comments logged into Budget Challenge
CHS SAV 19	Review 14-19 provision	No comments logged into Budget Challenge
CHS SAV 20	Reduce youth service to statutory minimum	
CHS SAV 21	Early Years & Childcare – reduce to statutory minimum	No comments logged into Budget Challenge
Consultee & Channel	Comments	Response/Action
UNISON - Via email (CHS Representative is Sue Gooding)	Wide-ranging concerns over the future of the youth service, especially in regard to reductions to statutory minimum and the concept of utilising the voluntary sector. Comments focus on:- - Reduction in sessions (YouthBus) and re-provision by uniformed voluntary sector; - Proposed reduction to the MALTs - Closure of The Vibe - Harm to Early Intervention Service	Divisional Director (Christine Pryor) has undertaken to discuss the submission with UNISON and other recognised TU reps in January (following 19 th December Cabinet decision).

	<p>Alternative suggestions include utilising the Youth Bus for outreach work</p> <p>Comments that Streetbase has been overly cost heavy and the levels of interest among young people demonstrate that it should not be continued.</p>	
Consultee & Channel	Comments	Summary of Responses/Action
<p>Resident - Via email</p> <p>Select Committee attendance</p> <p>Leader's Question Time</p>	<p>Concern over lack of consultation with Younger People in the borough on various Children's Services savings proposals.</p> <p>Asks why the BAD Youth Forum were not specifically consulted. Resident notifies LBBD that intends to raise this point of concern at the LQT</p> <p>Representative of BAD Youth Forum asked why a specific event was not organised this year for younger people to be consulted on the Budget Challenge?</p>	<p>Younger people did attend the Select Committee and were able to put their concerns.</p> <p>BAD Youth Forum representatives will attend the LQT on 29 November.</p> <p>Cllr. Smith responded that select committees were extremely well attended this year and that BAD Youth Forum – and younger residents – had lot of opportunities to challenge the process and the proposals.</p> <p>Cllr. Smith warmly welcomed the work of the BAD Youth Forum and congratulated the questioner who had attended the LQT.</p> <p>Cllr. Smith undertook to attend a future meeting of the BAD Youth Forum to answer questions on council policy.</p>

CEX SAV 01	Reduce spend on supplies/services in the CEx department	
Consultee & Channel	Comments	Summary of Responses/Action
Residents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Via email - Via letter - Via Leader's QT 	<p>A number of residents wrote in to BC welcoming any reductions in costs in the CEx department.</p> <p>Residents asked that senior salaries in the 'back office' departments be reduced and the number of staff be reduced.</p>	<p>Response to residents featured the potential for shared service.</p> <p>LBBD already shares a CEx and a Head of Legal – looking to replicate this across other services.</p>
CEX SAV 02 and 10	Reduction in Policy & Performance posts/supplies and services	No specific comments logged
CEX SAV 05	Reduction in supplier costs in Marketing & Comms and increased sponsorship & advertising	No specific comments logged
CEX SAV 11	Cease production of 'The News'	
Consultee & Channel	Comments	Summary of Responses/Action
Residents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Via email - Via letter - Via Deputy Leader's Question Time - Via letters to the Barking & Dagenham Post - Via LQT 	<p>A mixed response from residents to the proposal.</p> <p>Those in favour argued that the 'News' is not independent and should not be produced at cost to the taxpayer when other forms of media are available and councillors are available also to discuss Council matters with.</p> <p>Other residents – mainly older people – expressed a wish for the 'News' to be retained as it is the one communications</p>	<p>Barking and Dagenham is one of the very few local authorities that still produce a regular newspaper. Only 13 other councils do so. The Secretary of State has made it clear that he believes that local authorities should only produce newsletters 4 or less times per year and he has indicated that he will be taking legislation to Parliament soon to prohibit the production of fortnightly or weekly papers. Consequently, even if this proposal was not put forward this year, it is one we would have to return to in the very near future.</p> <p>The cost of producing 'The News' is about £60,000,</p>

<p>Staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Counter proposal from staff to produce 	<p>channel which goes to all doors and while online channels are increasingly replacing print, not all older people/residents have e-access.</p> <p>One resident wrote asking for a reduction in frequency of the paper, perhaps taking it monthly instead of fortnightly.</p>	<p>once the costs are reconciled against the income the newspaper brings in. Should Members agree to end the production of it, even more effort would need to be put in to building up coverage in local media such as the Barking and Dagenham Post. We would also make continued use of our increasingly popular Facebook and Twitter pages. Of course, not everyone has access to either of these here in the borough, but rapidly increasing numbers of people do so.</p> <p>Much of the content that is reported in 'The News' is also reported in the local media – but local councillors will also have a role in explaining to their constituents about their work and what is happening in the community.</p> <p>In his response at LQT, Cllr. Smith argued that a council newspaper is not something that can be justified when 'front line' jobs are under threat right across the Council.</p> <p>A less regular edition will not work financially because advertisers would withdraw from the paper and the reduced frequency results in ineligibility for statutory notices to be published.</p> <p>This is being considered as part of the formal consultation on potential deletion of the 4 posts – a response to this will be authored on completion of the</p>
---	--	---

a less regular publication		<p>formal consultation period.</p> <p>However, any reduced service would not deliver a saving as the distribution and print costs would still exist and advertising is likely to be impacted by lack of frequency.</p> <p>Additionally, any reduced frequency strips the publication of its right to carry statutory notices in any event and thus makes the cost to the Council higher.</p>
CEX SAV 06	Reductions of employee budgets in Legal & Democratic services	No comments logged into Budget Challenge (although Scrutiny Members on PAASC rejected part of this proposal).
CEX SAV 12	Additional savings through shared legal services with Thurrock	No comments logged into Budget Challenge
CEX SAV 09	Reduction in the health & safety team	
Consultee & channel	Comments	Summary of Responses/Action
<p>Staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Via email 	<p>One staff member raised a concern about this proposal impacting on staff training around H&S.</p> <p>Staff member raised concerns about the potential negative impact on H&S training courses and asked how improvements could be made.</p>	<p>We have a range of delivery models for delivering health and safety training. This particular course could be delivered in house but based on our costing model would be more expensive per head particularly when taking into consideration venue and printing costs. It also must be delivered in a particular way to meet legal and insurance requirements. So for this particular course it must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be run for ½ day • Be 50% practical • Include both a practical and written assessment

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Have a maximum number of delegates <p>This has cost implications, as such using an external provider who runs this course for a number of different organisations they are able to achieve economies of scale that we can't through running it inhouse.</p> <p>The booklets are used for all of their clients and are linked to a specific accredited course. As such the training company is able to bulk order, and it is included in the pricing for the course.</p> <p>The venue has to be suitable for practical activities and assessment and although they will come to our venues, we have found it makes sense to use their venue as it is included in the cost, and is suitable for this particular course. Feedback from participants shows high levels of satisfaction with the venue and its location.</p> <p>This training is evaluated, and we also use a quality assurance model through observation to make sure that it is delivering our specific requirements. We are satisfied that this course does this, and also represents value for money.</p> <p>We have tried to reduce the time that our H&S Officers deliver direct training where it makes sense to do so. Buying in training is not always a more expensive option and it does allow us to concentrate on other key</p>
--	--	---

		activities where we can deliver an added value. We do work hard to make sure that the rate charged by external trainers is competitive, and that the training couldn't be delivered in a more appropriate way such as e-learning or blended learning.
CEX SAV 08	Potential shared service with Thurrock	No comments logged with Budget Challenge (this will be subject to staff consultation once proposals emerge)
FIN RES SAV 06 - 19	Various finance measures, including efficiencies, internal audit, reductions in risk management etc.	No comments logged with Budget Challenge (although PAASC did make recommendations on several of the proposals)
CORP SAV 01	Increase fees and charges	No comments logged with Budget Challenge
ACS SAV 02	Deletion in posts of statutory social care and complaints function	No comments logged with Budget Challenge
ACS SAV 03	Occupational Therapy and Sensory Service	
Consultee & Channel	Comments	Summary of Responses/Action
Staff - Via CEx Feedback Forum	Concern that OT service staff were not properly briefed on proposals. Concern that OT service is staffed by agency staff and that reductions should be met via this route before permanent staff.	Staff in the OT service have been briefed both face-to-face with the relevant Divisional Director and in a written briefing from the Corporate Director.
ACS SAV 04	Sheltered Housing	
Consultee & Channel	Comments	Summary of Responses/Action
Residents - Via letter	Concern expressed about the proposals was wide-ranging.	Cllr Reason addressed deputation to HAASC.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Via email - Via Deputy Leader's QT - Via representations at HAASC 	<p>A very large number of concerned residents addressed HAASC.</p> <p>Residents did write in with specific concerns about the proposals and how they would impact their own accommodation needs.</p>	<p>A letter has now been sent to all sheltered accommodation residents informing them of the decision to review the proposal, to consult in more depth and to bring further proposals forward at a future date.</p> <p>Cllr. Reason addressed Deputy Leader's QT and made clear the Administration's approach to this proposal (namely, additional consultation with residents over the course of the next year).</p>
ACS SAV 10	Substitute savings in commissioning	(To HAASC)
Consultee & channel	Comments	Summary of Responses/Actions
<p>Only one comment on this saving proposal came through to the Budget Challenge, this was from a resident.</p>	<p>Resident believes that not everyone with mental health needs is ready or well enough to work. They require ongoing support in their recovery. What support will be made available to these people if you scrap the service that is currently supporting them, as DWP's concentrate on employment and do not offer vocational and social support which is currently being offered</p>	<p>Divisional Director responded as follows:-</p> <p>The Council does not have a statutory responsibility to provide vocational or support services to people with mental health needs and there are a wide range of other services which exist. However this is not a proposal that the Council would be considering if we were not subject to the austerity measures.</p> <p>When this proposal was discussed at HASSC, the recommendation from Councillors was that the saving achieved should be reduced and re-modelled. If the saving is agreed, then staff in the Council's Job Shops and the 15 community employment outreach services will receive specialist training in supporting people with mental health needs. There are also other supported employment services such as those run by the Shaw</p>

		<p>Trust for people with mental health needs.</p> <p>DABD has recently been awarded £300,000 to develop volunteering opportunities for disabled people. The current specialist employment service does not currently offer social support – the proposal includes an allocation to support a user led organization to develop social support services of their choice.</p>
ACS SAV 11 – 19 and 28, 29	Various measures – inc. reductions in funding for care packages, homelessness prevention, Business Support, reduce advocacy support to statutory minimum only.	No comments logged with Budget Challenge
H&E SAV 01 a	Catering Income from Parks	No comments logged with Budget Challenge
H&E SAV 01 c	Parks Rangers service	
Consultee & channel	Comments	Summary of Responses/Actions
<p>Residents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Via email - Via Deputy Leader’s QT - Via letter - Leader’s QT 	<p>A number of residents have written in congratulating the Parks Rangers service, especially in terms of the work done with children and their work in maintaining LBBD has such excellent, award winning parks.</p> <p>Calls on the Council to retain the service or face the parks becoming no-go areas again.</p> <p>Calls on the Council to maintain the Parks Rangers or the parks will quickly become unkempt and be vandalised.</p>	<p>Response has discussed whether the service could be re-provided via other means.</p> <p>Whether there is duplication with services that could be provided by other agencies.</p>

<p>Staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Via email into budget@lbbd.gov.uk - Chief Exec's Feedback Forum 1 	<p>Parks rangers staff expressed concern over lack of information and briefing</p> <p>Staff attended both CEx Feedback Forum meetings and discussed concerns with Graham Farrant</p>	<p>An alternative funding suggestion provided by staff is now being discussed with the Parks Rangers and with the relevant Divisional Director and with the Corporate Director.</p>
<p>H&E SAV 02 - 18</p>	<p>Various efficiency measures across services such as transport and plant, depot consolidation, Parking Services Improvement Plan, reducing on street parking enforcement and replace with cameras and auto-ticketing technology etc.</p>	<p>No comments logged with Budget Challenge</p>
<p>H&E SAV 19</p>	<p>End separate collection for green waste</p>	
<p>Consultee & channel</p>	<p>Comments</p>	<p>Summary of Responses/Action</p>
<p>Residents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Via email into budget@lbbd.gov.uk - Via letter - Via Facebook - Via Twitter - Via Dep Ldr QT - Via Leader's QT 	<p>Widespread concern from respondees that ceasing the green waste collection will be a backwards step.</p> <p>Older respondents especially find the service very useful.</p> <p>One resident described the service as a "godsend" that had improved the borough's look and feel and helped deal with eyesore gardens.</p>	<p>Response to consultees and respondees has been that the original proposal has now been reviewed and that proposals to rescind it partially or in full will be taken to Cabinet.</p> <p>This response was communicated to all consultees early on in the process following Member review.</p> <p>Cllr. Smith announced at LQT that he felt sure a service could be retained following fresh grant funding.</p>

H&E SAV 21	Charging for bulky waste collection	
Consultee & channel	Comments	Summary of Response/Action
Residents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Deputy Leader's QT - Letter 	<p>One resident asked about the cost of collection being increased. The resident felt this would add to the unsightly state of the borough's streets and would encourage fly-tipping.</p> <p>One resident wrote in via letter that she felt that increasing charges would create more work for road-sweepers (who themselves were hampered by their needing to use mechanical sweepers which she felt do not work).</p> <p>A further resident also criticised the use of mechanical sweepers.</p>	<p>Cllr. Gill responded that the original charge proposal was being reduced.</p> <p>The new charge was competitive compared with the costs incurred on residents by private sector organisations to remove old white goods.</p>
FIN RES SAV 01 , 17, 18, 20, 21 and 22	Various measures including savings in the enterprise and sustainable communities team, increase charging of staff time to the HRA, increase Local Implementation Plan income and delete one post, delete one post in planning and increase income.	<p>No comments logged with Budget Challenge.</p> <p>These measures were scrutinised by Living & Working Select Committee.</p> <p>The Select Committee did propose some recommendations to specific proposals (e.g. levels of support to Chamber of Commerce)</p>