



ROCHDALE
METROPOLITAN BOROUGH
COUNCIL

ITEM NO. PR103

Subject: Public Protection

Cabinet Member: Councillor Terry Linden

1. RECOMMENDATIONS / DECISION REQUESTED

- 1.1. It is recommended that the proposed budget and staffing proposals are agreed as a basis for consultation.

2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1. The Council is required to make substantial savings in its revenue budgets and Planning and Regulation is putting forward a series of proposals to contribute to the corporate requirements.

3. ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS CONSIDERED

- 3.1. A range of potential savings have been examined but there is limited scope for action given that the vast bulk of Service costs are staff related. There are parts of the Service eg Registrar's and Coroners where minimum standards of service are already being provided and much of the rest of the Service is either statutory or income generating.

4. BACKGROUND & SUMMARY

- 4.1. The Planning and Regulation Service has considered options for Service budget savings.

Following discussion the Service is proposing to put forward a range of proposals. This report deals with proposals within Public Protection as set out below.

The proposal set out here is based upon these principles

1. Maintenance of front line services as far as possible. There will be some impact on Service Standards and it is proposed to withdraw from some Services.
 2. Protection of smaller services where reductions would reduce service standards below statutory minimums
 3. Minimal dependence on additional income generation
- 4.2. On the basis of these principles a range of savings options have been developed which will deliver savings of £480,000 with options to increase this to £710,000 or £810,000.

In this context the services selected for reduction are those where there is no mandatory requirement and where the health and other risks are considered to be low.

The proposal put forward here is:

Savings in Public Protection involving:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

There are impacts and risks of doing this as we fail to meet statutory requirements and mandatory levels of service provision in these areas of Public Protection.

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

These savings will amount to £118,000 in a full year. These changes will shed 2 posts directly and one indirectly.

It is considered that these proposals will maintain a full range of service capability and there will be no noticeable reduction in the standard of service.

5. CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN / REQUIRED

- 5.1. Further consultation will be required with client groups such as animal welfare organizations. These groups will be identified more precisely over the next few weeks
- 5.2. Obviously there will be extensive staff consultation with an initial briefing having been made to all staff within the Service.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1. Theme Place

6.2. Proposal Title Savings in Public Protection

6.3. Breakdown of Savings from the Service

Service Name:

Area of Service:

Cost Centre affected:

Is this a cost or additional saving: This is a saving in staff costs.

	Savings 2013/14 £000		Savings 2014/15 £000		Savings Total £000	
	Ongoing	One Off	Ongoing	One Off	Ongoing	One Off
Employees						
Other Costs						
Income lost (Show as minus)						
Net Savings						
Additional Income Generated (show as a positive figure)						

Total Savings Implementation Costs				
Total Savings less Implementation Costs	118.0			118.0

6.4 Financial Impact on another service? No

6.5 Details of the Financial Impact on another service

N/A

6.6 Financial Risks

The bulk of our proposals have to be a direct consequence of staff reductions and can therefore be directly matched against actions controllable by the Service.

These proposals have been discussed with Finance and slight corrections made to figures as a consequence.

6.6 Voluntary Sector Financial Impact

There is no direct impact on the voluntary sector financially but the following impacts are anticipated:

- a. Reduced service to area forums and other community meetings
- b. Increased emphasis on voluntary sector to deal with issues such as animal welfare
- c. Loss of one job in a charitable organization.

7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1.

8. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

8.1.

9. RISK ASSESSMENT IMPLICATIONS

The following risks are envisaged

Inability to meet statutory requirements for Animal Welfare and Pest Control

Loss of funding opportunities for tackling contaminated land and consequential failure to address health risks.

10. ASSET IMPLICATIONS

There are no specific risk issues for members to consider arising from this report.

11. JOINT WORKING

Joint working with a voluntary agency on the Dog warden service would cease.

12. EQUALITIES IMPACTS

12.1 Workforce Equality Impacts Assessment

13. VOLUNTARY SECTOR IMPACTS

13.1 There are no (*significant*) equality/community issues arising from this report.

There are no background papers