

Revenue Budget: 2014-15

Appendix C iii - Feedback on specific savings proposals

Introduction

Given the scale of the savings requirement for 2014/15–15/16, we recognise that a number of the proposals being put forward within the revenue budget will be considered ‘front line’ services that people use and notice.

As such, we published a list of those proposals which would likely have a direct impact on users and sought to elicit from those directly affected and interested what the impact of the proposed saving might be. The purpose of this exercise was for residents, users or partners to put forward – and for us to ensure we more fully understood – the impact of the savings proposal on those who use them and should they be agreed, to explore ways in which the impact may be mitigated against.

This appendix summarises the feedback on each of the savings proposals where further information was sought.

Approach

There were 18 proposals which were published for comment on the impact in this way and from this individual exercises, eliciting comment and feedback on the implications of the proposals were undertaken.

This ran from November 5th, through to 13th December 2013 (6 weeks in total). As a minimum, details of all the proposals were posted on the Council’s Consultation Finder database with information disseminated to all registered consultees. The proposals were emailed to around 900 members of the community panel as well information posted on our Facebook and Twitter accounts. A press release was issued outlining proposals and directing people to further information and feedback forms which stimulated significant coverage in the local press.

Where relevant, individual service areas also contacted and sought the input of people / organisations directly affected by the proposals. These have been referenced in the individual summary of responses.

Overview of responses received and recommendations

This process generated a great deal of feedback. Individual papers providing an overview of responses received and subsequent recommendations for each of the proposals are provided as part of this appendix.

These ‘overview and recommendations’ papers should be read in conjunction with the more detailed ‘summaries of responses’ and verbatim responses received in relation to each of the proposals to ensure decision makers have a sufficient overview of the breadth and tenor of the comments received. These have been circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our Consultation Finder database.

The table below lists each of the proposals in the order which they appear in the revenue budget. For ease of reference, it also provides the conclusions as a result of the feedback and any subsequent recommendations put forward.

Summary of officer conclusions and recommendations as result of feedback on the impact of savings proposals

App Ci) Line Ref:	Proposal	Service area	Initial proposed saving		Officer conclusion	Officer recommendation	Amended proposed saving	
			14/15	15/16			14/15	15/16
4	Charging for Supporting People services	CCH&S	£250k (income)	£200k (income)	<p>In the face to face discussions all recognised it is right that people are asked to make a contribution to services on a means tested basis.</p> <p>The Fair Contributions Policy and process of financial assessment is robust and intended to ensure that the most vulnerable are not unduly disadvantaged by make a contribution towards the cost of their care and support.</p> <p>Charging will only apply to those in receipt of long term services (over 2 years) and therefore will protect those who are likely to be in greatest need receiving short term interventions.</p> <p>The approach of asking those who can pay, to pay, is intended to enable us to retain this level of preventative service in the community rather than reducing the commissioning budget. It also bring supporting people services in line with the charging regime for adult social care.</p>	Feedback has not uncovered any further issues which would prevent the council from proceeding with this saving. It is therefore recommended to implement this proposal with no changes	£250k (income)	£200k (income)
8	Integrate of services supporting vulnerable young people and careers information, advice, support and guidance provision.	Children's	£393k (34%)		<p>The feedback includes a strong set of evidence based points about the potential impacts of cuts to early targeted services. These are valid and we acknowledge that the impact of cutting early intervention services has the potential to have negative outcomes for some children and young people.</p> <p>Strong suggestions are put forward for greater integration, more pooling, more collaborative solution-focused thinking and action, particularly with community, voluntary and third sector partners. We will be working to incorporate this thinking in our work as we go forward with a view to ameliorating the impact of these savings.</p>	Feedback has not uncovered any further issues which would prevent the council from proceeding with this saving. It is therefore recommended to implement this proposal with no changes	£280k	£113K
9	Community-based care packages for disabled children	Education	£160k (21%)	n/a	<p>It is the Council's policy to make provision for children with SEN and disabilities as locally as possible and to support them to remain living within their own homes wherever possible. In recent years, the range of short breaks services available locally has increased, as has the use of Direct Payments / Personal Budgets, allowing families greater choice and control over how they are supported.</p> <p>As a direct result of this policy, the number of disabled children being placed in residential settings has decreased. It is likely that there will always be a small number of disabled children who require residential placements. It should be possible to further reduce reliance on residential placements by continuing to invest in local services, but it should be noted that the budget for short breaks will need to be protected in order to allow this to happen and also that there will be inevitable pressure on the budget which supports local care packages and Direct Payments if we are to continue to reduce residential placements.</p>	Feedback has not uncovered any further issues which would prevent the council from proceeding with this saving. It is therefore recommended to implement this proposal with no changes	£160k	n/a

App Ci) Line Ref:	Proposal	Service area	Initial proposed saving		Officer conclusion	Officer recommendation	Amended proposed saving	
			14/15	15/16			14/15	15/16
14	Children's Centres	Education	£50k (4%)	£105k (8%)	Suggestions and recommendations from the consultation responses are in line with our current approach to make best use of our resources and we will continue to develop in these areas.	Feedback has not uncovered any further issues which would prevent the council from proceeding with this saving. It is therefore recommended to implement this proposal with no changes	£50k	£105k
19	CAMHS	Education	£129k (72%)		<p>It was recognised in the feedback that this proposal would potentially affect the poorest and most vulnerable in our communities, at a time where the data show an increase in mental health issues in children and young people.</p> <p>However there is clearly a need to build on the commitment for joint planning and delivery across relevant agencies to try and mitigate against and/or cover the projected funding loss.</p> <p>If funding is found from a different source then the current level of service delivery can continue. Reviews of the delivery options could be undertaken. WBC is committed to developing further Early Intervention Emotional Wellbeing support for children and young people in schools which should reduce the numbers of CAMHS Tier 3 and 4 referrals by tackling some problems earlier. This is not without additional cost and involves a long term commitment to see the results.</p> <p>An alternative proposal would be to maintain the current reduced budget to CAMHS in the next financial year to allow Tier 2 CAMHS services to continue, or to make a small reduction. This would allow more time for Public Health, CCGs, NHS and WBC to work together to form a joint mental health strategy, discuss and agree different funding streams and develop provision in a planned and cost-effective way.</p>	Given the better than anticipated improving local economy, it is recommended that the proposed savings is not taken in full in 2014/15. Instead the collaborative working to improve pathways and support across all tiers should be taken forward through further discussion, consultation and service re-design.	£40k	£0
24	Therapy services	Education	£65K (20%)		<p>It was anticipated that this proposal would create anxiety particularly on the part of parents of children with SEN, who have expressed understandable concerns, as have others on their behalf. If this savings proposal is taken forward, our intention would be to seek to minimise its impact by seeking efficiency savings wherever possible, developing robust joint commissioning with health commissioners and reviewing models of service delivery.</p> <p>Opportunities to raise income by charging neighbouring local authorities for therapy services provided for children who attend WBC schools but reside in those authorities are also currently being explored. This was not previously permissible under inter-authority recoupment regulations but now seems to be possible under new SEN funding procedures.</p>	Feedback has not uncovered any further issues which would prevent the council from proceeding with this saving. It is therefore recommended to implement this proposal with no changes.	£15k	£50k
25	PreSchool counselling	Education	£20k (12%)	n/a	<p>Measures have already been put in place to spread the service as effectively as possible and to reduce the waiting list, for example visits to older children on the caseload are less frequent than previously.</p> <p>Suggestions for making better use of resources will all be considered in order to reduce the impact of the saving, but it is</p>	Feedback has not uncovered any further issues which would prevent the council from proceeding with this saving. It is therefore recommended to implement this proposal with no changes	£20k	£0

App Ci) Line Ref:	Proposal	Service area	Initial proposed saving		Officer conclusion	Officer recommendation	Amended proposed saving	
			14/15	15/16			14/15	15/16
					unlikely that this saving could be achieved without increasing waiting times for the service.			
27	Public transport subsidies	H&T	£375K (25%)		The exercise has proved valuable in identifying implications of potential changes to routes. These will feed into the conclusions of our review as to how to meet the savings target. However, we recognise the concerns around the impact of savings on voluntary sector transport.	Feedback has brought forward issues to consider in particular in relation to the voluntary and community transport providers. Given the better than anticipated improving local economy, it is recommended that the saving relating to the voluntary and community sector is reduced.	£100k	£185k
31	Libraries	C&EP	£75k (5%)	£100K (6%)	The greatest number of responses was received in relation to Pangbourne, Burghfield Common and Mortimer. Responses make a case for seeking smaller reductions. The suggestion that "mobile stops frequency could be reduced from 3 to 4 weekly" could be considered. The potential for shared service working is being explored.	Feedback has brought forward further issues to consider in relation to the reductions in opening hours. Given the better than anticipated improving local economy, it is recommended that the proposed savings is not taken in full in 2014/15. It is therefore recommended that the reduction in hours at Pangbourne Library be amended to 5 hours per week (library open 22 hours per week); at Mortimer Library the reduction in hours be amended to 3 hours per week (library open for 19 hours per week) and at Burghfield Common Library the reduction in hours be amended to 2 hours per week (library open for 19 hours per week)	£51k	£100k
33	Road safety	H&T	£96k (42%)		Feedback put forward some helpful comments regarding education and sponsorship which will be investigated. The feedback reinforced the Council's view that the remaining road safety resources need to be targeted effectively.	Feedback has not uncovered any further issues which would prevent the council from proceeding with this saving. It is therefore recommended to implement this proposal with no changes	£40k	£56k
34	Planning enforcement	P&C	£37k (30%)	n/a	The exercise has not highlighted any impacts that are not already anticipated.	Feedback has not uncovered any further issues which would prevent the council from proceeding with this saving. It is therefore recommended to implement this proposal with no changes	£37k	n/a
35	Theatres	C&EP	Corn Exchange: £170k (45%) Watermill: £10k (24%)		Whilst a number of people voiced concern regarding the need for reductions, a number also recognised the need for budget cuts to be made by the council. The scale and timing of the proposed reductions were regarded as a key factor of concern. The option of a longer term culture trust should be explored. The Corn Exchange has submitted a counter proposal of a lower saving profiled over a 5 year period.	Feedback has brought forward further issues to consider in relation to safeguarding the Corn Exchange. Given the better than anticipated improving local economy, it is recommended that the proposed savings is not taken in full and that the reduction in funding to the Corn Exchange be re-profiled over a five year period. With regard to the Watermill theatre, feedback has not uncovered any further issues which would prevent the Council from proceeding with this saving. It is recommended to implement this proposal with no changes.	Corn Exchange: £34k	£34k
			Watermill: n/a				n/a	£10k
41,42,45	Road and verge maintenance	H&T	£419k (11%)		There was concern from respondents about the impact on road conditions but the responses did not put forward any further evidence of impact, not already envisaged. A number of suggestions were put forward around reducing the frequency of grass cutting which are already being pursued.	Feedback has brought forward further issues in relation to road and verge maintenance. Given the better than anticipated improving local economy, it is recommended that the proposed savings is not taken in full in 2014/15. It is therefore recommended that the proposals relating to gully emptying, winter gritting and road maintenance are not progressed at this time.	£57k	£122k
44	Sunday car parking	H&T	£10k	n/a	The vast majority of the 31 responses expressed concern at the	Feedback has brought forward further issues to consider in relation to the increase in car parking charges adversely impacting	£10k	n/a

App Ci) Line Ref:	Proposal	Service area	Initial proposed saving		Officer conclusion	Officer recommendation	Amended proposed saving	
			14/15	15/16			14/15	15/16
	charges		(income)		potential effect of this proposal on town centre trade. Some comments put forward suggested an alternative option to increase the Sunday charge from £1 to £1.50 rather than implementing the full weekday tariff.	on trade in the town. It is therefore recommended that the Sunday charge is increased from £1 to £1.50 rather than implementing the full weekday tariff.	(income)	
43	Public toilets	P&C	£20k (14%)	£50k (34%)	At this stage no viable alternative solutions have been suggested. Beenham Parish Council have confirmed that they will not fund the toilets at Aldermaston Lock so it is recommended that these toilets close. Kintbury Lock and Thatcham Broadway will remain open until 31 March 2015. Further discussions with the respective parish and town councils will be required in the autumn of 2014. Pangbourne and Hungerford are seeking to fund the 3 sites in their areas. If formal agreement cannot however be reached, then it will be recommended that these facilities will close 30 September 2014.	Feedback has not uncovered any further issues which would prevent the council from proceeding with this saving. It is therefore recommended to implement this proposal as outlined above.	£20k	£50k
N/A	School crossing patrols	Education	n/a	£16k (100%)	The Council needs to ensure that the potential risk of death or injury to a child is mitigated if this proposal is to go ahead. Therefore, it is preferable that school crossing patrollers should continue in place to alleviate the risks. Communities should be encouraged to find alternative sources of funding, thus securing the crossing patrollers and reducing the risks. As the Council is receiving requests for an increasing number of patrollers, the solution of self-funded patrollers where there is demand would ensure that the Council did not receive increasing costs in this area as the number of crossing patrollers increases.	Given the better than anticipated improving local economy, it is recommended that the proposed savings is not taken at this time.	£0k	£0k
N/A	Parenting support	Education	n/a	£95k (65%)	West Berkshire currently offers many recognised evidenced based parenting programmes to meet a wide range of needs. However, the Parenting Support Team has trained a high number of staff and as a result the need for a co-ordinating and development function has reduced.	Feedback has not uncovered any further issues which would prevent the council from proceeding with this saving. It is therefore recommended to implement this proposal with no changes	n/a	£95k
N/A	Duke of Edinburgh award	C&EP	n/a	£72k (100%)	The initial intention for this proposal was to look for an alternative method of delivery, maintaining the saving for the council. This will continue.	Feedback has not uncovered any further fundamental issues which would prevent the council from proceeding with this saving. It is therefore recommended that the saving remains unchanged and is proceeded with over the next 12-24 months. Alternative methods of delivery will be explored.	n/a	£72k
N/A	Tourism	C&EP	n/a	£60k (100%)	The process has indicated that there is a continuing demand for face to face service provision.	Feedback has brought forward further issues in relation to the TIC. Given the better than anticipated improving local economy, it is recommended that the proposed savings is not taken in full. It is recommended that the saving target be reduced to £25k and an attempt be made to find this through contributions from Newbury BID, town and parish councils, local businesses and other potential funding streams.	n/a	£25k

2 Year totals

£2,977k

£2,381k

Overview of responses and recommendations: Charging People for Supporting People Services		June Graves, Head of Care Commissioning, Housing and Safeguarding	
Proposal:	To introduce a means-tested, charging scheme for people in receipt of long term Supporting People services	Projected income generated:	Total budget: £3.6m 2014/15: £250k 2015/16: £200k
Nos of responses:	11 feedback forms were received; including 3 from organisations and 1 from a councillor. In addition, 11 people attended specific engagement events to find out more about the proposals.		
Key issues raised:	<p>Concerns expressed about the process of establishing the ability to pay and the overall impact the additional cost may bring to already vulnerable people impacted by welfare reforms.</p> <p>Generally anxious that the financial assessment will be used as a blunt instrument that does not take into account all relevant factors, having a particular impact on younger people.</p> <p>Pressure on other services such as A&E, as a consequence of people declining services on the basis of cost and then falling into crisis.</p> <p>Concern that we are moving against the direction of travel in terms of prevention rather than cure and increasing long term costs to community.</p> <p>Overall concern about the impact on the most vulnerable who, it was felt, will be disproportionately targeted in comparison to those who are better off.</p>		
Equality issues:	<p>2 main concerns arise with respect to equalities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly, that implementation of this proposal may increase the overall level of contribution for individuals already subject to charging and therefore they could consider themselves financially disadvantage. • Secondly, that vulnerable adults may be put off accessing a service on the basis that they may be charged and therefore increasing risk of going into crisis and needing a more intensive / statutory service. 		
Suggestions for mitigating the impact on service users:	Suggestion	Council response	
	Develop and encourage self-help voluntary groups.	Engagement has already started with new and existing voluntary organisations as part of the Council's new Voluntary Sector Prospectus for preventative services. A key aim is to encourage new entrants as well as build on the good work of existing organisations and therefore the Council is working hard to ensure information about what would be involved and how to apply is circulated as widely as possible.	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

Alternative options for applying the saving in this area:	Suggestion	Council response
	Greater use of reserves to supplement this service	Council balances are held primarily to mitigate against any financial risks. These balances are currently considered to be close to minimum levels. Even if there were opportunities to use balances, it is noted that the savings proposals are ongoing, and this would only bridge the gap in the current year, meaning that the savings would still need to be found in the future.
	Increase Council Tax	The administration is proposing to deliver a council tax freeze for the next 2 years as one of their priorities.
	Reduce management tiers in the Council.	This has been and will continue to be addressed as part of delivering any savings required.
	Reduce subsidies for the arts	This is being dealt with through other savings proposals.
	Pass costs back to landlords and remove any duplication of service delivery in the system	These services sit outside housing management tasks and not attributable to the landlord. Work to remove duplication has already been completed.
Suggestions for how others may help contribute:	West Berkshire Therapy Centre have proposed helping general fitness, well-being, pain relief and mobility for individuals with disabilities, also tackling social isolation – will be making available the necessary resources to cope with the anticipated increase in demand from small local voluntary groups that are likely to come under pressure should the Council implement the cuts as described in through this exercise.	
Officer conclusion as a result of the responses:	<p>In the face to face discussions all recognised it is right that people are asked to make a contribution to services on a means tested basis. The Fair Contributions Policy and process of financial assessment is robust and intended to ensure that the most vulnerable are not unduly disadvantaged by make a contribution towards the cost of their care and support.</p> <p>Charging will only apply to those in receipt of long term services (over 2 years) and therefore will protect those who are likely to be in greatest need receiving short term interventions.</p> <p>The approach of asking those who can pay, to pay, is intended to enable us to retain this level of preventative service in the community rather than reducing the commissioning budget. It also bring supporting people services in line with the charging regime for adult social care.</p>	
Officer recommendation as a result of responses:	Feedback has not uncovered any further issues which would prevent the council from proceeding with this saving. It is therefore recommended to implement this proposal with no changes	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

Overview of responses and recommendations: Services to Support Vulnerable Young People		Julia Waldman, Commissioning Strategy and Partnerships Manager, Communities directorate Mark Evans, Head of Children's Services	
Proposal:	There are two key areas relating to this proposal: the first is to integrate services supporting vulnerable young people; the second is to work more closely with schools and a range of other services in the provision of targeted careers information, advice, support and guidance provision.	Proposed reduction in funding:	Total budget: £1.17m Reduce budget by £393k (33%) over 2 years
Nos of responses:	17 responses were received, of which 4 were from organisations and 1 from councillor.		
Key issues raised:	<p>The main concern was around the loss of very specific targeted support and reductions in early intervention work may lead to poorer outcomes for children and young people and increased future costs to the service</p> <p>Concern that these proposals will increase social and rural isolation, which will in turn affect life chances and social mobility.</p> <p>Views were that seeking more collaborative solutions with the voluntary and community sector should be sought and that better measurement of impact could help to identify areas for savings.</p> <p>That the cuts proposed will impact negatively on the other public services (e.g. Police and the Courts).</p> <p>Adviza, as a provider that is very affected by these proposals in terms of levels of reductions, has made the case for greater integration as well we the potential impact on young people of the proposed savings.</p>		
Equality issues:	It is noted that by its nature, this proposal would affect young people who may be considered more vulnerable.		
Suggestions for mitigating the impact on service users:	Suggestion	Council response	
	Review external contracts and ensure effective procurement.	This suggestion is being progressed by the council	
	Cut councillors' expenditure.	The scheme of allowances for West Berkshire is one of the lowest in the country. Members are only paid expenses in relation to predominantly mileage which is based on the Inland Revenue mileage rate.	
	Review efficiency of WBC services.	This is being done with further savings being delivered through reduction of back office services.	
	Use some of the Council's reserves to offset savings.	Council balances are held primarily to mitigate against any financial risks. These balances are currently considered to be close to minimum levels. Even if there were opportunities to use balances, it is noted that the savings proposals are ongoing, and this would only bridge the gap in the current year, meaning that the savings would	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

		still need to be found in the future.
	Improve the measurement of effectiveness of early intervention services.	We are working to improve our effectiveness in this area.
Alternative options for applying the saving in this area:	Suggestion	Council response
	Increase Council Tax.	The administration is proposing to deliver a council tax freeze for the next 2 years as one of their priorities.
	Develop more integrated and shared services.	We are doing this in a variety of areas. Much of the work in terms of services for vulnerable young people is aimed at developing more integrated services. We are also in discussion with other local authorities to explore expansion of our shared services.
	Prioritise young people ahead of other council service (e.g. road maintenance).	The budget simulator consultation undertaken in 2010 identified prioritising more people orientated services over those more place-based. As a result of this the revenue budget has been shaped over previous years with this in mind. The council has already absorbed a lot of the savings by cutting back on administration, the number of staff has been reduced by around 200 and the council has changed the way a number of services are provided. Although we will continue to do this, given the scale of savings required moving forward, reduced spending on services people use and will notice can no longer be avoided.
	Reduce duplication and ensure the most effective commissioning practice.	We are doing this and it is central to our business strategy
	Maximise use of other revenue sources (e.g. government grants, private and 3 rd Sector funding)	We are, and will continue to, do this.
Suggestions for how others may help contribute:	A range of suggestions were made these included: Working with schools and the 'City Deal' project to reduce the impact of the savings – we will be trying to do this. Encouraging voluntary sector work in this area by reducing bureaucracy – we are already doing this and will continue to do so. <i>Empowering West Berkshire</i> could promote a conference / workshop to identify the best way to minimise the savings – we would welcome it if EWB or any other relevant body decided to do this.	
Officer conclusion as a result of the	The feedback includes a strong set of evidence based points about the potential impacts of cuts to early targeted services. These are valid and we acknowledge that the impact of cutting early intervention services has the potential to have negative outcomes for some	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

responses:	<p>children and young people.</p> <p>Strong suggestions are put forward for greater integration, more pooling, more collaborative solution-focused thinking and action, particularly with community, voluntary and third sector partners. We will be working to incorporate this thinking in our work as we go forward with a view to ameliorating the impact of these savings.</p>
Officer recommendation as a result of responses:	<p>Feedback has not uncovered any further issues which would prevent the council from proceeding with this saving. It is therefore recommended to implement this proposal with no changes</p>

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

Overview of responses and recommendations: Community-Based Care Packages for Disabled Children		Jane Seymour, SEN and Disabled Children Service Manager, Educ	
Proposal:	To shift the focus of care and support for disabled children from residential to more community-based care packages	Proposed reduction in funding:	Total budget: £732k 2014/15: £160k (21%) 2015/16: £0k
Nos of responses:	12 responses were received, of which 3 came from organisations - Newbury Town Council, West Berkshire Mencap, Interakt and 1 from a councillor.		
Key issues raised:	<p>Concern expressed about any reduction in services for children with disabilities - increasing the burden on families with disabled children and potentially just shift responsibility to other agencies.</p> <p>Some supported a reduction in the use of residential placements provided that suitable services were available in the community to enable children to continue to be cared for at home.</p> <p>Some concern referenced a lack of capacity in local community services, such as short breaks services, community services being more expensive than residential placements and one queried the safety of children cared for within their local communities, rather than in residential settings.</p> <p>Some respondents, however, felt that it was better for children to remain in their local communities, rather than being in residential placements, but noted that it would be necessary to invest in local services in order to achieve a reduction in residential placements.</p>		
Equality issues:	It is noted that this proposal would affect children with disabilities, who are already vulnerable, and their families.		
Suggestions for mitigating the impact on service users:	Suggestion	Council response	
	Increasing the provision made by Castlegate	This could not be done without additional revenue funding.	
	Carrying out an audit of existing short breaks services to identify gaps	It is noted that audits of short breaks provision and requirements of families for particular types of short break services are routinely undertaken on a regular basis.	
Alternative options for applying the saving in this area:	Suggestion	Council response	
	Council Tax should be increased in order to continue to support services such as these.	The administration is proposing to deliver a council tax freeze for the next 2 years as one of their priorities.	
	Council reserves should be used to continue to support services such as these.	Council balances are held primarily to mitigate against any financial risks. These balances are currently considered to be close to minimum levels. Even if there were opportunities to use balances, it	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

		is noted that the savings proposals are ongoing, and this would only bridge the gap in the current year, meaning that the savings would still need to be found in the future.
Suggestions for how others may help contribute:	West Berkshire Mencap stated that they are willing to work with the Council to increase their short breaks provision.	
Officer conclusion as a result of the responses:	<p>It is the Council's policy to make provision for children with SEN and disabilities as locally as possible and to support them to remain living within their own homes wherever possible. In recent years, the range of short breaks services available locally has increased, as has the use of Direct Payments / Personal Budgets, allowing families greater choice and control over how they are supported.</p> <p>As a direct result of this policy, the number of disabled children being placed in residential settings has decreased. It is likely that there will always be a small number of disabled children who require residential placements. It should be possible to further reduce reliance on residential placements by continuing to invest in local services, but it should be noted that the budget for short breaks will need to be protected in order to allow this to happen and also that there will be inevitable pressure on the budget which supports local care packages and Direct Payments if we are to continue to reduce residential placements.</p>	
Officer recommendation as a result of responses:	Feedback has not uncovered any further issues which would prevent the council from proceeding with this saving. It is therefore recommended to implement this proposal with no changes	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

Overview of responses and recommendations: Children's Centres		Janet Scott, Adult and Community Learning Service Manager, Educ	
Proposal:	To make savings in the budget for Children's Centres by streamlining and integrating some of its functions and introducing charges for some of the services which are provided	Proposed reduction in funding:	Total budget: £1.4m 2014/15: £50k (4%) 2015/16: £105k (8%)
Nos of responses:	57 responses to the consultation were received in total. Within these, 40 were from Children's Centre Users; two from a Nursery School / Children's Centre; two from Head Teachers of Primary schools; 1 from Newbury Town Council and 1 from a district councillor.		
Key issues raised:	<p>Concern around the long term impact of reducing resource in an early intervention / preventative service such as children's centres. The main thrust of comments recognised the contribution children's centres made to the lives of families and a fear that these would be diminished.</p> <p>The importance of providing services to the most vulnerable families was seen as very important as was the need for the services to be available in the towns, villages and isolated communities.</p>		
Equality issues:	There was some concern around the impact on vulnerable families and particularly the value of the centres as a means of networking – as such, the use of centres by particular groups such as new / first time mothers; those without families in the area and families in isolated communities.		
Suggestions for mitigating the impact on service users:	Suggestion	Council response	
	-		
Alternative options for applying the saving in this area:	Suggestion	Council response	
	Investigate the charging for some activities or ask for voluntary contributions. Remove voluntary contributions and introduce mandatory costs for activities Introduce a £10 registration fee	Suggestions for increasing income will be explored alongside a consultation on charging	
	Greater sharing of resources across centres (ie. staff with specialisms, management, staff) or merge some centres to cover larger geographical areas	<p>We are investigating merging Children's Centres and sharing management where the buildings are situated relatively close together. However we recognise this is more difficult when centres service a large rural area.</p> <p>Equally, it is important for staff to form relationships with families and therefore the individual aspect of the Children's Centre work needs to be retained.</p> <p>There are sufficient numbers of staff trained in each programme to support delivery</p>	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

		<p>of different programmes across the area and support for staff with specialist training to deliver programmes beyond their own centre. This proposal will also ensure that groups have at least the minimum number of attendees to support discussion and be cost effective.</p> <p>To note however, merging Children's Centres will not reduce the number of buildings where Children's Centre activities take place. It will better utilise management time where centres are geographically close together.</p>
	Developing the centres as the central hub for all pre-school services (ie integrating health and social care through a central venue)	Good collaborative working practices exist with colleagues in health and Children's Services. Further joint working opportunities will be investigated.
	Opening up the centres for use by other services – eg integrating more with libraries. Offer the venues for hire to community groups.	Children's Centres can be used to support community groups and raise some income. This will be explored.
	Seek donations (ie from ex-service users) of old toys	Toys and equipment in good condition would be welcomed.
	Seek charitable status for centres	The benefits to be explored and if positive then this will be considered.
	Seek sponsorship from local businesses to support centres Centres to support fund raising events	Fundraising ideas, along the lines of a PTA will be explored.
	Use of more volunteers to support the centres Use trainee nursery teachers / assistants in centres	The recruitment of volunteers is ongoing and is supported by a training programme. Many volunteers are lost to the centres because the experience of volunteering has enabled them to find paid employment
	The council generally should not award pay bonuses to senior staff	<p>Our Statutory Pay Policy indicates that the ratio between the highest and lowest paid employees in the council (11:1) is well within national government guidelines (20:1).</p> <p>The council does not operate a bonus scheme. However honoraria payments are paid to staff in exceptional circumstances.</p>
Suggestions for how others may help contribute:	Children's centre buildings are available for use by other organisations that deliver services to young children and their families and make a contribution towards the running costs	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

Officer conclusion as a result of the responses:	Suggestions and recommendations from the consultation responses are in line with our current approach to make best use of our resources and we will continue to develop in these areas.
Officer recommendation as a result of responses:	Feedback has not uncovered any further issues which would prevent the council from proceeding with this saving. It is therefore recommended to implement this proposal with no changes

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

Overview of responses and recommendations: Child and Adult Mental Health Services (CAMHS)		Cathy Burnham, Principal Educational Psychologist, Educ	
Proposal:	To reduce the council's contribution to the Tier 2 Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust's CAMHS service, seeking to re-negotiate cost of the current contract for therapy services , explore other funder options and alternative and more cost effective ways of delivering all the services.	Proposed reduction in funding:	Total budget: £180k Reduce budget by £129k over 2 years
Nos of responses:	12 responses were received (shared with the savings proposal for therapy services) including from parents, a town council, an advisor for Health Watch, a councillor and the head of Berkshire Healthcare Trust.		
Key issues raised:	<p>Concern expressed about services being cut for the most vulnerable.</p> <p>Concern that if unable to secure contributions from the NHS / CCGs then possibility of a reduction to service delivery for the children and young people in the area.</p> <p>Concern that short term savings could lead to a longer-term increase in costs for a number of organisations when young people with unmet mental health needs become adults with even greater mental health needs.</p> <p>Concern that proposals would result in longer delays, with the CAMHS service already under strain due to an increase in demand.</p> <p>However, a level of support for the proposal was expressed, and it was noted that the Health services/NHS should be contributing more to this area.</p>		
Equality issues:	Given the nature of the service, children and young people with severe and long-term mental health difficulties could be adversely and disproportionately affected if these health needs are not addressed through Health funding. Developing young people's mental health provision is a WBC and LSCB priority.		
Suggestions for mitigating the impact on service users:	Suggestion	Council response	
	It was noted that it may be possible to make efficiency savings and streamline services, and perhaps make savings by amalgamating the parenting team and CAMHS.	<p>CAMHS cannot identify any potential efficiency savings.</p> <p>Some of the current contribution pays directly for Tier 2 Primary Mental Health workers. The Parenting Team is currently working with the Children's Centres and is due to move into the Early Support hub.</p> <p>Some Early Intervention Tier1/2 Emotional Wellbeing support to schools will be developed further by the Council's Educational Psychology Service. However, to develop this further would require additional funding.</p> <p>CAMHS referrals have increased greatly, with longer waiting times for vulnerable young people and their families. The aim of developing 'in house' support is to reduce the pressure on CAMHS and ensure an early response to potential mental health issues</p>	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

		through increased awareness and skills in schools.
	Share services across local authorities or with other service providers.	CAMHS already works across Berkshire.
Alternative options for applying the saving in this area:	Suggestion	Council response
	Use of council reserves to support such services	Council balances are held primarily to mitigate against any financial risks. These balances are currently considered to be close to minimum levels. Even if there were opportunities to use balances, it is noted that the savings proposals are ongoing, and this would only bridge the gap in the current year, meaning that the savings would still need to be found in the future.
	Increase council tax to support such services	The administration is proposing to deliver a council tax freeze for the next 2 years as one of their priorities.
Suggestions for how others may help contribute:	There is a willingness and interest amongst representatives of Public Health, Children and Young People's Services, CCGs and the NHS to work together improve pathways to and the support available for mental health support across all tiers. However, the size and suddenness of this current proposal has meant there has not been enough time to consult on these potential developments fully.	
Officer conclusion as a result of the responses:	<p>It was recognised in the feedback that this proposal would potentially affect the poorest and most vulnerable in our communities, at a time where the data show an increase in mental health issues in children and young people.</p> <p>However there is clearly a need to build on the commitment for joint planning and delivery across relevant agencies to try and mitigate against and/or cover the projected funding loss.</p> <p>If funding is found from a different source then the current level of service delivery can continue. Reviews of the delivery options could be undertaken. WBC is committed to developing further Early Intervention Emotional Wellbeing support for children and young people in schools which should reduce the numbers of CAMHS Tier 3 and 4 referrals by tackling some problems earlier. This is not without additional cost and involves a long term commitment to see the results.</p> <p>An alternative proposal would be to maintain the current reduced budget to CAMHS in the next financial year to allow Tier 2 CAMHS services to continue, or to make a small reduction. This would allow more time for Public Health, CCGs, NHS and WBC to work together to form a joint mental health strategy, discuss and agree different funding streams and develop provision in a planned and cost-effective way.</p>	
Officer recommendation as a result of responses:	Given the better than anticipated improving local economy, it is recommended that the proposed savings is not taken in full in 2014/15. Instead the collaborative working to improve pathways and support across all tiers should be taken forward through further discussion, consultation and service re-design.	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

Overview of responses and recommendations: Therapy Services		Jane Seymour, SEN and Disabled Children Service Manager, Educ	
Proposal:	To renegotiate the current contract for commissioning therapy services from the NHS.	Proposed reduction in funding:	Total budget: £325k Reduce budget by £65k (20%) over 2 years
Nos of responses:	12 responses were received (shared with the savings proposal for CAMHS). However, 3 of these respondents commented on the CAMHS proposals only, leaving 9 respondents who commented on this proposal. Of these 9 responses, 2 were from organisations (Newbury Town Council and Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust).		
Key issues raised:	<p>Concerns expressed that a reduced service would be detrimental to children's progress leading to greater difficulties and associated costs later in their lives;</p> <p>Concern that waiting times are too long already and that use of less qualified staff such as speech and language therapy assistants would damage children's progress.</p> <p>Concern regarding the impact on delivery of training for staff in schools which would reduce schools' ability to meet the needs of children with specific difficulties.</p>		
Equality issues:	<p>Given the nature of the service, more vulnerable children would be affected.</p> <p>One comment noted that children with speech, language and communication difficulties are more likely to be from poor socio economic backgrounds.</p>		
Suggestions for mitigating the impact on service users:	Suggestion	Council response	
	-		
Alternative options for applying the saving in this area:	Suggestion	Council response	
	Make greater efficiency savings rather than cutting direct therapy services	It is intended that efficiency savings will be sought in order to mitigate impact on direct service delivery	
	Share services with other councils and service providers Work jointly with health providers and commissioners to agree priorities and alternative service delivery models	Joint commissioning of therapy services with health commissioners is being pursued and could help to rationalise costs.	
	Review systems for identifying children for access to therapy services to ensure that too many children were not gaining access.	We are satisfied that identification systems are robust, but we will be reviewing procedures for discharging children from therapy services.	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

	Use of council reserves to support such services	Council balances are held primarily to mitigate against any financial risks. These balances are currently considered to be close to minimum levels. Even if there were opportunities to use balances, it is noted that the savings proposals are ongoing, and this would only bridge the gap in the current year, meaning that the savings would still need to be found in the future.
	Increase council tax to support such services	The administration is proposing to deliver a council tax freeze for the next 2 years as one of their priorities.
Suggestions for how others may help contribute:	The Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust stated that it would be happy to work with the Council to identify how efficiencies can be achieved.	
Officer conclusion as a result of the responses:	<p>It was anticipated that this proposal would create anxiety particularly on the part of parents of children with SEN, who have expressed understandable concerns, as have others on their behalf. If this savings proposal is taken forward, our intention would be to seek to minimise its impact by seeking efficiency savings wherever possible, developing robust joint commissioning with health commissioners and reviewing models of service delivery.</p> <p>Opportunities to raise income by charging neighbouring local authorities for therapy services provided for children who attend WBC schools but reside in those authorities are also currently being explored. This was not previously permissible under inter-authority recoupment regulations but now seems to be possible under new SEN funding procedures.</p>	
Officer recommendation as a result of responses:	Feedback has not uncovered any further issues which would prevent the council from proceeding with this saving. It is therefore recommended to implement this proposal with no changes.	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

Overview of responses and recommendations: PreSchool Teacher Counselling Service		Jane Seymour, SEN and Disabled Children Service Manager, Educ	
Proposal:	To streamline the PreSchool Teacher Counselling Service which supports preschool children with significant special educational needs.	Proposed reduction in funding:	Total budget: £167k Reduce by £20k over 2014/15 and 2015/16 (12%)
Nos of responses:	15 responses were received, of which 3 were from organisations (the Community Paediatric Service, Newbury Town Council and the PreSchool Teacher Counsellor Service) and 1 from a councillor.		
Key issues raised:	<p>There was a recognition that the service provides important practical and emotional help to families at a difficult time in their lives.</p> <p>Concern that there is no equivalent service which promotes the educational development of young children with SEN</p> <p>Early intervention is critical in order to maximise progress and development of children referred to the service who have severe SEN. Delaying intervention will detrimentally affect progress - likely to result in them having greater difficulties in school and later in life. From this, there was concern that the waiting times for this service already too long (on average 9 months from referral), and this proposal would further exacerbate the issue.</p> <p>Recognition that the service has an important role in facilitating access to the support children may require within educational settings, such as 121 support or specialist placements.</p> <p>Recognition that the service provides training and support for staff in pre-school and school settings in meeting the needs of children with SEN and disabilities. Without this support children may not have their needs met appropriately which may result in placement breakdown and could also detrimentally affect the education of other children in the setting.</p>		
Equality issues:	<p>This proposal would impact children with disabilities who are already vulnerable.</p> <p>Some noted the service supports children with Autistic Spectrum Disorder who have difficulty coping with change and who therefore have a particular need for professional support with transitions in to pre-school and from pre-school to school.</p> <p>It was noted that more well off and emotionally resilient parents may be able to compensate for a reduction in service by identifying / funding other sources of help whilst waiting to be seen by a PSTC. Less advantaged parents and their children are less likely to be able to do this and would therefore be disproportionately affected.</p>		
Suggestions for mitigating the impact on service users:	Suggestion	Council response	
	Families who were able, could travel to see the PSTC in a setting such as a Children's Centre to reduce staff travelling time	This has some potential and is being investigated.	
	Offer shared sessions for children with similar needs	There may be some scope for this but it would be limited as children with complex disabilities can have very disparate needs. It should also be recognised that whilst the	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

		primary role of the service is to promote the children’s educational development, the PSTCs also have an important role in providing emotional and practical support to parents who are coming to terms with their child’s diagnosis and the fact that they will have lifelong disabilities. Many parents need to have this support on a one to one basis and may be reluctant to attend group sessions.
	Parents could choose when to use their sessions and might be willing to have fewer sessions when the child is older in exchange for having more sessions early on.	There may be some scope to reduce sessions for older children in order to bring younger children off the waiting list and on to the caseload sooner. This will be explored. Involvement at the stage the child is transitioning to pre school or school is, however, critical.
	Reduce bureaucracy – shorter written reports	The only detailed reports which are written are the initial report and also the report for the statutory assessment / statementing process (if this is required). The initial report needs to be fairly detailed in order to aid the parents’ understanding of their child’s difficulties, and it is also used by other agencies and professionals. The report for the statutory assessment also needs to be thorough. However, all interim reports are already done as brief notes of visit only, so it is felt that opportunities to minimise report writing have already been taken.
	Charge families a small contribution to use the service, on a means tested basis	This would create an administrative burden which could be equal to the savings / income achieved. Means testing is always problematic as families who come just above the threshold may nevertheless be on low incomes and have difficulty paying. This could result in children being denied the service.
	Explore use of voluntary agencies	There are no known voluntary agencies who would have the capacity, expertise or resources to deliver an equivalent service.
	Greater use of online materials for parents	We are promoting on line training for parents which will certainly help them to support their children’s development. However, use of on line materials would not be a substitute for sessions with a PSTC ,as the effectiveness of their use would depend on parents having the educational ability to access and use the materials and the emotional resilience and motivation to do this at a time when they may be very emotionally vulnerable themselves.
Alternative options for applying the saving in this area:	Suggestion	Council response
	Increase Council Tax rather than cutting the service.	The administration is proposing to deliver a council tax freeze for the next 2 years as one of their priorities.

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

Suggestions for how others may help contribute:	None were put forward
Officer conclusion as a result of the responses:	Measures have already been put in place to spread the service as effectively as possible and to reduce the waiting list, for example visits to older children on the caseload are less frequent than previously. Suggestions for making better use of resources will all be considered in order to reduce the impact of the saving, but it is unlikely that this saving could be achieved without increasing waiting times for the service.
Officer recommendation as a result of responses:	Feedback has not uncovered any further issues which would prevent the council from proceeding with this saving. It is therefore recommended to implement this proposal with no changes

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

Overview of responses and recommendations: Public Transport Subsidies		Mark Edwards, Head of Highways and Transport, H&T	
Proposal:	Review of subsidised bus routes and contributions to community transport operators.	Proposed reduction in funding:	Reduce this budget by £375k (25%) over 2 years.
Nos of responses:	97 responses were received, of which 12 were from town / parish councils and a further 6 from organisations.		
Key issues raised:	<p>The main concerns were the threat and fear of travel deprivation and social isolation.</p> <p>The availability of transport in rural areas was believed to underpin the ability of people, especially those without private transport and those who were disabled, to live in such rural locations.</p>		
Equality issues:	Responses highlighted the fear of travel deprivation and social isolation. Comments noted that this proposal would adversely affect those who rely on services delivered by Readibus, the volunteer transport services and local buses. The availability of transport in rural areas was believed to underpin the ability of people, especially those without private transport and those who were disabled, to live in such rural locations.		
Suggestions for mitigating the impact on service users:	Suggestion	Council response	
	Reduced frequency of services rather than full withdrawal.	This is being examined as part of the process.	
	The means of delivering services may have to change to reduce costs.	Agreed.	
	Better advertising / marketing for existing services.	This became apparent during meetings held as part of the consultation process, particularly in respect of community transport. However a budget would initially be required.	
	Enhance the bus station in Newbury to make it more appealing.	Some improvements have recently been made but it should be noted that the bus station will be relocated as part of the Market Street redevelopment	
	Create incentives for people to use the buses - loyalty discounts and savings in shops etc.	This would be a matter for local businesses and the transport operators. However, the Council is looking at the 'Reward Your World' concept, to include incentives on bus tickets. Janet Duffield, Economic Development Officer, is the lead on this.	
	Increase the volunteer schemes into the rural areas which have no / poor bus services.	We are discussing this with the relevant voluntary sector organisations.	
	Extend travel training to individuals who may benefit	This is addressed through the work of the Learning Independence For Travel	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

		(LIFT) organisation.
Alternative options for applying the saving in this area:	Suggestion	Council response
	Raise fares to make the services more profitable. However, some noted that higher fares would cause hardship for those on low incomes.	We are looking at the fare structure. However this would also increase payments on concessionary fares reimbursement that Council has to make.
	Some services to be operated commercially (The Vitality 2 evenings and Sunday services).	The late evening and Sunday Vitality 2 journeys will operate commercially from 1 April 2014.
	Change the terms and conditions of the National Off-Peak Bus Pass scheme.	This is not within the power of local authorities and could only be instigated by the Department for Transport.
	Seek private or corporate sponsorship of the services.	This can be done as tenders come up for renewal. In the past it has not proved successful.
	Integrate the Vodafone services into the local bus network	There are legal reasons why this is currently not done.
	Switch to smaller buses in the off peaks (there are logistical reasons why this is not done).	This is a matter for the transport operators.
	Tender out networks of services, not single routes. This may attract more companies to bid for contracts.	We are looking at this. However recent contracts let on a wider network basis are still attracting very little interest from transport operators.
Suggestions for how others may help contribute:	.	
Officer conclusion as a result of the responses:	The exercise has proved valuable in identifying implications of potential changes to routes. These will feed into the conclusions of our review as to how to meet the savings target. However, we recognise the concerns around the impact of savings on voluntary sector transport.	
Officer recommendation as a result of responses:	Feedback has brought forward issues to consider in particular in relation to the voluntary and community transport providers. Given the better than anticipated improving local economy, it is recommended that the saving relating to the voluntary and community sector is reduced.	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

Overview of responses and recommendations: Libraries		Mike Brook, Library Services Manager, C&EP	
Proposal:	To reduce funding within the library service through reducing opening hours for libraries across the district, thereby honouring the commitment not to close any libraries.	Proposed reduction in funding:	Total budget: £1.6m 2014/15: £75k (5%) 2015/16: £100k (6%)
Nos of responses:	366 response forms received in total, of which 16 were from organisations.		
Key issues raised:	<p>Clear and evident support for libraries amongst respondents, valuing both the service and the staff that assist the users.</p> <p>Libraries seen by respondents as a cornerstone of the community, they are more than a book lending service, holding a wide range of activities and attracting a diverse audience. Recognition that libraries contribute to education, lifelong learning, literacy and IT literacy and to the preventative agenda. Several referred to the importance of libraries to their local economy.</p> <p>The traditional and growing contribution of volunteers is acknowledged by many. Some feel the balance between paid staff and volunteers is currently about right. Some expressed concern about greater use of volunteers: reliability and expertise.</p> <p>Noted that IT facilities in libraries used by those with low incomes: job seekers, applying for universal credit and social housing. Will likely add further demand in libraries to meet the assisted digital agenda. Also used by silver surfers to catch up on IT skills in the soft learning environment provided by their library.</p> <p>Concern that reduced hours are a step towards closure, and potentially a cynical step to create a spiral of decline to justify closure.</p> <p>Some felt proposed reduced hours in Pangbourne and Burghfield are unfairly savage. Some users at Hungerford and Mortimer said they'd accept this cut but no further cuts to their hours.</p> <p>Some complaints from people in the east, both in library and general terms, that their area doesn't get a fair share of resources, some feeling Newbury is favoured.</p> <p>Some concern that community-run library services would fragment a district-wide service.</p>		
Equality issues:	<p>Some responses referred to the impact on groups such as the elderly and young people and those unable to travel easily</p> <p>There is also reference to the impact on those less computer literate that depend upon more face to face contact.</p>		
Suggestions for mitigating the impact on service users:	Suggestion	Council response	
	If hours are reduced, care needed to spread available hours around to match the needs of as many groups as possible.	This is being done	
	Mobile stops frequency could be reduced from 3 to 4 weekly.	This would be a further variation to the front line service; the service reviews the schedule of stops frequently	
	Encourage more events in libraries to increase footfall, eg art	The service is working to increase additional activities and use of the	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

	exhibits, workshops etc	branch library venues
	Introduce coffee shops in libraries to draw people in	This has been previously trialled but proven not to increase footfall although it could be argued that it improved the visitor experience
Alternative options for applying the saving in this area:	Suggestion	Council response
	Introduce charging for internet use	This is being considered
	Partnership activities – CAB / credit union / health advice	This is being considered
	Cap on management salaries	Our Statutory Pay Policy indicates that the ratio between the highest and lowest paid employees in the council (11:1) is well within national government guidelines (20:1).
	Increase council tax to support services	The administration is proposing to deliver a council tax freeze for the next 2 years as one of their priorities.
Suggestions for how others may help contribute:		
Officer conclusion as a result of the responses:	<p>The greatest number of responses was received in relation to Pangbourne, Burghfield Common and Mortimer. Responses make a case for seeking smaller reductions.</p> <p>The suggestion that “mobile stops frequency could be reduced from 3 to 4 weekly” could be considered.</p> <p>The potential for shared service working is being explored.</p>	
Officer recommendation as a result of responses:	<p>Feedback has brought forward further issues to consider in relation to the reductions in opening hours.</p> <p>Given the better than anticipated improving local economy, it is recommended that the proposed savings is not taken in full in 2014/15. It is therefore recommended that the reduction in hours at Pangbourne Library be amended to 5 hours per week (library open 22 hours per week); at Mortimer Library the reduction in hours be amended to 3 hours per week (library open for 19 hours per week) and at Burghfield Common Library the reduction in hours be amended to 2 hours per week (library open for 19 hours per week)</p>	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

Overview of responses and recommendations: Road Safety Expenditure			Mark Edwards, Head of Highways and Transport, H&T		
Proposal:	To reduce spend on road safety campaigns to withdraw from the Safer Roads Partnership and end our contribution for funding of a Road Safety Constable.	Proposed reduction in funding:	<i>Road safety education</i> Total budget: £96k 2014/15: £40k (42%) 2015/16: £0k	<i>Road Safety Constable</i> Total budget: £16k 2014/15: £0k 2015/16: £16k (100%)	<i>Safer Roads Partnership</i> Total budget: £96k 2014/15: £0k 2015/16: £40k (42%)
Nos of responses:	In total, 20 responses were received, of which 3 were from organisations: Newbury Town Council, the Institute of Advanced Motorists and Road Safety Analysis Limited.				
Key issues raised:	Concern that this would have a detrimental impact on road safety. However, a number of responses felt that this would have little impact.				
Equality issues:	The impact on children, pedestrians, young drivers and cyclists were highlighted. It was noted that it was important to educate young people as soon as possible and instil good responsible road safety attitudes.				
Suggestions for mitigating the impact on service users:	Suggestion		Council response		
	Replace hands-on education in schools with e-learning.		There will be no budget available for this but the Council may be able to support schools.		
Alternative options for applying the saving in this area:	Suggestion		Council response		
	Seek sponsorship from pubs, drink manufacturers and taxi firms for events such as drink / drive campaigns.		We understand that the Police will still operate their regular campaigns but the Council will no longer be able to provide support.		
	Parish / town councils and complaining resident associations should fund any investigations		Officers will investigate this on a case by case basis.		
Suggestions for how others may help contribute:	The Institute of Advanced Motorists could assist to improve driver skills, but there would be a cost implication with this.				
Officer conclusion as a result of the responses:	Feedback put forward some helpful comments regarding education and sponsorship which will be investigated. The feedback reinforced the Council's view that the remaining road safety resources need to be targeted effectively.				
Officer recommendation as a	Feedback has not uncovered any further issues which would prevent the council from proceeding with this saving. It is therefore				

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

result of responses:

recommended to implement this proposal with no changes

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

Overview of responses and recommendations: Planning Enforcement			Gary Lugg, Head of Planning and Countryside, P&C
Proposal:	To reduce the resource in the planning enforcement team from 3, to 2FTE.	Proposed reduction in funding:	Total budget: £120k 2014/15: £37k (30%) 2015/16: £0k
Nos of responses:	20 in total, 4 from town / parish councils		
Key issues raised:	Concern that lead to people flouting planning law. Suggestion that this would lead to delays in planning process, increased disputes and poor quality buildings.		
Equality issues:	None were drawn out from the responses		
Suggestions for mitigating the impact on service users:	Suggestion	Council response	
	Clearer decision notices	Officer experience suggests that the vast majority of action results from developer or builder action not from misinterpretation of approval notices so any improvement here would not have a significant on the level of enforcement resource required.	
	Encouraging local communities to report breaches of planning controls	Local communities including town / parish councils do actively report breaches of planning control although it is also accepted that they do not have the capacity or expertise to investigate and progress enforcement action through the formal enforcement process.	
	Improve the reporting system for notifying the planning authority of breaches	A new public form is to be included on the Council's web site to allow easy notification of breaches of planning enforcement.	
	Take a harder line with offenders to discourage breaches	Increased fines to act as a deterrent is a matter for the courts and not something that the Council can control or influence.	
Alternative options for applying the saving in this area:	Suggestion	Council response	
	Use of fines to recover costs for breaches of planning law	Fees and charges cannot be implemented as Government set planning fees and we have no local discretion in this area.	
	Use of capital reserves	Council balances are held primarily to mitigate against any financial risks. These balances are currently considered to be close to minimum levels. Even if there were opportunities to use balances, it is noted that the savings proposals are ongoing, and this would only bridge the gap in the current year, meaning that the savings would still need to be found in the future.	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

	Increase council tax	The administration is proposing to deliver a council tax freeze for the next 2 years as one of their priorities.
	Provide a more explicit link between resources available for planning applications and enforcement	Planning resources are monitored and adjusted based on the current economic climate. Historically there is no evidence to suggest that Planning Enforcement workload is linked to the number of planning applications received.
Suggestions for how others may help contribute:	<p>Greater use of parish councils to report breaches of planning control</p> <p>Parish councils should be more involved and should contact builders / developers directly should they note an issue</p>	
Officer conclusion as a result of the responses:	The exercise has not highlighted any impacts that are not already anticipated.	
Officer recommendation as a result of responses:	Feedback has not uncovered any further issues which would prevent the council from proceeding with this saving. It is therefore recommended to implement this proposal with no changes	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

Overview of responses and recommendations: Theatres			Chris Jones, Arts and Leisure Manager, C&EP	
Proposal:	To reduce funding for the Corn Exchange and Watermill theatres in Newbury.	Proposed reduction in funding:	<i>Corn Exchange</i> Total budget: £378k 2014/15: £50k (13%) 2015/16: £120k (32%)	<i>Watermill</i> Total budget: £42k 2014/15: £0k 2015/16: £10k (24%)
Nos of responses:	322 response forms received in total, including 17 from organisations. In addition, discussions were held with both the Corn Exchange and Watermill theatres and key strategic funding bodies to look at the wider implications of the proposal.			
Key issues raised:	<p>Given the scope of the reduction proposed to The Corn Exchange, the greater majority of the comments related to this venue.</p> <p>A substantial number of respondents commented on the importance of both venues / organisations to the cultural and visitor economy of wider Newbury and in particular the town centre.</p> <p>Concern over the impact on families who use the venues – many young people have been introduced to careers in the theatre / arts and creative sectors as a result of attending performances or workshops provided through the venues.</p> <p>Concern was raised about the consequence of narrowing the content and volume of programmes (possibly more risk averse less creative selections), reducing the range of stakeholders by limiting choice and further create a spiral of declining opportunity.</p> <p>With regard to the geography of the venues, it was commented that The Corn Exchange is considered by many to provide the only true community resource within the town.</p> <p>Concern about the impact on special elements of the programme, in particular the Relaxed Performance provided at the Corn Exchange which cater specifically to the needs of children on the autism spectrum and their families.</p> <p>Concern about the impact on the non-performance element of the programme: outreach to local schools, cinema, outdoor events, variety and quality of live performance programme, hiring charges for local groups to perform at the Corn Exchange, volunteering opportunities.</p> <p>Concern about the negative impact on the Market Place as a focal point for the night time economy – would revert to a pub/clubbing focus rather than the diverse economy that is developing.</p> <p>Concern about the scale of the proposed reductions, especially to The Corn Exchange.</p>			
Equality issues:	The proposal for reductions in budgets will impact across the board at both venues without specifically prejudicing any specific sector of the community. Several respondents expressed a fear that any subsequent rise in ticket prices may have a detrimental effect on people with limited income.			
Suggestions for	Suggestion	Council response		

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

mitigating the impact on service users:	Range of concession priced performances to mitigate impact on people with low/limited income.	This will be a matter for the theatres to consider
Alternative options for applying the saving in this area:	Suggestion	Council response
	Levy on local pubs and restaurants which benefit from additional custom generated by attendees.	This would need to be examined in line with the growth of the BID and perhaps aligned to local commerce through Newbury Vision.
	Rise in ticket price / introduce a £1 levy on tickets	This will be a matter for the theatres to consider
	A reduction in the proposed saving implemented over a longer time scale.	This would need to be examined with a wider range of partners including key strategic arts and grant giving organisations.
	Cutting expenses in other non-arts budget areas to offset the impact of the reduction.	The savings package proposed sees reductions across the whole Council
	Supplement the revenue stream of the venues through broadening the range of events / hires to include non arts activities (small scale sporting events / weddings or regular community group activity hire).	This will be a matter for the theatres to consider
	Reducing the programming at New Greenham Arts to focus on the Corn Exchange.	This will be a matter for the Corn Exchange to consider
	Sponsorship of seats by more 'wealthy' residents or church groups to support subsidy for people with limited income. Sponsorship / investment from local businesses to support the venue(s) or key elements of the programme.	This will be a matter for the theatres to consider
	Transfer ownership of the Corn Exchange to Greenham Common Trust to reduce building and maintenance overheads.	This might form part of any discussion in consideration of a Cultural Trust
	Increase Council tax to offset or minimise the impact of the proposed savings.	The administration is proposing to deliver a council tax freeze for the next 2 years as one of their priorities.
Increase volunteer roles at both venues where appropriate.	This will be a matter for the theatres to consider	
Suggestions for how others may help contribute:	Other than the ideas already highlighted the only key suggestion to alleviate the impact of the proposals was in relation to establishing a Newbury town centre based Culture Trust. This is an option which whilst it might not deliver immediate savings appears to warrant further examination for longer term safe-guarding of the district's cultural and theatre assets.	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

<p>Officer conclusion as a result of the responses:</p>	<p>Whilst a number of people voiced concern regarding the need for reductions, a number also recognised the need for budget cuts to be made by the council.</p> <p>The scale and timing of the proposed reductions were regarded as a key factor of concern.</p> <p>The option of a longer term culture trust should be explored.</p> <p>The Corn Exchange has submitted a counter proposal of a lower saving profiled over a 5 year period.</p>
<p>Officer recommendation as a result of responses:</p>	<p>Feedback has brought forward further issues to consider in relation to safeguarding the Corn Exchange. Given the better than anticipated improving local economy, it is recommended that the proposed savings is not taken in full and that the reduction in funding to the Corn Exchange be re-profiled over a five year period.</p> <p>With regard to the Watermill theatre, feedback has not uncovered any further issues which would prevent the Council from proceeding with this saving. It is recommended to implement this proposal with no changes.</p>

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

Overview of responses and recommendations: Road and Verge Maintenance			Mark Edwards, Head of Highways and Transport, H&T
Proposal:	To reduce various budgets associated with road and verge maintenance.	Proposed reduction in funding:	Reduce expenditure over 2 years in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Sign and road marking maintenance</i>: £53k (28%) • <i>Crash barrier and guard railing maintenance</i>: £10k (14%) budget is £76k • <i>Gully emptying</i>: £30k (15%) • <i>Winter gritting</i>: £40k (6%) • <i>Roads maintenance</i>:£165k (17%) • <i>Unscheduled highway events</i>: £50k (8%) • <i>Grass cutting maintenance</i>: £71k (7%)
Nos of responses:	43 responses were received, of which 5 were from town / parish councils, 1 from an organisation and 1 from a councillor.		
Key issues raised:	<p>Signs and road markings Concern that would compromise safety.</p> <p>Safety fences/barriers Few comments however noted that the work should be carried out on a risk assessment basis, focusing around schools.</p> <p>Drainage/gully emptying Concern that this was a false economy as the reduced drainage capability would only lead to local flooding and further erosion of road surfaces.</p> <p>Winter gritting Concern that this was a crucial service that should not be reduced due to the likely increase in accidents and impact on access to services including work and school.</p> <p>Highway Maintenance Concern that road conditions would worsen and negatively impact on road safety.</p> <p>Verge maintenance/grass cutting Level of support for this element provided that sight lines are safely maintained. Concern about maintaining safer walking to school routes and in rural areas where no footways are present.</p>		
Equality issues:	Although would impact on all, some concern about the impact on the elderly should footway and verge maintenance be reduced, particularly, on the rural network. However, there are no proposals to reduce footway maintenance.		
Suggestions for	Suggestion	Council response	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

mitigating the impact on service users:	Removed superfluous signs to reduce maintenance costs.	Officers follow DfT guidance concerning sign clutter where resources permit.
	Remove unnecessary guardrails / safety fences where safety was no longer an issue	Officers follow this practice.
	Reductions in road maintenance should focus on little used rural roads and those serving individual properties like farms.	The Council has a responsibility to maintain all public highways but priority is given to well trafficked routes in accordance with the code of practice/national guidelines.
Alternative options for applying the saving in this area:	Suggestion	Council response
	Reduce the frequency of grass cutting even further to fund essential services provided that road safety is not compromised.	The proposal already includes a reduction in the number of rural cuts from 3 to 2. A further reduction would compromise road safety and is not recommended. In urban areas it is considered that any further reduction in standards would be unacceptable.
Suggestions for how others may help contribute:	Parish councils could help identify priority areas for verge grass cutting. Explore voluntary activity.	
Officer conclusion as a result of the responses:	There was concern from respondents about the impact on road conditions but the responses did not put forward any further evidence of impact, not already envisaged. A number of suggestions were put forward around reducing the frequency of grass cutting which are already being pursued.	
Officer recommendation as a result of responses:	Feedback has brought forward further issues in relation to road and verge maintenance. Given the better than anticipated improving local economy, it is recommended that the proposed savings is not taken in full in 2014/15. It is therefore recommended that the proposals relating to gully emptying, winter gritting and road maintenance are not progressed at this time.	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

Overview of responses and recommendations: Sunday Parking Charges		Mark Edwards, Head of Highways and Transport, H&T	
Proposal:	To introduce the weekday parking tariff on a Sunday to car parks in central Newbury.	Projected income generated:	2014/15: £10k
Nos of responses:	In total 31 responses were received, including 3 from organisations: Newbury Town Council, the West Berkshire Ramblers' Association, Interakt and 2 from councillors.		
Key issues raised:	<p>Concern that the increase in car parking charges would have a detrimental effect on Sunday trading in Newbury town centre.</p> <p>Concern about the impact on events in the town centre run on a Sunday (ie Crafty Raft).</p> <p>Concern that this would result in similar charges being levied in other towns in due course.</p> <p>Concern that would inhibit groups such as the Ramblers' Assoc. who use the car parks as a rendezvous before heading off for the day.</p> <p>Concern that would lead to increased on-street parking just outside of the residents' parking zones</p>		
Equality issues:	Noted that the elderly and disabled will be affected, as will people attending Sunday church services.		
Suggestions for mitigating the impact on service users:	Suggestion	Council response	
	Provide free parking for club members on days when there are significant events in the town centre (ie Crafty Raft)	This would be very difficult logistically. There would be a significant increase in resources needed to administer this and revenue would be lost. The Council would receive large number of requests for free parking from clubs and societies.	
Alternative options for applying the saving in this area:	Suggestion	Council response	
	Have a more modest increase in the flat Sunday fee (to say £1.50).	Sunday is just another normal shopping day for many people and the proposed parking tariff reflects that. However this alternative proposal has merit and is perhaps better suited to nature of Newbury.	
	Sunday parking charges should be applied to all other town car parks outside of Newbury.	The numbers in Hungerford, Theale and Pangbourne for Sunday parking are relatively small with very little financial effect.	
	Develop a parking refund scheme with retailers if you spend over a set amount.	This already exists in the Kennet Centre but has not been received enthusiastically more widely by local businesses.	
	Introduce a charging scheme for cyclists using cycle stations across the town centre	The Council does not want to discourage cycling.	
	Reduce parking charges to zero to encourage greater	Who will then pay for all the car park fixed costs? Such a proposal will not encourage turnover or necessarily increase trade for town centre	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

	footfall.	businesses.
	Sell off all council-owned car parks to the private sector to encourage competitive pricing	Council car park charges are competitive and there is no reason to believe that charges would be more competitive if they were privately operated
	Reduce the number of traffic wardens instead	The Council has a duty to provide adequate enforcement under the Traffic Management Act 2004. Civil Enforcement Officers are required to patrol the many towns and villages, including schools, where parking restrictions are in place. Reducing the number of CEOs would not necessarily save any money.
	Increase the charge for issuing resident parking / visitor permits	The residents parking scheme is currently being reviewed.
Suggestions for how others may help contribute:	None provided.	
Officer conclusion as a result of the responses:	The vast majority of the 31 responses expressed concern at the potential effect of this proposal on town centre trade. Some comments put forward suggested an alternative option to increase the Sunday charge from £1 to £1.50 rather than implementing the full weekday tariff.	
Officer recommendation as a result of responses:	Feedback has brought forward further issues to consider in relation to the increase in car parking charges adversely impacting on trade in the town. It is therefore recommended that the Sunday charge is increased from £1 to £1.50 rather than implementing the full weekday tariff.	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

Overview of responses and recommendations: Public Conveniences		Stewart Souden, Grounds Maintenance Manager, P&C	
Proposal:	To withdraw funding for public toilets in Kintbury, Aldermaston, Hungerford, Thatcham and Pangbourne and seek alternative funding through parish councils.	Proposed reduction in funding:	Total budget: £146k 2014/15: £20k (14%) 2015/16: £50k (34%)
Nos of responses:	37 response forms received in total. 4 from organisations. The majority of responses related to Pangbourne toilets. In addition a number of meetings were held with town and parish councils.		
Key issues raised:	Concern that the lack of facilities would put people off visiting the localities. Pressure on local businesses to accommodate people – may be unfair if not paying customers. No facilities for people in Kintbury waiting for the train Concern about health issues with people relieving themselves outside		
Equality issues:	Concern that people with medical conditions and disabilities may need the facilities. Discussions with the West Berkshire Disability Alliance however suggested that disabled people would not be more adversely affect than anyone else in the community.		
Suggestions for mitigating the impact on service users:	Suggestion	Council response	
	Local businesses could promote the use of their toilet by non-paying customers (and be recompensed as such)	This would be welcomed by the Council but it is for local business to promote the use of their facilities.	
	Convert part of Pangbourne toilet into a coffee shop to cover the cost of its upkeep	This is not considered a viable proposal.	
	Open up use of Adventure Dolphin toilets for public use	This can be explored.	
Alternative options for applying the saving in this area:	Suggestion	Council response	
	Use of car park charges to pay for toilets	This refers to the toilets would require an increase in car park charges to provide a public convenience service that is only used by a limited number of people using the car park.	
	Charge for use of toilets	With the possible exception of Thatcham Broadway, the nature of these small buildings is such that charging systems cannot be installed due to a lack of space. A charging system at Thatcham would only make up a small proportion of the saving to be found if a fee of for example 20p per visit were to be charged.	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

	Reduced opening hours of toilets	This would not help reduce costs significantly. The cost of repair, maintenance and cleaning would still be required.
	Local businesses (food establishments) should be asked to contribute to the upkeep of local toilets	This could be requested but it is unlikely that it will generate the required income to cover the cost of operating the toilets.
	Charge coffee / ice cream sellers for use of car parks	This is being investigated but it is unlikely to recover the cost required to operate the toilets.
	Increase council tax	The administration is proposing to deliver a council tax freeze for the next 2 years as one of their priorities.
Suggestions for how others may help contribute:	<p>Beenham Parish Council This parish council will not fund the Aldermaston Lock public toilet</p> <p>Thatcham Town Council There is a legal agreement in place between Thatcham Town Council and West Berkshire Council that means that the site must remain open until 31 March 2015.</p> <p>Kintbury Parish Council This parish council has decided to fund the Kintbury Lock public toilet until 31 March 2015. It will carry out a consultation at a local level to ascertain whether residents wish to fund this beyond that date.</p> <p>Pangbourne Parish Council The parish will consider funding this once new Council Tax bands are agreed.</p> <p>Hungerford Town Council The town council is looking to fund this site.</p>	
Officer conclusion as a result of the responses:	<p>At this stage no viable alternative solutions have been suggested.</p> <p>Beenham Parish Council have confirmed that they will not fund the toilets at Aldermaston Lock so it is recommended that these toilets close.</p> <p>Kintbury Lock and Thatcham Broadway will remain open until 31 March 2015. Further discussions with the respective parish and town councils will be required in the autumn of 2014.</p> <p>Pangbourne and Hungerford are seeking to fund the 3 sites in their areas. If formal agreement cannot however be reached, then it will be recommended that these facilities will close 30 September 2014.</p>	
Officer recommendation as a result of responses:	Feedback has not uncovered any further issues which would prevent the council from proceeding with this saving. It is therefore recommended to implement this proposal as outlined above.	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

Overview of responses and recommendations: School Crossing Patrols		Caroline Corcoran, Access, Planning, Governance and Trading Manager, Educ	
Proposal:	To cease funding of school crossing patrols and seek funding for these services through schools directly.	Proposed reduction in funding:	Total budget: £16k 2014/15: £0k 2015/16: £16k (100%)
Nos of responses:	45 response forms were received. 6 from organisations: Newbury Town Council, Thatcham Town Council, Stratfield Mortimer Parish Council, Pangbourne Parish Council, Pangbourne School Governing Body, and Mortimer St Johns Infant School governor, and 1 from a councillor. In addition, 2 petitions were received (relating to Fir Tree Lane and Theale schools).		
Key issues raised:	Concern raised about the increased risk of accidents and serious injury or death to children. To note that 3 requests are pending for crossing patrols at additional sites in the district.		
Equality issues:	This proposal will affect every school community who has a school crossing patrol. One comment expressed concern about the impact on children or parents who have a visual disability.		
Suggestions for mitigating the impact on service users:	Suggestion	Council response	
	Increased focus on the promotion of road safety Put in traffic calming measures such as pedestrian crossing or traffic lights.	The cost of these measures has not been assessed for a range of sites at this point. However, in general terms, the cost would be c.£40k per pelican or toucan crossing, so this option would be more expensive, and the cost would need to be balanced against the risk.	
Alternative options for applying the saving in this area:	Suggestion	Council response	
	Seek funding from particular school	Under the law, in order to be able to stop traffic, a school crossing patroller must be employed by the Council. The Council already has an arrangement with an independent school for a self-funding option, which works well, and this solution could be rolled out more fully.	
	Seek funding from parish / town council or sponsorship from local business	The Council already has an arrangement for a self-funding option, and this solution could be rolled out more fully. The cost per crossing patrol is c £2,500 p.a., including overheads.	
	Reduce back office functions in order to protect more fully front line services	The council has already absorbed a lot of the savings by cutting back on administration. The number of staff has been reduced by around 200 and we have changed the way some services are provided. Although we will continue to do this, reduced spending on services people use and will notice can no longer be avoided.	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

Suggestions for how others may help contribute:	
Officer conclusion as a result of the responses:	<p>The Council needs to ensure that the potential risk of death or injury to a child is mitigated if this proposal is to go ahead. Therefore, it is preferable that school crossing patrollers should continue in place to alleviate the risks.</p> <p>Communities should be encouraged to find alternative sources of funding, thus securing the crossing patrollers and reducing the risks.</p> <p>As the Council is receiving requests for an increasing number of patrollers, the solution of self-funded patrollers where there is demand would ensure that the Council did not receive increasing costs in this area as the number of crossing patrollers increases.</p>
Officer recommendation as a result of responses:	<p>Given the better than anticipated improving local economy, it is recommended that the proposed savings is not taken at this time.</p>

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

Overview of responses and recommendations: Parenting Support Team		Janet Scott, Adult and Community Learning Service Manager, Educ	
Proposal:	To reduce the budget for training practitioners to deliver parenting programmes in line with reduced demand and to integrate the service with other related parent support programmes.	Proposed reduction in funding:	Total budget: £145k 2014/15: £0k 2015/16: £95k (65%)
Nos of responses:	8 responses were received for this proposal. There were no organisations listed.		
Key issues raised:	<p>Comments noted the value of this service to both the parents and the children.</p> <p>The greatest concerns were around vulnerable families, those with low incomes and where mental health is a factor.</p> <p>Another concern was around the provision of parenting courses in the future when the 'pool' of those currently trained was reduced.</p> <p>It is noted, responses focussed on the delivery of parenting courses rather than the reduction in the team set up to train those delivering the programmes.</p>		
Equality issues:	It is noted that by its nature, this proposal would affect families who may be considered more vulnerable.		
Suggestions for mitigating the impact on service users:	Suggestion	Council response	
	<p>Ensure there is a funding reserve to pay for new staff to be trained in the future</p> <p>To engage with the voluntary sector and invest in their training.</p>	<p>Historically the parenting programme delivery has been funded through central government grants. Any further local delivery would be contingent on either new funding sources being available or developing collaborative joint funding models locally. This would still require time and resources to develop these kinds of arrangements.</p> <p>Some workforce development has been resourced jointly with Public Health and Troubled Families Programme funding and there is potential for parenting support to be considered in the future for funding via this route as it relates to wide health and well being agenda.</p>	
Alternative options for applying the saving in this area:	Suggestion	Council response	
	Work with the CCG to commission mental health services for parents and to work closely with the council;	<p>This would need to be raised through the Health and Wellbeing Board.</p> <p>Some initiatives to be jointly funded by the Council and health jointly.</p> <p>There is also a possibility of working with another local authority.</p>	
Suggestions for how others may help	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pooling resources • Being part of a capacity mapping exercise 		

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

contribute:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being part of further 'think tank' type activity • Paying for parenting programme training at cost • Charging those parents who can pay for parenting programmes
Officer conclusion as a result of the responses:	West Berkshire currently offers many recognised evidenced based parenting programmes to meet a wide range of needs. However, the Parenting Support Team has trained a high number of staff and as a result the need for a co-ordinating and development function has reduced.
Officer recommendation as a result of responses:	Feedback has not uncovered any further issues which would prevent the council from proceeding with this saving. It is therefore recommended to implement this proposal with no changes

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

Overview of responses and recommendations: Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme			Chris Jones, Arts and Leisure Manager, C&EP
Proposal:	To withdraw funding which supports the West Berkshire DoE award scheme	Proposed reduction in funding:	Total budget: £72k 2014/15: £0k 2015/16: £72k (100%)
Nos of responses:	79 in total of which 15 were from organisations		
Key issues raised:	<p>Valued programme, supporting young people to develop social and life skills – preparedness for higher education and potential employment, recognises talents and promotes independence, healthy lifestyle and community / social inclusion.</p> <p>Scheme already supported and supplemented by volunteers.</p> <p>Concern that although other organisations are able to provide the scheme, capacity to deliver would be reduced and young people would have to join these organisations to participate.</p> <p>Recognise economies of scale in terms of training, quality assurance, and consistent support as a result of a central licence holder / provider and concern amongst some organisations that they are not large enough to assume the responsibility, or the cost, of the licence.</p>		
Equality issues:	<p>This is a universal service, so young people generally would be affected.</p> <p>However, particular groups who do currently benefit from the scheme include PRUs, YOT programmes, special needs young people and young people from deprived areas where youth provision has been cut in previous budgets.</p>		
Suggestions for mitigating the impact on service users:	Suggestion	Council response	
Alternative options for applying the saving in this area:	Suggestion	Council response	
	Reduce / amalgamate the function, rather than cease altogether	Options for alternative deliver will be explored but on the basis of zero cost to WBC	
	Reduce the funding over a nos of years / gradual increase in cost of placements	The Council is looking at increasing income but it is unlikely that this could match the savings target.	
	Run a tiered scheme so participants who are able to contribute, do so	All participants pay. Options for increasing charges based upon the ability to pay are being explored	
	DoE centres paying a sign up fee to WBC as the central licence holder	The Council is looking at increasing income but it is unlikely that this could match the savings target	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

	Close award centres so that schools operate the scheme independently	Alternative hosts are being considered. Schools generally reluctant to run a scheme at this level, generally only cater for their own students.
	Utilise pupil premium funding and / or funding from Children's Services for more disadvantaged pupils	Draw down of Pupil Premium can be looked into. Funding from Children's Services would not generate a saving for the council
	Run jointly with a partner organisation / charity / neighbouring LAs	This would not realise the total saving
	Run the entire service through volunteers	A large number of volunteers deliver the service with WBC's provision. A voluntary group will be at liberty to obtain a licence and run the scheme
	Generate income through making use of existing staff to provide expedition training and management	There is no spare capacity within the team
	Greater sponsorship and grant aid	The Council is looking at increasing income in this and other ways but it is unlikely that this could match the savings target.
Suggestions for how others may help contribute:	<p>Noted that the scheme already supported greatly by volunteers.</p> <p>Some organisations indicated that would be prepared to consider increasing their contributions</p> <p>Some indicated they would be like to be involved in further discussions around the provision of the service</p> <p>Suggested that participating organisations could pool equipment and transport to reduce costs of expeditions – grant licences to inter-schools collaborative groups</p> <p>Seek sponsorship from local businesses – through their training budgets and getting younger staff involved as part of their development plans.</p> <p>Berkshire Youth indicated that would seek to spread the overhead costs by partnering with other areas.</p>	
Officer conclusion as a result of the responses:	The initial intention for this proposal was to look for an alternative method of delivery, maintaining the saving for the council. This will continue.	
Officer recommendation as a result of responses:	Feedback has not uncovered any further fundamental issues which would prevent the council from proceeding with this saving. It is therefore recommended that the saving remains unchanged and is proceeded with over the next 12-24 months. Alternative methods of delivery will be explored.	

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

Overview of responses and recommendations: Tourism		Amanda Loaring, Heritage and Tourism Manager, C&EP	
Proposal:	To cease funding for the Newbury Tourist Information Office and withdraw technical support for the <i>Visit Newbury</i> official tourism website managed by the Newbury BID.	Proposed reduction in funding:	Total budget: £60k 2014/15: £0k 2015/16: £60k (100%)
Nos of responses:	78 responses were received, 9 of which were from organisations.		
Key issues raised:	Support for the service as a valuable resource in supporting the local economy by encouraging visitors to the area but also as a beneficial resource to the local community. A number noted the use of the internet, but some preferred face-to-face contact.		
Equality issues:	This is a universal cut and the service itself is not intended to target any specific group, however, some respondents noted a greater impact on those not as computer literate, such as the elderly who therefore rely on more face to face contact.		
Suggestions for mitigating the impact on service users:	Suggestion	Council response	
	Improve and encourage greater use of the Visit Newbury website and the TIC transferring to the BID	Discussions with potential hosts of the TIC are in hand. The Visit Newbury Website is currently managed and maintained by the Business Improvement District company (Newbury BID)	
Alternative options for applying the saving in this area:	Suggestion	Council response	
	Move the TIC to a rent-free location	There may be some potential to make savings in that regard but they are unlikely to be significant to meet the target in this savings proposal.	
	Make more use of volunteers alongside paid staff	This would only make a small saving as the staffing levels are already very low. The costs of the venue and materials would not fall.	
Suggestions for how others may help contribute:			
Officer conclusion as a result of the responses:	The process has indicated that there is a continuing demand for face to face service provision.		
Officer recommendation as a	Feedback has brought forward further issues in relation to the TIC. Given the better than anticipated improving local economy, it is recommended that the proposed savings is not taken in full. It is recommended that the saving target be reduced to £25k and an		

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.

result of responses:	attempt be made to find this through contributions from Newbury BID, town and parish councils, local businesses and other potential funding streams.
----------------------	--

NB: This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the summary of responses and verbatim responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Finder](#) database.