

Appendix E

What 5%, 10%, 15% reductions in budget would look like?

The Service has already provided a 20.5% saving on budgets from 2009/10. By the end of 2013/4 this will have risen to around 25% as further reductions will need to be made due to the cash limited nature of the WRS budget (i.e. fixed at £5.626M) Further savings would be on top of this so partners will be looking at a 30-40% cut in resources associated with regulatory activity based on the original partner base budgets.

The table below outlines the approximate expenditure in each activity area that has been identified as a potential source of saving.

Activity	Approximate Current Cost
Private Water Supply Sampling	27000
Air Quality Monitoring / Contaminated Land inspection	59000
General Reactive work	1100000
Administrative	20000
Business Support	590000
General Proactive Work	1000000
Planning	175000
Dogs etc	172000
Total	3143000

These activities only represent a proportion of service activity within these areas of work identified and totally exclude licensing (£750K approx,) Support Team & associated costs (which including IT, accommodation costs, etc is around £1M,) and Senior Management (approx £300K.) Approximately £400K is not accounted for, in areas of core activity where a reduction in activity is identified but a staffing reduction is not made (e.g reduction in Nox tubes,) and for staffing where we are already at the minimum necessary to deliver a function e.g. Petroleum & Explosives Licensing.

Most Risk: significant potential impact on service

Medium Risk: customers will notice a reduction in service

Lower Risk: Little or no noticeable reduction in short term

The table below outlines the areas of service delivery that managers would recommend for reduction should we be faced with delivering the savings indicated. Managers have considered these and what you are presented with is the approach that would maximise the resources that remain on directly addressing the needs of residents and business customers. This should not be seen as a menu from which members can select. It must be remembered that a cash limited budget automatically requires savings year on year to deal with inflation and wage increases. We have allowed for this in the potential cuts outlined below so they exceed the 5,10,15% indicated

%	Change to Service Delivery	Statutory/ Non-Statutory	Risk/ Potential Impact	Current Cost	Potential Saving
5	Commercial samples only for private water supplies (householders will have to make own arrangements)	NS	Increased costs for householders and risk of deterioration of standards. Reputational issue if ill-health results.	£12000	£12000
5	Reduce Nox tube network by 25%	S	Reduced ability to identify areas with poor air quality and develop relevant plans for improvement	£16000	£4000
5	Reduce facilitation in civil advice complaints, threshold of £200 per transaction or requirement to be part of vulnerable group	MIXED	Reduction of service to public. Impacts on those who are poorer and more vulnerable to whom £200 represents a significant sum.	£110000	£20000
5	Increased thresholds for intervention in nuisance complaints including noise e.g. not deal with domestic bonfires on first report	S	Member of the public with a legitimate complaint will initially have to take own action to seek a remedy	£600000 NB: part of £900K above	£20000
5	Planned weekend monitoring of licensing and noise would cease	S	An increase in problem premises and public complaints	£30000 NB: part of £900K above	£30000
5	Reduced monitoring of daytime complaints to cover statutory duty only and where evidence is directly available.	S	Longer resolution times as evidence collated by complainants. Also increase in complaints to members and ombudsman.	£600000	£60000 NB: Based on the assumption we would investigate 10% fewer complaints.
5	Reduced website maintenance capacity	NS	Reduced ability to deliver good self service and increased impact of FOI as less published info.	£5000	£1000

5	Extended time periods to respond to Environmental Information requests.	S	Not meeting statutory time scales	£10000	£5000
5	20% reduction in proactive visits including inspections of food premises and health and safety	S	Not complying with national and European guidelines. Potential danger to health and well being of the public. If outbreak occurs FSA/ HSE may intervene and take over functions. Reputational risk.	£1,000,000 NB: all officers doing proactive work also do reactive so difficult to assess exactly what proportion of each is covered and it varies during the year and depending on circumstances. E.g disease outbreaks	£125000 (This looks at around 30FTE currently carrying out proactive visits as part of daily workload.)
5	Reduction in time spent on planning consultations including those with a direct impact on the public or environment. (all parts of service) No site visits in some areas i.e. contaminated land.	NS	Increased difficulty for partners to make decisions and increased costs if they have to get advice elsewhere	£175000	£30000
5	No informal planning advice	NS	Planning Officers unable to provide best advice, lower standards of development	£35000	£35000
5	Reduced level of support for discharge of planning conditions	NS	Increased cost for partners should they feel obliged to obtain external advice	£30000	£20000
5	No non-statutory collection, out of hours of stray dogs.	NS	Possible danger to public Reputational issue	£7000	£7000
					Total £369000 = 7.5%

%	Change to Service Delivery	Statutory/ Non-Statutory	Risk/ Potential Impact	Current Cost	Potential Saving
10	No sampling of private water supplies	S	Potential danger to public health if supplies become contaminated/ unfit. Reputational issues if this occurs.	£15000	£15000
10	Reduce Nox tube network by 50%	S	Severely reduced ability to identify areas with poor air quality and develop relevant plans for improvement	£16000	Additional £4000
10	No contaminated land inspections	S	Non remediation work to increase land available for development. Could hold up planning system or mean less acceptable areas have to be developed.	£18000	£18000
10	No action planning for air quality	S	Risk that poor air quality damages public health. Economic decline due to poor environment causing reduction in visitor numbers	£9000	£9000
10	Reduce facilitation in civil advice complaints, threshold of £500 per transaction or requirement to be part of vulnerable group	MIXED	Reduction of service to public. Impacts on those who are poorer and more vulnerable to whom £500 represents a significant sum.	£110000	Additional £15000
10	No monitoring of out of hours complaints including odour noise etc (except for recording equipment)	S	Public would have to deal with many issues themselves. Increased reliance on public as witnesses, longer to resolve issues, reputational issues for partners, & possibly Ombudsman	£50000	£30000

		challenge		
--	--	-----------	--	--

10	50% reduction in proactive visits including inspections of food premises and health and safety	S	Not complying with national and European guidelines. Potential danger to health and well being of the public. If outbreak occurs FSA / HSE may intervene and take over functions. Reputational risk.	As above	Additional £175000
10	Severe reductions in intelligence projects	MIXED	WRS may not be able to prevent harm to local residents and will not be able to participate in externally funded projects	Not easy to quantify savings. Likely to lead to increased costs and known problems do not get tackled	Potentially some limited savings in product testing fees but cost outweighed by value of intelligence to direct activity.
10	Reaction to environmental disasters e.g. oil spills, only the most serious event will be attended	S	Reduced service to partners such as Fire Brigade and Environment Agency and potential future contaminated land issues	Not quantifiable	NA
					Total £635000 = 13%

%	Change to Service Delivery	Statutory/ Non-Statutory	Risk/ Potential Impact	Current Cost	Potential Saving
15	Reduction of levels of support to business to maintain standards.	NS	Slow deterioration of standards at a time where businesses need help to grow economy	£550000	£65000
15	Removal of trader register and scores on the doors	NS	Detrimental to business as lose promotion. Public would suffer financial loss from rogue traders. Scores On Doors Scheme is being used as benchmark to support intervention decisions so would require change in approach.	£80000	£40000
15	80% reduction in proactive interactions only with the highest risk businesses (inspections carried out) NB: It is not possible to reduce staffing levels proportionate to the cut in inspection as need to maintain sufficient capacity to address emergencies e.g. animal disease outbreaks, food poisonings, etc.	S NB: Please see App F: Letter from Food Standards Agency expressing concern over variations in LA activity on European Food and Feed controls.	Not complying with national and European guidelines. Potential danger to health and well being of the public. If outbreak occurs FSA / HSE may intervene and take over functions. Risk of not being able to respond adequately to animal health emergencies. Reputational risk. Potential for public seeking recompense if can show authority has been negligent in delivering service.	As above	Additional £100000

15	No participation in planning consultations at all, except for largest/ most contentious applications	NS	Poor decisions leading to potential environmental and health impacts	£175000	£60000
15	Threshold for reactive work would rise significantly so that only obvious statutory nuisances were dealt with directly eg serious noise complaints	S	Public would have to deal with many issues themselves. Reputational issues for partners, & possibly ombudsman challenge	£600000	£30000 Again this very much depends on how many complaints can be left without action
15	No out of hours work for dogs. Basic Dog Warden service only	S	Danger to public/ reputational issue	£130000	£5000
15	High risk of not inspecting animal boarding est, pet shops, riding est, and zoos	S	Risk to animal welfare and, in case of zoo, potential of notifiable animal disease. General decrease in standards.		-£5000 Would have to pay vet to inspect rather than use animal; Health officer or dog warden.
15	Cessation of all pest control activities, so public told to get their own contractors	NS	Lesser service to public. Direct impact on a vulnerable group i.e. those on benefits	£35K	£32K approx
15	High risk of not meeting statutory timescales for FOI requests	S	Partners at risk of legal challenge. Some licenses deemed granted or refused if not challenged or dealt with in timescale	NA	Zero
15	Inability to participate in any health and well being work	NS	Future health of population would suffer	NA	Would limit scope for generating income
					Estimated total saving £900000 making allowance for element of double counting. 18.4%

					reduction
--	--	--	--	--	------------------

