

Business Change Mandate (Including Budget Mandates) Proposal Number: B15
Title: Highways Maintenance Review

All information requested must be completed on the proposed mandate to enable the Cabinet to decide whether to proceed with the proposal.

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Mandate Completed by | <i>Roger Hoggins, Head of Operations</i> |
| Date | <i>25/08/15</i> |

| |
|---|
| How much savings will it generate and over what period? |
| £200k recurring |
| Directorate & Service Area responsible |
| Chief Exec's – Operations department - county highways ops |
| Mandate lead(s) |
| Roger Hoggins, Ho S, Steve Lane – County Highways Manager, Gareth Sage SWTRA manager, |

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Final mandate approved by Cabinet | Date: |
|--|--------------|

1. Vision and Outcomes of the Mandate

Give a business context for the mandate. This must pick up on the vision and what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future including the anticipated experience of users. It must also consider any impact on the Council's key priorities and strategic outcomes. Similarly does it impact on service performance within the immediate service area or any impact on other services provided by the authority / any other providers. In doing so, the mandate must be tested against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment and must consider impact in relation to the new Future Generations Bill.

| |
|--|
| What is the issue that the proposal is seeking to address? |
| Reduces budget within the Highways section whilst seeking to protect basic service levels for essential safety services e.g. winter maintenance |
| What evidence have you got that this needs to be addressed? |
| Overall MTFP position requires net revenue budget reduction and the Continuance agreement accepts that highways expenditure will be reduced to protect the Council's priorities. |
| How will this proposal address this issue |
| Removes labour, transport and materials cost from the highways maintenance budget. |
| What will it look like when you have implemented the proposal |
| The County Highways Operations budget will reduce by 3 full time staff (£100k with O/T and employer's on costs etc.) leaving budget for 29 full time operatives (of which 2 are inspectors). 2 Staff will transfer to SWTRA funding and one post will be lost. A vehicle will be removed from the fleet and material usage (and budget) will reduce with the reduction in manpower leading to the inevitable reduction in works undertaken. |
| Expected positive impacts |
| The essential safety services of winter maintenance, snow clearing, emergency response will be maintained but staff may be required from the SWTRA, grounds maintenance and waste teams to supplement the county highways teams |
| Expected negative impacts |

Reduction in capacity to respond to highway routine and emergency maintenance issues with gradual deterioration in county highway network (exacerbated by reduction in capital budget).

2. Savings proposed

Show how the budget mandate will make savings against the current service budget. This must cover each year implicated. This section must also cover any other efficiency that will arise from the mandate.

| What savings and efficiencies are expected to be achieved? | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|-------------------------|--|-------------|-------|-------|-------|------------------------|
| Service area | Current Budget £ | Proposed Cash Savings £ | Proposed non cash efficiencies – non £ | Target year | | | | Total Savings proposed |
| | | | | 16/17 | 17/18 | 18/19 | 19/20 | |
| County Highways Ops - manpower | | £100k | | 100 | | | | 100 |
| Vehicle and plant provision and maintenance | | £30k | | 30 | | | | 30 |
| County highways materials | | £70k | | 70 | | | | 70 |

3. Options

Prior to the mandate being written, an options appraisal will have taken place. Summarise here the outcome of the Options considered and detail the rationale on why they were disregarded. (see options appraisal guide for further information)

| Options | Reason why Option was not progressed | Decision Maker |
|--|---|----------------|
| Further reduction in mgt and admin costs | This is being progressed through a different mandate | |
| Cuts to other services areas within Ops | Some of these are being taken as well plus some of the large spending budgets are on contract bases and prioritised by WG targets and grants (e.g. recycling, waste disposal) so less scope to achieve savings. | |
| Cuts to other service areas | Some service areas provide income generation that is included in the corporate budget. To reduce the teams undermines the capacity to generate income. | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

4. Consultation

| Have you undertaken any initial consultation on the idea(s)? | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------|
| Name | Organisation/ department | Date |
| Roger Hoggins | Operations | 28/08/15 |

| Has the specific budget mandate been consulted on? | | |
|--|----------|---|
| Function | Date | Details of any changes made? |
| Department Management Team | 27/08/15 | Savings in traffic mgt to be included in a separate mandate |
| Other Service Contributing to / impacted | | |
| Senior leadership team | | |
| Select Committee | | |
| Public or other stakeholders | | |
| Cabinet (sign off to proceed) | | |

| Will any further consultation be needed? | | |
|--|--------------------------|------|
| Name | Organisation/ department | Date |
| | | |

5. Actions to deliver the mandate

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to deliver the mandates and the action holders. This includes any actions contributed to by other services. Give the timescales to complete the work. This must also factor in any business activities that will need to be done differently or cease in order to achieve the mandate.

| Action | Officer/ Service responsible | Timescale |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| Fleet reduced and managers advised of reduction in materials budget and the loss of one post. 2 staff to be funded from SWTRA so necessary coding required. | Highways mgt team, accountant | Last qtr of 15/16 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

6. Additional resource/ business needs

Describe any additional finance, resource and capability needed in order to carry out the proposed mandate successfully. For example new funding, expertise e.g. marketing and knowledge etc..

| Any additional investment required | Where will the investment come from | Any other resource/ business need (non-financial) |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

7. Measuring performance on the mandate

How do you intend to measure the impact of the mandate? This could include: speed of service; quality of service; customer satisfaction; unit cost; overall cost. For advice on developing performance measures you can contact Policy and Performance Team, for advice on unit costs speak with your directorate accountant.

| Focus- Budget / Process / Staff / Customer | Indicator | Actual 2016/17 | Actual 2017/18 | Actual 2018/19 | Actual 2019/20 | Target 2016/17 | Target 2017/18 | Target 2018/19 | Target 2019/20 |
|--|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| budget | Service budget reduction – monitor actuals | £200k | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

8. Key Risks and Issues

Are there any potential barriers and risks that will need to be managed in delivering the mandate, including any negative impacts identified in section 1 that need to be accounted for. Also, set out the steps that will be taken to mitigate these. The risks should be scored in accordance with the [council's policy](#).

| Barrier or Risk | Strategic/ Operational | Reason why identified (evidence) | Risk Assessment | | | Mitigating Actions | Post mitigation risk level |
|---|---------------------------|--|-----------------|--------|---------------|---|----------------------------|
| | | | Likelihood | Impact | Overall Level | | |
| Deterioration in highway and our capacity to respond to ad hoc repairs will reflect badly upon this very high profile service | operational | Continued budget reduction in highways | medium | medium | medium | Improve our communication – internally to make better use of resources available (through the connected worker) and externally to keep enquirers, complainants etc. briefed on what is happening. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

9. Assumptions

Describe any assumptions made that underpin the justification for the option.

| Assumption | Reason why assumption is being made (evidence) | Decision Maker |
|------------|--|----------------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

10. Monitoring the budget mandate

The budget mandates must be monitored through directorate budget monitoring. This will lead into corporate budget monitoring. In addition the action plan, performance measures and the risk assessment must be transferred into the service plans for the business area in order to monitor and challenge the delivery of the budget mandate, including the savings being achieved and the level of impact.

11. Evaluation

It is important to evaluate the impact of the mandate once it has been fully delivered to know whether it has successfully achieved what it set out to do and to ensure that findings can be used to inform future work.

| Planned Evaluation Date | Who will complete the evaluation? |
|------------------------------------|---|
| During the financial year and past | Finances by accountants and managers. Service performance from key indicators |