

Corporate Priority 3

A clean and safe borough where people are proud to live

Ref	Proposal	2017-18 £000's	2018-19 £000's	2019-20 £000's	2020-21 £000's	2021-22 £000's	Total £000's	Current Budget	Current Staff	Delivery Risk RAG
3.1	Charge Green waste - income generation	375	375				750	N/A	N/A	Amber
3.2	Charging for Bulky Household Waste	300	100				400	N/A	N/A	Green
3.3	Charging for Replacement Wheelie Bins	100	50				150	N/A	N/A	Green
3.4	Charging for recycling bins and increasing residual bins for RSLs, Managing Agents, Developers etc...	50	50				100	N/A	N/A	Green
3.5	Flats Above Shops -Provision of bags - Service reduction	120					120	N/A	N/A	Green
3.6	Reduce Outreach/ Education team - Service reduction	50	65				115	N/A	N/A	Green
3.7	Closure of Park View Road R&R - Service reduction	115	115				230	N/A	N/A	Green
3.8	Veolia Operational Efficiencies	200					200	N/A	N/A	Green
3.9	Rationalisation of Parking Visitor Permits	125	225				350	N/A	N/A	Green
3.10	New Parking Operating Model		920				920	N/A	70	Amber
3.11	Relocation of Parking/CCTV processes and appeals		380				380	N/A	13	Amber
3.12	Cashless Parking Payments	150					150	N/A	N/A	Green
3.13	Online Parking Permit Applications & Visitor Permits			50			50	N/A	N/A	Amber
3.14	Parking New IT Platform			100			100	N/A	N/A	Amber
3.15	Sustainable Transport in CO2 Parking Permit Charge	100	300				400	N/A	N/A	Green
	Total	1,685	2,580	150	-	-	4,415			

Green Waste Charging

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Commercial & Ops - Neighbourhood Action
Reference:	Green Waste Charging
Type of saving:	Increase in income
Responsible Officer:	Waste Strategy Manager
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Free garden waste collection service stops	Resident satisfaction rates decrease
	Potential increase in fly tipping
	Reduction in recycling rate - 2%
	Potential greater contamination of Dry Recycling
	Increased side waste

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: Charging for Garden Waste: Stopping the current free weekly universal green waste collection service and reverting to a weekly opt in charged green waste collection service. The charge would be set at £75 per annum.</p>
<p>Rationale: Green garden waste is household waste for which a charge can be made for the collection. The service will be paid for by those who opt in only rather than a contract cost which is funded universally by all residents.</p>

SUMMARY			
	Financial Data		Workforce Data
Base Data	£000		
Current budget	N/A	Employees	N/A
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees	
Year 1	375	Year 1	n/a
Year 2	375	Year 2	n/a
Year 3		Year 3	
Year 4		Year 4	
Year 5		Year 5	
Total	750	Total	0

Key benefits:
<p>An estimate of £150K has been deducted and includes, call centre, IT development, container costs administration and any additional treatment/disposal costs. By charging for green waste and proposing that we provide composting bins 'at costs' we will be encouraging residents to deal with their waste sustainably at source.</p>

Internal dependencies and external constraints:
<p>Chargeable service will be fully administered by Veolia. Develop IT booking provision. Will need to complete a communications plan.</p>

Procurement strategy - N/A

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	375	375			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	375	375	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	375	750	750	750	750
Payback Period: n/a					

Charge for Bulky Household Waste

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Commercial & Ops - Neighbourhood Action
Reference:	Charge for Bulky Household Waste
Responsible Officer:	Waste Strategy Manager
Type of saving:	Increase in income
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Stopping a free bulk waste collection service to a	Fly tipping may increase
	Increased use of R & R
	Resident Satisfaction may be reduced
	Could increase side waste

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: To move from a free bulk collection service for recyclables to a standard bulky waste collection service where a charge of £25 would be levied for the collection of up to 4 items plus £10 for each additional item.</p>
<p>Rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 24 London boroughs charge for all bulky collections. - 10 offer some form of concession. - In North London – only Hackney and Waltham Forest also have some element of free bulky collections - Evidence from Newham saw a 75% reduction demand with no discernible increase in fly-tipping when they introduced a charge. - Modelled a 60% drop in demand for bulky collections from 30,850 p/a to 11500 p/a. <p>Impact on recycling rate will be low as material will still go to the bulk waste recycle facility at Edmonton.</p>

SUMMARY				
		Financial Data	Workforce Data	
Base Data		£000		
Current budget		N/A	Employees	N/A
Savings/Invest		£000	Change in employees	
Year 1		300	Year 1	n/a
Year 2		100	Year 2	n/a
Year 3			Year 3	
Year 4			Year 4	
Year 5			Year 5	
Total		400	Total	0

Key benefits
Total savings and Income generated has been estimated at £400K pa based on the demand levels noted above and an average price of £35 per collection.

Internal dependencies and external constraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Likely to lead to increase in tonnage through Reuse & Recycling centres. - Veolia will need to develop with the Council an IT online booking system. - A Communications plan will need to be developed.

Procurement strategy
N/A

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	300	100			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	300	100	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	300	400	400	400	400
Payback Period: n/a					

Charging for replacement wheelie bins

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Commercial & Ops - Neighbourhood Action
Reference:	Charging for replacement wheelie bins
Responsible Officer:	Waste Strategy Manager
Type of saving:	Increase in income
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Free service becoming chargeable for new or replacement residual and recycling bins	May discourage recycling
	Increase in stolen bins
	Impact on resident satisfaction

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: Charging for new and replacement containers to residents for both recycling and residual bins.</p>
<p>Rationale: Based on the assumption that once the charge is introduced demand for containers will reduce by 50%, resulting in the number of requests for containers reducing from 8,000 to 4,000. The savings are made up of two components, the reduction in the current contractual sum (£100K) together with a profit of £11.00 per bin equating to an annual sum of £50K. It is assumed that both recycling and residual bins will be charged for.</p> <p>Creates a value to the bins – engender greater responsibility for looking after bins and responsible waste management. Some other local authorities charge for replacement containers – Enfield and Brent for example.</p> <p>The Outreach team would continue to vet requests to encourage recycling and correct use and allocation of containers.</p>

SUMMARY				
	Financial Data		Workforce Data	
Base Data	£000		Employees	
Current budget	N/A		Employees	N/A
Savings/Invest	£000		Change in employees	
Year 1	100	Year 1	n/a	
Year 2	50	Year 2	n/a	
Year 3		Year 3		
Year 4		Year 4		
Year 5		Year 5		
Total	150	Total	0	

<p>Key benefits: Total Income generated has been estimated at £100K in the 1st year and £50k in the following year based on the demand levels noted above.</p>

<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints: Continued outreach team to determine residents needs. Risk that if this policy is announced in advance it could lead to a demand on containers whilst still free. New IT / online payment system to be developed with Veolia.</p>

<p>Procurement strategy N/A</p>
--

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	100	50			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	100	50	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	100	150	150	150	150
Payback Period: n/a					

Charging for recycling bins and increasing residual bins for RSLs, Managing Agents, Developers etc...

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Commercial & Ops - Neighbourhood Action
Reference:	Charging for recycling bins and increasing residual bins for RSLs, Managing Agents, Developers etc...
Responsible Officer:	Waste Strategy Manager
Type of saving:	Increase in income
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
	May discourage recycling
Free service to Managing agents/developers becoming chargeable for supply/replacement of Communal Recycling bins - possibility of costs being passed to residents	Charging for recycling bin hire would make flats policy consistent with schools bin charges
	Could increase levels of stolen bins
	Could increase side waste

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: Extend charging of managing agents/developers for hire/replacement of communal recycling bins and review communal residual bin hire charge</p>
<p>Rationale: Currently managing agents of blocks of flats are charged £145/year (£2.80/week) for Communal Residual Waste bin hire but Communal Recycling bins are made available free of charge, at the council's expense for supply, repair/maintenance and replacement. Set Recycling Hire @ £145/year (£2.80/week); Additional Income = £100K Increase Residual hire charge by 20% to £3.40 per week = £20K additional income</p>

SUMMARY			
Base Data	Financial Data	Employees	Workforce Data
	£000		
Current budget	N/A		N/A
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees	
Year 1	50	Year 1	n/a
Year 2	50	Year 2	n/a
Year 3		Year 3	
Year 4		Year 4	
Year 5		Year 5	
Total	100	Total	0

<p>Key benefits: Total Income generated has been estimated at £50K pa.</p>

<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints: Income not guaranteed</p>

<p>Procurement strategy: N/A</p>

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	50	50			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	50	50	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	50	100	100	100	100
Payback Period: n/a					

Flats Above Shops - Provision of Bags

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Commercial & Ops - Neighbourhood Action
Reference:	Flats Above Shops - Provision of Bags
Responsible Officer:	Waste Strategy Manager
Type of saving:	Stopping /Reducing service
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Limited impact as service is not widely used by residents	May reduce resident satisfaction

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: Cease to provide and deliver pink sacks for residual waste and green sacks for recycling to Flats Above Shops. It is proposed that green sacks for recycling will continue to be provided for free but will need to be collected from libraries/ Customer Service Centres directly by residents.</p>
<p>Rationale: On a quarterly basis approximately 10,000 sacks for residual and recycling waste are provided and delivered to Flats Above Shops. The savings in total are £120K pa and are roughly split 50/50 between recycling and residual. Reviewing how waste is presented on our High Streets (14 x collections per week) there is limited use of these sacks by the residents in the FAS. Limited recycling tonnage is collected from FAS less than 0.05%.</p>

SUMMARY			
		Financial Data	Workforce Data
Base Data		£000	
Current budget		N/A	Employees N/A
Savings/Invest		£000	Change in employees
	Year 1	120	Year 1 n/a
	Year 2		Year 2
	Year 3		Year 3
	Year 4		Year 4
	Year 5		Year 5
	Total	<u>120</u>	Total <u>0</u>

<p>Key benefits: A total saving of £120K.</p>
--

<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints: Retain funding to provide recycling sacks on request/from libraries – no more than £5K p.a.</p>

<p>Procurement strategy: N/A</p>

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	120				
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	120	0	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	120	120	120	120	120
Payback Period: n/a					

Reduce Education & Outreach Team

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Commercial & Ops - Neighbourhood Action
Reference:	Reduce Education & Outreach Team
Responsible Officer:	Waste Strategy Manager
Type of saving:	Stopping /Reducing service
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Potentially less engagement/ communications with residents on waste minimisation, recycling and waste collection issues	Reduced recycling
	Increased fly tipping
	Residents satisfaction levels reduced

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: Restructure entire Veolia Communications, Education & Outreach function and reduce Education/Outreach team by 50%.</p>
<p>Rationale: Following changes in the Veolia contract with service level reductions and changes in legislation relating to recycling (i.e. TEEP) the need for Veolia to have all the tools to deliver performance targets has reduced. Therefore it is proposed to reduce the educational and outreach team and review how the remaining resources can be used more effectively by working more closely with Council's communication team.</p>

SUMMARY			
	Financial Data		Workforce Data
Base Data	£000		
Current budget	N/A	Employees	N/A
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees	
Year 1	50	Year 1	n/a
Year 2	65	Year 2	n/a
Year 3		Year 3	
Year 4		Year 4	
Year 5		Year 5	
Total	115	Total	0

<p>Key benefits: The proposed changes would deliver a savings of £115K pa.</p>

<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints: Review and negotiation of contractual performance targets/ payment mechanism with Veolia. There will be a greater need for the outreach team to support the other income/service change proposals as set out in this document. Therefore savings split over two years.</p>
--

Procurement strategy:

Personnel Implications:

Up to 4 Veolia staff members could be made redundant. The Council will be liable for redundancy payments.

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	50	65			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	50	65	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	50	115	115	115	115

Payback Period: n/a

Close Park View Road R&R

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Commercial & Ops
Reference:	Close Park View Road R&R
Responsible Officer:	Waste Strategy Manager
Type of saving:	Stopping /Reducing service
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Reduction of an R&R site	Reduction in resident satisfaction
	Potential increase in fly tipping

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: To close the Park View Road Reuse and Recycling Centre</p>
<p>Rationale: Historically Haringey has had only one Reuse and Recycling Centre, which has been a small site on Park View Road (PVR), Tottenham. The borough now has a larger second site in the centre of the borough, which can cater for the waste which is currently deposited at PVR. The impact of the closure of PVR is assumed to be minimal as those who wish to responsibly dispose of their waste in a car will travel to an alternative site within the NLWA network, including the Western Road site. As part of its DCO application NLWA intend to add to the current network by building a new R&R site at Edmonton in 2020/21. The PVR site is earmarked for redevelopment as part of the wider regeneration proposals for residential housing/ new school on Ashley Road Depot. Relocating the site locally (Sedge Road) has been considered, however the cost of this site has been estimated at a £1m plus and would not deliver the £230K revenue savings. Also the site could be made redundant with the building of the new R&R site at Edmonton.</p>

SUMMARY				
Base Data	Financial Data £000	Employees	Workforce Data	
Current budget	N/A		Employees	N/A
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees		
Year 1	115	Year 1	n/a	
Year 2	115	Year 2	n/a	
Year 3		Year 3		
Year 4		Year 4		
Year 5		Year 5		
Total	230	Total	0	

<p>Key benefits: Revenue savings of £230K paid to NLWA through the levy payment.</p>

<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints: Value of the regeneration site at Ashley Road has been calculated on the site being vacant, including the PVR R&R. The capital receipt for this site is helping to fund the proposed new depot site/ development at Marsh Lane.</p>

<p>Procurement strategy: Personnel Implications: London Waste Limited will need to relocate or make redundant up to 5 staff</p>
--

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	115	115			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	115	115	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	115	230	230	230	230
Payback Period: n/a					

Veolia Operational Efficiencies

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Commercial & Ops
Reference:	Veolia Operational Efficiencies
Responsible Officer:	Waste Strategy Manager
Type of saving:	Efficiency savings
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Proposals are intended to have minimal or no impact	n/a

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: To deliver the following operational efficiency savings which seeks to minimise any impacts and to continue to meet existing performance outputs. It is assumed that the proposals will not result in any change of policy.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To reduce Weed Spraying from 3 to 2 pa; 2) Reduce leaf clearance resourcing; 3) Change graffiti service from a proactive to a reactive service; 4) Increase commercial waste portfolio; and 5) Extend leases on Veolia vehicles. <p>In order to give flexibility around these savings it is proposed that only 2/3rds of the savings are utilised as operational changes are tested and proven.</p>
<p>Rationale:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) - Weed Spraying - that sweepers take a more proactive approach to remove weeds all year round to reduce the need for weed spraying; 2) - Leafing - to reduce the 14 week additional resource period during leafing to a 10 week period. The service will be redesigned to meet actual needs on the ground. 3) - Graffiti - moving to a reactive service where graffiti will be removed between 3 to 5 days. Offensive, racist etc, graffiti will still be removed in 24 hours. 4) - Trade waste - building the customer base and generating further profit which is shared with Veolia on 50/50 basis. 5) - Extend a number of Veolia vehicle leases by up to 2 years.

SUMMARY			
	Financial Data		Workforce Data
Base Data	£000		
Current budget	N/A	Employees	N/A
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees	
Year 1	200	Year 1	n/a
Year 2		Year 2	
Year 3		Year 3	
Year 4		Year 4	
Year 5		Year 5	
Total	200	Total	0

<p>Key benefits: In total the savings accrue to £300K , however it has been recommended that 2/3rds of the savings are utilised (£200K) to enable a flexible approach to reallocate funds if required to ensure required performance outputs are met.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Weed Spraying - £20K; 2) Leafing - £45K; 3) Graffiti - £100K; 4) Trade Waste - £50K; and 5) Vehicle Leases - £85K

<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints:</p>

Procurement strategy:

Personnel Implications: This relates to Veolia sub contractors and temporary staff employed by Veolia during leafing.

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	200				
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	200	0	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	200	200	200	200	200
Payback Period: n/a					

Rationalisation of Visitors Permits and increase in hourly permit charge.

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Traffic Management
Reference:	Rationalisation of Visitors Permits and increase in hourly permit charge.
Responsible Officer:	Head of Traffic Management
Type of saving:	Increase in income
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Residents will have to pay more for VP	Less VPs issued
Residents aged between 60 and 75 will no longer be entitled to a concession	More journeys undertaken by walking, cycling or public transport

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: This involves a review of the Visitor Parking (VP) Permit scheme, rationalising provision of permits and bringing charges in line with other boroughs, see below.</p> <p>Proposals also involve reducing the concessionary entitlement, which currently offers a 50% reduction in charge to residents aged 60 years or over, and those registered disabled (this group is also allowed double the normal allocation of permits). In future it is proposed that this concession will be limited to those aged 75 years or over. No change is proposed to those residents registered as disabled.</p> <p>The proposals include a reduction in the range of different types of VP permits offered, reducing unnecessary overheads. This will involve removing the two hourly, weekend and two weekly Permits. It is proposed to increase the VP from 35p to 80p per hour.</p>
<p>Rationale: For a borough with Inner London parking pressures the cost of an hourly visitor permit is low, which in turn does not help to manage demand for parking space and encourage residents and visitors to walk, cycle or use public transport. Rationalisation of the number of permits will help the administration of the scheme and reduce overheads.</p>

SUMMARY			
	Financial Data		Workforce Data
Base Data	£000		
Current budget	N/A	Employees	N/A
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees	
Year 1	125	Year 1	n/a
Year 2	225	Year 2	n/a
Year 3		Year 3	
Year 4		Year 4	
Year 5		Year 5	
Total	350	Total	0

<p>Key benefits: This would involve removing the current limit on the number of hourly permits that may be purchased, but increasing charges from 35p per hour to either; -60p per hour, which would generate in the region of an additional £250k annually or -80p per hour, which would generate in the region of an additional £300k annually Both estimates take account of a possible reduction in the numbers purchased The concession change would result in a saving of £50K.</p>
--

<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints: Will require IT development and working closely with Customer Services</p>
--

Procurement strategy:

N/A

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	125	225			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	125	225	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	125	350	350	350	350
Payback Period: n/a					

New Parking Operating Model

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Traffic Management
Reference:	New Parking Operating Model
Responsible Officer:	Head of Traffic Management
Type of saving:	New delivery model
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
None	None

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: To consider the delivery of a new parking enforcement operating model. For the purpose of the financial modelling it is assumed that the existing MTFS saving of £600K relating to this proposal is all moved to the new MTFS. One of the options being considered is the provision of a labour only type model (as utilised in Westminster) where strategic and tactical deployment of staff will still be undertaken by the Council.</p>
<p>Rationale: A detailed financial analysis undertaken by consultants supporting the commissioning project estimated savings over and above those originally anticipated in the existing MTFS- £600k. The new savings by moving to this model has been estimated at £920K.</p>

SUMMARY			
	Financial Data		Workforce Data
Base Data	£000		
Current budget	N/A	Employees	70
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees	
Year 1		Year 1	
Year 2	920	Year 2	55
Year 3		Year 3	
Year 4		Year 4	
Year 5		Year 5	
Total	920	Total	55

<p>Key benefits: The total potential savings identified by moving to the new operating model is estimated at £920K.</p>
--

<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints: - If agreed the Council will need to take a commercial position on the where the service will be accommodated.</p>
--

Procurement strategy:

A full procurement of the service would need to be undertaken taking between 12 to 18 months

Personnel Implications: If agreed 75 staff would be transferred (TUPEd) to a new provider

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)		920			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	0	920	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	0	920	920	920	920
Payback Period: N/A					

Relocating Parking/CCTV Back office Processing & Appeals

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Traffic management
Reference:	Relocating Parking/CCTV Back office Processing & Appeals
Responsible Officer:	Head of Traffic Management
Type of saving:	New delivery model
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
None	None

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: To relocate 1st stage parking appeals and CCTV enforcement processing outside London. A number of operating models will be considered. Final 2nd stage appeals will be retained by the Council.</p>
<p>Rationale: Services delivered outside of London attract reduced cost due to a number of factors which includes accommodation costs and staffing costs as well as benefits in being able to recruit more readily. The London Borough of Islington successfully operate an in house service provision in Manchester. We are also aware that the London Boroughs of Barnet, Enfield and Waltham Forest operate 1st stage appeals outside of London through a third party provider.</p>

SUMMARY			
	Financial Data		Workforce Data
Base Data	£000		
Current budget	N/A	Employees	13
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees	
Year 1	380	Year 1	13
Year 2		Year 2	
Year 3		Year 3	
Year 4		Year 4	
Year 5		Year 5	
Total	380	Total	13

<p>Key benefits: A reduction in operating costs of £380K</p>

<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IT systems will have to be developed and aligned between offices. - Finding suitable accommodation to relocate staff. - The potential recruitment of new staff.

<p>Procurement strategy A full procurement of the service would need to be undertaken, taking between 12 to 18 months</p>
<p>Personnel Implications: If agreed up to 13 staff would be relocated or transferred (TUPEd) to a new provider. Staff not willing to relocate will face compulsory redundancy.</p>

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)		380			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	0	380	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	0	380	380	380	380
Payback Period: N/A					

Parking Cashless Payments

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Traffic Management
Reference:	Cashless payments - parking
Responsible Officer:	Head of Traffic Management
Type of saving:	Efficiency savings
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Unable to use cash at pay & display	More efficient service
	More customer focused - texting reminders
	Less theft from Pay & Display units

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: To remove all existing cash options for on street payments moving to APP or telephone electronic payments.</p>
<p>Rationale: Reduces the costs of collecting money, theft of money and maintenance of equipment. Also the service offer can improve customers experience by sending reminders to phone to top up payments to avoid parking tickets. This service is currently offered by Westminster, Barnet and Islington.</p>

SUMMARY			
Base Data	Financial Data	Employees	Workforce Data
	£000		
Current budget	N/A	Employees	N/A
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees	
Year 1	150	Year 1	n/a
Year 2		Year 2	
Year 3		Year 3	
Year 4		Year 4	
Year 5		Year 5	
Total	150	Total	0

<p>Key benefits: A reduction in operating costs of £150K</p>

<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints: Communications - web site development etc.</p>
--

<p>Procurement strategy:</p>
<p>Personnel Implications: Indirect unknown impact on contractor's staff that currently collect cash.</p>

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	150				
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	150	0	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	150	150	150	150	150
Payback Period: N/A					

Electronic Applications for Permits & Visitor Vouchers

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Traffic Management
Reference:	Electronic permits and visitor vouchers
Responsible Officer:	Head of Traffic Management
Type of saving:	Efficiency savings
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Some residents may not be able to access online services	More efficient service
Electronic services available 24/7	More customer focused

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: To move to online parking permit applications removing the existing paper based system and to provide visitor vouchers online.</p>
<p>Rationale: Reduces the level of face to face and telephone transactions currently being delivered in the Customer Service and Call Centres. Removes current paper based system.</p>

SUMMARY			
Base Data	Financial Data £000	Employees	Workforce Data
Current budget	N/A	Employees	N/A
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees	
Year 1	50	Year 1	n/a
Year 2		Year 2	
Year 3		Year 3	
Year 4		Year 4	
Year 5		Year 5	
Total	50	Total	0

<p>Key benefits: A reduction in operating costs of £50K</p>
--

<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints: Communications - web site development etc..Linked to the reprocurement of a new parking IT platform - see savings proposal for new IT platform.</p>

<p>Procurement strategy: In relation to Visitor Vouchers will possible need to form part of procured new IT platform or otherwise will be a development project with existing provider Civica.</p>

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)			50		
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	0	0	50	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	0	0	50	50	50
Payback Period: n/a					

New IT platform - Parking

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Sustainable Transport
Reference:	New IT Platform
Responsible Officer:	Head of Traffic Management
Type of saving:	Efficiency savings
Version:	1.0

PROPOSAL	
Proposal:	To procure a new IT platform which undertakes all parking processes and links through to SAP. The service is currently provided by Civica.
Rationale:	Recent work undertaken as part of the North London commissioning exercise suggests that Haringey can reduce its costs with its IT platform provider by comparing current costs with other boroughs.

Key benefits:	A reduction in operating costs of £100K
----------------------	---

Procurement strategy:	A procurement for a new provider will need to undertaken, due to the complexities of the processes and the transitioning from old system to the new it is envisaged that the timeline for implementation could be two years.
------------------------------	--

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
None	More efficient service
Enabler for Electronic services available 24/7	More customer focused

SUMMARY			
Base Data	Financial Data	Workforce Data	
	£000		
Current budget	N/A	Employees	N/A
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees	
Year 1	100	Year 1	n/a
Year 2		Year 2	
Year 3		Year 3	
Year 4		Year 4	
Year 5		Year 5	
Total	100	Total	0

Internal dependencies and external constraints:	Will require extensive engagement with IT and Finance colleagues to ensure a successful transition to a new platform
--	--

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)			100		
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	0	0	100	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	0	0	100	100	100
Payback Period: n/a					

Permits CO2 charging regime

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Sustainable Transport
Reference:	Permits CO2 charging regime
Responsible Officer:	Head of Traffic Management
Type of saving:	Increase in income
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Increased cost for those resident with higher CO2 emissions.	Residents select vehicles with lower CO2 emissions
	Improved air quality
	Reduced vehicles

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: To review the existing CO2 charging regime and change the banding linked to the DVLA scheme. Also to remove the additional charge per vehicle per household.</p>
<p>Rationale: The council's transport policies aim to reduce the harmful emissions from transport and improve air quality. As a result the Council introduced a CO2 emissions based permit charging structure in 2008. It is proposed to review the existing charges and introduce the same CO2 banding as used by the DVLA.</p> <p>It also intended to remove the current incremental increase for additional cars per household as this has proved to be difficult to administrater.</p>

SUMMARY			
Base Data	Financial Data £000	Employees	Workforce Data
Current budget	N/A		N/A
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees	
Year 1	100	Year 1	n/a
Year 2	300	Year 2	n/a
Year 3		Year 3	
Year 4		Year 4	
Year 5		Year 5	
Total	400	Total	0

Key benefits:

To charge vehicles with higher CO2 emissions. It is expected the charging regime will increase revenue up to £400K.

Internal dependencies and external constraints:

New charging for bands will require IT development/costs. Permit charge increase will be subject to statutory consultation.

Procurement strategy N/A

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	100	300			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	100	300	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	100	400	400	400	400
Payback Period: n/a					