

## Working with you to shape Stirling's future – CC Response sheet

Community Council:     Balfron Community Council    

We are committed to delivering high quality services that meet priorities and outcomes which have been agreed with our communities. The Council is working to 42 priorities which can be found at [www.stirling.gov.uk/key-priorities](http://www.stirling.gov.uk/key-priorities).

We have already done much to identify savings in the last few years and will continue the Priority Based Budgeting (PBB) process to open up the discussion on how we direct spending and what is important to our communities. Depending on how our budget assumptions develop, over the next five years between 2108/19 and 2022/23, Stirling Council has a projected budget gap of £24 million.

We are looking for feedback on options that have been proposed by officers. Full details of the options can be found at [www.stirling.gov.uk/shapingstirling](http://www.stirling.gov.uk/shapingstirling) as well as other ways of feeding into the process and being involved. This feedback will influence the decisions made by elected members when next year's budget is set in late February.

Please complete by **Monday 5th February 2018** for your comments to be taken into account when decisions are made. If you have any queries or need more information, please contact [communityengagement@stirling.gov.uk](mailto:communityengagement@stirling.gov.uk). Please return the completed response to the Community Engagement Team.

This year the options are in split into five sections -

**Transformation Options** propose ways to transform services or deliver them differently. This could involve radically or significantly changing the way in which a service is currently delivered to reduce costs, while also improving customer experience or outcomes. By transforming services, we can reduce the amount of cuts we have to make.

**Income Generation Options**, rather than identifying ways of reducing expenditure, propose ways of increasing existing income or creating new revenue streams for the Council. This could involve expanding a service to serve more customers in an area which currently delivers income. Alternatively, it could mean pursuing opportunities for commercialisation, such as delivering services to the private sector or other public sector organisations. By generating additional income, we can reduce the amount of cuts we have to make.

**Efficiency Options** propose ways of operating more efficiently and effectively, reducing spending while leaving the existing service unchanged.

**Fees and Charges Options** propose ways to increase Council income through introducing or increasing fees and charges for particular products or services. By generating increased income, we can reduce the amount of cuts we have to make.

**Stop/Reduce Options** propose ways of reducing expenditure through reducing or stopping a service. A reduction in a service could involve reducing the level or frequency of a service provided or restricting its availability. Alternatively, Stirling Council would entirely cease delivering the service.

You can choose to comment on as many or as few themes and options as you like.

**Transformation Options**

<i>Reference</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Descriptions</i>	<i>Comments/Suggestions</i>
<b>T001</b>	<b>Establish Children's Services multi-agency locality teams</b>	Establishment of teams bringing together Stirling Council Children & Families staff and staff from relevant partner agencies to be co-located within specific geographic areas. This aims to deliver a joined-up approach for the delivery of social work services to children, young people and their families. This would save £353k over a three year period from 20/21	<p>In principle this is welcome if it facilitates more effective and efficient partnership working between different agencies and making services more attuned to local needs / local solutions.</p> <p>It is however unclear how exactly the savings would be realised – if this involved reducing capacity in frontline services there would be a danger of hollowing out services, undermining the benefits of the more joined-up approach. Also, by focussing too much on geographically / locality based working economies of scale might be lost for services that are unlikely to operate effectively in smaller populations.</p> <p>Guarantees required that rural areas will not be disadvantaged given that there is a reduced possibility that experienced staff will be located in a rural area.</p>
<b>T002</b>	<b>Increase number of schools with shared headships</b>	Increase the number of so-called partner schools with shared or executive headships to reduce costs and encourage collaboration. Some establishments would become partner schools with a shared or executive headship and some nursery schools would become nursery classes within their local primary school. This would save £341k over a 4 year period from 18/19.	In principle, not against this proposal, although the recruitment process must appoint executive head teachers appropriate to the complexity of the task. . It would need to be managed carefully however to ensure that all the schools and nurseries involved had equitable managerial support and focus to allow them to function effectively and support the children in their care.
<b>T003</b>	<b>Enhanced support for independent living</b>	Supporting Looked After and Accommodated Children leaving care to progress from more expensive placements to less costly independent living arrangements. This would save £66k over a 3 year period from 19/20.	What is meant by independent living? A saving of £66k is negligible, and what guarantees are in place for these young people; eg personal security, physical and mental wellbeing, how they feed and look after themselves, mentoring, support when issues arise (eg financial problems, rent arrears), ensuring that they go to apprenticeships or college?

<b>T004</b>	<b>Shared public sector property service</b>	Development of a shared property service with other public sector bodies, to deliver a more efficient property, facilities and energy management service for Council non-housing property at reduced cost and through closer collaboration. This would save £120k over a two year period from 21/22.	Again, while welcomed in principle, no indication how these savings can be achieved or whether other public sector bodies will participate; which are to be involved and would this result in more SC staff being made redundant than in other bodies?
-------------	--	--	--

### Income Generation Options

<i>Reference</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Comments/Suggestions</i>
<b>IG007</b>	<b>Recruitment of adoptive families</b>	Increase the recruitment of adoptive families in the Stirling Council area to generate income through the receipt of inter-agency adoption fees. This would only apply once all cared for children from Stirling have suitable homes. This would generate income of £63k in the year 19/20.	No indication of the cost of recruitment process. There is an assumption that such recruitment will be relatively simple. Seems more an aspiration than guaranteed action. Is this an actual generation of income or non-payment of existing fees through SG subsidy?
<b>IG008</b>	<b>Recruitment of foster carers</b>	Increase the recruitment of foster carers in the Stirling Council area to generate income through the receipt of inter-agency fees. This would only apply once all cared for children from Stirling have suitable homes. This would generate income of £47k in the year 19/20.	As above.
<b>IG009</b>	<b>Investment in private rented sector</b>	Investment in the private rented sector property market in the Stirling area; developing a Council accommodation portfolio to generate additional income from rent. This would generate income of £60k over a three year period from 20/21.	Surely a local authority's job is creating housing in public sector. What is the difference between a local authority in the private sector and providing local authority housing at non-private sector rental prices. £60k is an insignificant amount over 3 years. What level of upfront investment would be required to develop the Council owned portfolio? What the risk assessment has the Council undertaken to gauge the likelihood of achieving the suggested rent returns?

<b>IG0011</b>	<b>Station Square office development</b>	Develop the key strategic Station Square site in the centre of Stirling into high-quality and distinct office space, with potential retail or restaurant opportunities. The development may generate an additional income stream through a development model or a capital receipt. This would generate income of £58k over a two year period from 21/22.	No knowledge of the extent of the development, therefore cannot comment, although £58k income over 2 years seems to be insignificant.
<b>IG0012</b>	<b>Re-use hub</b>	Creation of a Re-use hub for waste goods, such as furniture and white goods, intended for landfill and deposited at Lower Polmaise Waste Management Centre or acquired via special uplifts. Items of potential market value would be upcycled and sold for re-use at a city centre outlet, reducing waste and landfill costs and generating income. This would generate income of £30k over a three year period from 18/19.	This is welcomed in principle, both from an income generation and from an environmental point of view. What is the evidence base that such a scheme would operate at a profit in Stirling? Has there been a pilot to test the proposed approach in practice?  £30k seems a guesstimate rather than an achievable forecast. Is the estimate based on any evidence from other areas?
<b>IG0013</b>	<b>Advertising revenue generation from Council assets</b>	Generation of advertising revenue from roundabouts, waste vehicles and other Stirling Council-owned and operated assets. This would generate income of £241k over a two year period from 18/19.	Not contentious, and accept, in principle. However, is there not a potential, inherent risk in advertising in roundabouts?  Given the stated potential for income generation – which is much higher than the other proposed measures – this would be worth pursuing. However, it is important to ensure that this is managed and implemented sensitively to avoid negatively impacting the built environment with unsightly and/or inappropriate advertising.
<b>IG0014</b>	<b>Lower Polmaise expansion project</b>	Expansion of the existing depot facility at Lower Polmaise. The additional capacity would be developed to: a) facilitate the move of other Council operations to this site to deliver greater efficiency; b) create a new revenue stream from the use of	No indication of savings achievable from expected efficiencies. Does such centralisation of services impact on rural economies and services? Which other Council operations would be expected to move to the expanded Lower Polmaise site? While greater efficiency is very attractive, it is also important to consider the implications that any move of Council operations may have on local areas that services may be moved out of. In particular, if this involved moving operations out of

		space by public sector or commercial partners. This would generate income of £120k over a two year period from 21/22.	more rural areas the negative impact on those localities may outweigh the potential benefits.  How concrete are the plans for other partners to use the new space?
<b>IG0015</b>	<b>Solar canopies at The Peak and Castlevie Park &amp; Ride</b>	Installation of solar canopies at The Peak and Castlevie Park & Ride, to generate renewable energy for use by electric vehicles and sale to the National Grid. This will be linked to a feasibility study for commercialising the site. This would generate income of £139k over a four year period from 19/20.	This proposal is acceptable and, indeed, welcome. However, why limit to only 2 sites?
<b>IG0016</b>	<b>Road barriers repair and inspection service</b>	Delivering a highly-skilled and technically competent road barrier repair and inspection service to external organisations, including other local authorities, to generate income. Roads & Land staff possess expertise in which other local authorities have not invested, creating a niche market which can be commercialised. This would generate income of £20k in 18/19.	Acceptable, if achievable. Have discussions taken place with other local authorities?

**Income Generation Options** (Surely Efficiency Savings?)

<i>Reference</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Comments/Suggestions</i>
<b>E020</b>	<b>Reduce Adult Assessment &amp; Partnerships business and finance Staff</b>	Identify opportunities for increased efficiency and reduced staffing complement in the Business and Finance Unit within Adult Assessment & Partnerships. This will include stopping non-essential tasks and automating essential processes. This would save £116k	No knowledge of this service, therefore cannot comment on impact.  This is welcome in principle, on the assumption that any reduction in staffing would be through natural turnover rather than redundancies. Also, “non-essential” would need to be defined carefully to avoid cutting the services too far and losing the ability to respond to changing needs and demands long term.

		over a two year period from 18/19.	
<b>E021</b>	<b>Remove vacant Adult Assessment &amp; Partnerships Quality Assurance post</b>	Delete the vacant post of Quality Assurance Officer in Adult Assessment & Partnerships. This vacancy has not affected service delivery. This would save £30k in the year 18/19.	If there has indeed been no impact on service delivery then this is a sensible step. However, if Quality Assurance is not assessed, how can you be sure that service delivery has not been affected?
<b>E022</b>	<b>Reduce numbers of Education Central Support staff</b>	Reduce the numbers of Central Support staff in the Education Team. This would save £100k in year 18/19.	Given the increased autonomy of schools through Scottish Government such a proposal is to be expected. Debate can be had re the benefits of losing experienced staff. Is there a danger here that this places a greater burden on other parts of the Education Team to take on central support staff functions, in turn undermining their delivery of their own core purpose?
<b>E023</b>	<b>Reduce Children's Services Business Support staff</b>	Centralise Children's Services Business Support and pursue opportunities for efficiency, automation, non-completion of non-essential tasks and increased customer self-service to reduce costs. This would save £82k over a two year period from 19/20.	Savings from economies of scale and standardisation as a result of centralisation would be welcome.  However, we have little knowledge of what this service does; therefore, cannot comment on effect given inadequacy of information given.
<b>E024</b>	<b>Demand analysis for younger children entering care</b>	Identify and implement earlier interventions to reduce the number of children accommodated by local foster carers through better use of data and a review of current processes and governance. This would save £60k in the year 19/20.	While earlier intervention is a laudable goal, it is unclear if this proposal is sufficiently mature to actually achieve the stated outcome, or if it is a proposal to undertake research and development into potential solutions that may (or may not) provide the suggested savings (and improved outcomes for the children)
<b>E025</b>	<b>Reduce administrative staff numbers</b>	Reduce administrative workforce through natural turnover. This would save £200k over a four year period from 19/20.	Similar to E022, to what extent would the proposed reduction in administrative support lead to other (frequently more highly paid) staff picking up administrative work? A £200k saving sounds attractive but unintended consequences would need to be recognised and mitigated.  There must come a point where constantly reducing support staff impacts on the quality and efficiency of any service. After previous cuts, has the admin service not borne the brunt of these more significantly than other areas? No thought of

			increased stress levels and concomitant support required (and negative effects, eg in greater staff absence) in costings?
<b>E027</b>	<b>Reduce staff overtime</b>	Reduce overtime payments made to staff. Plain time rate is payable to all hours worked by Stirling Council staff up to 40 hours per week. Overtime worked at the weekend is payable at time plus a half. This Option would apply greater scrutiny on the authorisation of overtime, ceasing all non-essential overtime and thereby reducing costs. This would save £100k in one year - 18/19.	<p>Exactly what is non-essential overtime? When does non-essential become essential? If overtime is the norm, surely staffing levels are inadequate. Given the sporadic and non-forecastable nature of some services and when overtime is required, how can such savings be guaranteed?</p> <p>Greater scrutiny of existing overtime rules is certainly welcome to ensure overtime is necessary and justifiable. Again, the exact definition of “non-essential” would be crucial as the reduction of overtime usage would effectively reduce the Council workforce and therefore likely necessitate a reduction in Council services to communities. A conversation with those communities would need to be had to be transparent about which “non-essential” services should cease.</p>
<b>E029</b>	<b>Council Tax income surplus</b>	There is an anticipated Council Tax income surplus of around £200k in 2017/18. This revenue can be used to ease the immediate budgetary pressure.	<p>It is obviously sensible to use any surplus to mitigate against future pressures.</p> <p>Has the Council identified priority expenditure where the proposed use of the surplus can deliver the most long-term benefit to Council finances (e.g. reducing debt payments)?</p>
<b>E030</b>	<b>Review advice services</b>	Review existing structure of provision of Advice Services across the Council and investigate opportunities for increased efficiency.	<p>Surely the emphasis must be on getting this part of the service working efficiently and appropriately before making reductions, for which “review existing structure” is an interesting euphemism.</p> <p>Exploiting opportunities for more efficient working is sensible. However, that in itself doesn’t create any savings and it’s not clear why this is included here now, rather than wait until after the investigation when actual tangible proposals may be known.</p>
<b>E031</b>	<b>Ensure best value operating model for Wallace Monument</b>	The Wallace Monument is currently managed by Stirling District Tourism. A review of operational options is currently underway and will report in February. This would save £50k in one year - 20/21.	Does this mean outsourcing? Surely politically inappropriate at this time.

<b>E032</b>	<b>Review fleet</b>	Reduce the number of Council vehicles, based on a full review of the fleet. This would save £30k in one year - 21/22.	While sensible and, indeed, something that would be done as a matter of course surely, what is the expected impact on services offered? Would there be an increase in expenses payable to staff using own transport?
<b>E033</b>	<b>In-house operating model for Wellgreen Multi-storey Car Park</b>	Wellgreen Multi-storey Car Park is owned by Stirling Council, but currently operated under a management agreement by an external firm which manages all aspects of the car park on behalf of the council and in return receives a management fee and recovery of overheads. It could be more cost-effective for the Council to operate and manage the carpark in-house. This would save £50k in one year - 19/20.	Approve wholeheartedly of bringing income generating assets into Council control.
<b>E034</b>	<b>Active Stirling efficiencies</b>	Agree strategies to drive income growth and tighten costs whilst seeking to deliver services to a wider community and demographic footprint. This would save £430k over a 5 year period from 18/19.	Very vague on how such a positive statement of intent can be achieved without impacting on services offered. Doing more with less is a laudable aim. To what extent have concrete proposals already been developed that could substantiate the suggested £430k savings?
<b>E035</b>	<b>Review and renew user agreement with McLaren Community Leisure Centre</b>	Review the existing user agreement between Stirling Council and McLaren Community Leisure Centre, ensuring that it is renewed to deliver reduced costs and/or increased revenue. This would save £50k in one year - 19/20.	Insufficient knowledge of current agreement to comment.
<b>E036</b>	<b>Reduce Business Improvement Team</b>	Reduce the size of the remaining Business Improvement Team, in light of the creation of a Portfolio Management Office. This will not impact on service provision or affect fulfilment of business needs. This would save £116k over two years from 19/20.	Fait accompli?
<b>E064</b>	<b>Delay reinstatement of Loan Charges Budget</b>	The current financial strategy contains a reduction to the Loans Charges Budget in 2017/18 of £1.5M, with that reduction	If it means what it could mean, this makes complete financial sense, assuming stability of current interest rates for the foreseeable future. However, badly expressed and inadequate description of what is involved.

		then being built back in by a budget increase of £0.5M in each of the years 2018/19, 2019/20 and 2020/21. Given the continued low interest rate regime, this timescale could be pushed back out by a year, or even not build that increase in at all for one of the years.	
<b>E065</b>	<b>Reduce funding for Central Scotland Joint Valuation Board</b>	Reduce Stirling Council funding for the Central Scotland Joint Valuation Board and alter the future terms of the Board's governance, including funding arrangements. This would save £40k in one year - 18/19.	The CSJVB performs essential functions – what are the ramifications of reduced funding for the Board?

#### Fees and Charges Options

<i>Reference</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Comments/Suggestions</i>
<b>FC037</b>	<b>Increase car parking charges</b>	Increase car parking charges for public on- and off-street car parking to increase income; implement charges in facilities which are currently free; and implement charges for staff car parking, which is currently free of charge for Stirling Council personnel next to several Council office buildings, to generate income. This would generate income of £73k over a two year period from 18/19.	No indication of level of increase and therefore requires more detail to be able to comment appropriately. Will this not have an impact on economic activity in the city centre and surrounding areas? Surely, attempts should be made to welcome more people into the city. Are non-central parking facilities adequate to encourage reduced use of cars in city centre – or will this simply place undue stresses on the local infrastructure and traffic e.g. by displacing parking to other areas. ?  Charging Council staff for parking at their place of work is not acceptable, given that many will be on the living wage and thereby such an increase would have a significant impact on their disposable income. Better to offer incentives to staff to increase use of public transport, especially from rural areas and, especially, given the extortionate cost of public transport from, eg, West Stirlingshire into the city.
<b>FC038</b>	<b>Review Council concession policy</b>	Cross-organisational review of concessions applied by the Council to fees and charges for its services, to ensure consistency in policy and implementation.	No indication of which concessions will be affected; therefore difficult to comment.

		This would generate income of £70k in one year - 18/19.	
<b>FC067</b>	<b>Increase telecare charges</b>	Increase charges - only for those who already pay for telecare - by £0.66 per week. This would generate income of £47k in one year - 18/19.	Asking for an appropriate payment for such a service is acceptable. However, what percentage does £0.66 per week represent? Is this increase in line (or below) inflation? Any increase above inflation would not be acceptable.

### Stop/Reduce Options

<i>Reference</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Comments/Suggestions</i>
<b>SR040</b>	<b>Reduce school meals menu choice</b>	Reduce the menu options on offer to pupils from the current three-tray/multi-choice offering to a less varied and diverse menu in schools, to reduce costs. This would save £55k over a two year period from 18/19.	How does this fit in with health and well-being policies? Will the numbers of children using this service not simply reduce. "... less varied and diverse ..." means less attractive to the users of the service, or do we just go back to the old days of going down the route of offering the "easy", "more attractive" option. Fewer options available on a given day may be feasible to implement but arguably, current school menus are already fairly limited and don't provide a wide range of different foods over the full menu cycle.
<b>SR044</b>	<b>Reduce Educational Psychology Service</b>	As a smaller-scale alternative to establishing multi-agency locality teams (T001), Educational Psychologists would spend part of their week co-located with outreach teachers and support workers within a school in each locality. These locality-based approaches to service delivery across schools would result in efficiencies, mitigating against a reduction in the size of the Educational Psychology Service. This would save £50k in one year - 18/19.	Exactly what efficiencies? If there is a guarantee that such an important service will be protected, then such a proposal could be considered as positive, as long as outcomes are maintained.  However, timely access to educational psychology is crucial for some children who require their specialist support. Services as they are already insufficient and any reduction would be a step in the wrong direction. It is not clear how the proposed co-location would necessarily counteract the loss of sheer capacity in a reduced Educational Psychology Service.  If anything it could be argued that this budget should be increased - existing services are inadequate and much needed to minimise problems in later years.
<b>SR053</b>	<b>Revised partnership agreement with</b>	Revised partnership agreement with Sistema Scotland from March 2018 for	If such a revised agreement can be achieved, this must be acceptable. However, can the project be maintained to the same extent? Would this jeopardise the positive

	<b>Sistema Scotland – Big Noise Raploch</b>	delivery of the Big Noise programme in Raploch. This would save £225k over a three year period from 19/20.	impact the project has had on the local community? Will savings be allocated to improved musical provision throughout the education service?
<b>SR054</b>	<b>Review Communities &amp; People payments to third sector organisations</b>	Review of all Communities & People payments to third sector organisations to identify opportunities for reductions in funding or recommissioning. This would save £200k over a four year period from 19/20.	Which third sector organisations will be impacted, and how? If there is simply a review, how can a cost saving of £50k on average pa be guaranteed?  Frequently, Council funding is an essential core part of the overall funding package that allows many organisations or projects to continue their work. Following reductions in Council budgets and ultimately, services, the role of third sector organisations is often now more important than ever. While a review of Council funding is sensible, this should include a clear focus on being evidence based and must protect third sector work that has demonstrable positive impact.
<b>SR057</b>	<b>Reduce grounds maintenance</b>	Stop the planting of bedding flowers and vegetables on an annual basis each summer. Existing beds would be removed or replanted with perennial plants to reduce costs and redeploy resources. Reduce the rate of herbicide applications to combat roadside weeds from twice a year to once a year from 2018. The existing contract expires in 2017, providing an opportunity for retendering. Also, stop annual treatments designed to reduce the spread of invasive weeds, to save money. Existing work is focussed on areas of need near settlements or near access points to the Rivers Forth and Teith. This would save £36k in one year - 18/19.	An insignificant cost saving that would impact the environment of communities in what is, to a great extent, a tourism-dependent rural community. Local residents will also be impacted. There is a serious problem now across all the river banks in Stirlingshire, particularly the Forth and the Endrick, where giant hogweed has taken control. A serious piece of work should be undertaken to eradicate this weed, and to ensure it remains eradicated. It is a mammoth task, and to date appears only to be addressed piecemeal.  We note that there is no mention of such cutback with the City boundaries.
<b>SR058</b>	<b>Stop deep cleans of communities</b>	Stop deep cleans of communities which are currently delivered on a recurring basis to maintain the cleanliness of areas of need to reduce costs. This would save £70k in one year - 18/19.	Not aware of any “deep cleans” in any community. What are “areas of need” in this context. If an area is in need of any such activity, who then takes responsibility for it? Without proper maintenance and cleaning, public areas are more liable to decay and appear “run down” quickly.

<b>SR059</b>	<b>Restructure and redesign Safer, Connected Communities Service</b>	Restructure and redesign of the Safer, Connected Communities Service, resulting in reduced staff numbers and service provision. This will necessitate the stopping and/or reduction of services, including enforcement, community engagement and other functions. This would save £100k in one year - 18/19.	<p>In other words, community organisations which rely on local authority assistance to help them support local organisations, events and activities will be adversely affected, at a time when such support is increasing. An appalling expectation and proposal.</p> <p>Enforcement is insufficient as it is – especially in rural parts of Stirling – and a reduction is not acceptable.</p> <p>Also, in other developments both Scottish Government and Stirling Council are pursuing greater community empowerment and ownership. Reducing the Council’s capacity for community engagement at the same time does not make any sense.</p>
<b>SR061</b>	<b>Reduce grass cutting</b>	Reduce grass cutting to open spaces including parks, residential areas, burial grounds and general open spaces currently maintained by Stirling Council and reduce the frequency of grass cutting cycles from 15 to 10 per year. Only the perimeter of grass open space plots would be cut, leaving the remaining grass plot unmaintained. This would save £100k over a two year period from 18/19.	<p>Already reduced quality of grass cutting in rural areas has had a negative impact on the environment in which communities live. Open spaces, unmaintained, will not be used and will therefore lose their purpose. Will this apply to areas within the City boundary? Or is the administration simply expecting communities to take this activity on board?</p> <p>This would require further consultation with relevant local communities in relation to specific grasslands affected. In some areas alternative maintenance arrangements may be feasible but where that cannot be achieved, the Council should consider retaining overall responsibility for grass cutting the full area.</p>
<b>SR063</b>	<b>Reduce funding to Smith Art Gallery &amp; Museum</b>	Reduce funding provided by Stirling Council to the Smith Art Gallery & Museum, which is a £242,000 annual subsidy at present. This would save £242k over a two year period from 21/22.	Such a recommendation can only come from someone (we hesitate to use ‘philistine’) who does not recognise the contribution that this wonderful facility makes to both the indigenous population and to tourists, on which the area greatly depends. Surely funds need to be used to promote the facility to increase attendance, and hopefully contributions.

## Comments from Buchlyvie Community Council on the PBB5 options

Discussed at their Meeting on 8 February 2018

### Roads

Roads play a vital role in the rural areas and we are pleased to note that reductions are not planned. In fact, with the poor state of the roads a strong case can be made for an increase in this budget. At a minimum, we wish to see the budget maintained, in spite of additional reductions elsewhere following the option analysis.

### Transformation options

T002 Increase number of schools with shared headships

We are not, in principle, in favour of this option.

### Stop/reduce Options

SRO40 Reduce school meals menu choice

We are not in favour of this reduction, particularly as the savings are so small.

Alison McGilvray

For Buchlyvie Community Council

**Email response (included Community Council template) –**

**For the attention of the relevant Community Engagement officer**

In my capacity as the Secretary of Bridge of Allan Community Council, I am forwarding for your attention, via the attachment to this email, the fully detailed and collated response of the Community Council to Stirling Council's current PBB proposals.

My colleagues have asked me to include in this covering email the following observations which are made with the intention of enhancing the effectiveness of future consultative exercises of this nature:

- the limited timescale for responding to such a comprehensive and expansive set of precisely detailed and often highly specific proposals was simply inadequate, particularly given the scope of what was a challenging exercise meriting nothing less than the most careful and measured consideration;
- attempting to comment on and to rate / rank the proposals in a responsible way was often frustrated by the absence of appropriate financial and management information required to set the proposals in their proper context and, in this regard, a significant impediment was that the exercise assumed a clear knowledge of internal Stirling Council organisation and operational processes;
- the absence of a clearly articulated Stirling Council vision, setting a context within which the budget cuts and revenue generating proposals are being made, was unhelpful;
- to address the consultation in a meaningful way, requires a reasonably sound understanding of the implications of a range of policies and strategic aspirations, including the LOIP, City Deal, Sustainable Transport and Local Development;
- the Community Council benefited to a marked degree from the constructive input from our community link officer, Andrew Davis, underlining the fact that, if community councils are to acquire a clarity of understanding and also if they are to engage in productive debate on Stirling Council initiatives, the support of link officers is essential;
- with the Community Empowerment Act and the Community Planning Partnerships, the role of community councils is changing and it is vital that our own community council anticipate and plan ahead in a proactive way for the impact on both the resources and skills required for us to adapt successfully to meet new demands

We hope that these comments are of assistance.

Leslie Harkness ( Secretary , Bridge of Allan Community Council)

## Working with you to shape Stirling's future – CC Response sheet

**Community Council: BRIDGE OF ALLAN COMMUNITY COUNCIL, COMPLETED AT TEAM DEVELOPMENT MEETING 30<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY**

**PRESENT: CC members LESLIE HARKNESS, MICHAEL BURT, NICK YARROW, JO CHISHOLM, SIOBHAN HENCHER, VICKY MCDOWELL, JANIE MEIKLE BLAND, ANDY DAVIS(SC)**

We are committed to delivering high quality services that meet priorities and outcomes which have been agreed with our communities. The Council is working to 42 priorities which can be found at [www.stirling.gov.uk/key-priorities](http://www.stirling.gov.uk/key-priorities).

We have already done much to identify savings in the last few years and will continue the Priority Based Budgeting (PBB) process to open up the discussion on how we direct spending and what is important to our communities. Depending on how our budget assumptions develop, over the next five years between 2108/19 and 2022/23, Stirling Council has a projected budget gap of £24 million.

We are looking for feedback on options that have been proposed by officers. Full details of the options can be found at [www.stirling.gov.uk/shapingstirling](http://www.stirling.gov.uk/shapingstirling) as well as other ways of feeding into the process and being involved. This feedback will influence the decisions made by elected members when next year's budget is set in late February.

Please complete by **Monday 5th February 2018** for your comments to be taken into account when decisions are made. If you have any queries or need more information, please contact [communityengagement@stirling.gov.uk](mailto:communityengagement@stirling.gov.uk). Please return the completed response to the Community Engagement Team.

This year the options are in split into five sections -

**Transformation Options** propose ways to transform services or deliver them differently. This could involve radically or significantly changing the way in which a service is currently delivered to reduce costs, while also improving customer experience or outcomes. By transforming services, we can reduce the amount of cuts we have to make.

**Income Generation Options**, rather than identifying ways of reducing expenditure, propose ways of increasing existing income or creating new revenue streams for the Council. This could involve expanding a service to serve more customers in an area which currently delivers income. Alternatively, it could mean pursuing opportunities for commercialisation, such as delivering services to the private sector or other public sector organisations. By generating additional income, we can reduce the amount of cuts we have to make.

**Efficiency Options** propose ways of operating more efficiently and effectively, reducing spending while leaving the existing service unchanged.

**Fees and Charges Options** propose ways to increase Council income through introducing or increasing fees and charges for particular products or services. By generating increased income, we can reduce the amount of cuts we have to make.

**Stop/Reduce Options** propose ways of reducing expenditure through reducing or stopping a service. A reduction in a service could involve reducing the level or frequency of a service provided or restricting its availability. Alternatively, Stirling Council would entirely cease delivering the service.

You can choose to comment on as many or as few themes and options as you like.

1 **BRIDGE OF ALLAN CC – RANKING: 5 = LEAST ACCEPTABLE.... 1 = MOST ACCEPTABLE PROPOSAL**

**Transformation Options**

<i>Reference</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Descriptions</i>	<i>Comments/Suggestions</i>
<b>T001</b>	<b>Establish Children's Services multi-agency locality teams</b>	Establishment of teams bringing together Stirling Council Children & Families staff and staff from relevant partner agencies to be co-located within specific geographic areas. This aims to deliver a joined-up approach for the delivery of social work services to children, young people and their families. This would save £353k over a three year period from 20/21	<b>1</b> <b>Transforming the service to improve the service</b>
<b>T002</b>	<b>Increase number of schools with shared headships</b>	Increase the number of so-called partner schools with shared or executive headships to reduce costs and encourage collaboration. Some establishments would become partner schools with a shared or executive headship and some nursery schools would become nursery classes within their local primary school. This would save £341k over a 4 year period from 18/19.	<b>3</b>  More information required on the rationale for this. Benefits and Risks? Which schools are affected? Are struggling schools going to be put under more stress? Rural schools – possibly, if it helps ensure schools remain open in rural locations
<b>T003</b>	<b>Enhanced support for independent living</b>	Supporting Looked After and Accommodated Children leaving care to progress from more expensive placements to less costly independent living arrangements. This would save £66k over a 3 year period from 19/20.	<b>2</b>  Transforming the service to improve the service. Must be measured on improvement to the lives of those affected by changes. Potentially some of the most vulnerable
<b>T004</b>	<b>Shared public sector property service</b>	Development of a shared property service with other public sector bodies, to deliver a more efficient property, facilities and energy management service for Council non-housing property at reduced cost and through closer collaboration. This would save £120k over a two year period from 21/22.	<b>1</b>  <b>Good management practice</b>

**Income Generation Options**

<i>Reference</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Comments/Suggestions</i>
<b>IG007</b>	<b>Recruitment of adoptive families</b>	Increase the recruitment of adoptive families in the Stirling Council area to generate income through the receipt of inter-agency adoption fees. This would only apply once all cared for children from Stirling have suitable homes. This would generate income of £63k in the year 19/20.	<b>2</b> Principle of recruiting adoptive families sounds ideal. Allowing potential parents to become an active family
<b>IG008</b>	<b>Recruitment of foster carers</b>	Increase the recruitment of foster carers in the Stirling Council area to generate income through the receipt of inter-agency fees. This would only apply once all cared for children from Stirling have suitable homes. This would generate income of £47k in the year 19/20.	<b>2</b> Principle of recruiting foster families sounds ideal. Allowing potential foster parents to become an active family
<b>IG009</b>	<b>Investment in private rented sector</b>	Investment in the private rented sector property market in the Stirling area; developing a Council accommodation portfolio to generate additional income from rent. This would generate income of £60k over a three year period from 20/21.	<b>3</b> concerns about the initial capital investment and on-going cost of administering this plan.  Dependent on level of rent , availability of housing and current landlord behaviour
<b>IG0011</b>	<b>Station Square office development</b>	Develop the key strategic Station Square site in the centre of Stirling into high-quality and distinct office space, with potential retail or restaurant opportunities. The development may generate an additional income stream through a development model or a capital receipt. This would generate income of £58k over a two year period from 21/22.	<b>1</b> Part of City Deal/ dependent on funding? What will be the impact on other localities ie city centre businesses? Who is marketing Stirling as a destination for business and enterprise? New retail premises opposite station are still vacant as are many city centre lots.
<b>IG0012</b>	<b>Re-use hub</b>	Creation of a Re-use hub for waste goods,	

		such as furniture and white goods, intended for landfill and deposited at Lower Polmaise Waste Management Centre or acquired via special uplifts. Items of potential market value would be upcycled and sold for re-use at a city centre outlet, reducing waste and landfill costs and generating income. This would generate income of £30k over a three year period from 18/19.	<b>1</b>  Impact on other up-cycling schemes and providers. Eg Salvation Army, FEL, Recycabike, Good Green Fun.  Could this not be better run by social enterprises and existing agencies?
<b>IG0013</b>	<b>Advertising revenue generation from Council assets</b>	Generation of advertising revenue from roundabouts, waste vehicles and other Stirling Council-owned and operated assets. This would generate income of £241k over a two year period from 18/19.	<b>2</b>  Control needed, impact on the environment, visual impact/ eyesore
<b>IG0014</b>	<b>Lower Polmaise expansion project</b>	Expansion of the existing depot facility at Lower Polmaise. The additional capacity would be developed to: a) facilitate the move of other Council operations to this site to deliver greater efficiency; b) create a new revenue stream from the use of space by public sector or commercial partners. This would generate income of £120k over a two year period from 21/22.	<b>1</b>
<b>IG0015</b>	<b>Solar canopies at The Peak and Castlevie Park &amp; Ride</b>	Installation of solar canopies at The Peak and Castlevie Park & Ride, to generate renewable energy for use by electric vehicles and sale to the National Grid. This will be linked to a feasibility study for commercialising the site. This would generate income of £139k over a four year period from 19/20.	<b>2</b>  What is the initial investment required and the return?
<b>IG0016</b>	<b>Road barriers repair and inspection</b>	Delivering a highly-skilled and technically competent road barrier repair and	<b>2/3</b>

	<b>service</b>	inspection service to external organisations, including other local authorities, to generate income. Roads & Land staff possess expertise in which other local authorities have not invested, creating a niche market which can be commercialised. This would generate income of £20k in 18/19.	opportunities to be enterprising and sell services to other agencies should be explored, however not at the expense of delivering good services to local council tax payers and businesses
--	----------------	---	--

**Income Generation Options \*\*\* DIFFICULT TO COMMENT AS IMPACT IS NOT CLEAR \*\*\***

<i>Reference</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Comments/Suggestions</i>
<b>E020</b>	<b>Reduce Adult Assessment &amp; Partnerships business and finance Staff</b>	Identify opportunities for increased efficiency and reduced staffing complement in the Business and Finance Unit within Adult Assessment & Partnerships. This will include stopping non-essential tasks and automating essential processes. This would save £116k over a two year period from 18/19.	<b>2</b>  This should be on -going, good management practice
<b>E021</b>	<b>Remove vacant Adult Assessment &amp; Partnerships Quality Assurance post</b>	Delete the vacant post of Quality Assurance Officer in Adult Assessment & Partnerships. This vacancy has not affected service delivery. This would save £30k in the year 18/19.	<b>1</b>
<b>E022</b>	<b>Reduce numbers of Education Central Support staff</b>	Reduce the numbers of Central Support staff in the Education Team. This would save £100k in year 18/19.	<b>?</b> What is the impact on front line delivery of great education?
<b>E023</b>	<b>Reduce Children's Services Business Support staff</b>	Centralise Children's Services Business Support and pursue opportunities for efficiency, automation, non-completion of non-essential tasks and increased	<b>?</b>

		customer self-service to reduce costs. This would save £82k over a two year period from 19/20.	This is good management practice
<b>E024</b>	<b>Demand analysis for younger children entering care</b>	Identify and implement earlier interventions to reduce the number of children accommodated by local foster carers through better use of data and a review of current processes and governance. This would save £60k in the year 19/20.	<b>1</b> Provided there is no detrimental impact on the most vulnerable
<b>E025</b>	<b>Reduce administrative staff numbers</b>	Reduce administrative workforce through natural turnover. This would save £200k over a four year period from 19/20.	<b>1</b> Good management
<b>E027</b>	<b>Reduce staff overtime</b>	Reduce overtime payments made to staff. Plain time rate is payable to all hours worked by Stirling Council staff up to 40 hours per week. Overtime worked at the weekend is payable at time plus a half. This Option would apply greater scrutiny on the authorisation of overtime, ceasing all non-essential overtime and thereby reducing costs. This would save £100k in one year - 18/19.	<b>1</b> Basic good management practice Consider impact on morale Consider creative alternatives, overtime is an outmoded concept
<b>E029</b>	<b>Council Tax income surplus</b>	There is an anticipated Council Tax income surplus of around £200k in 2017/18. This revenue can be used to ease the immediate budgetary pressure.	<b>1</b> Use Council Tax income to deliver the services expected !
<b>E030</b>	<b>Review advice services</b>	Review existing structure of provision of Advice Services across the Council and investigate opportunities for increased efficiency.	<b>1</b> Consider the impact on the most vulnerable in our community Otherwise this is just good management practice

<b>E031</b>	<b>Ensure best value operating model for Wallace Monument</b>	The Wallace Monument is currently managed by Stirling District Tourism. A review of operational options is currently underway and will report in February. This would save £50k in one year - 20/21.	<b>1</b>
<b>E032</b>	<b>Review fleet</b>	Reduce the number of Council vehicles, based on a full review of the fleet. This would save £30k in one year - 21/22.	<b>1</b> Good asset management practice
<b>E033</b>	<b>In-house operating model for Wellgreen Multi-storey Car Park</b>	Wellgreen Multi-storey Car Park is owned by Stirling Council, but currently operated under a management agreement by an external firm which manages all aspects of the car park on behalf of the council and in return receives a management fee and recovery of overheads. It could be more cost-effective for the Council to operate and manage the carpark in-house. This would save £50k in one year - 19/20.	<b>1</b> ? Is SC equipped to run and manage car parks? Is this your role?
<b>E034</b>	<b>Active Stirling efficiencies</b>	Agree strategies to drive income growth and tighten costs whilst seeking to deliver services to a wider community and demographic footprint. This would save £430k over a 5 year period from 18/19.	<b>4</b> ** Debate on this – management should maximise these excellent resources for the benefit of the community – savings is part of this, as long as services are enhanced** Active Stirling services are key to delivering health and wellbeing opportunities. Not clear how savings derived?? Is this not an enterprising, business growth/ income generating opportunity, rather than cost cutting? Affordable and accessible basic requirement for such services
<b>E035</b>	<b>Review and renew user agreement with McLaren Community Leisure Centre</b>	Review the existing user agreement between Stirling Council and McLaren Community Leisure Centre, ensuring that it is renewed to deliver reduced costs and/or increased revenue. This would save £50k in one year - 19/20.	<b>4</b> as above
<b>E036</b>	<b>Reduce Business</b>	Reduce the size of the remaining Business	

	<b>Improvement Team</b>	Improvement Team, in light of the creation of a Portfolio Management Office. This will not impact on service provision or affect fulfilment of business needs. This would save £116k over two years from 19/20.	<b>1</b> ? Insufficient detail here, assume this is a good management decision
<b>E064</b>	<b>Delay reinstatement of Loan Charges Budget</b>	The current financial strategy contains a reduction to the Loans Charges Budget in 2017/18 of £1.5M, with that reduction then being built back in by a budget increase of £0.5M in each of the years 2018/19, 2019/20 and 2020/21. Given the continued low interest rate regime, this timescale could be pushed back out by a year, or even not build that increase in at all for one of the years.	<b>1</b>
<b>E065</b>	<b>Reduce funding for Central Scotland Joint Valuation Board</b>	Reduce Stirling Council funding for the Central Scotland Joint Valuation Board and alter the future terms of the Board's governance, including funding arrangements. This would save £40k in one year - 18/19.	<b>?</b> No comment, insufficient knowledge of implications

### Fees and Charges Options

<i>Reference</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Comments/Suggestions</i>
<b>FC037</b>	<b>Increase car parking charges</b>	Increase car parking charges for public on- and off-street car parking to increase income; implement charges in facilities which are currently free; and implement charges for staff car parking, which is currently free of charge for Stirling Council personnel next to several Council office buildings, to generate income. This would generate income of £73k over a two year period from 18/19.	<b>2</b>  Subject to consultation with local communities; consider the dispersal effect of this decision into other areas, impact on quality of life and services. Offer excellent alternatives to driving in public transport/ active travel options

<b>FC038</b>	<b>Review Council concession policy</b>	Cross-organisational review of concessions applied by the Council to fees and charges for its services, to ensure consistency in policy and implementation. This would generate income of £70k in one year - 18/19.	No Comment Not enough information
<b>FC067</b>	<b>Increase telecare charges</b>	Increase charges - only for those who already pay for telecare - by £0.66 per week. This would generate income of £47k in one year - 18/19.	<b>4</b> Consider the affordability/ impact of this as these are the most vulnerable in our community who use this service

#### Stop/Reduce Options

<i>Reference</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Comments/Suggestions</i>
<b>SR040</b>	<b>Reduce school meals menu choice</b>	Reduce the menu options on offer to pupils from the current three-tray/multi-choice offering to a less varied and diverse menu in schools, to reduce costs. This would save £55k over a two year period from 18/19.	<b>2</b> Opportunity to enhance varied, healthy offering, make sure it is the choice not the quality that is reduced
<b>SR044</b>	<b>Reduce Educational Psychology Service</b>	As a smaller-scale alternative to establishing multi-agency locality teams (T001), Educational Psychologists would spend part of their week co-located with outreach teachers and support workers within a school in each locality. These locality-based approaches to service delivery across schools would result in efficiencies, mitigating against a reduction in the size of the Educational Psychology Service. This would save £50k in one year - 18/19.	<b>4/5</b> Is this service not already under stress? Ensure increased client contact time, this is one of our most vulnerable groups with teen mental health issues recognised as a growing societal issue
<b>SR053</b>	<b>Revised partnership agreement with Sistema Scotland – Big Noise Raploch</b>	Revised partnership agreement with Sistema Scotland from March 2018 for delivery of the Big Noise programme in Raploch. This would save £225k over a three year period from 19/20.	<b>3</b> Need to know if the Big Noise is achieving the targets set, have the social improvement aims been met. If so, then a programme should continue and alternative funding routes explored in the long term

SR054	<b>Review Communities &amp; People payments to third sector organisations</b>	Review of all Communities & People payments to third sector organisations to identify opportunities for reductions in funding or recommissioning. This would save £200k over a four year period from 19/20.	<b>3</b> Need more information and data on what specific organisations are to be impacted, what services do they provide and what is the impact of removing/reducing their funding.
SR057	<b>Reduce grounds maintenance</b>	Stop the planting of bedding flowers and vegetables on an annual basis each summer. Existing beds would be removed or replanted with perennial plants to reduce costs and redeploy resources. Reduce the rate of herbicide applications to combat roadside weeds from twice a year to once a year from 2018. The existing contract expires in 2017, providing an opportunity for retendering. Also, stop annual treatments designed to reduce the spread of invasive weeds, to save money. Existing work is focussed on areas of need near settlements or near access points to the Rivers Forth and Teith. This would save £36k in one year - 18/19.	<b>1</b> – replacing annuals for perennials – labour and environmental benefits  <b>1</b> – reducing the use of herbicides – environmental benefits also  <b>5</b> – invasive weeds need to be tackled – environmental and health and safety benefits
SR058	<b>Stop deep cleans of communities</b>	Stop deep cleans of communities which are currently delivered on a recurring basis to maintain the cleanliness of areas of need to reduce costs. This would save £70k in one year - 18/19.	<b>1 / 2</b> – there needs to be an opportunity to access deep cleaning services on an as required basis in case of ‘emergency’ or special circumstances
SR059	<b>Restructure and redesign Safer, Connected Communities Service</b>	Restructure and redesign of the Safer, Connected Communities Service, resulting in reduced staff numbers and service provision. This will necessitate the stopping and/or reduction of services, including enforcement, community engagement and other functions. This would save £100k in one year - 18/19.	<b>4</b> – there is a big job to be done on community education and engagement esp as we move through the impact of the CE Act, aim to deliver the aims of the LOIP and the Community Partnership aspirations. Some members of this team are key to facilitating learning, community engagement and the transfer of services into the community.  Good management should prevail in all departments re priority management, customer service and efficiencies

<p><b>SR061</b></p>	<p><b>Reduce grass cutting</b></p>	<p>Reduce grass cutting to open spaces including parks, residential areas, burial grounds and general open spaces currently maintained by Stirling Council and reduce the frequency of grass cutting cycles from 15 to 10 per year. Only the perimeter of grass open space plots would be cut, leaving the remaining grass plot unmaintained. This would save £100k over a two year period from 18/19.</p>	<p><b>3 / 4</b></p> <p>Considerable debate around relative priorities, however as a village that markets its Victorian Spa heritage, the need to reflect the formal, well kept landscaping as part of our character and offering is key for Bridge of Allan. We have several formal green spaces reflecting this.</p>
<p><b>SR063</b></p>	<p><b>Reduce funding to Smith Art Gallery &amp; Museum</b></p>	<p>Reduce funding provided by Stirling Council to the Smith Art Gallery &amp; Museum, which is a £242,000 annual subsidy at present. This would save £242k over a two year period from 21/22.</p>	<p><b>3 / 4</b> – short and longer term challenges recognised.</p> <p>Seen as a valuable community and national asset which has further potential to modernise, develop its offering and attract a wider interest group. Agreed a programme of capacity building over this timescale could support a transition to a more sustainable funding base encouraging enterprise, and building marketing and fundraising capability. This will require a programme of capacity building and skills development, which will require investment.</p>

## Working with you to shape Stirling's future – CC Response sheet

### Community Council: Strathblane \_\_\_\_\_

We are committed to delivering high quality services that meet priorities and outcomes which have been agreed with our communities. The Council is working to 42 priorities which can be found at [www.stirling.gov.uk/key-priorities](http://www.stirling.gov.uk/key-priorities).

We have already done much to identify savings in the last few years and will continue the Priority Based Budgeting (PBB) process to open up the discussion on how we direct spending and what is important to our communities. Depending on how our budget assumptions develop, over the next five years between 2108/19 and 2022/23, Stirling Council has a projected budget gap of £24 million.

We are looking for feedback on options that have been proposed by officers. Full details of the options can be found at [www.stirling.gov.uk/shapingstirling](http://www.stirling.gov.uk/shapingstirling) as well as other ways of feeding into the process and being involved. This feedback will influence the decisions made by elected members when next year's budget is set in late February.

Please complete by **Monday 5th February 2018** for your comments to be taken into account when decisions are made. If you have any queries or need more information, please contact [communityengagement@stirling.gov.uk](mailto:communityengagement@stirling.gov.uk). Please return the completed response to the Community Engagement Team.

This year the options are in split into five sections -

**Transformation Options** propose ways to transform services or deliver them differently. This could involve radically or significantly changing the way in which a service is currently delivered to reduce costs, while also improving customer experience or outcomes. By transforming services, we can reduce the amount of cuts we have to make.

**Income Generation Options**, rather than identifying ways of reducing expenditure, propose ways of increasing existing income or creating new revenue streams for the Council. This could involve expanding a service to serve more customers in an area which currently delivers income. Alternatively, it could mean pursuing opportunities for commercialisation, such as delivering services to the private sector or other public sector organisations. By generating additional income, we can reduce the amount of cuts we have to make.

**Efficiency Options** propose ways of operating more efficiently and effectively, reducing spending while leaving the existing service unchanged.

**Fees and Charges Options** propose ways to increase Council income through introducing or increasing fees and charges for particular products or services. By generating increased income, we can reduce the amount of cuts we have to make.

**Stop/Reduce Options** propose ways of reducing expenditure through reducing or stopping a service. A reduction in a service could involve reducing the level or frequency of a service provided or restricting its availability. Alternatively, Stirling Council would entirely cease delivering the service.

You can choose to comment on as many or as few themes and options as you like.

**Transformation Options**

<i>Reference</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Descriptions</i>	<i>Comments/Suggestions</i>
<b>T001</b>	<b>Establish Children's Services multi-agency locality teams</b>	Establishment of teams bringing together Stirling Council Children & Families staff and staff from relevant partner agencies to be co-located within specific geographic areas. This aims to deliver a joined-up approach for the delivery of social work services to children, young people and their families. This would save £353k over a three year period from 20/21	Following explanation of this at the PBB event we agree that this is sensible
<b>T002</b>	<b>Increase number of schools with shared headships</b>	Increase the number of so-called partner schools with shared or executive headships to reduce costs and encourage collaboration. Some establishments would become partner schools with a shared or executive headship and some nursery schools would become nursery classes within their local primary school. This would save £341k over a 4 year period from 18/19.	School head teachers play a vital role in communities and we are not convinced that this will work well. We do understand that this already works in some small rural schools but do not feel that this will work in larger schools and the leadership role would be lost in communities.
<b>T003</b>	<b>Enhanced support for independent living</b>	Supporting Looked After and Accommodated Children leaving care to progress from more expensive placements to less costly independent living arrangements. This would save £66k over a 3 year period from 19/20.	Agree if done with sensitivity to individual needs

<b>T004</b>	<b>Shared public sector property service</b>	Development of a shared property service with other public sector bodies, to deliver a more efficient property, facilities and energy management service for Council non-housing property at reduced cost and through closer collaboration. This would save £120k over a two year period from 21/22.	Agree
-------------	--	--	-------

### Income Generation Options

<i>Reference</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Comments/Suggestions</i>
<b>IG007</b>	<b>Recruitment of adoptive families</b>	Increase the recruitment of adoptive families in the Stirling Council area to generate income through the receipt of inter-agency adoption fees. This would only apply once all cared for children from Stirling have suitable homes. This would generate income of £63k in the year 19/20.	Agree
<b>IG008</b>	<b>Recruitment of foster carers</b>	Increase the recruitment of foster carers in the Stirling Council area to generate income through the receipt of inter-agency fees. This would only apply once all cared for children from Stirling have suitable homes. This would generate income of £47k in the year 19/20.	Agree

<b>IG009</b>	<b>Investment in private rented sector</b>	Investment in the private rented sector property market in the Stirling area; developing a Council accommodation portfolio to generate additional income from rent. This would generate income of £60k over a three year period from 20/21.	Agree but would like to know more about this
<b>IG0011</b>	<b>Station Square office development</b>	Develop the key strategic Station Square site in the centre of Stirling into high-quality and distinct office space, with potential retail or restaurant opportunities. The development may generate an additional income stream through a development model or a capital receipt. This would generate income of £58k over a two year period from 21/22.	No doubt the viability will be thoroughly investigated
<b>IG0012</b>	<b>Re-use hub</b>	Creation of a Re-use hub for waste goods, such as furniture and white goods, intended for landfill and deposited at Lower Polmaise Waste Management Centre or acquired via special uplifts. Items of potential market value would be upcycled and sold for re-use at a city centre outlet, reducing waste and landfill costs and generating income. This would generate income of £30k over a three year period from 18/19.	Agree and should be expanded Recycling/upcycling is this an area where council's may have to drive new ventures in recycling probably jointly with other councils, either to carryout preliminary sorting to improve waste quality for sale to processors or to actually process themselves. China doesn't want our plastic waste anymore and anyway everything possible should be done to reduce plastic waste and make it more recyclable. Saves to on transport halfway around the world.
<b>IG0013</b>	<b>Advertising revenue generation from Council assets</b>	Generation of advertising revenue from roundabouts, waste vehicles and other Stirling Council-owned and operated assets. This would generate income of £241k over a two year period from 18/19.	Agree and should be throughout the area including rural areas to help promote tourism and assist local businesses if they can afford to advertise. Must be done in a way that does not damage the environmental assets which attract tourists in the first place.

<b>IG0014</b>	<b>Lower Polmaise expansion project</b>	Expansion of the existing depot facility at Lower Polmaise. The additional capacity would be developed to: a) facilitate the move of other Council operations to this site to deliver greater efficiency; b) create a new revenue stream from the use of space by public sector or commercial partners. This would generate income of £120k over a two year period from 21/22.	Agree
<b>IG0015</b>	<b>Solar canopies at The Peak and Castlevie Park &amp; Ride</b>	Installation of solar canopies at The Peak and Castlevie Park & Ride, to generate renewable energy for use by electric vehicles and sale to the National Grid. This will be linked to a feasibility study for commercialising the site. This would generate income of £139k over a four year period from 19/20.	Agree
<b>IG0016</b>	<b>Road barriers repair and inspection service</b>	Delivering a highly-skilled and technically competent road barrier repair and inspection service to external organisations, including other local authorities, to generate income. Roads & Land staff possess expertise in which other local authorities have not invested, creating a niche market which can be commercialised. This would generate income of £20k in 18/19.	Agree if no detriment to the service for Stirlingshire citizens.

**Income Generation Options**

<i>Reference</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Comments/Suggestions</i>
<b>E020</b>	<b>Reduce Adult Assessment &amp; Partnerships business and finance Staff</b>	Identify opportunities for increased efficiency and reduced staffing complement in the Business and Finance Unit within Adult Assessment & Partnerships. This will include stopping non-essential tasks and automating essential processes. This would save £116k over a two year period from 18/19.	Agree
<b>E021</b>	<b>Remove vacant Adult Assessment &amp; Partnerships Quality Assurance post</b>	Delete the vacant post of Quality Assurance Officer in Adult Assessment & Partnerships. This vacancy has not affected service delivery. This would save £30k in the year 18/19.	Agree
<b>E022</b>	<b>Reduce numbers of Education Central Support staff</b>	Reduce the numbers of Central Support staff in the Education Team. This would save £100k in year 18/19.	Agree
<b>E023</b>	<b>Reduce Children's Services Business Support staff</b>	Centralise Children's Services Business Support and pursue opportunities for efficiency, automation, non-completion of non-essential tasks and increased customer self-service to reduce costs. This would save £82k over a two year period from 19/20.	Agree
<b>E024</b>	<b>Demand analysis for younger children entering care</b>	Identify and implement earlier interventions to reduce the number of children accommodated by local foster carers through better use of data and a review of current processes and governance. This would save £60k in the year 19/20.	Agree

<b>E025</b>	<b>Reduce administrative staff numbers</b>	Reduce administrative workforce through natural turnover. This would save £200k over a four year period from 19/20.	Agree
<b>E027</b>	<b>Reduce staff overtime</b>	Reduce overtime payments made to staff. Plain time rate is payable to all hours worked by Stirling Council staff up to 40 hours per week. Overtime worked at the weekend is payable at time plus a half. This Option would apply greater scrutiny on the authorisation of overtime, ceasing all non-essential overtime and thereby reducing costs. This would save £100k in one year - 18/19.	This should happen anyway
<b>E029</b>	<b>Council Tax income surplus</b>	There is an anticipated Council Tax income surplus of around £200k in 2017/18. This revenue can be used to ease the immediate budgetary pressure.	Agreed
<b>E030</b>	<b>Review advice services</b>	Review existing structure of provision of Advice Services across the Council and investigate opportunities for increased efficiency.	Care should be taken to ensure that advice services can still be delivered to meet priority 2
<b>E031</b>	<b>Ensure best value operating model for Wallace Monument</b>	The Wallace Monument is currently managed by Stirling District Tourism. A review of operational options is currently underway and will report in February. This would save £50k in one year - 20/21.	Agreed
<b>E032</b>	<b>Review fleet</b>	Reduce the number of Council vehicles, based on a full review of the fleet. This would save £30k in one year - 21/22.	Agreed

E033	<b>In-house operating model for Wellgreen Multi-storey Car Park</b>	Wellgreen Multi-storey Car Park is owned by Stirling Council, but currently operated under a management agreement by an external firm which manages all aspects of the car park on behalf of the council and in return receives a management fee and recovery of overheads. It could be more cost-effective for the Council to operate and manage the carpark in-house. This would save £50k in one year - 19/20.	Agreed
E034	<b>Active Stirling efficiencies</b>	Agree strategies to drive income growth and tighten costs whilst seeking to deliver services to a wider community and demographic footprint. This would save £430k over a 5-year period from 18/19.	Agreed but activities must remain affordable to encourage wellbeing
E035	<b>Review and renew user agreement with McLaren Community Leisure Centre</b>	Review the existing user agreement between Stirling Council and McLaren Community Leisure Centre, ensuring that it is renewed to deliver reduced costs and/or increased revenue. This would save £50k in one year - 19/20.	Agreed but activities must remain affordable to encourage wellbeing
E036	<b>Reduce Business Improvement Team</b>	Reduce the size of the remaining Business Improvement Team, in light of the creation of a Portfolio Management Office. This will not impact on service provision or affect fulfilment of business needs. This would save £116k over two years from 19/20.	Agreed

<b>E064</b>	<b>Delay reinstatement of Loan Charges Budget</b>	The current financial strategy contains a reduction to the Loans Charges Budget in 2017/18 of £1.5M, with that reduction then being built back in by a budget increase of £0.5M in each of the years 2018/19, 2019/20 and 2020/21. Given the continued low interest rate regime, this timescale could be pushed back out by a year, or even not build that increase in at all for one of the years.	No comment
<b>E065</b>	<b>Reduce funding for Central Scotland Joint Valuation Board</b>	Reduce Stirling Council funding for the Central Scotland Joint Valuation Board and alter the future terms of the Board's governance, including funding arrangements. This would save £40k in one year - 18/19.	No comment

**Fees and Charges Options**

<i>Reference</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Comments/Suggestions</i>
------------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------------------------

<b>FC037</b>	<b>Increase car parking charges</b>	Increase car parking charges for public on- and off-street car parking to increase income; implement charges in facilities which are currently free; and implement charges for staff car parking, which is currently free of charge for Stirling Council personnel next to several Council office buildings, to generate income. This would generate income of £73k over a two year period from 18/19.	Agree
<b>FC038</b>	<b>Review Council concession policy</b>	Cross-organisational review of concessions applied by the Council to fees and charges for its services, to ensure consistency in policy and implementation. This would generate income of £70k in one year - 18/19.	Agree that concessions should be applied consistently across services
<b>FC067</b>	<b>Increase telecare charges</b>	Increase charges - only for those who already pay for telecare - by £0.66 per week. This would generate income of £47k in one year - 18/19.	Reluctantly agree

**Stop/Reduce Options**

<i>Reference</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Comments/Suggestions</i>
------------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------------------------

<b>SR040</b>	<b>Reduce school meals menu choice</b>	Reduce the menu options on offer to pupils from the current three-tray/multi-choice offering to a less varied and diverse menu in schools, to reduce costs. This would save £55k over a two year period from 18/19.	Reluctantly agree
<b>SR044</b>	<b>Reduce Educational Psychology Service</b>	As a smaller-scale alternative to establishing multi-agency locality teams (T001), Educational Psychologists would spend part of their week co-located with outreach teachers and support workers within a school in each locality. These locality-based approaches to service delivery across schools would result in efficiencies, reducing the need for a reduction in the size of the Educational Psychology Service. This would save £50k in one year - 18/19.	Concern that this may further reduce services for children’s mental health
<b>SR053</b>	<b>Revised partnership agreement with Sistema Scotland – Big Noise Raploch</b>	Revised partnership agreement with Sistema Scotland from March 2018 for delivery of the Big Noise programme in Raploch. This would save £225k over a three year period from 19/20.	Reluctantly agree. Real concern over the scale of the cut.
<b>SR054</b>	<b>Review Communities &amp; People payments to third sector organisations</b>	Review of all Communities & People payments to third sector organisations to identify opportunities for reductions in funding or recommissioning. This would save £200k over a four year period from 19/20.	Concern that this may further reduce services for vulnerable members of our community. Conflicts with Priority 2

<p><b>SR057</b></p>	<p><b>Reduce grounds maintenance</b></p>	<p>Stop the planting of bedding flowers and vegetables on an annual basis each summer. Existing beds would be removed or replanted with perennial plants to reduce costs and redeploy resources. Reduce the rate of herbicide applications to combat roadside weeds from twice a year to once a year from 2018. The existing contract expires in 2017, providing an opportunity for retendering. Also, stop annual treatments designed to reduce the spread of invasive weeds, to save money. Existing work is focussed on areas of need near settlements or near access points to the Rivers Forth and Teith. This would save £36k in one year - 18/19.</p>	<p>Major concern with this proposal which is in conflict with Priority 5 and 6. Perennial plants still need regular maintenance. Road side weed spraying must reduce costs in the longterm if weeds are kept at bay on footways either formal or informal at road sides. It is a false economy to stop spraying invasive weeds. Neighbouring authorities have invested in floral displays and wild flower areas which look fabulous if done correctly. Much more discussion is needed with communities is needed to see what might be possible. This should not be implemented until sponsorship or community involvement is in place.</p>
<p><b>SR058</b></p>	<p><b>Stop deep cleans of communities</b></p>	<p>Stop deep cleans of communities which are currently delivered on a recurring basis to maintain the cleanliness of areas of need to reduce costs. This would save £70k in one year - 18/19.</p>	<p>This is a valued service and keeps areas looking good. consideration should be given to enhancing the effectiveness of this service by using assistance from the criminal justice system.</p>
<p><b>SR059</b></p>	<p><b>Restructure and redesign Safer, Connected Communities Service</b></p>	<p>Restructure and redesign of the Safer, Connected Communities Service, resulting in reduced staff numbers and service provision. This will necessitate the stopping and/or reduction of services, including enforcement, community engagement and other functions. This would save £100k in one year - 18/19.</p>	<p>We do not see how this fits with the council's new responsibilities under the Community empowerment Act. Areas of SW Stirlingshire outwith the National Park require the services of an adequately resourced and qualified Access Officer.</p>

<b>SR061</b>	<b>Reduce grass cutting</b>	Reduce grass cutting to open spaces including parks, residential areas, burial grounds and general open spaces currently maintained by Stirling Council and reduce the frequency of grass cutting cycles from 15 to 10 per year. Only the perimeter of grass open space plots would be cut, leaving the remaining grass plot unmaintained. This would save £100k over a two year period from 18/19.	Strathblane CC is deeply concerned about this proposal and the affect this will have on tourism throughout the area. It is contrary to priority 6 making Stirling a must visit area and to priority 5 improving environment and infrastructure. The quality of this service during the previous growing season was the worst ever with grass being scalped and large tufts being left uncut. It is unclear if grass cutting of playing fields will be reduced thereby making them unplayable. Neighbouring authorities pick up grass so maybe a 'spend to save' initiative with new machinery might make this workable. Alternative savings could be made from waste services.
<b>SR063</b>	<b>Reduce funding to Smith Art Gallery &amp; Museum</b>	Reduce funding provided by Stirling Council to the Smith Art Gallery & Museum, which is a £242,000 annual subsidy at present. This would save £242k over a two year period from 21/22.	Again contrary to priority 6 making Stirling a must visit destination. We appreciate that funding models change over time but the Smith must be able to continue its excellent work