

Savings Proposal								
Cabinet Member	Councillor John Reynolds			Type:	Cut in Service			
Assistant Director	Nick Edwards							
Savings Owner	Andy Jervis							
Proposal: Review of Pest Control Service		2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	Total	
<p>Details of proposal: There is no statutory duty to provide any form of pest control service, the only duty is to address incidents of infestations by requiring property owners/occupiers to deal with them. Currently, the Council offers a free pest control service to those in receipt of full benefits and offers a chargeable service in other instances. The basic charge is £63 for an initial visit/treatment. The vast majority of free services are taken up by Wolverhampton Homes residents. The current service is approx 60% funded by Regulatory Services (£50,000) and 40% (£30,000) by charges. It is delivered via Public Realm Services. Any proposal which would reduce the staffing compliment may result in a risk the service may not be able to meet demand and operate in a sustainable way. The proposal is therefore to explore ways of reducing the current £50K subsidy from Regulatory Services by between £10K and £25K by either increasing charges, reducing free service provision, negotiating a contribution from Wolverhampton Homes, seeking some ongoing funding from Public Health or a combination of these.</p>	Reduction in Revenue Expenditure (Show as Positive)	25					25	
	Additional Income (Show as Positive)						-	
	Net Saving	25	-	-	-	-	-	25
	Invest-to-save Funds Required							
	Revenue (Negative)							-
	Capital (Negative)							-
	Total Invest-to-save Funds Required	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Reduction in Staffing - Headcount	1						1
	Reduction in Staffing - FTE	1						1
Staffing remaining - post savings FTE	2.0							
Current Revenue Budget for Service Area (£000)	80 gross, 50 net							
Revenue Budget for Service Area - post savings (£000)	55 gross, 25 net							
Communications Strategy Implications								
This savings proposal will need to be explained and communicated to all internal and external partners and stakeholders including Councillors. Reputational risk exists. Needs comms plan.								
Corporate Landlord Implications								
WCC directorates currently meet the cost of pest control provided at their premises.								
Customer Implications								
Some occupiers of property will be unable to pay for treatment. Legal provisions exist to enable the Council to deal with pest infestations at premises - but the council would not be able to assist the most deprived or those in poverty.								
Economic Implications								
Evidence shows that charging policy reduces demand because people do not report as readily if they believe they will have to pay for the service. The private sector will pick up some of the business no longer provided by the council.								
Environmental Implications								
Local environmental quality would fall as the number of pest infested sites would rise. There would be an associated risk of the 'broken window syndrome' scenario arising in certain areas as it has been established that areas already subject to environmental problems tend to attract more / other problem issues.								
Equality Implications								
Some of the worst cases of pest infestations exist in the more deprived parts of the city. Requires an equalities screening.								
Financial Implications								
The proposal represents a saving of up to £25K. However, Regulatory Services are likely to receive more complaints to investigate at a time when resources are decreasing. Removal of part of the £50K subsidy may result in complete removal of the WCC service if the service is unable to sustain without the subsidy. This would result in directorates having to meet the higher cost of external contractors to undertake essential work/treatments.								
Health Implications								
Certain pests carry infectious disease. The proposal would lead to less pest treatment and therefore more pests. Also there is an established link between mental health & wellbeing of an individual and the quality of the environment in which they live. This could have an adverse impact on the health of certain residents.								
Legal Implications								
The Council is under an obligation to maintain its estate pest free.								
Policy Implications								
The proposal has potential implications for the Council's policy of protecting the most vulnerable people in society.								
Procurement Implications								
N/A								
Staffing Implications								
Public Realm Services may have to make posts redundant if the service can not be self funding.								