

Kent Communities Programme Detailed Options Appraisal

Whilst this Business Case is focused on providing assurance that a decision can be implemented it is important to note that this options appraisal is a tool to assist in decision making. It therefore should be considered alongside all other relevant factors when decisions are made, including the consultation response, impact of the proposals on residents and the overall policy and financial context within which the Council currently operates. These factors should be debated and assessed alongside each other as part of the decision-making process.

Assessment Methodology

Following public consultation and review of the responses received, the Programme team, in collaboration with the Cross Directorate team and supported by the SRP team have developed a range of options for consideration (in order of number of proposed closures):

1. **Go further:** making more significant changes to the model and closing more sites than originally set out in the consultation model. This option would require further consultation on a new rationale and methodology (potential future programme of work post any key decision on Phase 1 in its current form rather than an option for this Key Decision).
2. **Consultation option:** proceed and implement the option as set out in the consultation (incorporating the required changes as detailed above).
3. **Amend Need Framework to take greater weight of public transport network analysis:** responding to the consultation by bringing back into the model centres that respond to the transport accessibility feedback (incorporating the required changes as detailed above).
4. **Amend Need Framework to take greatest weight of public transport network analysis:** more significant changes to the model as a response to the consultation feedback (incorporating the required changes as detailed above).
5. **Do nothing:** continue with the status quo and make no changes.

These five options been each been assessed to determine performance against the following appraisal factors:

1. **Critical Success Factors (Pass/Fail):** the key considerations that link back to our rationale.
2. **Need Framework (Pass Fail):** does the option meet the current understanding of need as set out by the need Framework.
3. **Cost (ranked):** the cost to deliver the changes.
4. **Financial Benefit (ranked):** Best value duty, savings and cost avoidance as well as project capital receipts.
5. **Non-Financial Benefits (ranked):** response to consultation and service integrity.
6. **Cost Benefit (ranked):** what we get for the cost of each option.
7. **Risks (ranked):** performance against key risk considerations.

The following section assesses each of the five emerging options against the seven appraisal factors listed above.

To begin with the options are assessed against the two Pass/Fail criteria. The first looks at the Critical Success Factors which link to the rationale of the Programme. Any option that is assessed to not meet the objectives of the Programme is marked as a failure and not taken forward. The second

Pass/Fail criteria considers whether each option meets the current understanding of need, as set out by the need framework. Any option that is assessed as not meeting the need set out in the need framework is marked as a failure and is not taken forward.

Following the Pass/Fail appraisals the options are then assessed using the ranked appraisals, a short narrative is provided which sets out how each option performs against the specific appraisal factor. If there is more than one aspect to the appraisal factor (for instance, 'cost-benefit' looks at the revenue saving predicted for each option as well as the forecast reduction in backlog maintenance and potential capital receipts) then each point is detailed in the appraisal narrative for each option.

Each appraisal factor concludes with a summary table following the narrative. This table ranks each option from 1-5 against each aspect of the appraisal factor, with 1 being the best and five being the worst, to clearly demonstrate how the options compare to each other.

For example, the table below demonstrates that Option 1 ranks the best when considering the estimated revenue savings, forecast maintenance reduction and potential capital receipts (highlighted in green). It also shows that Option 5 ranks the worst of all five options against the same aspects of the appraisal (highlighted in orange).

Option	CLL Saving	Maintenance Reduction	Capital Receipts
1 Go Further	1	1	1
2 Consultation model	2	2	=2
3 Minor amendments	3	3	=2
4 Major amendments	4	4	4
5 Do Nothing	5	5	5

Once the five options have been ranked against each aspect of the appraisal, the ranking scores are added together to provide the overall appraisal score (highlighted in green). As shown in the table below the score for Option 1 is 3 (1+1+1 because Option 1 is ranked the best across the three aspects of the appraisal). The scores are in turn ranked 1-5 (1 being the best, 5 being the worst) to provide the overall ranking against the appraisal factor (highlighted in red orange).

Option	CLL Saving	Maintenance Reduction	Capital Receipts	Score	Ranking
1 Go Further	1	1	1	3	1
2 Consultation model	2	2	=2	6	2
3 Minor amendments	3	3	=2	8	3
4 Major amendments	4	4	4	12	4
5 Do Nothing	5	5	5	15	5

Therefore, the table above demonstrates that Option 1 is the best performing of the five options against the 'Financial Benefit' appraisal. This process is repeated for all five of the ranked appraisal factors.

Finally, the ranked and pass/fail appraisals are combined to identify which options are not taken forward, which are considered viable, and which is preferred. The implications of moving forward

with each option is set out briefly before the preferred option is then considered in the following sections of this Business Case. It is however intended that all viable options will be considered by members for their decision.

Assessment of Options

Critical Success Factors

The Critical Success Factors listed below have been endorsed by both SRP Board and CMM. These factors link back to the rationale for the programme – they are the four outcomes which the Programme objectives seek to achieve to solve the problems detailed in the rationale. All four of the CSFs form part of other appraisals and are therefore detailed above. The ranked appraisals earlier in this section allow direct comparison between the options in relation to the critical success factors.

Critical Success Factor	Ranked Appraisal
Less costly estate leading to reduction in revenue costs	Financial Benefit Appraisal
Reduction in pressure on backlog maintenance budget	Financial Benefit Appraisal
Reduction in carbon emissions linked to the physical estate	Non-Financial Benefit Appraisal
Increased co-location sites, based on the need model	Non-Financial Benefit Appraisal

Option 1: Go Further

As set out in the ranked appraisals above, Option 1 scores the best of all options against the financial benefits. Whilst it is ranked fourth of the five options overall for non-financial benefits, this is largely due to the weakness of this option against the Need Framework. In terms of the non-financial critical success factors, Option 1 scores very well. The narrative above makes it clear that Option 1 meets the Programme objectives and therefore passes this appraisal.

Option 2: Consultation model.

As set out in the ranked appraisals above, Option 2 scores well against the financial and non-financial benefits. The narrative above makes it clear that Option 2 meets the Programme objectives and therefore passes this appraisal.

Option 3: Amend Need Framework to take greater weight of public transport network analysis.

As set out in the ranked appraisals above, Option 3 scores third of five against the financial benefits and the best against the non-financial benefits. The narrative above makes it clear that Option 3 meets the Programme objectives and therefore passes this appraisal.

Option 4: Amend Need Framework to take greatest weight of public transport network analysis.

As set out in the ranked appraisals above, Option 4 scores fourth of five against the financial benefits and the third of five against the non-financial benefits. However, the narrative in the ranked appraisals demonstrates that Option 4 meets the Programme objectives. This is therefore a pass, however it must be noted within the appraisals above that whilst this is a pass, Options 1, 2 and 3 perform much better when ranked.

Option 5: Do Nothing.

This option does not make any change to the physical estate and therefore does not meet the Programme objectives. Option 5 fails and is discounted.

Need Framework

This appraisal considers how each option responds to the understanding of the need for services within communities as set out in our Need Framework.

Option 1: Go Further

This option fundamentally rejects the Need Framework and would need to identify alternative rationale and methodology to draw our model from. Therefore, this option fails this assessment.

Option 2: Consultation model.

Based on the work undertaken ahead of the consultation, this option is the most appropriate response to the Need Framework. This view is reinforced by the fact that a majority of respondents agreed with our designing the proposals by looking at where need was highest for our services. Option 2 passes this appraisal.

Option 3: Amend Need Framework to take greater weight of public transport network analysis.

There is little difference between this option and the consultation option. Option 3 represents an amendment to the Need Framework whereby the public transport service regularity and travel time criteria is assessed to determine whether, in the event of a building closure, a journey on public transport would take more than 35 minutes and whether the regularity of the service results in less than 1 service per hour. Following this consideration, two locations are brought back into the model. Option 3 therefore amends the Need Framework based on the consultation response. Option 3 passes this appraisal.

Option 4: Amend Need Framework to take greatest weight of public transport network analysis.

This option brings amends the Need Framework by accounting for service regularity data to alternative sites in the event of a proposed closure. As a result, ten sites come back into the model when compared with Options 2 and 3. Whilst this does undermine the original Needs Analysis by retaining physical locations where other methods of service delivery are considered equally justified or more appropriate under the Needs Framework, Option 4 allows for the consultation to impact our understanding of need by of the transport network. Therefore Option 4 passes this appraisal.

Option 5: Do Nothing.

This option does not make any change to the physical estate and does not respond at all to our needs analysis. Option 5 fails and is discounted.

Cost

The following assessment of cost considers the cost of implementing the changes included within each of the five options. The following assumptions are made when considering the costs of implementation:

1. Revenue costs of implementing the options will in all possible cases be undertaken as part of the Infrastructure teams Business as Usual operations and therefore will be funded through base budget provision. As such most options are considered as 'cost neutral' in that no additional revenue costs will be required. The risk around certain unquantifiable revenue costs remains and is detailed more against each option. The opportunity cost of some options is equally outlined where relevant.
2. Across all options except for Option 5: 'Do Nothing', the Capital investment to enable the co-location sites is assumed the same.
3. Outreach costs are covered by service core budgets achieved through reinvestment of the reduction in costs of delivering their service currently from a KCC building.
4. Room booking solution in co-location sites is common across each of the first four options and is estimated as £73,000 one off and £49,000 recurring annually as set out in Section B.

Option 1: Go Further

This option would involve a greater number of site closures than the consultation model. Whilst the majority of revenue costs would be covered under Infrastructure base budget (assumption 1 above) there would be additional revenue costs to consider. This includes redundancies for third party contract employees, such as cleaners, for which KCC is liable under the terms of the contract. This would clearly be balanced against increased revenue savings. These costs are historically considered very low.

Given the increased number of sites proposed for closure there would be a larger number of options appraisals to undertake and therefore the timeline for implementation would increase.

Room booking solution in co-location sites is common across each of the first four options and is estimated as £73,000 one off and £49,000 recurring annually as set out in Section B.

It is assumed that the number of co-location sites proposed would not necessarily increase as part of this option, however the specific details of a go further option may in fact suggest that further co-locations are possible. Therefore, the capital cost of implementation for this option is estimated as £5.6m.

Option 2: Consultation model.

Same as above – the assumptions remain unchanged although the timescale for delivery is potentially shorter in Option 2 than Option 1, therefore freeing Infrastructure base budget to focus on other Corporate priorities sooner. Unquantifiable revenue costs such as third-party contract would be less than in Option 1, however the figure is considered low risk to begin with.

Room booking solution in co-location sites is common across each of the first four options and is estimated as £73,000 one off and £49,000 recurring annually as set out in Section B.

Capital costs are £5.6m to facilitate the co-location sites.

Option 3: Amend Need Framework to take greater weight of public transport network analysis.

Assumptions remain the same as above and therefore revenue and capital costs are the same. Difference between Options 2 and 3 are slight and so even unquantifiable revenue costs would be

similar between the two options. Option 3 would represent a slightly smaller workload for the Infrastructure division.

Room booking solution in co-location sites is common across each of the first four options and is estimated as £73,000 one off and £49,000 recurring annually as set out in Section B.

Capital costs remain at £5.6m to facilitate the co-location sites.

Option 4: Amend Need Framework to take greatest weight of public transport network analysis.

Assumptions remain the same as above. This option represents a lower number of changes to services and locations and therefore, whilst still to be covered by the Infrastructure base budget, the lower workload will free up the Infrastructure team for other priorities sooner.

Room booking solution in co-location sites is common across each of the first four options and is estimated as £73,000 one off and £49,000 recurring annually as set out in Section B.

This option would still provide the same co-locations and therefore the capital costs remain the same at £5.6m.

Option 5: Do Nothing.

No changes are made and therefore no cost of implementation on either revenue or capital budgets.

Summary Table

Option	Capital Costs	Revenue Costs	Score	Ranking
1 Go Further	=2	5	7	5
2 Consultation model	=2	=3	5	=3
3 Minor amendments	=2	=3	5	=3
4 Major amendments	=2	2	4	2
5 Do Nothing	1	1	2	1

Financial Benefit

The following assessment considers the financial performance of each of the options. As set out in the Outline Business Case and in the Strategic Case above there are two elements to the savings profile for the Kent Communities Programme:

1. CLL Saving (savings linked to the number of buildings we operate from and the cost of running the estate).
2. Service Savings (savings facilitated within the services areas as a result of changes within the operational estate).
3. The below appraisal is based on the CLL savings.

As was the case in the Outline Business Case the assessments made here focus on the Corporate Landlord saving only, and not any savings within the service areas. Whilst this programme assists in facilitating savings within the services, they are responsible for achieving their MTFP targets. The savings expectations of the services are included in the table at the start of this Business Case for reference.

As detailed above in the Strategic Case, Phase 2 of the Kent Communities Programme has been placed on hold by the Leader and therefore the CLL savings do not meet the MTFP target within any assessed option. The early modelling on Phase 2 demonstrated a potential CLL saving of circa £900k.

This assessment also considers the impact on the backlog maintenance costs and the Capital receipts anticipated.

Option 1: Go Further

Greatest amount of saving made on the CLL budget as a greater number of buildings are marked for closure. However, as this option does not take account of need a resultant lack of buildings undermines service provision and additional revenue costs for venue hire outweigh the savings made by the model.

This option would conceivably see the greatest reduction in backlog maintenance liability and would likely achieve the largest cumulative receipt from disposals (subject to Options Appraisals).

Option 2: Consultation model.

Based on the consultation model, incorporating the required changes outlined in the Strategic Case, this option saves £1.37m against the CLL budget.

The reduction to the backlog maintenance liability is estimated as £6.34m.

The estimated capital receipts are £3.8m.

Option 3: Amend Need Framework to take greater weight of public transport network analysis.

This model saves £1.29m against the CLL budget.

The reduction to the backlog maintenance liability is estimated as £5.85m.

The estimated capital receipts are £3.8m.

Option 4: Amend Need Framework to take greatest weight of public transport network analysis.

This model saves £1.11m against the CLL budget.

The reduction to the backlog maintenance liability is estimated as £4.84m.

The estimated capital receipts are £3.2m.

Option 5: Do Nothing.

No changes are made and therefore no savings are made.

Summary Table

Option	CLL Saving	Maintenance Reduction	Capital Receipts	Score	Ranking
1 Go Further	1	1	1	3	1
2 Consultation model	2	2	=2	6	2
3 Minor amendments	3	3	=2	8	3
4 Major amendments	4	4	4	12	4
5 Do Nothing	5	5	5	15	5

Non-Financial Benefits

This section assesses each of the options against a range of non-financial benefits that are linked back to either the Programme rationale or the consultation response. The specific factors considered are:

1. CO2 emission savings
2. Number of co-locations
3. Response to Need Framework
4. Accessibility for service users
5. Health and wellbeing of residents (inclusive of mental health considerations)

Option 1: Go Further

The Go Further option would deliver greater CO2 savings on the basis that our operational estate would reduce the fastest of all options.

The number of co-locations is the same within Options 1, 2, 3 and 4 as per the assumption outlined above.

This option, dependent on how far it is taken, will reach a tipping point whereby the Need Framework is undermined. This option could easily result in a greater reliance on outreach provision or digital services in locations where the Need Framework demonstrates a physical location is the right solution for service users.

This option will have the biggest detrimental impact on service accessibility and on the health and wellbeing of service users.

Option 2: Consultation model.

This option is anticipated to save 977 tonnes of CO2 from our operational estate.

There are 14 new co-locations proposed as part of this model.

Based on the work undertaken ahead of the consultation, this option is the most appropriate response to the Need Framework. This view is reinforced by the fact that the consultation response included very little constructive challenge to the Need Framework in principle, or the method in which it had been applied to the Kent Communities proposal.

Feedback from the consultation highlights a concern from service users around the accessibility of services and the resultant detrimental impact of their health and wellbeing.

Option 3: Amend Need Framework to take greater weight of public transport network analysis.

This option is anticipated to save 938 tonnes of CO2 from our operational estate.

There are 14 new co-locations proposed as part of this model.

There is little difference between this option and the consultation option. Based on the work undertaken ahead of the consultation, this option would still be considered an appropriate response to the Need Framework when viewed in conjunction with the consultation feedback.

Feedback from the consultation highlights a concern from service users around the accessibility of services and the resultant detrimental impact of their health and wellbeing. This option deals with that concern by bringing back into the model three centrally located, easily accessible Children Centre locations.

Option 4: Amend Need Framework to take greatest weight of public transport network analysis.
This option is anticipated to save 798 tonnes of CO2 from our operational estate.

There are 14 new co-locations proposed as part of this model.

This option brings a larger number of sites back into the model when compared with Options 2 and 3. This undercuts the Needs Analysis by retaining physical locations where other methods of service delivery would be considered more appropriate under the Needs Framework.

Feedback from the consultation highlights a concern from service users around the accessibility of services and the resultant detrimental impact of their health and wellbeing. This option performs very well when assessed against this criteria by retaining more physical locations, thus responding more directly to the responses received during the consultation.

Option 5: Do Nothing.

No changes are made and therefore there is no CO2 savings.

There are no new co-location sites.

This option does not respond to the Needs Framework at all.

In terms of the consideration of accessibility of services for residents and the impact on health and wellbeing of residents this option proposes no change and is therefore the most effective option against this particular assessment.

Summary Table

Option	CO2	Co- Locations	Need Framework	Accessibility	Health	Score	Ranking
1 Go Further	1	=1	3	5	5	15	4
2 Consultation model	2	=1	1	4	4	12	=1
3 Minor amendments	3	=1	2	3	3	12	=1
4 Major amendments	4	=1	4	2	2	13	3
5 Do Nothing	5	5	5	1	1	17	5

Cost Benefit

This appraisal considers the overall financial benefit of the proposal. The estimated total cost of the programme, including the funding of the programme work, estimated capital costs and implementation costs and the digital booking system is £8.1m (£5.6m capital costs, YTD £2.4m revenue from SRP reserve).

1. Vast majority of future revenue costs of implementation will be covered under existing budgets across all options. These costs may include additional storage, confidential waste requirements, officer time, staff moves.
2. Currently revenue costs do change between options, but this is unquantifiable at this stage, this is currently seen as a low risk to the programme of works.
3. Capital costs of implementation remain the same at £5.6m across options 1, 2, 3 and 4 as this relates to the co-location sites which is constant for all options.
4. Outreach costs are covered by service core budgets achieved through reinvestment of the reduction in the costs of delivering their services from a KCC building.
5. Room booking solution in co-location sites is common across each of the first four options and is estimated as £73,000 one off and £49,000 recurring annually as set out in Section B. The one-off cost is included in the following appraisals, the £49,000 needs to be considered for inclusion within base budget – this is detailed in the next section.
6. The cost of the Programme to date has been factored in at £2.36m.

Option 1: Go further.

This option would make the biggest revenue saving and reduction in backlog maintenance. Depending on the extent to which the model was taken further, it is likely that a breakeven position could be achieved before factoring the impact of the disposal income.

Option 2: Consultation model.

For an investment of £8.1m, the programme will generate a base saving of £1.37m for CLL by the end of 26/27; a cost avoidance in the backlog of maintenance on the estate of £6.3m and an estimated capital receipts of £3.8m. The smaller estate is less susceptible to the fluctuations in market conditions that can impact the CLL revenue budget.

Option 3: Amend Need Framework to take greater weight of public transport network analysis.

For an investment of £8.1m, the programme will generate a base saving of £1.27m for CLL by the end of 26/27; a cost avoidance in the backlog of maintenance on the estate of £5.85m and an estimated capital receipts of £3.8m. The smaller estate is less susceptible to the fluctuations in market conditions that can impact the CLL revenue budget.

Option 4: Amend Need Framework to take greatest weight of public transport network analysis.

For an investment of £8.1m, the programme will generate a base saving of £1.11m for CLL by the end of 26/27; a cost avoidance in the backlog of maintenance on the estate of £4.84m and an estimated capital receipts of £3.2m. The larger estate in Option 4 results in a greater risk of the CLL (and service) budgets being susceptible to market fluctuations.

Option 5: Do Nothing.

No savings made and no implementation costs so there is no benefit.

Summary Table

Option	Cost Benefit	Ranking
--------	--------------	---------

1 Go Further	1	1
2 Consultation model	2	2
3 Minor amendments	3	3
4 Major amendments	4	4
5 Do Nothing	5	5

Risks

The following key risks are incorporated within this assessment of each option:

1. Consultation risk (scale of response to the consultation feedback)
2. Clawback liability (liability to pay back capital investment from DfE for the Sure Start centres) – whilst the likelihood of having to pay clawback is low, it has been included in the appraisals and further sections. This risk will be mitigated through the standard Building Options Appraisal process and the KCP solution can be reconfigured if needed to manage the risk.
3. Strategic conflict between Family Hubs objective and KCP objective (community reach and engagement versus the need to close buildings and save money)
4. Undermining service integrity (changes result in service cuts that render the service undeliverable or jeopardise the value for money proposition)
5. Savings and capital receipt realisation (Options appraisals may undercut ability to realise financial benefits)

Option 1: Go Further

In practice the consultation risk on this option is irrelevant as further consultation would be required. However, on the assumption that this option would proceed as a preferred option for Decision without further consultation, this would be considered an extremely high risk.

The clawback liability for this option is likely to be the highest. Whilst any potential disposal will be subject to an Options Appraisal in line with the Council's adopted policy, this option would logically include the highest number of potential disposals and therefore the highest potential clawback liability.

This option would carry the greatest risk of conflict with the objectives of the Family Hub programme as a greater number of sites would be proposed for closure. This would undermine the service ability to deliver the outcomes that sit at the heart of the Family Hub model by placing too great a reliance on outreach and digital service provision.

Similarly, the integrity of service delivery for the other services in scope would be most dramatically undermined without very careful consideration within this option.

Whilst the anticipated savings and capital receipts would be higher under Option 1, there would be a greater number of Options Appraisals to undertake and therefore a greater number of instances where other service uses to be identified.

Option 2: Consultation model.

There is a consultation risk in that there are no changes made under this option in response to the consultation feedback. Whilst it is absolutely within the rights of Members to decide to proceed without making any changes, it is important to acknowledge the inherent reputational risk in proceeding as such.

The potential clawback liability of this option is circa £2.3m.

This option has the second highest risk of conflicting with the objectives of the Family Hub programme. However, given the extremely close work between the two Programmes during the formation of the Kent Communities proposal, this is still considered a very low risk overall.

Similarly, whilst service provision for the other services in scope is impacted, the impact has been assessed by the service representatives on the Cross Directorate group and considered acceptable ahead of consultation.

There is equally a risk in this option that the realisation of savings and capital receipts will be impacted by the Options Appraisal process as part of the disposal process.

[Option 3: Amend Need Framework to take greater weight of public transport network analysis.](#)

Whilst it is possible to highlight changes made to the model following the consultation, the response in Option 3 is limited. Overall, Option 3 does demonstrate some change to the consultation based in the feedback received – namely the requirement to retain locations where travel to the nearest alternative location is considered too difficult, or the consultation response suggests that the importance of the service to the community is a key factor.

The clawback liability would reduce under this option to £1.8m.

This option would have a lower risk of conflicting with the objectives of the Family Hub programme (however, it would undercut the Need Framework and saving potential).

There are no changes for other services between Options 2 and 3 and so the risk of impacting service integrity is the same between Options 2 and 3.

There is slightly lower, but still present risk in Option 3 that the realisation of savings and capital receipts could be impacted by the Options Appraisal process.

[Option 4: Amend Need Framework to take greatest weight of public transport network analysis.](#)

Option 4 carries a lower risk in terms of the consultation response as it represents a more comprehensive response to the consultation feedback.

The clawback liability is also significantly lower in this option, reducing to £395k.

This option would have the lowest risk in terms of conflict with the Family Hub model as it allows greater permanent physical provision within more communities. However, it is not so simple, as this model will undercut the ability to provide outreach provision in locations where a permanent physical presence is not possible. Equally, the service savings position would be compromised as highlighted above.

Equally the service provision of other services would in theory be protected, however the reality of the financial position will likely undermine that. For this assessment however, Option 4 is considered lower risk.

With a lower savings position and more service provision, this option carries a smaller risk in terms of the realisation of the savings. However, given this option would create a shortfall against the target CLL savings position of £1.9m, Option 4 is considered a higher risk.

[Option 5: Do Nothing.](#)

This option carries no consultation risk as there would be no change.

Equally there is no clawback liability under Option 5.

The Family Hub objectives are protected under Option 5, however the CLL and service savings are severely compromised.

Current provision for other services remains unchanged in Option 5. Whilst this protects current services for residents, the knock-on impact of unrealised savings here will undoubtedly have severe impacts elsewhere. It is also important to note that for some services, current provision is not expected to be sustainable.

By virtue of there being no savings achieved under Option 5, there is little risk against the realisation of savings. However, given this option would create the greatest shortfall against the target savings position, Option 5 is considered the highest risk.

Summary Table

Option	Consultation Risk	Clawback Liability	Family Hub	Service Integrity	Savings realisation	Score	Ranking
1 Go Further	5	5	5	5	=2	22	5
2 Consultation model	4	4	=3	4	=2	17	4
3 Minor amendments	3	3	=3	3	1	13	3
4 Major amendments	2	2	2	2	4	12	2
5 Do Nothing	1	1	1	1	5	9	1

Discounted Options

Based on the analysis above Options 1 and 5 are discounted due to receiving a Fail in one or both of the Pass/Fail appraisals.

Options 2, 3 and 4 are all considered viable. There is little difference in the financial considerations between options 2 and 3.

Implications of Each Option

Option 1: Go Further

This option would abandon our current methodology and would require further consultation work ahead of any decision. This would result in an unacceptable delay to benefit realisation. It may be agreeable for additional phases of work to investigate further changes to the estate by working more closely with other partners across the public and voluntary sectors. However, Option 1 does not achieve a Pass against the Need Framework appraisal and the implication of proceeding with this option would mean that a decision is not taken at this stage.

Option 2: Consultation model.

Option 2 delivers the best viable revenue saving for the CLL budget and therefore reduces pressure to find alternative savings solutions elsewhere within the Council. Of the viable options, Option 2 performs best against the Need Framework and Critical Success Factors. The main risk of Option 2 is proceeding without making amendments due to the consultation feedback. Our Best Value duty considerations and the financial challenges facing the Council may be considered the most important factor meaning that whilst the consultation feedback has been carefully considered, the decision is taken to proceed with the option as set out at consultation.

Option 3: Amend Need Framework to take greater weight of public transport network analysis.

There is not a small difference between option 2 and 3 in terms of revenue savings, but more of a difference in terms of the reduction in backlog maintenance liability and capital receipts estimated. However, the service model implications of retaining additional buildings does have a small impact on the savings realised by the Family Hubs service team. Proceeding with Option 3 would mean that whilst overall we are delivering the financial and non-financial benefits, there would be a requirement to find alternative savings elsewhere to meet the shortfall. Option 3 does demonstrate a response to the consultation, and whilst it is a modest response balanced against the financial imperative, the changes are based directly in the feedback received from the consultation.

Option 4: Amend Need Framework to take greatest weight of public transport network analysis.

Option 4 demonstrates a much more significant response to the consultation however proceeding with this option would mean a much lower savings realisation. This would likely impact other parts of the Council's operations as alternative savings solutions will need to be found.

Option 5: Do Nothing.

This option does not make any change to the physical estate and does not respond at all to our needs analysis. This option is not considered viable as it does not pass wither of the Pass/Fail appraisals. Proceeding with Option 5 would mean that alternative solutions need to be found to deliver the entirety of the financial and non-financial benefit's the Programme is designed to deliver. This will impact other service areas and will almost certainly impact statutory service delivery.

Preferred Option

Based purely on the detailed analysis set out above the preferred option with which to proceed is 'Option 2: Consultation Option'. The next preferred viable option is Option 3, and it is noted that there is very little difference in the scoring between them. Option 4 is also considered viable, although it should be noted that when considering the ranking scores, Option 4 does not provide the same level of benefit as Option 2 or 3.

Members have the opportunity to consider the appraisal process outlined above and debate the relative importance of each factor, alongside all other relevant factors when decisions are made, including the consultation response, impact of the proposals on residents and the overall policy and financial context within which the Council currently operates. These factors should be debated and assessed alongside each other as part of the decision-making process.