

# Public Document Pack



## Department of Corporate Resources

Members of Council

### Committee Secretariat

Legal and Democratic Services  
Room 112, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor  
City Hall  
Bradford  
West Yorkshire  
BD1 1HY

Tel: 01274 432435  
Contact: Adrian Tumber  
Email: [adrian.tumber@bradford.gov.uk](mailto:adrian.tumber@bradford.gov.uk)  
Your Ref: AT/Council

Date: 14 February 2018

Dear Councillor

### MEETING OF COUNCIL – THURSDAY, 22 FEBRUARY 2018

You are requested to attend the meeting of the Council to be held in the Council Chamber - City Hall, Bradford, City Hall, Bradford, on Thursday, 22 February 2018 at 4.00 pm

The agenda for the meeting is set out overleaf.

Yours sincerely

Parveen Akhtar  
Interim Strategic Director Corporate Resources

#### **Notes:**

- ◆ This agenda can be made available in Braille, large print or tape format.
- ◆ The taking of photographs, filming and sound recording of the meeting is allowed except if Councillors vote to exclude the public to discuss confidential matters covered by Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972. Recording activity should be respectful to the conduct of the meeting and behaviour that disrupts the meeting (such as oral commentary) will not be permitted. Anyone attending the meeting who wishes to record or film the meeting's proceedings is advised to liaise with the Agenda Contact who will provide guidance and ensure that any necessary arrangements are in place. Those present at the meeting should be aware that they may be filmed or sound recorded.

The Council's Fire Bell and Evacuation Procedure requires people to leave the building in an orderly fashion by the nearest exit, should the fire alarm sound. No one will be allowed to stay or return until the building has been checked.

**Members are reminded that under the Members' Code of Conduct, they must register within 28 days any changes to their financial and other interests and notify the Monitoring Officer of any gift or hospitality received.**

## AGENDA

### A. PROCEDURAL ITEMS

#### 1. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

1 - 18

(Members Code of Conduct - Part 4A of the Constitution)

To receive disclosures of interests from members and co-opted members on matters to be considered at the meeting. The disclosure must include the nature of the interest.

An interest must also be disclosed in the meeting when it becomes apparent to the member during the meeting.

*Notes:*

- (1) *In relation to Agenda Item 7A concerning the approval of the Council's Budget and setting the level of Council Tax and Business Rates for 2018/19 and 2019/20 Members will be asked to approve the following recommendations contained in the report of the Monitoring Officer (**Document "O"**) on the granting of dispensations to all Members who have certain Disclosable Pecuniary Interests as defined in the Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012 and as listed in the Appendix A to the report:*

*That Council:*

1. *Grants a dispensation to the Members of the Authority who have requested one, to enable them to participate in full in the decision to approve the budgets for 2018/19 and 2019/20 and to set the Council Tax and Business Rates for 2018/19 and 2019/20 .*
2. *Approves the dispensation for a period of 2 years until 21 February 2019.*
3. *Notes the Monitoring Officer's advice that personal*

*interests that rise to a perception of a conflict of interest shall not prevent Members from speaking and voting at the Budget meetings.*

- (2) *Members in arrears of Council Tax by more than two months must not vote in decisions on, or which might affect, budget calculations, and must disclose at the meeting that this restriction applies to them. A failure to comply with these requirements is a criminal offence under section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.*
- (3) *Members have also disclosed interests which are not disclosable pecuniary interests but which they consider should be made in the interest of clarity (as listed in Appendix B to the report. Any other interests may be disclosed prior to, or at, the meeting.*
- (4) *Officers must disclose interests in accordance with Council Standing Order 44.*

## **2. MINUTES**

**Recommended –**

**That the minutes of the meeting held on 16 January 2018 be signed as a correct record (previously circulated).**

(Adrian Tumber – 01274 432435)

## **3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

## **4. WRITTEN ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE LORD MAYOR (Standing Order 4)**

*(To be circulated before the meeting).*

## **5. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS**

(Access to Information Procedure Rules – Part 3B of the Constitution)

Reports and background papers for agenda items may be inspected by contacting the person shown after each agenda item. Certain reports and background papers may be restricted.

Any request to remove the restriction on a report or background paper should be made to the relevant Strategic Director or Assistant Director whose name is shown on the front page of the report.

If that request is refused, there is a right of appeal to this meeting.

Please contact the officer shown below in advance of the meeting if you wish to appeal.

(Adrian Tumber - 01274 432435)

## **B. BUSINESS ITEMS**

### **6. MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES AND JOINT COMMITTEES (Standing Order 4)**

To consider any further motions (i) to appoint members to a Committee or a Joint Committee; or (ii) to appoint Chairs or Deputy Chairs of Committees (excluding Area Committees).

### **7. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE AND COMMITTEES (Standing Order 15)**

#### **7.1 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE - BUDGET 2018/19** 19 - 234

The Executive at its meeting on 20 February 2018 will make recommendations to Council on the Budget for 2018/19 and 2019/20.

The following reports are submitted:

(i) The Council's Revenue Estimates for 2018/19

The report of the Assistant Director Finance and Procurement provides details of the Council's Revenue Estimates for 2018/19 and 2019/20 (**Document "P"**).

(Tom Caselton – 01274 434472)

(ii) Allocation of the Schools' Budget 2018/19 Financial Year

The report of the Assistant Director Finance and Procurement presents and seeks approval of the recommendations of the Schools Forum in allocating the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for 2018/19 (**Executive Document "BA"**).

(Andrew Redding – 01274 432678)

(iii) The Council's Capital Investment Plan for 2018/19 Onwards

The report of the Assistant Director Finance and Procurement proposes the Capital Investment Plan for 2018/19 to 2021/22 (**Executive Document "BB"**).

(James Hopwood – 01274 432882)

(iv) 2018/19 Budget Proposals and Forecast Reserves - Section 151 Officer Assessment

The report of the Assistant Director Finance and Procurement (**Document “Q”**) sets out the S151 Officer’s assessment of the proposed budget for the financial year 2018/19, the adequacy of the forecast level of reserves and associated risks.

(Andrew Crookham – 01274 433656)

(v) Consultation Feedback and Equality Assessments for the 2018/19 and 2019/20 Council budget proposals

The report of the Assistant Director, Office of the Chief Executive, appendices and addenda provide feedback from the public engagement and consultation programme and sets out a summary of the equality assessments carried out on the Executive’s Budget proposals for 2018/19 and 2019/20 (**Executive Document “AV”**). There is particular reference to the Council’s responsibilities under equality legislation to enable the Council to have due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty when considering the Executive’s recommendations to Council on a budget for 2018/19 and 2019/20.

(Kathryn Jones – 01274 433664)

(vi) Interim Trade Union Feedback on the Executive’s Budget Proposals for the 2018/19 and 2019/20 Council Budget

The report of the Interim Director of Human Resources, appendices and addenda provide interim feedback from the Council’s Trade Unions on the Executive’s budget proposals for the 2018/19 and 2019/20 Council budget (**Executive Document “AW”**).

(Michelle Moverley – 01274 437883)

**Note**

***In view of the short timescale between the Executive on 22 February and the meeting of Council on 24 February the budget recommendations from the Executive to Council will be e-mailed to all Members of Council following the Executive on 22 February and will be published on the Council’s website at [www.bradford.gov.uk](http://www.bradford.gov.uk) . The recommendations will also be circulated at this meeting of Council.***

- 7.2 To consider any other recommendations (if any) arising from meetings of the Executive and Committees held after the publication of this agenda and prior to the Council meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

## O

### REPORT OF THE MONITORING OFFICER

### APPLICATIONS FOR DISPENSATION

### SECTION 33 OF THE LOCALISM ACT 2011

### THE RELEVANT AUTHORITIES (DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS) REGULATIONS 2012

22 February 2018

#### 1.0 Purpose of Report

1.1 To request the Council to grant a dispensation to all Members who have certain Disclosable Pecuniary Interests, as defined in the Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012, in the decision to approve the budget and to set the level of Council Tax and Business Rates for 2018/19 and 2019/20 during the Budget Council meetings on 22 February 2018 and 21 February 2019.

#### 2.0 Background

2.1 Under the Localism Act 2011 and the Members' Code of Conduct adopted by Bradford Council, a Member is required to consider whether he/she has a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI) in a matter to be considered at a formal meeting of the Authority. Dependent upon whether the DPI is included within their Register of Interests, Members are then required to disclose the interest to the meeting. In either case they may then not speak or vote on the matter concerned.

2.2 In the decision to approve the budget and to set the level of Council Tax and Business Rates for 2018/19 and 2019/20 there are a number of categories of interest which give rise to the need for a declaration of a DPI.

These include the following:

- Property Ownership/ Licences
- Employment or Business Interests
- Sponsorship/ Membership of Organisations
- Contracts

2.3 Guidance from the DCLG ("Openness and Transparency on personal interests – a guide for councillors", September 2013) states that any payment of, or liability to pay Council Tax does not create a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest. Accordingly members who pay or are liable to pay Council Tax do not require a dispensation to take part in the business of setting the Council Tax or precept or local arrangements for Council Tax support.

2.4 The DCLG guidance does not extend to similar issues arising with National Non-Domestic Rates, however, the same arguments would apply, namely that a payment of business rates, or a liability to pay business rates relating to

employment or business interests would not itself create a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest.

2.5. All councillors have completed their Registers of Interests as required by the Localism Act 2011 and, as such, councillors have declared Disclosable Pecuniary Interests. Those interests are a matter of public record and available for public inspection and on-line.

2.6 Council on 23 February 2017 approved dispensations for two years, including 2018/19. The matter is being reported again to Council to ensure all changes in the matter of Councillors' disclosable pecuniary interests are approved for the purposes of a dispensation.

### **3.0 Issues**

3.1 Section 31 (4) of the Localism Act 2011 states that where a Member is present at a meeting of an Authority and has a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in any matter to be considered, they may not:

- participate, or participate further, in any discussion of the matter at the meeting, or
- participate in any vote, or further vote, taken on the matter at the meeting.

If a Member fails to comply with these requirements, they would potentially commit a criminal offence.

3.2 Section 33 of the Act provides that on written request the Authority may grant a dispensation relieving the Member from either or both of the above restrictions.

3.3 The Act allows the Council to grant a dispensation in the following circumstances for a specified period of time not exceeding 4 years.

- (i) The number of Members having DPIs in a matter is so great a proportion of the Council that it would impede the transaction of the business;
- (ii) That, without the dispensation, the representation of different political groups on the Council would be so upset as to alter the outcome of any vote on the matter;
- (iii) That the Authority considers that the dispensation is in the interests of persons living in the Authority's area;
- (iv) That the Authority considers that it is otherwise appropriate to grant a dispensation.

In the circumstances it is considered that the requests for dispensation fall into all four categories set out above.

3.4 Due to the number of Councillors who have a relevant Disclosable Pecuniary Interest there is a real risk that without a dispensation, a significant number of Councillors would be required to declare an interest and as such be prevented from



participating in the decision making process. The lack of the ability for a significant number of Councillors to participate could have the impact of either making the Council meeting inquorate or upsetting the political balance of the meeting at which the decision is to be made.

- 3.5 It is in the interests of the citizens of the Bradford District that they are represented by their democratically elected Councillors at the debate to approve the budget and to set the Council Tax. These are the most important decisions taken by Council and it is therefore imperative that constituents are not disenfranchised by the provisions of the Localism Act 2011 relating to Disclosable Pecuniary Interests.
- 3.6 The Council's Code of Conduct also requires that where a Member has another interest in a matter to be discussed which should be declared in the public interest, it should be declared at the meeting. In circumstances where the interest may give rise to a perception of a conflict of interest in the matter, the Member must consider whether continued participation in the matter would be reasonable.
- 3.7 On the same grounds as the case for dispensations in respect of DPIs, I advise that Members who have personal interests where there is or may be a conflict of interest should also not be prevented from speaking and voting at Budget Council owing to the number of Councillors likely to be affected.
- 3.8 Attached as an appendix is a schedule of Members DPIs (part A) and a schedule of personal interests (part B). Council is requested to grant dispensations under s33 of the Localism Act to permit Members to speak and vote at the Budget meetings. It is also recommended that the dispensations continue in force until February 2019 as the budget consideration spans two years.

#### **4.0 Legal Implications**

- 4.1 The Localism Act enables the Council to consider applications for dispensations in the accordance with the grounds referred to above. In order to grant a dispensation, the Council needs to be satisfied that on the information available, the application meets one or more of the criteria for dispensations set out above.

#### **5.0 Conclusions**

- 5.1 In the circumstances, the Monitoring Officer is satisfied that the criteria are met and considers it appropriate for the Council to grant a dispensation to those Members of Council who have requested such dispensations for a period of two years so as to enable all Members to participate in the decision to approve the Council budget and the setting of the Council Tax and Business Rates for 2018/19 and 2019/20.

#### **6.0 Recommendation**

That Council:

1. Grants a dispensation to the Members of the Authority who have requested one, to enable them to participate in full in the decision to approve the budgets for 2018/19 and 2019/20 and to set the Council Tax and Business Rates for 2018/19 and 2019/20.

2. Approves the dispensation for a period of 2 years until 21 February 2019.
3. Notes the Monitoring Officer's advice that personal interests that may give rise to a perception of a conflict of interest shall not prevent Members from speaking and voting at the Budget meetings.

Parveen Akhtar  
Monitoring Officer

9 February 2018

G:\Legal Services\City Solicitor\Committees\Council\Budget Council 2018\Report Requesting Dispensations 22 02 18.doc

**BUDGET COUNCIL MEETING  
22 FEBRUARY 2018**

Appendix "A"

List of Elected Members recommended to be granted dispensations under the Localism Act 2011 in relation to their declared Disclosable Pecuniary Interests relating to employment, sponsorship, contracts, land and licences for the purposes of speaking and voting at the Budget Council meeting on 22 February 2018.

**EMPLOYMENT**

<u>Labour</u>	<u>Con</u>	<u>Lib Dem</u>	<u>Green</u>	<u>Ind</u>	<u>The Ind</u>	<u>The QW Ind</u>
Amran	Brown		Hussain	Sajawal		
Berry				Morris		
Imran Hussain						
Tariq Hussain						
Lal						
Ross-Shaw						
Salam						
Tait						
Thornton						

**SPONSORSHIP**

<u>Labour</u>	<u>Con</u>	<u>Lib Dem</u>	<u>Green</u>	<u>Ind</u>	<u>The Ind</u>	<u>The QW Ind</u>
Dodds	Davies	Fear	Love			
Engel	Gibbons	Griffiths				
Farley	Miller	Pollard				
Green	Pennington	Reid				
Imran Hussain	Poulsen	Stelling				
Tariq Hussain		Stubbs				
Iqbal		J Sunderland				
Jabar		R Sunderland				
Johnson						
Imran Khan						
Mullaney						
Pullen						
Ross-Shaw						
Sharp						
M Slater						
Swallow						
Tait						
Thornton						
Wainwright						

## CONTRACTS

<u>Labour</u>	<u>Con</u>	<u>Lib Dem</u>	<u>Green</u>	<u>Ind</u>	<u>The Ind</u>	<u>The QW Ind</u>
Salam Shafiq Sharp	D Smith				Naylor	

## LAND

<u>Labour</u>	<u>Con</u>	<u>Lib Dem</u>	<u>Green</u>	<u>Ind</u>	<u>The Ind</u>	<u>The QW Ind</u>
A Ahmed	Ali Barker Brown Cooke Davies Ellis Gibbons Heseltine Mallinson Miller Pennington Pollard Poulsen Riaz Rickard Shaw Senior D Smith M Smith Townend Whiteley	R Ahmed Fear Griffiths Pollard Reid Stelling Stubbs J Sunderland R Sunderland Ward	Hussain Love	K Hussain Morris  Sajawal	Hawkesworth Naylor	L Cromie P Cromie
Amran Azam Bacon Berry Dodds Duffy Dunbar Engel Farley Ferriby Greenwood Hinchcliffe Abid Hussain Arshad Hussain Imran Hussain Shabir Hussain Tariq Hussain Iqbal Jabar Jamil Johnson Hassan Khan Imran Khan Lal Lee Mohammed Mullaney Nazir Peart Pullen Ross-Shaw Salam Shabbir Shafiq						

**LAND (CONT)**

<u>Labour</u>	<u>Con</u>	<u>Lib Dem</u>	<u>Green</u>	<u>Ind</u>	<u>The Ind</u>	<u>The QW Ind</u>
Shaheen						
Sharp						
M Slater						
V Slater						
Swallow						
Tait						
Thirkill						
Thornton						
Wainwright						
Warburton						
Watson						

**LICENCES**

<u>Labour</u>	<u>Con</u>	<u>Lib Dem</u>	<u>Green</u>	<u>Ind</u>	<u>The Ind</u>	<u>The QW Ind</u>
Bacon	D Smith M Smith	J Sunderland				

**CORPORATE TENANCIES**

<u>Labour</u>	<u>Con</u>	<u>Lib Dem</u>	<u>Green</u>	<u>Ind</u>	<u>The Ind</u>	<u>The QW Ind</u>
						L Cromie P Cromie

**SECURITIES**

<u>Labour</u>	<u>Con</u>	<u>Lib Dem</u>	<u>Green</u>	<u>Ind</u>	<u>The Ind</u>	<u>The QW Ind</u>

This page is intentionally left blank

## Council (All Parties)

**Budget Meeting  
22 February 2018**

### Disclosures of Interest

Appendix "B"

The following members have disclosed a personal interest in the item on the agenda relating to the Budget 2018 – 19 and of the nature and description indicated by each category:

#### 1. **Members with a spouse, partner or close relative in the employment of the Council**

##### **Labour**

Cllr Ahmed  
Cllr Amran  
Cllr Dodds  
Cllr Imran Hussain  
Cllr Tariq Hussain  
Cllr Iqbal  
Cllr Imran Khan  
Cllr Lal  
Cllr Nazir  
Cllr Ross-Shaw  
Cllr Salam  
Cllr Shabbir  
Cllr Shafiq  
Cllr Sharp  
Cllr M Slater  
Cllr V Slater  
Cllr Swallow  
Cllr Tait

##### **Conservative**

Cllr Brown  
Cllr Ellis  
Cllr Pennington  
Cllr Riaz  
Cllr Shaw  
Cllr Townend

##### **Lib Dem**

Cllr Ward (Ind)

##### **Green**

Cllr Hussain  
Cllr Love

##### **The Independents**

Cllr Hawkesworth

##### **Independent**

Cllr Morris

#### 2. **Members employed by or who have a spouse, partner or close relative employed by a voluntary organisation/public body funded by the Council.**

##### **Labour**

Cllr Imran Khan  
Cllr Lal  
Cllr Mullaney  
Cllr Shabbir  
Cllr Shaheen  
Cllr Thirkill

##### **Conservative**

Cllr Brown

##### **Green**

Cllr Hussain

3. **Members who occupied land or who had a spouse, partner or relative who did or who were directors of companies or sat on the management committee of an organisation that occupies land under a lease or licence granted by the Council.**

**Labour**

Cllr Jamil  
Cllr Imran Khan  
Cllr Mullaney  
Cllr Ross-Shaw

**Conservative**

Cllr Brown  
Cllr Heseltine  
Cllr D Smith  
Cllr M Smith

**Lib Dem**

Cllr Pollard  
Cllr Reid  
Cllr Stelling  
Cllr J Sunderland  
Cllr R Sunderland (Related to J Sunderland)

**Green**

Cllr Hussain  
Cllr Love  
Cllr Warnes

4. **Members of other public authorities.**

**Adoption Panel**

Cllr Duffy (Lab)  
Cllr Davies (Con)

**Airedale Drainage Commissioners**

Cllr Ellis (Con)  
Cllr Rickard MBE (Con)

**Airedale Partnership**

Cllr Ross-Shaw (Lab)  
Cllr Cooke (Con)

**Association for Public Service Excellence (APSE)**

Cllr Berry (Lab)

**Better Start Bradford**

Cllr Sajawal (Ind)

**Bingley Voluntary Action**

Cllr Pennington (Con)

**Bradford & Airedale Citizens Advice Bureau**

Cllr Watson (Lab)  
Cllr Barker (Con)

**Bradford Deaf Community Association**

Cllr Akhtar (Lab)  
Cllr Iqbal (Lab)  
Cllr Martin Smith (Con)

**Bradford District Care Trust**

Cllr Aneela Ahmed (Lab)

**Bridge Project**

Cllr Berry (Lab)



Christopher Tophams Apprenticing Foundation  
Cllr Whiteley (Con)

City Regions Board (LGA)  
Cllr Hinchcliffe

Court of the University of Leeds  
Cllr Jamil (Lab)

Drake and Tonson Foundation  
Cllr Bacon (Lab)

Fostering Panel  
Cllr Aneela Ahmed (Lab)  
Cllr Sameena Akhtar (Lab)  
Cllr Townend (Con)

Greenmoor Community Board – City and Great Horton Wards  
Cllr Azam (Lab)  
Cllr Dodds (Lab)  
Cllr Jabar (Lab)

Harehills Education Trust  
Cllr Bacon (Lab)  
Cllr Malcolm Slater (Lab)  
Cllr Brown (Con)

Haworth Exhibition Trust  
Cllr Farley (Lab)  
Cllr Poulsen (Con)

Ilkley Youth & Community Association and Childrens Centre  
Cllr Gibbons (Con)  
Cllr M Smith (Con)

Joseph Nutter's Foundation  
Cllr Lee (Lab)  
Cllr Thirkill (Lab)  
Cllr Gibbons (Con) (Member of the Management Board)

Key Cities  
Cllr Hinchcliffe (Lab)  
Cllr I Khan (Lab)

Leeds Bradford International Airport – Consultative Committee  
Cllr Ross-Shaw (Lab)  
Cllr Lal (Alternate) (Lab)

Leeds City Region Local Enterprise Partnership  
Cllr Hinchcliffe (Lab)

Leeds City Region Employment and Skills Board  
Cllr Hinchcliffe (Lab)

Leeds City Region Land and Assets Board

Cllr Hinchcliffe (Lab)

Manningham Housing Association

Cllr Bacon (Lab)

Nell Bank Outdoor Education Centre

Cllr Ferriby (Lab)

Cllr Martin Smith (Con)

Cllr Poulsen (Con) (Trustee)

Cllr Hussain (Green)

NHS Foundation Trust

Cllr Ahmed (Lab)

Cllr Gibbons (Con)

NHS Mental Health Board

North Regional Association for Sensory Support (NRASS)

Cllr Wainwright (Lab)

Cllr Gibbons (Con)

Play Partnership

Cllr Swallow (Lab)

Roshni Ghar

Rural Action Yorkshire

Cllr Hawkesworth (The Ind)

Salt Foundation

Cllr Love (Green)

Sir Titus Salt Trust

Cllr Amran (Lab)

Cllr Hinchcliffe (Lab)

Cllr Thirkill (Lab)

Cllr Cooke (Con)

Cllr Heseltine (Con)

Cllr Hawarun Hussain (Green)

Cllr Love (Green)

Southern Pennine Rural Regeneration (Pennine Prospects)

Cllr Ellis (Alternate) (Con)

Cllr Hawkesworth (The Independents)

Standing Advisory Council on Religious Education (SACRE)

Cllr Nussrat Mohammed (Lab)

Cllr Swallow (Lab)

Cllr Davies (Con)

Cllr Reid (Lib Dem & Ind)

University of Bradford - Council

University of Bradford – Court

Cllr Berry (Lab)  
Cllr Duffy (Lab)  
Cllr D Smith (Con)  
Cllr Whiteley (Con)  
Cllr Jeanette Sunderland (Lib Dem & Ind)  
Cllr Khadim Hussain (Ind)

West Yorkshire Combined Authority

Cllr Hinchcliffe (Lab) (Chair)  
Cllr I Khan (Alt) (Lab)  
Cllr Cooke (Alt) (Con)

West Yorkshire Combined Authority West Yorkshire & York Investment Committee

Cllr Ross-Shaw (Lab)

West Yorkshire Combined Authority – LCR Land and Assets Board

Cllr Hinchciffe (Lab)

West Yorkshire Combined Authority – LCR Planning Portfolio

Cllr Ross-Shaw (Lab)

West Yorkshire Combined Authority Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Cllr Shaheen (Lab)  
Cllr Watson (Lab)  
Cllr Ellis (Con)

West Yorkshire Combined Authority Transport Committee

Cllr Hassan Khan (Lab)  
Cllr Mohammed (Lab)  
Cllr Salam (Lab)  
Cllr Poulsen (Con)

West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority

Cllr Dodds (Lab)  
Cllr Peart (Lab)  
Cllr Tait (Lab)  
Cllr Pollard (Con)  
Cllr Ahmed (Lib Dem & Ind)

West Yorkshire Joint Services Committee

Cllr Duffy (Lab)  
Cllr Hinchcliffe (Lab)  
Cllr V Slater (Lab)  
Cllr Imran Khan (Alt) (Lab)  
Cllr Salam (Alt) (Lab)  
Cllr Ellis (Alt) (Con)  
Cllr Riaz (Con)

West Yorkshire Pension Fund Investment Advisory Panel

Cllr Thornton (Lab)  
Cllr Miller (Con)

West Yorkshire Pension Fund Joint Advisory Group

Cllr Lal (Lab)

Cllr Thornton (Lab)

Cllr Miller (Con)

The Pension Board

Cllr M Slater (Lab)

West Yorkshire Police & Crime Panel

Cllr Tariq Hussain (Lab)

Cllr Pullen (Lab)

Cllr Mallinson (Con)

Wrose Carnival Management Committee

Cllr Hinchcliffe (Lab)

Yorkshire and Humber – Employers Association (Local Authorities)

Cllr Duffy (Lab)

Yorkshire Libraries and Information

Cllr Ferriby (Lab)

Yorkshire Purchasing Organisation Holding Company

Cllr Warburton (Lab)

Yorkshire Purchasing Organisation Procurement Holdings Ltd

Cllr Lal (Alt) (Lab)

Cll Warburton (Lab)

Cllr Ellis (Alt) (Con)

Cllr Whiteley (Con)

Yorkshire Regional Flood & Coastal Committee

Cllr Farley (Sub Member) (Lab)

Cllr Ellis (Con)

**Parish Councillors.**

Cllr Thirkill (Lab)

Cllr Naylor (The Independents)

Cllr Gibbons (Con)

Cllr Rickard MBE (Con)

Cllr D Smith (Con)

Cllr Whiteley (Con)

**5. Members who sit on the management committee/ trustee of a Council voluntary organisation in receipt of Council Funding.**

**Labour**

Cllr Berry  
Cllr Dodds  
Cllr Ferriby  
Cllr Hinchcliffe  
Cllr Imran Hussain  
Cllr Tariq Hussain  
Cllr Jabar  
Cllr Jamil  
Cllr Imran Khan  
Cllr Tait  
Cllr Thirkill

**Conservative**

Cllr Davies  
Cllr Heseltine  
Cllr Mallinson  
Cllr Poulsen  
Cllr Riaz  
Cllr D Smith  
Cllr M Smith  
Cllr Townend

**Lib Dem**

Cllr Ahmed  
Cllr Pollard  
Cllr G Reid  
Cllr J Sunderland

**Green**

Cllr Hawarun Hussain  
Cllr Warnes

**Independent**

Cllr Khadim Hussain  
Cllr Sajawal

**The Independents**

Cllr Hawkesworth

**The Queensbury Ward Independents**

Cllr P Cromie

**6. Members who are members of a Council funded organisation.**

**Labour**

Cllr Imran Khan  
Cllr Val Slater  
Cllr Thirkill  
Cllr Ross-Shaw

**Conservative**

Cllr Brown  
Cllr Gibbons  
Cllr Rickard MBE  
Cllr D Smith

**Lib Dem**

Cllr Ahmed  
Cllr Fear  
Cllr Pollard  
Cllr G Reid  
Cllr J Sunderland

**The Independents**

Cllr Hawkesworth

**7. Members appointed by the Council to a public body with an interest in the Council's budget**

**Bradford College**

Cllr Berry (Lab)  
Cllr Dunbar (Lab)

**Cathedral Council**

Cllr Dodds (Lab)

**Community and Arts Umbrella**

Cllr Warnes (Green)

Incommunities Ltd (HA Board)

Cllr Duffy (Lab)

Cllr Cooke (Con)

Keighley Business Improvement District Board

Cllr Ross-Shaw (Lab)

Saffron Dean Community Association

Strategic Disability Partnership

Cllr Dale Smith (Con)

**8(i) Members who are appointed to external bodies**

Baildon in Bloom

Cllr Pollard (Con)

Bradford City Challenge Limited

Cllr Johnson (Lab)

Bradford City Challenge Foundation Limited

Cllr Imran Khan (Lab)

Cllr Wainwright (Lab)

Bradford Teaching Hospital NHS Trust

Cllr Tariq Hussain (Lab)

Bradford Trident

Cllr Lal (Lab)

Cllr Salam (Lab)

Cllr Sajawal (Ind)

Bradford Twin Towns Association

Cllr Lee (Lab)

Cllr D Smith (Con)

Canal Road Urban Village

Cllr Ross-Shaw (Lab)

Canterbury Active Partnership

City of Film

Cllr Ferriby (Lab)

Executive Board of Women's Aid

Friends of Brackenhill Park

Cllr Jabar (Lab)

Friends of Harold Park

Cllr Tait (Lab)

Great Horton Partnership

Cllr Dodds (Lab)

Cllr Jabar (Lab)

Hainworth Wood Community Centre

Cllr Lee (Lab)

Cllr M Slater (Lab)

Keighley Association Women and Children's Centre (KAWACC)

Cllr Lee (Lab)

Long Lee Village Hall

Cllr Lee (Lab)

Cllr M Slater (Lab)

Marshfields Residents Association

Patrol Adjudication Joint Committee and BLASJC

Cllr Thirkill (Lab)

Ummid/Himmat Management Board

Cllr Jabar (Lab)

**8(ii) Other Interests**

Unison Calderdale

Cllr Tariq Hussain (Lab)

Cllr Jabar (Lab)

**9. Members who are school governors.**

**Labour**

Cllr Dodds

Cllr Duffy

Cllr Farley

Cllr Ferriby

Cllr Jamil

Cllr Lee

Cllr Peart

Cllr Shafiq

Cllr V Slater

Cllr Swallow

Cllr Tait

Cllr Thirkill

Cllr Warburton

Cllr Watson

**Conservative**

Cllr Ali – Community Governor

Cllr Brown

Cllr Davies

Cllr Pollard

Cllr D Smith

Cllr Rickard MBE – Moorlands  
Learning Trust (MAT)

Cllr Riaz – Elected Governor at  
Bolton NHS Trust

**Independent**

Cllr Sajawal

**10. Members entitled to receive an allowance paid by the Council**

All members of the Council in attendance.

**11.** All members who are in receipt of a West Yorkshire Pension Fund pension.

This page is intentionally left blank





## **Report of the Assistant Director Finance and Procurement to the meeting of the Council to be held on 22 February 2018.**

**P**

---

### **Subject:**

**The Council's Revenue Estimates for 2018/19**

### **Summary statement:**

**The report provides Members with details of the Council's Revenue Estimates for 2018/19 and 2019/20**

Andrew Crookham  
Assistant Director Finance and  
Procurement  
Report Contact: Tom Caselton  
Phone: (01274) 434472  
E-mail: [tom.caselton@bradford.gov.uk](mailto:tom.caselton@bradford.gov.uk)

**Portfolio: Leader of the Council**

**Overview & Scrutiny Area:**

**Corporate**

---

## **THE COUNCIL'S REVENUE ESTIMATES FOR 2018/19**

### **1.0 PURPOSE**

1.1 This report proposes the estimates of net revenue expenditure be recommended to Council for approval as the Council's balanced revenue budget for 2018/19 and that Executive recommend to Council for approval budget savings proposals for 2019/20.

It also forecasts the revenue position for 2020/21.

1.2 The revenue estimates are part of the overall budget proposal for the Council which includes:

- the recommended Capital Investment Plan (Document BB)
- the allocation of the Schools Budget 2018/19 (Document BA).

1.3 This report is submitted to enable the Executive to make recommendations to Budget Council on the setting of the 2018/19 budget and the Council Tax for 2018/19, as required by Part 3C of the Council's Constitution.

### **2.0 PROPOSED REVENUE BUDGET 2018/19 and BUDGET SAVINGS PROPOSALS FOR 2019/20**

2.1 The balanced 2018/19 revenue budget is predicated on total available general resources (Council Tax income, Business Rates income, general government grant and use of reserves) of £358.110m in 2018/19.

2.2 The total expenditure takes account of changes to the underlying (base) level of expenditure at the start of the year arising from:

- The net effect of previous years' policy decisions, including decisions made by Budget Council in February 2017 in respect of 2018/19 which amounted to a net reduction in the budget of £18.699m (Appendix E). Appendices F(i) and F(ii) set out amendments to the February 2017 decisions with a net reduction in proposals of £15.271m in 2018/19 and falling to a cumulative net reduction of £4.536m by 2020/21.
- Provision to pay the proposed two year pay offer and a 1% increase for 2020/21.
- Price increases (an average of 2.5% applied to contract budgets in 2018/19 and 2.0% in later years, 2.5% to utilities and specific indexation applied to income budgets)
- The impact on the Council's funding arising from 2018/19 Local Government Settlement
- Council's decisions about changes to Council Tax, a total increase of 5.99%, including a 3% increase for Adult Social Care, as enabled by the Local Government Settlement
- Additional expenditure to deal with recurrent Service pressures
- One-off and transitional investment in other services
- Public Health Grant reductions and estimates on other specific grants not yet announced

- Service and non Service savings
- One off increase in business rates and s31 grant compensation of £5.1m and on-going increase in business rates of £450k p.a.

2.3 The summary position is shown at Appendix A, with further detail in Appendices B to G:

- On-going and non recurrent investments (Appendices B and C)
- New budget proposals ( Appendix D)
- Schedule of 2019/20 proposals subject to consultation (2018/19 for reference only) (Appendix E)
- Schedule of proposed amendments to previous budget decisions (Appendices F(i) and F(ii))
- Proposed Use of reserves statement (Appendix G).

*At the time of publication all Appendices are based on savings proposals previously approved by Council in February 2017 for 2018/19, proposed amendments to those budget decisions approved in February 2017 together with new proposals which were approved by Executive for consultation on 5 December 2017.*

2.4 Executive is asked to recommend to Council following their consideration of the feedback received to date from the on-going consultation processes with the public, interested parties and stakeholders, staff and Trade Unions and consideration of equality issues (and in particular Equality Impact Assessments) on the Council's new Budget Proposals:

- a 2018/19 budget; and
- budget savings proposals for 2019/20, requiring the Chief Executive, Strategic Directors and Directors to take necessary action during 2018/19 to ensure those savings are fully achievable for 2019/20.

Consultation has previously been carried out on the saving proposals approved by Council in February 2017 for 2018/19. There has been further consultation on the proposed amendments to a number of these savings proposals as detailed in Appendix F(i).

2.5 After taking into account the full year effect of the 2018/19 proposed budget, the projections for 2018/19 shows a balanced budget with additional indicative savings required for 2019/20 of £4.0m and a further £39.2m in 2020/21.

2.6 The proposed use £2.9m of reserves over the period 1 April 2018 to 31 March 2021 together with the replenishment of reserves in 2018/19 by £3.0m as detailed in Appendix G. There are no current proposals to use unallocated reserves given the increasingly challenging nature of delivering budget proposals against a backdrop of rising demand and costs. The risks associated with this position and an assessment of the adequacy of reserves is discussed in the separate Section 151 Officer's report (Document Q).

### **3.0 COUNCIL TAX IMPLICATIONS**

3.1 In setting the Council Tax for 2018/19, Council will have regard to the Council Tax base approved by the Executive on 9 January 2018. The Council will also wish to note the precepts of the parish and town councils, of the West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority (WYFRA) and the Police and Crime Commissioner for West

Yorkshire as detailed below.

#### **4.0 MATTERS RELATING TO 2018/19 FINANCIAL POSITION**

- 4.1 The 2018/19 financial position is contingent upon the 2017/18 audited out-turn. The Executive is therefore asked to give the s151 Officer authority to secure the best position for the Council in respect of 2018/19 in preparing the Final Accounts for 2017/18.

#### **5.0 RISK MANAGEMENT**

- 5.1 The uncertainties regarding the funding that will be available to the Council are considered within the Section 151 Officer's Report (Document Q).

#### **6.0 LEGAL APPRAISAL**

- 6.1 It is necessary to ensure that Executive have comprehensive information when considering the recommendations to make to Council on the budget for 2018/19 and the budget savings proposals for 2019/20 at their meeting on 20 February 2018. It is a legal requirement that Members have regard to all relevant information. The information in this report and any updated information produced to Executive on 20 February 2018 following their consideration on 6 February 2018 of the feedback received to date from the on-going consultation processes and their consideration of equality issues are considered important in this context. It will also be necessary to consider any further information produced subsequent to the 20 February 2018 Executive meeting.

#### **7.0 OTHER IMPLICATIONS**

##### **7.1 EQUALITY & DIVERSITY**

- 7.1.1 The equality implications of the new budget proposals and the proposed amendments to previous budget decisions were highlighted in the separate report presented to the meeting of Executive on 6 February 2018 (Document AV) together with the Addendum to that Report circulated to Executive on 6 February 2018. The equality implications of the 2018/19 proposals previously approved by Budget Council in February 2017 were fully considered by Council at that time.

- 7.1.2 Equality impact assessments are undertaken on all budget proposals. Where impacts are identified on particular protected characteristic groups, the assessments are published, consulted on and then further updated reflecting on any feedback received. These updated assessments for the 2018/19 and 2019/20 proposals are accessible via this link

<https://www.bradford.gov.uk/your-council/council-budgets-and-spending/budget-eias-2018-19/>

Elected Members should consider the Equality Impact Assessments in full.

The consultation provides the opportunity for the Council to better understand:

- The consequences for individuals with protected characteristics affected by changes, particularly related to proposals relating to social care;
- Any cumulative impact on groups with protected characteristics.

## **7.2 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS**

7.2.1 There are no direct sustainability implications resulting from this report.

## **7.3 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS IMPACTS**

7.3.1 There are no direct greenhouse gas emissions implications resulting from this report.

## **7.4 COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

7.4.1 Community safety implications of specific new budget proposals were highlighted in a separate report presented to the meeting of Executive on 6 February 2018 at paragraph 11.4 (Document AV).

## **7.5 HUMAN RIGHTS ACT**

7.5.1 Any human rights implications resulting from this report are referred to in the Equality Impact Assessments.

## **7.6 TRADE UNION**

7.6.1 The Interim Trade Union feedback on the Council's new budget proposals and the proposed amendments to previous budget decisions was detailed in a separate report presented to the meeting of Executive on 6 February 2018 (Document AW) together with the addendum to that report. The Trade Union feedback on the proposals previously approved by Budget Council in February 2017 was fully considered by Council at that time.

## **7.7 WARD IMPLICATIONS**

7.7.1 In general terms, where proposed cuts affect services to the public, the impact will typically be felt across all wards. Some proposals will have a more direct local impact on individual organisations and/or communities.

## **7.8 NOT FOR PUBLICATION DOCUMENTS**

7.8.1 None.

## **8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL**

### **8.1 REVENUE ESTIMATES 2018/19**

- (a) That the Base Revenue Forecast of £371.445m for 2018/19 as set out in this report "P" (Revenue Estimates) be approved.
- (b) That Executive Document "P" and the consequent net reduction in investments of £7.197m in 2018/19 be approved.
- (c) That Executive Document "P" and the service savings and additional income of £6.138m in 2018/19 be approved.

- (d) That it be noted that within the revenue budget there is a net contribution of £1.796m to revenue reserves in 2018/19.
- (e) That Executive Document “P” and the service savings proposals for 2018/19 be approved, requiring the Chief Executive, Strategic Directors and Directors to take necessary action during 2018/19 to ensure those savings are fully achievable for 2019/20.
- (f) That the comments of the Assistant Director Finance and Procurement set out in Executive Document “Q” on the robustness of the estimates and the adequacy of reserves taking account of the recommendations made at 8.1(a) to (e) above be noted.

## **8.2 PROPOSED COUNCIL TAX 2018/19**

- 8.2.1 That it be noted that the projected council tax base and expenditure forecasts outlined in this report together with the 2018/19 resources and the budget variations approved at 8.1(b) and 8.1(c) above produce a proposed Band D council tax of £1,333.21 for 2018/19. This includes a social care precept of 3.0% which is to be ring fenced for expenditure on adult social care.

## **8.3 PAYMENT DATES FOR COUNCIL TAX AND NATIONAL NON-DOMESTIC RATES**

- 8.3.1 That the first instalment date for payment of National Non-Domestic Rates and Council Tax shall be specified by the s151 Officer.

## **8.4 DELEGATION TO OFFICERS**

- 8.4.1 That for the avoidance of doubt and without prejudice to any of the powers contained in Article 14 of Part 2 of the Council's Constitution on the Function of Officers, the s151 Officer shall have full delegated powers to act on behalf of the Council on all matters relating to the Council Tax, Non-Domestic Rates and Accounts Receivable Debtors including (without prejudice to the generality of the delegation) assessments, determinations, recovery, enforcement and, in accordance with the statutory scheme, full delegated powers to act on behalf of the Council with regard to all aspects of the granting of Discretionary and Hardship Rate Relief to qualifying ratepayers.

## **8.5 PREPARATION OF ACCOUNTS**

- (a) That in preparing the Final Accounts for 2017/18, the s151 Officer be empowered to take appropriate steps to secure the best advantage for the Council's financial position.
- (b) That the s151 Officer be empowered to deal with items which involve the transfer of net spending between the financial years 2017/18 and 2018/19 in a manner which secures the best advantage for the Council's financial position.
- (c) That the s151 Officer report any action taken in pursuance of 8.5(a) and 8.5 (b) above when reporting on the Final Accounts for 2017/18.

## **8.6 COUNCIL TAX REQUIREMENT 2018/19**

- (a) That the council tax base figures for 2018/19 calculated by the Council at its

meeting on 9 January 2018 in respect of the whole of the Council's area and individual parish and town council areas be noted.

- (b) That the only special items for 2018/19 under Section 35 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 are local parish and town council precepts and no expenses are to be treated as special expenses under Section 35(1) (b) of that Act.
- (c) That the Council Tax Requirement, excluding parish and town council precepts, be calculated as follows:

<b>Gross expenditure</b>	<b>£1,166,760,324</b>
<b>Income</b>	<b>£977,676,352</b>
<b>Council Tax requirement</b>	<b>£189,083,972</b>
<b>Council tax base</b>	<b>140,348</b>
<b>Basic amount of council tax</b>	<b>£1,347.25</b>
<b>Adjustment in respect of parish and town council precepts</b>	<b>£ 14.04</b>
<b>Basic amount excluding parish and town councils</b>	<b>£1,333.21</b>

- (d) That the precepts of parish and town councils be noted and the resulting basic council tax amounts for particular areas of the Council be calculated as follows:

<u>Parish or Town Council Area</u>	<u>Local Precept</u> £	<u>Council Tax Base</u>	<u>Parish/Town Council Tax</u> £	<u>Whole Area Council Tax</u> £	<u>Basic Council Tax Amount</u> £
Addingham	98,845	1,720	57.47	1,333.21	1,390.68
Baildon	199,000	6,277	31.70	1,333.21	1,364.91
Bingley	140,918	8,640	16.31	1,333.21	1,349.52
Burley	194,220	2,988	65.00	1,333.21	1,398.21
Clayton	54,511	2,416	22.56	1,333.21	1,355.77
Cullingworth	28,880	1,172	24.64	1,333.21	1,357.85
Denholme	31,558	1,111	28.41	1,333.21	1,361.62
Harden	20,475	819	25.00	1,333.21	1,358.21
Haworth, Crossroads and Stanbury	60,228	2,262	26.63	1,333.21	1,359.84
Ilkley	286,615	7,097	40.39	1,333.21	1,373.60
Keighley	500,570	14,845	33.72	1,333.21	1,366.93
Menston	117,828	2,182	54.00	1,333.21	1,387.21
Oxenhope	27,405	1,015	27.00	1,333.21	1,360.21
Sandy Lane	15,498	871	17.79	1,333.21	1,351.00
Silsden	76,030	2,937	25.89	1,333.21	1,359.10
Steeton with Eastburn	50,220	1,674	30.00	1,333.21	1,363.21
Wilsden	52,130	1,754	29.72	1,333.21	1,362.93
Wrose	15,765	2,102	7.50	1,333.21	1,340.71
<b>Total of all local precepts</b>	<b>1,970,696</b>	<b>61,882</b>			

- (e) That the council tax amounts for dwellings in different valuation bands in respect of the Council's budget requirement, taking into account parish and town council precepts applicable to only part of the Council's area, be calculated as follows, which includes the 3% social care precept:

	Council Tax Amount for Each Valuation Band							
	<u>Band A</u> £	<u>Band B</u> £	<u>Band C</u> £	<u>Band D</u> £	<u>Band E</u> £	<u>Band F</u> £	<u>Band G</u> £	<u>Band H</u> £
<b>All parts of the Council's area other than those below</b>	888.81	1,036.94	1,185.08	1,333.21	1,629.48	1,925.75	2,222.02	2,666.42
<b>The parish and town council areas of:</b>								
<b>Addingham</b>	927.12	1,081.64	1,236.16	1,390.68	1,699.72	2,008.76	2,317.80	2,781.36
<b>Baildon</b>	909.94	1,061.60	1,213.25	1,364.91	1,668.22	1,971.54	2,274.85	2,729.82
<b>Bingley</b>	899.68	1,049.63	1,199.57	1,349.52	1,649.41	1,949.31	2,249.20	2,699.04
<b>Burley</b>	932.14	1,087.50	1,242.85	1,398.21	1,708.92	2,019.64	2,330.35	2,796.42
<b>Clayton</b>	903.85	1,054.49	1,205.13	1,355.77	1,657.05	1,958.33	2,259.62	2,711.54
<b>Cullingworth</b>	905.23	1,056.11	1,206.98	1,357.85	1,659.59	1,961.34	2,263.08	2,715.70
<b>Denholme</b>	907.75	1,059.04	1,210.33	1,361.62	1,664.20	1,966.78	2,269.37	2,723.24
<b>Harden</b>	905.47	1,056.39	1,207.30	1,358.21	1,660.03	1,961.86	2,263.68	2,716.42
<b>Haworth, Crossroads and Stanbury</b>	906.56	1,057.65	1,208.75	1,359.84	1,662.03	1,964.21	2,266.40	2,719.68
<b>Ilkley</b>	915.73	1,068.36	1,220.98	1,373.60	1,678.84	1,984.09	2,289.33	2,747.20
<b>Keighley</b>	911.29	1,063.17	1,215.05	1,366.93	1,670.69	1,974.45	2,278.22	2,733.86
<b>Menston</b>	924.81	1,078.94	1,233.08	1,387.21	1,695.48	2,003.75	2,312.02	2,774.42
<b>Oxenhope</b>	906.81	1,057.94	1,209.08	1,360.21	1,662.48	1,964.75	2,267.02	2,720.42
<b>Sandy Lane</b>	900.67	1,050.78	1,200.89	1,351.00	1,651.22	1,951.44	2,251.67	2,702.00
<b>Silsden</b>	906.07	1,057.08	1,208.09	1,359.10	1,661.12	1,963.14	2,265.17	2,718.20
<b>Steeton with Eastburn</b>	908.81	1,060.27	1,211.74	1,363.21	1,666.15	1,969.08	2,272.02	2,726.42
<b>Wilsden</b>	908.62	1,060.06	1,211.49	1,362.93	1,665.80	1,968.68	2,271.55	2,725.86
<b>Wrose</b>	893.81	1,042.77	1,191.74	1,340.71	1,638.65	1,936.58	2,234.52	2,681.42



- (f) That it be noted that for the year 2018/19 the Police Crime and Commissioner and West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority (WYFRA) have issued the following precepts.

<u>Precept Amount</u> £	<u>Council Tax Amount for Each Valuation Band</u>							
	<u>Band A</u> £	<u>Band B</u> £	<u>Band C</u> £	<u>Band D</u> £	<u>Band E</u> £	<u>Band F</u> £	<u>Band G</u> £	<u>Band H</u> £
<u>West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority</u>								
8,802,600	41.81	48.78	55.75	62.72	76.65	90.59	104.53	125.43
<u>Police and Crime Commissioner for West Yorkshire</u>								
22,869,608	108.63	126.74	144.84	162.95	199.16	235.37	271.58	325.90

- (g) That having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at (e) and (f) above, the Council set the following amounts of council tax for 2018/19 in each of the categories of dwellings shown below which includes the 3% social care precept:

	<u>Band A</u> £	<u>Band B</u> £	<u>Band C</u> £	<u>Band D</u> £	<u>Band E</u> £	<u>Band F</u> £	<u>Band G</u> £	<u>Band H</u> £
All parts of the Council's area other than those below	1,039.25	1,212.46	1,385.67	1,558.88	1,905.29	2,251.71	2,598.13	3,117.75
The parish and town council areas of:								
Addingham	1,077.56	1,257.16	1,436.75	1,616.35	1,975.53	2,334.72	2,693.91	3,232.69
Baildon	1,060.38	1,237.12	1,413.84	1,590.58	1,944.03	2,297.50	2,650.96	3,181.15
Bingley	1,050.12	1,225.15	1,400.16	1,575.19	1,925.22	2,275.27	2,625.31	3,150.37
Burley	1,082.58	1,263.02	1,443.44	1,623.88	1,984.73	2,345.60	2,706.46	3,247.75
Clayton	1,054.29	1,230.01	1,405.72	1,581.44	1,932.86	2,284.29	2,635.73	3,162.87
Cullingworth	1,055.67	1,231.63	1,407.57	1,583.52	1,935.40	2,287.30	2,639.19	3,167.03
Denholme	1,058.19	1,234.56	1,410.92	1,587.29	1,940.01	2,292.74	2,645.48	3,174.57
Harden	1,055.91	1,231.91	1,407.89	1,583.88	1,935.84	2,287.82	2,639.79	3,167.75
Haworth, Crossroads and Stanbury	1,057.00	1,233.17	1,409.34	1,585.51	1,937.84	2,290.17	2,642.51	3,171.01
Ilkley	1,066.17	1,243.88	1,421.57	1,599.27	1,954.65	2,310.05	2,665.44	3,198.53
Keighley	1,061.73	1,238.69	1,415.64	1,592.60	1,946.50	2,300.41	2,654.33	3,185.19
Menston	1,075.25	1,254.46	1,433.67	1,612.88	1,971.29	2,329.71	2,688.13	3,225.75
Oxenhope	1,057.25	1,233.46	1,409.67	1,585.88	1,938.29	2,290.71	2,643.13	3,171.75
Sandy Lane	1,051.11	1,226.30	1,401.48	1,576.67	1,927.03	2,277.40	2,627.78	3,153.33
Silsden	1,056.51	1,232.60	1,408.68	1,584.77	1,936.93	2,289.10	2,641.28	3,169.53
Steeton with Eastburn	1,059.25	1,235.79	1,412.33	1,588.88	1,941.96	2,295.04	2,648.13	3,177.75
Wilsden	1,059.06	1,235.58	1,412.08	1,588.60	1,941.61	2,294.64	2,647.66	3,177.19
Wrose	1,044.25	1,218.29	1,392.33	1,566.38	1,914.46	2,262.54	2,610.63	3,132.75

- (h) That Council notes the movement in Band D equivalent charges for 2018/19 over 2017/18 as set out in the table below.

	Council Tax 2018-19	Council Tax 2017-18	Percentage change 2018-19 on 2017-18
	Band D Equivalent	Band D Equivalent	
<b>Bradford Metropolitan District Council</b>	<b>1,333.21</b>	<b>1,257.86</b>	<b>5.99%</b>
<b>West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority</b>	<b>62.72</b>	<b>60.90</b>	<b>2.99%</b>
<b>West Yorkshire Police Authority</b>	<b>162.95</b>	<b>150.95</b>	<b>7.95%</b>
<b>Local (Parish Council) Precepts:</b>			
<b>Addingham</b>	<b>57.47</b>	<b>34.95</b>	<b>64.4%</b>
<b>Baildon</b>	<b>31.70</b>	<b>28.54</b>	<b>11.1%</b>
<b>Bingley</b>	<b>16.31</b>	<b>15.96</b>	<b>2.2%</b>
<b>Burley</b>	<b>65.00</b>	<b>48.02</b>	<b>35.4%</b>
<b>Clayton</b>	<b>22.56</b>	<b>16.98</b>	<b>32.9%</b>
<b>Cullingworth</b>	<b>24.64</b>	<b>17.10</b>	<b>44.1%</b>
<b>Denholme</b>	<b>28.41</b>	<b>23.98</b>	<b>18.5%</b>
<b>Harden</b>	<b>25.00</b>	<b>20.00</b>	<b>25.0%</b>
<b>Haworth etc</b>	<b>26.63</b>	<b>20.23</b>	<b>31.6%</b>
<b>Ilkley</b>	<b>40.39</b>	<b>37.43</b>	<b>7.9%</b>
<b>Keighley</b>	<b>33.72</b>	<b>33.72</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>Menston</b>	<b>54.00</b>	<b>51.30</b>	<b>5.3%</b>
<b>Oxenhope</b>	<b>27.00</b>	<b>23.26</b>	<b>16.1%</b>
<b>Sandy Lane</b>	<b>17.79</b>	<b>18.00</b>	<b>-1.2%</b>
<b>Silsden</b>	<b>25.89</b>	<b>14.37</b>	<b>80.2%</b>
<b>Steeton/ Eastburn</b>	<b>30.00</b>	<b>30.00</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>Wilsden</b>	<b>29.72</b>	<b>27.86</b>	<b>6.7%</b>
<b>Wrose</b>	<b>7.50</b>	<b>7.50</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

## 9.0 BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

- 9.1 Proposed Financial Plan updated 2018/19 – 2020/21 - Executive Report 5 December 2017 (Doc AJ)
- 9.2 2018/19 Budget Update– Executive Report 6 February 2018 (Doc AT)
- 9.3 Consultation Feedback and Equality Assessments for the 2018/19 and 2019/20 Council Budget Proposals – Executive Report 6 February 2018 (Doc AV) and the addendum to that report circulated to Executive on 6 February 2018
- 9.4 Interim Trade Union Feedback on the Council’s Budget Proposals for the 2018/19 and 2019/20 Council Budget - Executive Report 6 February 2018 (Doc AW) and the addendum to that report circulated to Executive on 6 February 2018
- 9.5 Section 151 Officer’s Report – Council 22 February 2018 – (Doc Q)

## **10.0 APPENDICES**

- 10.1 Appendix A - Council Cumulative Budget 2018/19 and outlook for 2020/21
- 10.2 Appendix B - Recurring pressures and investment proposals
- 10.3 Appendix C - Non - recurring investment proposals
- 10.4 Appendix D - New Proposals subject to consultation
- 10.5 Appendix E - Schedule of 2019/20 proposals subject to consultation (2018/19 for reference only)
- 10.6 Appendix F - Proposed schedule of amendments to previous budget decisions
- 10.7 Appendix G – Proposed Use of Reserves statement

## Appendix A

### COUNCIL CUMULATIVE BUDGET 2018/19, 2019/20 and outlook for 2020/21

	2018/19 Budget £'000	2019/20 Budget £'000	2020/21 Budget £'000
<b>NET EXPENDITURE</b>			
2017/18 Base Budget	375,197	375,197	375,197
Reversal of non recurring investment	(1,575)	(2,025)	(2,025)
Recurring pressures (Appendix B)	4,162	5,683	7,223
<b>Sub total</b>	<b>377,784</b>	<b>378,855</b>	<b>380,395</b>
<b>FUNDING CHANGES</b>	(20,165)	(5,498)	(334)
<b>INFLATION</b>	13,826	26,817	38,277
<b>Base Net Expenditure Requirement</b>	<b>371,445</b>	<b>400,174</b>	<b>418,338</b>
Demographic pressures in Adults	2,993	6,045	9,160
Children's demographic pressure	625	1,250	1,875
One off investment (Appendix C)	766	1,203	25
Ring fenced expenditure on Adult Social Care	1,436	(1,436)	(1,436)
Transitional funding	(235)	(235)	(235)
Termination costs	(4,342)	(4,342)	(4,342)
Transformation fund	0	(2,500)	(2,500)
Capital financing and central budget adjustments	(8,440)	(6,381)	(5,831)
Public Health reduction in expenditure due to grant cut	(1,116)	(2,203)	(2,203)
2017/18 Budget decisions (Appendix E)	(18,699)	(33,512)	(33,512)
Amended prior Budget decisions (Appendix F)	15,271	12,076	4,536
New Budget proposals for consultation 2018/19 and 2019/20 (Appendix D)	(1,594)	(5,810)	(8,371)
Indicative savings required per four year plan	0	(3,989)	(43,240)
<b>Net Expenditure Requirement</b>	<b>358,110</b>	<b>360,340</b>	<b>332,264</b>
<b>RESOURCES</b>			
Localised Business Rates	(126,693)	(65,159)	(65,589)
Council Tax Deficit 2017/18	400	0	0
Top Up Business Rate Grant	(46,500)	(68,100)	(69,462)
Revenue Support Grant	0	(34,054)	0
Use of Reserves (Appendix G)	1,796	(1,170)	(500)
Council Tax	(187,113)	(191,857)	(196,713)
<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>(358,110)</b>	<b>(360,340)</b>	<b>(332,264)</b>
<b>Budget shortfall</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Memorandum</b>			
Council Tax base	140,348	141,098	141,848
Council Tax Band D	£1,333	£1,360	£1,387

**Appendix B**  
**Recurring pressures and investment proposals**  
*(impact is shown on an incremental basis)*

Ref.	Description of proposal	2018-19 Impact £'000	2019-20 Impact £'000	2020-21 Impact £'000
	<b>Better Health Better Lives</b>			
CRP5.1	Continuing investment to prevent Child Sexual Exploitation	300	0	0
CRP5.2	Additional investment in Children's Social Work – earmarked funding for frontline services to mitigate growing caseloads, subject to detailed business case	450	0	0
	<b>Total Better Health Better Lives</b>	<b>750</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
	<b>Better Skills More Jobs &amp; a Growing Economy</b>			
RRP5.1	Funding for Growth Initiative	750	0	0
	<b>Total Better Skills More Jobs &amp; a Growing Economy</b>	<b>750</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
	<b>Safe Clean and Active Communities</b>			
ERP5.1	Increased costs associated with waste disposal	1,717	521	540
ERP5.2	Prudential borrowing budget for waste vehicles	288	0	0
	<b>Total Safe Clean and Active Communities</b>	<b>2,005</b>	<b>521</b>	<b>540</b>
	<b>Well Run Council</b>			
NRP5.1	Additional capital financing costs	0	1,000	1,000
FRP5.1	Council Tax Reduction Scheme – hardship fund	500	0	0
FRP5.2	Council Tax Reduction Scheme – administration costs	100	0	0
LRP5.1	Investment into school admission appeals service	57	0	0
	<b>Total Well Run Council</b>	<b>657</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>1,000</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,162</b>	<b>1,521</b>	<b>1,540</b>

## Appendix C

### Non-recurring investment proposals (impact is shown on an incremental basis)

Ref.	Description of Option	2018-19 Impact £'000	2019-20 impact £'000	2020-21 impact £'000
	<b>Great Start Good Schools</b>			
CNR5.1	Two year post to work on quality assurance	67	0	(67)
CNR5.2	Two-year investment in Children's Services – to support frontline services and aid transition to new model, subject to detailed business case and subject to decision on Early Help	500		(500)
	<b>Great Start Good Schools</b>	<b>567</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(567)</b>
	<b>Safe Clean and Active Communities</b>			
PNR5.1	One off foreign exchange loss on new waste disposal contract	133	(133)	0
	<b>Total Safe Clean and Active Communities</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>(133)</b>	<b>0</b>
	<b>Better Skills More Jobs</b>			
PNR5.2	Temporary funding for markets	0	636	(611)
	<b>Total Better Skills More Jobs</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>636</b>	<b>(611)</b>
	<b>A Well Run Council</b>			
LNR5.1	Temporary funding for mortuary services	66	(66)	0
	<b>Total - A Well Run Council, Using All Our Resources to Deliver Our Priorities</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>(66)</b>	<b>0</b>
	<b>Total Non-recurring investment – Appendix A</b>	<b>766</b>	<b>437</b>	<b>(1,178)</b>

**Appendix D(i)**  
**New Proposals subject to consultation**

Ref	Proposal for Change	2018/19 £'000 Impact	2019/20 £'000 Impact
-----	---------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

**Better Health Better Lives**

5PH1	A Home From Hospital Service – Bradford Respite and Integrated Care & Support Service (BRICCS) – review and redesign of the service.	0.0	170.1
5C1	Review Respite Provision after the introduction of personalised budgets	0.0	400.0

<b>Total Better Health Better Lives</b>		<b>0.0</b>	<b>570.1</b>
---	--	------------	--------------

**Better Skills, More Jobs and a Growing Economy**

5E1	Museums and Galleries – Review of service to include potential for income generation, service efficiency and integration and remodelling of operational delivery	0.0	260.0
5R1	Reducing de-trunked (previously Highway Agency controlled) road maintenance budget	224.8	0.0
5R2	Increased charges for activities on the highway – review of charging schedule.	25.0	0.0
5R3	Increasing percentage level of staff capital recharges to external projects/ customers	250.0	0.0

<b>Total Better Skills, More Jobs and a Growing Economy</b>		<b>499.8</b>	<b>260.0</b>
---	--	--------------	--------------

**Safe Clean Active**

5E2	Youth Service – All commissioned grants will be reviewed during 2018, with grants to VCS groups providing youth work ceasing from April 2019.	0.0	311.0
-----	---	-----	-------

<b>Total Safe Clean Active</b>		<b>0.0</b>	<b>311.0</b>
--------------------------------	--	------------	--------------

**Well Run Council**

5FM1	Residential catering – budget reduced in line with current requirement and cost, no change in service levels	80.0	0.0
5FM2	School Catering and Cleaning – increased sales, price review and administrative efficiencies.	200.0	0.0
5F1	Revenues and Benefits – Review and release of budget relating to external contractor system,	200.0	0.0
5F2	Revenues and Benefits – General efficiency savings – combination of cost and staffing reductions	100.0	0.0
5F3	Procurement Supplies and Services Budget – overall net savings subsequent to a review of the Procurement function as a whole	100.0	0.0
5H1	Workforce Development reprioritised to focus on use of more specialist ad-hoc external delivery. Review of Occupational	250.0	0.0

**Appendix D(i)  
New Proposals subject to consultation**

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Proposal for Change</b>	<b>2018/19 £'000 Impact</b>	<b>2019/20 £'000 Impact</b>
	safety.		
5L1	Register Office – Net additional contribution from increased fees.	15.0	0.0
5L2	Reduction of Member support budget following pension changes – specific budget contribution no longer required	149.2	0.0
5X1	Reduce total cost of top management - the scope is the senior management (Strategic and Assistant Directors) and their PA structure	0.0	75.0
<b>Total Well Run Council</b>		<b>1,094.2</b>	<b>75.0</b>
<b>New draft proposals open for consultation</b>		<b>1,594.0</b>	<b>1,216.1</b>

**Appendix D (ii)  
New proposal under separate consultation process until 12<sup>th</sup> February 2018 as per Executive Document AC 7<sup>th</sup> November 2017**

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Great Start Good Schools</b>	<b>2018/19 £'000 Impact</b>	<b>2019/20 £'000 Impact</b>	<b>2020/21 £'000 Impact</b>
4C2	Prevention and Early Help – detailed proposals form part of the Executive report Doc AC -7 <sup>th</sup> November 2017	0.0	3,000.0	2,561.0
<b>Total Great Start Good Schools</b>		<b>0.0</b>	<b>3,000.0</b>	<b>2,561.0</b>
<b>Total of new proposals subject to consultation – Appendix A</b>		<b>1,594.0</b>	<b>4,216.1</b>	<b>2,561.0</b>



## Appendix E

### Schedule of 2019/20 proposals subject to consultation (2018/19 for reference only)

REF	Proposal for Change	2018/19 £'000 NOT subject to consultation	2019/20 £'000 Impact
-----	---------------------	--	----------------------------

#### Better Health Better Lives

4PH1	<b>School Nursing and Health Visiting</b> - service based efficiencies – primarily management, back office and vacancy control <i>Please note this proposals affects both Better Health, Better Lives and Great Start, Good Schools but for clarity is shown here</i>	1,390.0	1,959.0
4PH2	<b>Substance Misuse Service</b> – combination of redesign, re-commissioning and ceasing recovery service, dual diagnosis service, supervised medication programme, inpatient detoxification services.	1,634.0	625.0
4PH3	<b>Sexual Health</b> - combination of redesign, review and ceasing services Health development with young people, sex and relationship education in schools, emergency hormonal contraception	25.0	0.0
4PH4	<b>Tobacco</b> – combination of redesign, review and ceasing services	59.2	2.0
4PH5	<b>Homestart, Worksafe, Injury Minimisation Programme</b> - phase out of these services providing support for vulnerable parents and children age 0-5 years.	93.0	0.0
4PH6	<b>Physical Activity, Food and Nutrition</b> - cessation of grants to Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) organisations delivering range of activities including 'cook and eat', physical activity, food growing and breastfeeding support.	250.0	0.0
4PH8	<b>Warm Homes Healthy People</b> – reduction in the short term winter activity based programme	40.0	20.0
4PH9	<b>CCG Rebasing</b> – to redesign services as part of an accountable care system, involving health, social care and other providers	499.0	0.0
4PH10	<b>Public Health</b> – reduction in staffing in line with redirecting investment profile towards reducing demand and maintaining health and wellbeing	350.0	310.0
4PH11	<b>Environmental Health</b> – management restructure	40.0	0.0
4E11	<b>Sport and Physical Activity</b> – investigate all methods of future operational service delivery	150.0	50.0
4A1	<b>Adults - Overall Demand Management Strategy</b> - moving from a dependency model to one that promotes independence and resilience (e.g. reducing numbers coming in to care, care system culture change, speeding up integration, redesign enablement, reviewing financial needs, continued personalisation).	8,000.0	8,000.0
3C7	<b>Looked After Children</b> - Reducing the cost of high cost placements	250.0	0.0
4C4	<b>Child Protection management restructure</b> – reduction in teams by four to ten with potential reduction in team	240.0	0.0

## Appendix E

### Schedule of 2019/20 proposals subject to consultation (2018/19 for reference only)

REF	Proposal for Change	2018/19 £'000 NOT subject to consultation	2019/20 £'000 Impact
	managers plus review other overall budgets		
4C5	<b>Children's Social Care management restructure</b> – review of management structure leading to proposed reduction of two service manager posts and one team manager	85.0	0.0
4C6	<b>Early Help</b> –review structures in early help for children and families commissioned from VCS, youth offending team, crime prevention, family centres, families first	120.0	660.0
4C7	<b>Looked After Team</b> – review of staffing and non staffing budgets	19.0	19.0
4C8	<b>Fostering and Adoption</b> – review team manager structure with potential reduction of one team manager post	50.0	0.0
4C9	<b>Disabled Children Team</b> – to build on review already underway with CAMHS, review overall staffing and non staffing budget	34.0	0.0
4C10	<b>Child Protection Review Team</b> – vacancy management, use of software to reduce administrative requirements	24.0	0.0
4C11	<b>Leaving Care</b> – to review staffing and non staffing budgets to achieve a saving of 2% in yr 1 and a further 1% in yr 2	34.0	0.0
4C13	<b>Drugs and Alcohol Team</b> – review of the work of the team and all other services that support young people with alcohol and drug issues	50.0	0.0
4C14	<b>Child Protection</b> - Reducing agency spend in Children's Social Care Services	36.0	0.0
4C15	<b>Child Protection</b> - Review of front door customer contact to Children's Social Care Services	46.0	0.0
	<b>Reduction to Public Health Grant Cut met from proposals above</b>	(1,116.0)	(1,087.0)
	<b>Total - Better Health Better Lives</b>	<b>12,402.2</b>	<b>10,558.0</b>

### A Great Start and Good Schools for All Our Children

4C1	<b>Education Services</b> – From 2017 part of the Dedicated Schools Grant will be passed directly to schools. There will therefore be a reduction in Council spending but no reduction in base budget. The proposal is included here as there could be staffing implications.	0.0	0.0
4C2	<b>Early Years</b> - From 2017 part of the Dedicated Schools Grant will be removed. Plans are being formulated to develop a coherent and targeted suite of early years' services including early help, family centres and early years' including Children's Centres. The proposal is included here as there could be staffing implications.	0.0	0.0

## Appendix E

### Schedule of 2019/20 proposals subject to consultation (2018/19 for reference only)

REF	Proposal for Change	2018/19 £'000 NOT subject to consultation	2019/20 £'000 Impact
	<b>Total – A Great Start and Good Schools for All Our Children</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

#### Better Skills More Jobs and a Growing Economy

4E7	<b>Remodel of Visitor Information &amp; frontline service</b> - reduce the number and/or size of Visitor Information Centres (VICs), moving to a more digital basis promoting the district to target audiences, with the potential for VIC information points as co-located provision.	50.0	50.0
4E8	<b>Events and Festivals</b> – review to develop a more sustainable and balanced events programme	150.0	150.0
4E9	<b>Libraries</b> – reduction in the number of libraries directly provided by CBMDC. Further investigation of potential for alternative delivery models	100.0	950.0
4E10	<b>Theatres and Community Halls</b> – Halls to be transferred through Community Asset Transfer. Theatres to generate greater income	130.0	130.0
4E12	<b>Ministry of Food</b> –cessation of the service teaching people how to cook, eat and improve their long term health	96.0	0.0
4C3	<b>Children's Services</b> – staffing, restructure, reduction in the Connexions contract with longer term service brought back in to Council, investigate regional data centre, cessation of Employment Opportunities Fund (EOF).	150.0	50.0
4R1	<b>Industrial Services Group (ISG)</b> – reduce the staffing structure to suit the present workloads	43.3	0.0
4R2	<b>West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA) Transport Levy</b> – proposed reduction in the levy	1,234.1	750.0
4R3	<b>Commercialise Highway Delivery Unit (HDU)</b> – to increase the range of services provided by the HDU through increasing involvement in existing capital works programmes and delivery of services which are externally funded	223.0	0.0
4R4	<b>Centralisation of Urban Traffic Control</b> including reduced maintenance of street lighting asset	246.0	0.0
4R5	<b>Planning, Transportation and Highways</b> – increase in discretionary charges	44.1	0.0
4R6	<b>Planning, Transportation and Highways</b> - options related to discretionary budgets for highway maintenance works including minor drainage improvements, pavement repairs and footpath and snicket maintenance	(6.4)	0.0
4R7	<b>Planning, Transportation and Highways</b> - reduction in Highways Services operational budgets associated with operational transport gateway and subway maintenance	2.5	0.0
4R8	<b>Planning, Transportation and Highways</b> - Robust administration of the Yorkshire Common Permit Scheme on the Highways	70.0	0.0

## Appendix E

### Schedule of 2019/20 proposals subject to consultation (2018/19 for reference only)

REF	Proposal for Change	2018/19 £'000 NOT subject to consultation	2019/20 £'000 Impact
4R9	<b>Planning, Transportation and Highways</b> - reduce area committee support and stop processing/charge for all requests for service delivery for non casualty led projects	124.0	0.0
4R10	<b>Education Capital Team</b> – combination of vacancy control, reduction in facilities management and other charges	50.0	0.0
4R11	<b>Planning, Transportation and Highways</b> - introduction of limited lighting hours / switch off of street lighting on non-principal road network	60.0	60.0
4R12	<b>School Catering and Cleaning</b> – increased sales and price reviews	35.0	0.0
4R13	<b>Economic Development Service</b> – reduction in City Park sinking fund (fund set aside to fund future expense), matched funding for European Strategic Investment Fund programmes. Remove support for “B-funded” community funding information website	0.0	26.0
4R20	<b>Regeneration</b> – no longer accept new schools onto the Active School Travel programme with existing provision being phased out over the following years of this budget process	28.0	28.0
4R21	<b>Regeneration</b> – reduction in the funding for the Road Safety Team	62.5	62.5
	<b>Total - Better Skills More Jobs and a Growing Economy</b>	<b>2,892.1</b>	<b>2,256.5</b>

#### Decent Homes That People Can Afford to Live In

4R19	<b>Housing Operations</b> – increase income generation from agency fees	44.0	0.0
	<b>Total – Decent homes that people can afford to live in</b>	<b>44.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

#### Safe Clean and Active Communities

4E1	<b>Parks and Bereavement</b> management rationalisation; withdrawal from direct management of sport pitches and bowling greens; raise prices of bereavement services.	160.0	60.0
4E2	<b>Waste Collection and Disposal Services</b> – Full year effect of introduction of alternate weekly collection and	807.0	(84.0)

## Appendix E

### Schedule of 2019/20 proposals subject to consultation (2018/19 for reference only)

REF	Proposal for Change	2018/19 £'000 NOT subject to consultation	2019/20 £'000 Impact
	associated round reduction, improved recycling, reduction in residual waste and improved efficiencies.		
4E3	<b>Trade Waste</b> – process and service improvements including back office, round efficiencies and business development opportunities.	0.0	43.0
4E4	<b>Customer Services</b> – redirect face to face contact towards self service and telephone services will see a continuing decline in contact resulting in staffing efficiencies. Automated services will increase with fewer options for people to speak to a customer services advisor. More people will be expected to 'self serve' using on line services	50.0	50.0
4E5	<b>Street Cleansing and Public Conveniences</b> – reduction to street cleansing resources for 2019/20	336.3	1,004.5
4E6	<b>Pest Control</b> – cessation of the pest control service	36.2	0.0
4E13	<b>Car Parking</b> - Remove Christmas parking concessions, amend tariffs in Little Germany and other car park changes.	108.0	0.0
	<b>Total - Safe Clean Active Communities</b>	<b>1,497.5</b>	<b>1,073.5</b>

Page 39

### A Well Run Council, Using All Our Resources to Deliver Our Priorities

4F1	<b>Financial Services</b> – reduction in function reflecting reduced emphasis on retrospective reporting, more self service by budget managers and targeting staffing resources at highest risk, and most complex issues.	130.0	0.0
4F2	<b>Insurance</b> – reduce the total cost of insurance, including premiums paid to the Council's insurer, the cost of maintaining an internal insurance fund for self-insured risks and the cost of meeting claims	300.0	300.0
4F3	<b>Revenues and Benefits</b> – reduce significantly the amount of cash used by and within the organisation and reduce the cost of cash management functions through the increased digitalisation of customer payment options. Also consider if transactional functions across the Department will be more efficient and sustainable by bringing them together	160.0	0.0
4F4	<b>West Yorkshire Joint Committees</b> – cap contribution to Joint Committees at £1.1m which will require concerted action with other Councils	35.0	35.0
4H1	<b>Human Resources</b> – reduce HR transactional support, to reduce volume of service specific training	204.0	0.0
4H2	<b>Terms and Conditions</b> – removal of non contractual overtime payments and removal of essential car	400.0	300.0

## Appendix E

### Schedule of 2019/20 proposals subject to consultation (2018/19 for reference only)

REF	Proposal for Change	2018/19 £'000 NOT subject to consultation	2019/20 £'000 Impact
	allowance lump sum payments		
4L1	<b>Legal and Democratic Services</b> – to reflect the reduced size and scope of the Council, reductions to Civic, Legal and Committee Services, including Overview and Scrutiny are proposed	55.0	90.0
4X1	<b>Office of the Chief Executive</b> – restructure of the Office of the Chief Executive to improve coherence and integration of core corporate functions	479.0	0.0
4R15	<b>Facilities Management</b> – operational cost reductions reflecting the continued contraction of the organisation	100.0	200.0
	<b>Total - A Well Run Council, Using All Our Resources to Deliver Our Priorities</b>	<b>1,863.0</b>	<b>925.0</b>
	<b>Total – Schedule of Decisions for 2018/19 of Budget Council 2017 for information and 2019/20 proposals subject to consultation – Appendix A</b>	<b>18,698.8</b>	<b>14,813.0</b>

**Appendix F (i) – SCHEDULE OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO PREVIOUS BUDGET DECISIONS SUBJECT TO CONSULTATION (incremental basis)**

Ref	Description	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000
<b>Well Run Council</b>			
4S1	<b>Information Technology Services</b> – reduction in costs associated with device support, licences and infrastructure. Switching technology solutions where better value can be achieved and rationalising the number of existing IT applications to simplify the technology in use	700.0	690.0
4R14	<b>Asset Management</b> – make the best use of the Council's and public sector partners' estate working with the Voluntary and Community Sector Also seek to invest in non-operational property to generate surplus income	360.0	200.0
4R16	<b>Facilities Management</b> – reduction in the maintenance budget as the size of the operational estate shrinks	100.0	780.0
4R17	<b>Facilities Management</b> – reduction in the size of the estate together with energy efficiency measures	147.5	0.0
<b>Total Well Run Council</b>		<b>1,307.5</b>	<b>1,670.0</b>
Net amendments to previous budget decisions <b>subject</b> to consultation		<b>1,307.5</b>	<b>1,670.0</b>

**Appendix F (ii) - SCHEDULE OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO PREVIOUS BUDGET DECISIONS NOT SUBJECT TO CONSULTATION (incremental basis)**

Ref	Description	Prior Year Savings £'000	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	2020-21 £'000
<b>Better Health Better Lives</b>					
3A2	Changes to Home Care Services	(1,500.0)	0.0	0.0	0.0
3A6	Changes to Learning Disability day care and procurement	(1,000.0)	0.0	1,000.0	0.0
3A10	Changes to contracts for Learning Disability residential and nursing	(1,000.0)	0.0	1,000.0	0.0
4A1	Adults Demand management	(8,000.0)	0.0	0.0	8,000.0
3C7	Reducing the cost of high cost placements – Children's Social Care	(1,039.0)	(250.0)	0.0	0.0
3C8	Reducing the number of looked after children by 75	(815.0)	0.0	0.0	0.0
4C4	Child Protection Management restructure	(60.0)	(240.0)	0.0	0.0
4C9	Disabled Children – reduce staffing on Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) and reduce budget by 1%	0.0	(34.0)	0.0	0.0
4C10	Review Team – review budget and reduce by 2% in 2018/19	0.0	(24.0)	0.0	0.0
4C14	Reducing agency spend	(1,025.0)	(36.0)	0.0	0.0
4C15	Review of front door customer contact	0.0	(46.0)	0.0	0.0
<b>Total Better Health Better Lives</b>		<b>(14,439.0)</b>	<b>(630.0)</b>	<b>2,000.0</b>	<b>8,000.0</b>

<b>Better Skills, More Jobs and a Growing Economy</b>					
4R2	WYCA levy	0.0	(968.1)	(250.0)	(250.0)
4R4	UTC Centralisation	0.0	(246.0)	0	0.0
<b>Total Better Skills, More Jobs and a Growing Economy</b>		<b>0.0</b>	<b>(1,214.1)</b>	<b>(250.0)</b>	<b>(250.0)</b>
<b>Well Run Council</b>					
4H2	Revised terms and conditions	0.0	(280.0)	(210.0)	(210.0)
4L1	<b>Legal and Democratic Services</b> – to reflect the reduced size and scope of the Council, reductions to Civic, Legal and Committee Services, including Overview and Scrutiny are proposed	0.0	(15.0)	(15.0)	0.0
<b>Total Well Run Council</b>		<b>0.0</b>	<b>(295.0)</b>	<b>(225.0)</b>	<b>(210.0)</b>
		<b>Prior Year Savings £'000</b>	<b>2018-19 £'000</b>	<b>2019-20 £'000</b>	<b>2020-21 £'000</b>
Net amendments to previous budget decisions <b>not</b> subject to consultation		<b>(14,439.0)</b>	<b>(2,139.1)</b>	<b>1,525.0</b>	<b>7,540.0</b>
<b>Total Net effect of Appendix F(i) and Appendix F(ii) – see Appendix A</b>		<b>(14,439.0)</b>	<b>(831.6)</b>	<b>3,195.0</b>	<b>7,540.0</b>



**Appendix G  
Proposed Use of Reserves**

	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>
<b>Reference</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>
<b>Trade Waste VAT Reserve</b>			
Financial Services- Partially finance service from VAT reclaims. £120k p.a.	(120)	(103)	0
<b>Transition and Risk Reserve</b>			
Three year funding for growth strategy	(500)	(500)	(500)
Funding for two year post for Children's quality assurance	(67)	(67)	0
Two year investment into Children's Services	(500)	(500)	0
Replenishment of reserve from gain on business rates	2,983	0	0
<b>Total movement on reserves- see Appendix A</b>	<b>1,796</b>	<b>(1,170)</b>	<b>(500)</b>

This page is intentionally left blank

**Report of the Assistant Director, Finance and Procurement to the meeting of the Executive to be held on 20 February 2018 and Council to be held on 22 February 2018.**

---

Document BA

**Subject:**

**Allocation of the Schools Budget 2018/19 Financial Year**

**Summary statement:**

The report seeks Executive approval of the recommendations of the Schools Forum in allocating the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for 2018/19 and subsequent recommendation to Full Council.

---

Andrew Crookham  
Assistant Director, Finance and  
Procurement  
Report Contact: Andrew Redding  
Phone: (01274) 432678  
E-mail: [andrew.redding@bradford.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.redding@bradford.gov.uk)

**Portfolio: Leader of Council**

**Overview & Scrutiny Area: Corporate**

## **1. SUMMARY**

- 1.1 This report informs the Executive of the recommendations of the Schools Forum in allocating the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for the 2018/19 financial year.
- 1.2 The Schools Budget is part of the overall budget proposal for the Council, which includes:
- the recommended Capital Investment Plan (Document BB)
  - the Revenue Estimates (Document AZ)
- 1.3 This report is submitted to enable the Executive to make recommendations to Council on the setting of the budget and the Council Tax for 2018/19, as required by Article 4 of the Council's Constitution.

## **2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 Under national Regulations, every local authority is required to operate a Schools Forum. The primary function of a Schools Forum is consultative; to recommend to the Council's Executive how the funding, which the Government provides for schools and individual pupils (known as the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG)), is managed. The Schools Forum has some specific decision making powers.
- 2.2 Following the Government's National Funding Formula reforms, implemented from April 2018 (the final details of which were published on 14 September 2017), the DSG is constructed in four blocks with each block having a 'national formula' basis: the Schools Block, based on October 2017 pupil census data; the Early Years Block, based on January 2018 and 2019 census data; the High Needs Block, based partly on population, deprivation and other needs-led data and partly on historic spending levels; the newly created Central Schools Block, based on pupil numbers and deprivation data. All four Blocks in 2018/19 include some ceiling and floor arrangements as the Government moves to the new National Funding Formula over time. Our Schools Block and Early Years Block allocations are protected by these transitional arrangements. Our High Needs Block and Central Schools Block allocations are capped by these transitional arrangements and our funding in 2018/19 would be higher if the transition was not in place.
- 2.3 Within the 2018/19 DSG settlement, after transitional adjustments, Bradford has received an additional:
- £8.54m within the Schools Block (+ 2.1%). £3.99m of this from the continued growth of numbers in our primary and secondary schools and academies (+43 primary; +815 secondary). £4.55m is received as a result of the Government's implementation of National Funding Formula alongside the commitment to allocate a minimum 0.5% increase in primary and secondary per pupil funding in 2018/19. The Government has committed to a further minimum 0.5% per pupil funding increase in 2019/20. This is a shift from the initial position outlined by the Government in its December 2016 consultation, which was for a protection for losers as a result of National Funding Formula of negative 3% per pupil.
  - £1.95m within the High Needs Block (+ 3.1%). This is the first year of allocation

of the growth resulting from the National Funding Formula. The Government's modelling shows that Bradford should receive an additional £15m (on 2017/18 base). This growth is capped by transitional arrangements to £7.5m, which is expected to be allocated over the next 4 years. There is currently no indication of the timescale for the allocation of the outstanding growth value.

- Estimated £2.65m within the Early Years Block for the full year delivery of the extended early years entitlement for eligible 3 and 4 year olds, which began at September 2017. This increase however, is netted against an estimated £1.38m reduction, which completes the £3m total reduction in our funding for 3 and 4 year olds as a result of the national reforms implemented at April 2017. The Early Years Block continues to include the specific allocation to protect maintained nursery schools. The Government has committed to this funding until the end of 2019/20 and has stated that there will be further consultation on the future funding of nursery schools.
  - £0.08m within the Central Schools Block (+ 2.9%). This is the first year of allocation of the growth in our Central Schools Block as a result of the Government's National Funding Formula. We anticipate similar sized cash growth annually over the next 5 years.
- 2.4 The Government has stated its intention to implement the 'hard' National Funding Formula for primary and secondary schools and academies at April 2020. This means that for 2018/19 and 2019/20 the Local Authority with the Schools Forum continues to have responsibility for setting formula funding arrangements locally within tight regulations. After April 2020, local responsibility will be retained for the High Needs Block, Early Years Block and Central Schools Block, but the main Schools Block primary and secondary funding formula will be calculated nationally and only 'passported' by the Authority to schools.
- 2.5 Given this direction of travel, a key decision for all local authorities is whether to adopt the Government's National Funding Formula for the allocation of funding to individual primary and secondary schools for 2018/19. The Government has also enabled local authorities to decide locally the value of the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) for primary and secondary schools, which can be set between minus 1.5% and positive 0.5% per pupil. This is a key decision, as 75% of Bradford's schools and academies will be funded at the MFG level in 2018/19. The MFG is the mechanism, which either limits the value of loss of funding per pupil or sets a minimum value of increase per pupil for every school compared against their allocation in the previous year. The MFG has been previously set nationally by Government at minus 1.5%.
- 2.6 The Authority, with the Schools Forum, completed consultations over the autumn 2017 on 2018/19 formula funding arrangements. The Authority has informally discussed with schools now for some time the possible implications of, and options around, National Funding Formula.
- 2.7 The Schools Forum has recommended on 10 January 2018 that we fully adopt the National Funding Formula for the calculation of primary and secondary formula allocations for 2018/19 and that the Schools Block MFG be set at positive 0.4%. 0.4% is the level at which arrangements are affordable within our DSG envelope. The recommended move to National Funding Formula enables the growth in

Schools Block monies that has come into the District from this to flow to individual schools and confirms the plan the Authority set out in outline in early 2017.

- 2.8 The recommendation to set the MFG at 0.4% is made in the context of the forecasted further growth in costs over 2018-2021. National Funding Formula, as it currently stands, does not address the very significant cut in the real terms value of school funding. This is a national issue. The National Audit Office has calculated, in its report published in December 2016, that on a national average basis the reduction in the real terms value of existing levels of education funding is 8.7% across 2016-2020. 8.7% is roughly a reduction of £45m in Bradford's DSG in real terms. The NAO's figure includes assumptions about inflationary pressures on non-staffing spending, the apprenticeship levy, annual pay awards and salaries increases, teacher pension scheme costs and increases in national insurance contributions. It is anticipated that annual pay awards will generally increase above 1% over the 2018-2021 period and the employer's contribution to teacher pensions will increase by at least 1.5% in 2019/20. As such, the cumulative pressure is now likely to exceed 8.7%. In addition to these factors, locally, education budgets are being required to absorb increased employer contributions to non-teaching staffing pension costs.
- 2.9 The total estimated amount of DSG available for distribution in 2018/19 is £535.908m, which includes a forecasted value of under spend (one off carry forward) within the DSG up to 31 March 2018 of £7.929m. The final 2018/19 DSG High Needs Block allocation will be confirmed in March 2018. The value of one off DSG carry forward will be confirmed by July 2018. The final value of the 2018/19 Early Years Block allocation will be confirmed in July 2019 (following the collection of the January 2019 Census data). The recommended distribution of the estimated DSG is summarised in the table below:-

Description	Early Years Block £m	Schools Block £m	High Needs Block £m	Central Schools Block £m	Total DSG £m
Estimated DSG available 2018/19	£43.997	£415.336	£65.793	£2.853	£527.979
Estimated DSG B'fwd from 2017/18	£1.523	£4.775	£1.631	£0.000	£7.929
<b>Total Estimated DSG (Schools Budget) 2018/19</b>	<b>£45.520</b>	<b>£420.111</b>	<b>£67.424</b>	<b>£2.853</b>	<b>£535.908</b>
Delegated to Schools / Providers	£42.970	£411.422	£52.317	£0.000	£506.709
Non-Delegated Items	£1.027	£3.913	£13.825	£2.853	£21.618
Allocation of One Off	£0.606	£0.550	£1.631	£0.000	£2.787
<b>Total Funding Allocated</b>	<b>£44.603</b>	<b>£415.885</b>	<b>£67.773</b>	<b>£2.853</b>	<b>£531.114</b>
<b>Difference (reserve)</b>	<b>+ £0.917</b>	<b>+ £4.226</b>	<b>- £0.349</b>	<b>£0.000</b>	<b>+ £4.794</b>



Bradford children in out of authority and in non-maintained provisions.

High Needs Block allocations are now calculated via National Funding Formula under transitional arrangements. Bradford receives £4,000 for pupils in special schools and academies (including independent special schools), plus 50% of the value of our 2017/18 High Needs Block spending plus a capped allocation under the new National Funding Formula, which is based on population, deprivation and other needs-led data. An adjustment is made to recognise cross border movement of children between authority areas. The Authority also receives within the High Needs Block a specific allocation for Education in Hospital provision, estimated at £1.6m in 2018/19.

Please note that the funding for high needs places in Bradford-located academies and Post 16 settings is 'top sliced' from this Block so that these settings can be funded directly by the Education Skills Funding Agency.

**(£'000)**

**3.3 The Early Years Block £43,997**

This Block funds delegated budgets, support services and other funds held centrally, relating to the provision of the free entitlement to nursery education for eligible 2, 3 and 4 year olds in nursery schools, primary schools and academies with nursery classes and private, voluntary and independent settings. The total value of this Block is currently estimated and will be finalised on the number of eligible children recorded in the January 2018 and January 2019 Censuses x £4,361 per FTE (£4.59 per hour) for pupil aged 3 & 4 and £4,940 per FTE (£5.20 per hour) for pupils aged 2.

Estimated figures of £0.491m and £0.193m are included in this Block for the Early Years Pupil Premium and the Disability Access Fund. In addition, an estimated £1.110m is included for the DfE's Maintained Nursery School Supplement.

**3.4 The Central Schools Block £2,853**

The Central Schools Block is newly established at April 2018. A number of items previously funded via 'top-slice' within the Schools Block are transferred to this Block, including Admissions and Local Authority statutory duties in respect of all state funded schools previously funded through the Education Services Grant.

The 2018/19 financial year allocation is calculated on a National Funding Formula basis. Bradford receives £27.82 per pupil x October 2017 Census numbers in primary and secondary schools and academies, plus a lump sum of £0.44m to match to the value of the 'historic commitments' spend within our 2017/18 DSG. This £0.44m lump sum is not expected to be received after 2018/19.

**3.5 Estimated DSG Brought Forward from 2017/18 £7,929**

Final DSG allocations are not confirmed by the DfE until later in the financial year and the School Forum's recommendations are based on estimates of expenditure



especially within the High Needs and Early Years Blocks. These estimates are reconciled at the end of each financial year and differences are added to the DSG in the next year for the Schools Forum to allocate on a one off basis. Decisions taken in previous years have already committed a proportion of the sum estimated to be carried forward at April 2018.

The table in paragraph 1.9 separates the DSG carry forward into the four blocks. This follows the local informal approach to the management of DSG reserves agreed with the Schools Forum; that end of year balances will be earmarked by Block. The Schools Forum specifically established in 2017/18 the principle of ring-fencing of the Early Years Block. For formal (external) purposes however, a single DSG carry forward figure is recorded. DSG reserves are not ring-fenced by the Regulations and can be used cross-block.

#### **4. ALLOCATION TO DELEGATED BUDGETS (€000)**

**Total Allocated to School / Provider Delegated Budgets £506,709**

**Broken down as follows:**

##### **4.1 Early Years Providers via Single Funding Formula £42,970**

This is funding delegated to maintained nursery schools, nursery classes in primary schools and academies and Private, Voluntary and Independent (PVI) providers, to support the delivery of the free entitlements to nursery education:

- Nursery Schools 3 / 4 year old universal and extended entitlement, incorporating the Maintained Nursery School Supplement £3.321m
- Nursery Classes in Primary Provisions 3 / 4 year old universal and extended entitlement £14.934m
- PVI Providers 3 / 4 year old universal and extended entitlement £14.762m
- The free entitlement for the 40% most deprived 2 year olds £9.269m
- Early Years Pupil Premium £0.491m
- Disability Access Fund £0.193m

The Schools Forum recommends that the amendments that were set out in the Authority's consultation document, published in October 2017, are taken forward to be incorporated into our Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF) used to calculate budget shares for settings delivering provision for 2 and 3 / 4 year olds in 2018/19, with the exception of the proposal for a new monthly starters and leavers framework, which is not being taken forward. The Schools Forum proposes to retain the current termly headcount basis for the EYSFF.

These amendments continue to respond to the Government's national early years funding reform, which has placed restrictions on how early years funding can be allocated e.g. in setting a maximum spend on additional supplements, including deprivation and which requires the adoption of a single universal setting base rate for all providers for the 3 / 4 year old entitlements by April 2019. A simple summary of Bradford's EYSFF that is recommended for 2018/19 is attached at Appendix 3.

(£000)

#### 4.2 **Primary and Secondary Schools and Academies** **£411,422**

Primary £231.240m  
Secondary £180.182m

The Forum has recommended to:

- Use the formulae outlined in Appendix 1 to calculate budget shares. The formulae have been agreed, following consultation with schools in the autumn. We submitted the final version of the required Pro-forma on 15 January and this is subject to final validation by the ESFA.
- ‘Move to National Funding Formula’ (NFF) at April 2018, thereby using the NFF announced on 14 September 2017 to calculate individual formula funding budget shares for both the primary and secondary phases. This is as set out in the autumn 2017 consultation and defined in detail in the Pro-forma.
- Set the value of Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) at + 0.4%.
- Set the value of the Ceiling at + 3.0% per pupil (+ 3.0% cap, 100% scaling).
- Fully implement the £3,500 (primary), £4,800 (secondary) and £4,042 (all-through) new minimums for eligible schools, discounting Building Schools for the Future and Business Rates from the calculation of these minimums.
- Continue our current formulae for the allocation of both split sites and pupil mobility.
- Continue the value of the DSG contribution to the Building Schools for the Future affordability gap at £6.670m in 2018/19.
- Meet the cost (estimated) of expanding places in primary and secondary schools and academies through the DSG Growth Fund; a total planned budget of £1.790m, excluding items funded by one off monies.

Please note that there is no transfer of Schools Block monies to the High Needs Block within the 2018/19 DSG recommendations. Members will recall that a sum of £5.7m in total was transferred from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block in 2017/18.

#### 4.3 **Special Schools and Special Academies** **£25,040**

The national definition of a “High Needs” pupil is one whose education, incorporating all additional support, costs more than £10,000 per annum. The Government has introduced a national framework of “Place Plus” to allocate funding to schools and other settings. The “Place” element has been set nationally at £10,000 for both SEN and Alternative Provision settings. The “Plus” element is the top up above the “Place” funding and is based on an assessment of the additional need of an individual pupil. Local authorities are permitted to establish bands or ranges for this element of funding. The allocation of the High Needs Block for 2018/19 is recommended on the basis on Bradford’s existing Place-Plus model with two significant structural amendments, which were set out in the autumn 2017 consultation document:

- The cessation, from 1 September 2018, of the High Needs Block’s direct funding of Top Up (the Plus element) for the placement of pupils in

alternative provision settings without EHCPs that remain on the roll of mainstream schools. Following this change, the commissioner of the placement (the mainstream school) will hold the responsibility for funding the top up element from their delegated budget.

- The full establishment of Bradford's Place-Plus model for the funding of early years resourced provision, replacing previous temporary methodologies that have been in place for the funding of Children's Centre Plus provisions.

Bradford's Ranges Model, and the values of 'Plus' funding attached to each range, are outlined in Appendix 2. The funding values are reduced by 1.50% on those allocated in 2017/18.

The 2018/19 planned spending of £25.040m incorporates the allocation of an additional 162 FTE places to special schools in the 2018/19 academic year vs. the 2017/18 academic year.

**(£'000)**

#### **4.4 Pupil Referral Units (PRUs)**

**£7,155**

The PRUs are funded via the Place-Plus framework explained above and via the Plus funding rates shown in Appendix 2. The Schools Forum has recommended the cessation, from 1 September 2018, of the High Needs Block's direct funding of Top Up (the Plus element) for the placement of pupils in alternative provision settings without EHCPs that remain on the roll of mainstream schools. The settings specifically within the scope of this amendment are the primary behaviour centres and Bradford Central PRU. Following this change, the commissioner of the placement (the mainstream school) will hold the responsibility for funding the top up element from their delegated budget. The Schools Forum has also given its support to the Authority's work towards the cessation of the High Needs Block's direct funding of Top Up (the Plus element) for the placement of pupils in District PRU, beginning from September 2018. This proposal is captured within the Authority's continuing wider SEMH review.

The 2018/19 planned spending of £7.155m incorporates the allocation of an additional 42 FTE places to PRUs in the 2018/19 academic year vs. the 2017/18 academic year.

#### **4.5 Behaviour Centres (Primary)**

**£810**

The Primary Behaviour Centres are funded via the Place-Plus framework explained above and via the Plus funding rates shown in Appendix 2. The adjustment described in paragraph 4.4 above relating to the funding of placements of pupils without EHCPs also applies to this sector. The number of funded places in 2018/19 is the same as 2017/18.

(£'000)

**4.6 Resourced Provisions (Primary & Secondary) £6,489**

All resourced provisions attached to mainstream primary and secondary schools and academies; Designated Specialist Provisions (DSPs) and Additional Resourced Centres (ARCs), in 2018/19 are funded via the Place-Plus framework explained above and via the Plus funding rates shown in Appendix 2. Please note that ARC provision is centrally managed. Please also note that there is a technical revision to the funding of resourced provisions, directed by the DfE, the result of which is that the value of the place element for places occupied at October 2017 is £6,000 rather than £10,000, with the host school now receiving instead full formula funding for the resourced provision pupils.

The 2018/19 planned spending of £6.489m incorporates the allocation of an additional 126 FTE places to primary and secondary resourced provisions in the 2018/19 academic year vs. the 2017/18 academic year.

**4.7 Pupils with EHCPs in Mainstream Schools and Academies £6,461**

Funding is delegated to mainstream schools and academies for pupils with Education Health and Care Plans based on the Ranges Model. The planned cost of £6.461m incorporates the SEN Funding Floor (the factor that ensures a minimum level of funding for SEND provision in schools and academies), which is affected by the National Funding Formula. The Schools Forum has recommended that SEN Floor allocations for mainstream primary and secondary schools and academies are protected at their 2017/18 financial year values i.e. schools and academies currently in receipt of the SEN Funding Floor will not receive less via this factor in 2018/19 than they did in 2017/18.

The Schools Forum has also recommended that the 'notional SEN' values for primary and secondary schools and academies are calculated on the basis set out in the autumn 2017 consultation (allowing the impact of National Funding Formula to flow into this). The Forum has asked the Authority to benchmark our approach against that in other authorities, using the 2018/19 pro-forma information, to determine how our notional SEN calculation should develop under National Funding Formula from April 2019.

**4.8 Post 16 Further Education Providers £4,435**

The transfer to the DSG of the full cost of Post 16 High Needs provision was completed at April 2017. Places are funded at £6,000 from the High Needs Block. For the 'Plus' element, Further Education providers are funded for the vast majority of students at 60% of the Ranges Model value (shown in Appendix 2) for the primary need of the student. The exceptions are students with the primary need of sensory impairment (Hearing / Visual), where funding is calculated on an actual cost basis.

The 2018/19 planned spending of £4.435m incorporates the allocation of an additional 125 FTE places to Further Education providers in the 2018/19 academic

year vs. the 2017/18 academic year.

(£'000)

**4.9 Early Years Resourced Provision £998**

Early years resourced provision, newly established, is to be funded via the full Place-Plus framework explained above. The 2018/19 planned spending of £0.998m is based on an allocation of 78 FTE places. Please note that the children placed in early years resourced provisions continue to receive their allocations under the Early Years Single Funding Formula (see paragraph 4.1). The High Needs Block allocates £6,000 per FTE place plus the respective top up value via the Ranges Model.

**4.10 Education in Hospital and Tracks Provision £929**

Education in Hospital and Tracks provision is funded on the agreed planned number of places, with the Finance Regulations requiring that the funding per place in 2018/19 is not lower than the value in 2017/18. The number of funded places in 2018/19 is the same as 2017/18.

**5. AMOUNT ALLOCATED TO NON-DELEGATED BUDGETS (£000)**

**Total Allocated to non-delegated Budgets £21,618**

**Broken down as follows:**

The School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations have, over time and in preparation for National Funding Formula, altered the treatment of non-delegated items and contingencies. The Regulations now require a greater proportion of the DSG to be delegated to schools and early years providers and also require that the Schools Forum makes recommendations for permitted centrally managed items individually and some on a phase specific basis. The DfE published its Policy Document entitled "The national funding formula for schools and high needs" and the 2018 Regulations came into effect on 5 February 2018, which formally establishes the new Central Schools Block.

**5.1 Schools Block non-delegated budgets £3,913**

A total of £3.913m is recommended to be held within the Schools Block for the following purposes:

- £2.203m for items de-delegated from maintained primary and secondary schools. The Schools Forum recommends the continuation of de-delegation for the same purposes as 2017/18 with the exception of behaviour support services for the primary phase, which is recommended to cease at 31 August 2018. This is recommended with the understanding that these services are proposed to form part of the Authority's wider SEND support services traded

offer from September 2018. The Schools Forum has also asked to consider a benefit vs. cost analysis of the current level of funding of Trade Union Facilities Time, which may affect the value of de-delegation for this purpose going forward.

- £1.014m provision for new growth (pupil numbers expansion in primary and secondary schools and academies) at September 2018. £0.700m of this is for growth in the secondary phase.
- £0.696m Business Rates provision.

**(£000)**

## **5.2 High Needs Block non delegated budgets £13,825**

A total of £13.825m (before the allocation of one off monies) is recommended to be held within the High Needs Block. There are sum smaller budgets within this total e.g. for speech and language therapy of copyright licences. However, this total is primarily made up of spending in 4 areas:

- £7.420m for the cost of placements in out of authority maintained and independent schools. This is £0.84m greater than the planned budget in 2017/18.
- £4.516m for centrally managed SEND support services, the development of which from September 2018 is currently under consultation.
- £1.000m for the provision of home tuition for children not able to access school on medical grounds.
- £0.740m for the DSG's contribution to the Affordability Gap for Building Schools for the Future for special schools.

## **5.3 Early Years Block non delegated budgets £1,027**

A total of £1.027m is recommended to be held within the Early Years Block for the following purposes:

- £0.800m Early Years SEND Inclusion Fund, which is to be allocated to support high incidence low need SEND in early years settings. This is increased from a fund of £0.600m held in 2017/18. Although recorded as centrally managed in this report this funding is expected to be paid out to providers during the year.
- £0.193m for nursery school access to relevant agreed 'de-delegated' funds.
- £0.034m for copyright licences.

Please note that £1.027m constitutes 1.2% of the 3 / 4 year old DSG funding allocation and therefore, complies with the DfE's 5% Early Years Block central funds restriction.

## **5.4 Central Schools Block £2,853**

The Central Schools Block is newly established at April 2018. A number of items previously funded via 'top-slice' within the Schools Block are transferred to this

Block. The £2,853m is recommended to be allocated as follows:

- Schools Forum costs £0.001m.
- School Admissions £0.580m.
- Education Services Grant Centrally Retained Duties in support of the statutory duties delivered by the Local Authority on behalf of all state funded schools including academies £1.331.
- Copyright licences Schools Block £0.357m.
- £0.584m to enable the transfer of High Needs Block activities where the nature of the expenditure is covered by the Regulations, which govern the purposes for which Central Schools Block monies can be used i.e. statutory and regulatory duties for all maintained schools and academies regarding the exclusions of pupils and school attendance. The budgets are Youth Offending, Behaviour Support, and Travellers Children.

**6. AMOUNTS ALLOCATED ON A ONE OFF BASIS (€000)**

**Total allocated on a one off basis in 2018/19 £2,787**

The £2.787m is made up of the following recommended allocations:

- Schools Block: £0.550m estimated for the cost in 2018/19 of the financial support for Beckfoot Upper Heaton Academy allocated via the agreed model.
- Early Years Block: £0.606m estimated for the cost in 2018/19 of protecting against the full reduction in the value of the setting base rate for 3 and 4 year olds that would otherwise come as a result of national reform. £0.605m uplifts the base rate value from £4.03 to £4.12 per hour.
- High Needs Block: £1.631m is estimated at this stage to be used to offset the forecasted overspending within the High Needs Block in 2018/19. £1.631m is the full value of the estimated carry forward balance held in the High Needs Block at April 2018. The £1.631m is subject to confirmation following the closure of the 2017/18 financial year.

**7. AMOUNTS NOT ALLOCATED IN 2018/19 (€000)**

**Total amount not allocated in 2018/19 £4,794**

The £4.794m is made up of the following sums net of the forecasted £0.349m overspending in the High Needs Block:

Schools Block £4.226m:

- £1.790m to support meeting the cost of the agreed financial support model for Beckfoot Upper Heaton Academy after 31 March 2019.
- £0.650m for the deficit of a school converting to academy status.
- £0.716m of reserve specifically earmarked for supporting additional costs of

- pupil numbers growth from April 2019.
- £0.091m balance of de-delegated funds carried forward.
  - £0.979m resilience reserve. This sum is effectively the remaining unallocated balance within the Schools Block.

Early Years Block £0.917m:

- £0.606m earmarked to continue to protect the setting base rate for the 3 and 4 year old free entitlements for 1 further financial year in 2019/20.
- £0.311m resilience reserve. This sum is effectively the remaining unallocated balance within the Early Years Block.

## **8. RISK MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE ISSUES**

If the allocations are not agreed by Elected Members then representations have to be made to the Schools Forum. In the event that agreement cannot be reached with the Schools Forum, the Council must refer the matter to the Department for Education (DfE).

## **9. LEGAL APPRAISAL**

Section 45 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 provides that for the purposes of the financing of maintained schools by local authorities every such school shall have for each funding period a budget share, which is allocated to it by the authority which maintains it to be determined in accordance with sections 45 – 47 of that Act.

Section 47(A) of the Act requires that every local authority must, in accordance with regulations, establish for their area a body to be known as a schools forum. The purpose of a schools forum is to advise the local authority on such matters relating to the authority's schools budget as may be prescribed by regulations.

The Schools Forum has some decision making powers in relation to school budget functions. The role of the Local Authority is to make proposals to the Forum on those matters, which the Forum can decide, and to consult the Forum annually in connection with various schools budget functions. Where the Schools Forum and the Local Authority are in disagreement about proposals made by the Authority the Secretary of State for Education will adjudicate.

In 2018/19 the new national funding formula (NFF) for schools, high needs and central school services will come into effect. The national funding formula for early years was introduced in 2017/18. The new NFF will determine how the DSG is allocated to local authorities. The formula for schools means that school funding will be distributed to local authorities according to a formula based on the individual needs and characteristics of every school in the country. However in 2018/19 and 2019/20 local authorities still retain discretion to determine schools' budget allocations locally. The Department for Education consulted on the proposed changes.

The School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2018 came into force on 5th February 2018. These Regulations apply in relation to the financial year



beginning on 1st April 2018. Local Authorities are required to calculate budgets for all maintained schools using a funding formula. The Regulations require the Local Authority to decide the formula it will use for the financial year 2018/2019. A local authority must, not later than 28th February 2018 (a) make an initial determination of its schools budget; and (b) give notice of that determination to the governing bodies of the schools which it maintains.

## **10. OTHER IMPLICATIONS**

There are no direct implications resulting from this report.

### **11.1 EQUALITY & DIVERSITY**

There are no direct implications resulting from this report.

### **11.2 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS**

There are no direct implications resulting from this report.

### **11.3 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS IMPACTS**

There are no direct implications resulting from this report.

### **11.4 COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

There are no direct implications resulting from this report.

### **11.5 HUMAN RIGHTS ACT**

There are no direct implications resulting from this report.

### **11.6 TRADE UNION**

There are no direct implications resulting from this report.

### **11.7 WARD IMPLICATIONS**

There are no direct implications resulting from this report.

## **12. NOT FOR PUBLICATION DOCUMENTS**

None

## **13. OPTIONS**

Please see the recommendations below.

## **14. RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **14.1 It is recommended that the Executive asks Council to:**

- a) Accept and approve the proposals from the Schools Forum for the allocation of the 2018/19 DSG as set out in this report.**
- b) Approve the total amount of £535.908m to be appropriated in respect of all schools covered by the Bradford Scheme for the Local Management of Schools, so as to establish the Individual Schools Budget for 2018/19.**

## **11. APPENDICES**

- Appendix 1 – Local Authority Funding Reform Pro-Forma 2018/19
- Appendix 2 – High Needs Provision: Proposed Fund Categories, Bands & Amounts 2018/19
- Appendix 3 – Early Years Single Funding Formula 2018/19

## **12. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

- [Decisions List of School Forum 10 January 2018](#)
- Section 151 Officer's Report – Executive 20 February 2018 – (Doc BC)

## Local Authority Funding Reform Proforma

LA Name:	Bradford
LA Number:	380

Premises costs to exclude from allocation when calculating the minimum funding level	Mobility	Rates	PFI	Split Sites
	No	Yes	Yes	No
Primary minimum per pupil funding level	Middle school minimum per pupil funding level for secondary pupils		Secondary minimum per pupil funding level	
3,500			4,800	

## Pupil Led Factors

1) Basic Entitlement Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU)	Reception uplift	No	Pupil Units		0.00	Total	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)	Notional SEN (%)			
	Description	Amount per pupil	Pupil Units		Sub Total						
	Primary (Years R-6)	£2,747.44	55,134.00		£151,477,331	£280,969,629	37.47%	7.51%			
	Key Stage 3 (Years 7-9)	£3,863.62	19,620.00		£75,804,187			6.28%			
	Key Stage 4 (Years 10-11)	£4,386.70	12,238.83		£53,688,112			6.28%			
2) Deprivation	Description	Primary amount per pupil	Secondary amount per pupil	Eligible proportion of primary NOR	Eligible proportion of secondary NOR	Sub Total	Total	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)	Primary Notional SEN (%)	Secondary Notional SEN (%)	
	FSM	£440.07	£440.07	9,821.49	5,988.14	£6,957,349	£47,461,977	11.74%	23.08%	10.16%	
	FSM6	£540.09	£785.13	16,389.93	12,000.30	£18,273,720			23.08%	10.16%	
	IDACI Band F	£200.03	£290.05	7,299.28	4,381.60	£2,730,955			22.45%	19.18%	
	IDACI Band E	£240.04	£390.06	9,238.22	5,645.90	£4,419,778			22.45%	19.18%	
	IDACI Band D	£360.06	£515.08	7,653.27	4,594.51	£5,122,168			22.45%	19.18%	
	IDACI Band C	£390.06	£560.09	3,679.73	2,049.84	£2,583,419			22.45%	19.18%	
	IDACI Band B	£420.07	£600.10	7,260.10	4,009.20	£5,455,635			22.45%	19.18%	
	IDACI Band A	£575.09	£810.13	1,837.43	1,064.35	£1,918,951			22.45%	19.18%	
3) Looked After Children (LAC)	Description	Primary amount per pupil	Secondary amount per pupil	Eligible proportion of primary NOR	Eligible proportion of secondary NOR	Sub Total	Total	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)	Primary Notional SEN (%)	Secondary Notional SEN (%)	
	LAC X March 17	£0.00			489.57	£0	£8,060,696	0.00%	0.00%		
4) English as an Additional Language (EAL)	EAL 3 Primary	£515.08		11,858.68		£6,108,198			1.81%	0.00%	
	EAL 3 Secondary		£1,385.22		883.64	£1,224,040				0.00%	
5) Mobility	Pupils starting school outside of normal entry dates	£1,608.19	£1,915.87	444.15	7.40	£728,457			0.18%	0.00%	0.00%
6) Prior attainment	Description	Weighting	Amount per pupil	Percentage of eligible pupils	Eligible proportion of primary and secondary NOR respectively	Sub Total	Total	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)	Primary Notional SEN (%)	Secondary Notional SEN (%)	
	Low Attainment % new EFSP	100.00%	£1,050.17	39.17%	20,274.52	£21,291,649	£34,523,992	8.54%	100.00%		
	Low Attainment % old FSP 78			24.74%							
	Secondary low attainment (year 7)	58.05%	£1,550.25	26.19%	8,535.63	£13,232,343			100.00%		100.00%
	Secondary low attainment (year 8)	48.02%		26.41%							
	Secondary low attainment (years 9 to 11)			27.15%							

Factor	Lump Sum per Primary School (£)	Lump Sum per Secondary School (£)	Lump Sum per Middle School (£)	Lump Sum per All-through School (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)	Notional SEN (%)	
7) Lump Sum	£110,017.60	£110,017.60			£20,793,326	5.14%	0.00%	0.00%
8) Sparsity factor	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Please provide alternative distance and pupil number thresholds for the sparsity factor below. Please leave blank if you want to use the default thresholds. Also specify whether you want to use a tapered lump sum for one or both of the phases.

Primary distance threshold (miles)		Primary pupil number average year group threshold		Fixed or tapered sparsity primary lump sum?	Fixed	
Secondary distance threshold (miles)		Secondary pupil number average year group threshold		Fixed or tapered sparsity secondary lump sum?	Fixed	
Middle schools distance threshold (miles)		Middle school pupil number average year group threshold		Fixed or tapered sparsity middle school lump sum?	Fixed	
All-through schools distance threshold (miles)		All-through pupil number average year group threshold		Fixed or tapered sparsity all-through lump sum?	Fixed	
9) Fringe Payments				£0	0.00%	
10) Split Sites				£402,889	0.10%	0.00%
11) Rates				£4,391,906	1.09%	0.00%
12) PFI funding				£6,230,144	1.54%	0.00%
13 ) Exceptional circumstances (can only be used with prior agreement of ESFA)						
Circumstance				Total (£)	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)	Notional SEN (%)
Additional lump sum for schools amalgamated during FY17-18				£77,012	0.02%	0.00%   0.00%
Additional sparsity lump sum for small schools				£0	0.00%	0.00%
Additional funding under the minimum per pupil level of funding factor				£0	0.00%	0.00%
Exceptional Circumstance4				£0	0.00%	0.00%
Exceptional Circumstance5				£0	0.00%	0.00%
Exceptional Circumstance6				£0	0.00%	0.00%
Exceptional Circumstance7				£0	0.00%	0.00%
Additional funding to meet minimum per pupil funding level				£1,314,493		
<b>Total Funding for Schools Block Formula (excluding MFG Funding Total) (£)</b>				<b>£404,226,064</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>£62,948,995</b>
17) Minimum Funding Guarantee			0.40%	£8,870,959		
Apply capping and scaling factors? (gains may be capped above a specific ceiling and/or scaled)				Yes		
Capping Factor (%)	2.60%	Scaling Factor (%)	100.00%			
18) Deduction if capping and scaling factors are applied				-£277,887		
				Total (£)	Proportion of Total funding(%)	
MFG Net Total Funding (MFG + deduction from capping and scaling)				£8,593,072	2.08%	
High Needs threshold (only fill in if, exceptionally, a high needs threshold different from £6,000 has been approved)						
Additional funding from the high needs budget				£467,714.74		
Growth fund (if applicable)				£2,340,161.20		
Falling rolls fund (if applicable)				£0.00		
<b>Total Funding For Schools Block Formula</b>				<b>£412,819,136</b>		
% Distributed through Basic Entitlement				69.51%		
% Pupil Led Funding				91.78%		
Primary: Secondary Ratio				1 : 1.37		
Total funding for schools block formula contains funding from outside of the 2018-19 Schools Block allocation?				No		

HIGH NEEDS PROVISION: PROPOSED FUNDING CATEGORIES, BANDS & AMOUNTS 2018/19

	Range 1	Range 2	Range 3	Range 4				Range 5	Range 6	Range 7
	Delegated Place Funding			Band A (16.5-21.5 hours)	Band B (22-27 hours)	Band C (27.5-34.5 hours)	Band D (35+ hours)			
PRIMARY NEED			£0	£952	£3,000	£4,597	£7,160	£10,440	£13,910	£22,857
Additional "Plus" Funding										
Mainstream Autism & SLCN						SLCN	ASD		ASD+	ASD++
Mainstream MLD/SLD/PMLD			MLD		MLD+	SLD	PMLD	SLD+	PMLD+	PMLD++
Mainstream PD							PD		PD+	PD++
Mainstream HI/VI						HI/VI		HI+/VI+		
Mainstream BESD							BESD		BESD+	BESD++

Points

Mainstream funding is within colour coded Bands (mainly range 4)

Special School funding is determined by actual Primary Need and is shown as text

This page is intentionally left blank

EYSFF Factor Heading	Description of Factor	Unit Value (£)			Unit Applied	Number of Units (estimated)			Estimated Total Spend
		PVI	Nursery School	Primary Nursery Class		Unit Type	PVI	Nursery School	
<b>1a. EYSFF (three and four year olds) Setting Base Rate(s) per hour, per provider type</b>	Base rate applicable to all providers of the same type	£4.12	£5.70	£4.12	PerHour	3,382,194	480,266	3,311,788	<b>£30,314,359</b>
<b>2a. Supplements: Deprivation (Average rate per hour)</b>	Deprivation Variable 1 - using 3 year average IMD scores to calculate funding for all providers	£0.81	£1.49	£0.81	PerHour	1,065,610	216,011	1,384,767	<b>£2,307,788</b>
	Deprivation Variable 2 - using 3 year average IMD scores to calculate additional funding for providers with above average IMD scores	£0.20	£0.34	£0.20	PerHour	1,158,457	324,832	1,926,399	<b>£732,843</b>
<b>2b. Nursery School Lump Sums</b>	Nursery Schools Sustainability Top-Up: this funding tops up the school to a minimum level of funding based on that school's specific circumstances, taking into account premises, rates, insurance, base allocations, mainstreamed grants		Variable		Lump Sum		7		<b>£268,135</b>
<b>3. Two year old Base Rate(s) per hour, per provider type</b>	Base rate applicable to all providers	£5.20	£5.20	£5.20	PerHour	1,269,180	180,079	333,150	<b>£9,268,526</b>

Early Years Block Additional Managed Funds

<b>4. Early Years Inclusion</b>	2 Year Olds	<b>£100,000</b>
	3 & 4 Year Olds	<b>£700,000</b>
<b>5. Early Years Centrally Retained Spending</b>	Contribution for access to de-delegated services	<b>£192,633</b>
	DfE Copyright Licences (proportionate EYB charge)	<b>£34,374</b>
<b>6. Early Years Pupil Premium (EYPP)</b>	Allocated as per DfE Methodology	<b>£491,315</b>
<b>7. Early Years Disability Access Fund (DAF)</b>	Allocated as per DfE Methodology	<b>£193,110</b>

Position vs. Statutory Restrictions (3&4 Year Old EYSFF)

<b>Pass Through Rate (Central Spend Restriction)</b>	EYSFF 3&4 year old delegated £pp spend must be >= 95% of DSG £app rate of funding (Bradford's calculation in 2018/19 includes one off monies)	<b>98.7%</b>
<b>Spend on Supplements (Deprivation)</b>	Restricted to 10% of 3&4 Year Old EYSFF (Bradford's calculation in 2018/19 is 9.5% excluding one off monies and MNS protection)	<b>9.5%</b>

2018/19 Summary & Comparison - Indicative Total Hourly Funding Rates by Sector

	2018/19 Indicative	2017/18 Actual	Cash Difference	% Difference
<b>2 Year Offer - Universal Base Rate</b>	<b>£5.20</b>	<b>£5.20</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
3 & 4 Year Old Setting Base – Nursery Schools	£5.70	£5.70	£0.00	0.0%
3 & 4 Year Old Setting Base – Nursery Classes	£4.12	£4.13	-£0.01	-0.2%
3 & 4 Year Old Setting Base – PVI Providers	£4.12	£4.62	-£0.50	-10.8%
3 & 4 Year Old Mean Deprivation & SEN Rate	£0.42	£0.43	-£0.01	-2.1%
3 & 4 Year Old Nursery Schools Sustainability	£0.58	£1.07	-£0.49	-45.7%
<b>3 &amp; 4 Year Old Total - Nursery Schools</b>	<b>£7.20</b>	<b>£7.73</b>	<b>-£0.53</b>	<b>-6.8%</b>
<b>3 &amp; 4 Year Old Total - Nursery Classes</b>	<b>£4.58</b>	<b>£4.58</b>	<b>-£0.01</b>	<b>-0.2%</b>
<b>3 &amp; 4 Year Old Total - PVI</b>	<b>£4.44</b>	<b>£4.93</b>	<b>-£0.50</b>	<b>-10.0%</b>

Please note deprivation rates are subject to change once January 2018 postcode data is available to calculate updated IMD scores  
 Number of units (estimated) include an estimate of 30 hours delivery

This page is intentionally left blank



## **Report of the Assistant Director Finance and Procurement to the meeting of Executive to be held on 20 February 2018 and Council to be held on 22 February 2018**

---

**Subject:**

**Document: BB**

**The Council's Capital Investment Plan for 2018-19 onwards**

### **Summary statement:**

**This report presents the Capital Investment Plan for 2018-19 to 2021-22. Appendix A sets out the Council's Capital Strategy to date.**

---

Andrew Crookham  
Assistant Director Finance and  
Procurement

Report Contact: James Hopwood  
Head of Financial Accounting &  
Systems

Phone: (01274) 432882  
E-mail: [James.Hopwood@bradford.gov.uk](mailto:James.Hopwood@bradford.gov.uk)

**Portfolio:**

**Leader of the Council**

**Overview & Scrutiny Area:**

**Corporate**

## **1. SUMMARY**

1.1 This report outlines the Council's proposed Capital Investment Plans from 2018-19 to 2021-22. These plans are part of the overall 2018-19 budget proposal for the Council which includes:

- The Council's Revenue Estimates for 2018-19 (Document AZ)
- Allocation of the Schools Budget 2018-19 Financial Year (Document BA)
- Section 151 Officer's Assessment of proposed budgets (Document BC)

1.2 This report is submitted to enable the Executive to make recommendations to Budget Council on the setting of the budget and Council Tax for 2018-19 as required by Article 4 and Part 3C of the Council's Constitution.

## **2. CAPITAL INVESTMENT PLAN (CIP) BACKGROUND**

2.1 The Capital Investment Plan (CIP) provides for investment in assets like buildings and vehicles. It impacts on the district over many years, in contrast to the annual Revenue Estimates, which details the annual budget for day to day expenditure.

2.2 The overriding purpose of the CIP is investment in assets to enable service delivery. Examples include investment in schools to deliver education, buildings to provide care and affordable housing.

2.3 Overall the CIP aims to maximise service delivery based on the Council's overall vision: Great start, good schools; Better health, better lives; Better skills, more good jobs and a growing economy; Safe, clean and active communities; A well run Council.

2.4 Another increasing consideration for the CIP is to generate income. Currently the Council is investigating options on how to invest in property to generate income (9 January 2018 Executive; A strategy for Growth in income from Council Tax, Business Rates and Investment, Document AP). Such income can be used to support the Revenue Estimates when the Revenue Support Grant is reducing.

2.5 Further there are a number of other reasons that the Council invests in assets. This includes regenerating the local economy and working jointly with other public sector bodies in the district. Such reasons are further explored in the Capital Strategy within Appendix A of this report.

## **3 FUNDING BACKGROUND**

3.1 Funding sources for the CIP are limited. The largest source of funding is capital grants provided by other parts of the public sector and the Government.

3.2 Another funding source is capital receipts from the sale of the Council's assets, such as land, which is recycled directly back into the new capital expenditure proposed in the CIP.

3.3 Any other funding apart from capital grants and capital receipts has an implication

for the Revenue Estimates. For example, one of the allowed funding sources is to fund capital expenditure directly from a budget line in the Revenue Estimates (Direct Revenue Financing).

- 3.4 Another allowed funding source is to use earmarked reserves. However, this means the funding is not being used to support day to day expenditure in the Revenue Estimates.
- 3.5 The most significant funding source for the CIP is borrowing because this has the largest impact on the Revenue Estimates. This impact is from the repayment of the principal as well as the interest, which are both charges in the Revenue Estimates. (Appendix 1 shows the borrowing limits and prudential indicators)
- 3.6 Some of the borrowing in the CIP is to fund the purchase of assets, that once operational make a saving for the Council (Invest to Save Borrowing). This saving pays for the principal and interest charges of the borrowing. As an example, the affordable housing scheme generates rental income to pay the principal and interest.
- 3.7 However, other borrowing cannot be paid for from additional income or savings (Corporate Borrowing). The principal repayments and the interest are additional charges for the Revenue Estimates.

#### **4 PROPOSED CAPITAL INVESTMENT PLAN 2018-22**

- 4.1 Please see Appendix 2 for the detail on the proposed CIP.
- 4.2 The proposed CIP removes the District Heating scheme. The original purpose of the scheme was to recycle energy from the Council's buildings back into the national grid. It is proposed to remove this scheme from the plan until a suitable site is identified to progress with the project. As and when a suitable site is identified, it is now anticipated that the scheme costs can be fully funded by way of external funding.
- 4.3 Further the CIP proposes to continue the annual £10m allocated for property investment – called Strategic Acquisitions – into 2021-22. The CIP also proposes to add a new £3.5m scheme for traffic management called the National Productivity Investment Fund, previously approved by Officers as there is no requirement for new Corporate borrowing (£2.3m grant funded and £1.2m vired from another highway scheme).
- 4.4 In addition, the proposed CIP includes £98m of other new schemes for approval. Some of these proposed new capital schemes have no net impact on the total expenditure in the Revenue Estimates. This is because they are funded from Capital Grants, receipts or Invest to Save schemes. These schemes are listed below:
  - (1) Former Odeon building
  - (2) Affordable Housing

- (3) Roydsdale Way car park
  - (4) Investment Strategy for Enterprise Zone
- 4.5 Some of the schemes will increase the total cost of the Revenue Estimates. This is because the proposed schemes rely in part or wholly on Corporate borrowing. They are listed below:
- (5) Relocation of Coroner's Office
  - (6) Learning Development home
  - (7) Sports Pitches Rationalisation
  - (8) City Hall Rugby Football League project
  - (9) New Builds at Top of Town
  - (10) Additional funding for St Georges Hall
  - (11) Additional funding for Markets
- 4.6 The schemes for Affordable Housing, Roydsdale Way car park and St Georges Hall have already been subject to detailed business cases. The remaining schemes are all subject to further work and a detailed, costed business case. Also all the new schemes (1) to (9) are held in the Reserves & Contingencies section of the CIP and as such cannot be released to budget managers until further approval from Executive.
- 4.7 To pay for the additional Corporate borrowing for these new schemes, an additional £2m costs have been set aside in the 2018-19 Revenue Estimates. It is expected that the cost of the Corporate borrowing for these schemes will be contained within this £2m estimate.
- 4.8 The overall funding sources of the 2018-22 CIP are summarised in Table 1 below.

**Table 1: Analysis of funding sources**

Funding source	£m
Capital Grants	208.223
Corporate Borrowing	121.173
Invest to Save Borrowing	125.511
Capital Receipts	25.874
Direct Revenue Financing	10.804
Reserves	4.859
Total	496.444

- 4.9 As noted in table 1 above total expenditure in 2018-19 to 2021-22 is planned at £496.444m. There may be further Government funding allocations announced prior to the start of 2018-19 and the outcome of specific grant bids will be announced. There may also be the opportunity to bid for additional funding. The Council may identify other funding sources, including capital receipts, to finance additional capital expenditure.
- 4.10 Further it is recommended that the £2m repairs and maintenance budget in the Reserves & Contingency section of the CIP is spent as set out in the Property Programme.

## 5 CIP CAPITAL FINANCING COSTS INCLUDED IN THE REVENUE ESTIMATES

- 5.1 As described above, the CIP impacts on the revenue estimates through Capital Financing costs. Therefore the new recommended CIP and the additional Corporate borrowing required has an incremental impact on the Revenue Estimates through increased Capital Financing costs.
- 5.2 These Capital Financing costs comprise repayment and interest costs for borrowing. They exclude Capital Grants, Capital Receipts and Direct Revenue Financing.
- 5.3 Invest to Save borrowing is financed by compensating savings. However, there is an incremental impact on the Revenue Estimates from 2018-19 to 2021-22 due to the new Corporate Borrowing financing the additional capital expenditure.
- 5.4 Table 2 below shows the Capital Financing costs included in the Revenue Estimates for Corporate Borrowing only.

**Table 2: Capital Financing Costs**

		2018-19 £m	2019-20 £m	2020-21 £m	2021-22 £m
Principal & interest from Corporate Borrowing		31.818	36.028	38.056	38.971

- 5.5 The Capital Financing costs shown in table 2 are already included in the 2018-19 Revenue Estimates.
- 5.6 The estimates in table 2 also assume that interest rates will be 3% in 2018-19 and 3.8% in the following financial years. This is based on projections from the Council's Treasury Management advisers. Further for any new borrowing, the principal will be repaid in equal instalments over the life of the asset that has been purchased. It is also assumed that the Council will not borrow to replace £10m of debt that is due to be repaid in February 2018. However, it is also assumed the Council will borrow to fund any new capital expenditure from 2018-19 onwards.
- 5.7 There is a risk that interest rates will be higher than projected. However, the risk from interest rate increases is partly mitigated if some of the capital schemes shown in the CIP were to be delayed.

## 6 RATIO OF CAPITAL FINANCING COSTS TO THE NET REVENUE STREAM

- 6.1 CIPFA sets out the methodology to calculate the ratio of the Capital Financing costs as a proportion of the net revenue stream. The main difference to the figures set out in table 2 above is that CIPFA's Capital Financing costs include the impact of finance leases, including the Private Finance initiative (PFI). Finance leases are where the Council has formally rented an asset, but the underlying economic reality is that it has been purchased, with the borrowing and related interest repaid via rental payments.
- 6.2 The repayment of the borrowing and interest for finance leases are already budgeted for as rental payments within the Revenue Estimates. As part of accounting for these assets in accordance with CIPFA's guidelines, these rental payments are shown as repayments of borrowing and interest within the Council's Statement of Accounts and shown as Capital Financing costs.
- 6.3 There are also some other minor adjustments included in CIPFA's methodology. Table 3 below shows the Council's ratio of Capital Financing costs to the Net Revenue Stream.

**Table 3: Ratio of Capital Financing costs to the Net Revenue Stream**

	2018-19 £m	2019-20 £m	2020-21 £m	2021-22 £m
Principal & interest from Corporate Borrowing (per table 2)	31.818	36.028	38.056	38.971
Finance Leases and PFI borrowing	25.871	25.000	24.500	24.300
Other	(0.170)	(0.170)	(0.170)	(0.170)
<b>Total Capital Financing costs</b>	<b>57.519</b>	<b>60.858</b>	<b>62.386</b>	<b>63.101</b>
Ratio to Net Revenue stream of £357m	16%	17%	17%	17%

- 6.4 Previously the Council set a long term objective of reducing its Capital Financing costs, with a long term objective to reduce Capital financing costs to below 15%. This was achieved in previous years due to reduced interest costs. Either debt was repaid by the Council and funded from cash balances or replaced with new debt at a lower interest rate. In 2015-16 the Council repaid £78m of maturing debt resulting in a reduction in cash balances. In 2016-17 the Council took out £26 million in new loans in order to ensure cash balances did not fall too low when a similar amount of loans matured in March 2017.
- 6.5 However, the Council's general funding or net revenue stream has reduced because of a lower Revenue Support Grant. In itself this has increased Capital Financing costs as a proportion of the net revenue stream. Further, the Council has set aside an additional £1m in 2019-20 and a further £1m in 2020-21 to fund the new schemes in the CIP (See 4.7). As a result, the ratio of Capital Financing costs to the Net Revenue Stream is due to increase over the next few years.

- 6.6 Further, schemes are included in the CIP when they are Invest to Save schemes. As there are compensatory savings from service budgets, these are not included in the ratio of Capital Financing costs to the Net Revenue Stream. However, they are summarised in Table 4 below:

**Table 4: Invest to Save Capital Financing costs**

		2018-19 £m	2019-20 £000	2020-21 £000	2021-22 £000
Invest to Save Principal and interest		4.193	7.452	9.783	11.805
Compensatory savings from service budgets		(4.193)	(7.452)	(9.783)	(11.805)
Net impact on Revenue Estimates		0	0	0	0

## 7 REPAYMENT OF DEBT

- 7.1 The Capital Financing costs described above, include an amount set aside to repay the principal from any borrowing. This is a requirement of the Local Government Act 2003 which specifies that Councils are required to make a provision for the repayment of borrowing used to finance its capital expenditure. This is officially known as the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP).
- 7.2 The amount of borrowing required to finance capital expenditure is based on a calculation known as the Capital Financing Requirement (CFR). The CFR is all expenditure for a capital purpose less any sources of funding, such as capital grants, capital receipts and Direct Revenue Financing. Borrowing may come from loans taken from the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) or commercial banks, finance leases (including PFI) or from the use of the Council's own cash balances.
- 7.3 In summary, the MRP is the amount of principal capital repayment that is set aside each year in order to repay the CFR based on the requirement of statutory regulation and the Council's own accounting policies.
- 7.4 As noted above, in most cases, the MRP is calculated in equal instalments over the life of the asset. However, the Council is formally required to state as part of its budget process the policy for determining its MRP. The policy was changed in 2016-17 generating savings in the current and future years. The method for calculating the MRP on each category of debt is outlined below:
- The policy for charging MRP on historic supported borrowing is on the asset life method calculated on an equal instalment basis over 50 years.
  - Unsupported or prudential borrowing MRP is based on the Asset Life method – that is, the expenditure financed from borrowing is divided by the expected asset life. For schemes funded before 31<sup>st</sup> March 2012 the MRP is calculated on the

annuity basis and for schemes funded after 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012 the MRP is calculated on an equal instalment basis. This means no change to existing policy.

- c) Since 2009-10 the appropriate financing costs for the Council's Building Schools for the Future (BSF) Private Finance Initiative (PFI) schemes have been included in MRP calculations. Appropriateness includes an ongoing consideration of asset lives.
  - d) To consider whether amounts set aside using an annuity calculation previously in excess of the equal instalment basis should be returned to the General Fund for current and future years.
- 7.5 External debt can be less than the CFR. External debt cannot exceed the CFR (other than for short term cashflow purposes or cashflow management.)
- 7.6 There is an International Financial Reporting Standards requirement that assets funded from finance leases (including PFI deals) are brought onto the balance sheet. This also includes the liability as well as the asset. Therefore the term borrowing does not just include loans from PWLB and banks, but also the liability implicit in PFI and other finance leases.
- 7.7 The CIP will need to be reviewed through the planning cycle to ensure it remains affordable within revenue resources and to take account of the actual implementation timeframes.

## **8 OTHER FINANCIAL ACCOUNTING CONSIDERATIONS**

- 8.1 In March 2016 the DCLG published statutory guidance on the flexible use of capital receipts for a three year period covering 2016-17 to 2018-19. Councils were previously only allowed to spend such money on further capital projects or repay debt. But now capital receipts can be used to fund the revenue costs of transformation projects which are designed to generate ongoing revenue savings in the delivery of public services to transform service delivery in a way that reduces costs or demand for services in the future. As part of 2018-19 Local Government Finance Settlement, the Secretary of State announced an extension of this flexibility for a further three years to 2022.
- 8.2 There are no plans to use this flexibility in the 2018-19 financial year. However, given the size and scale of the transformation programme, it is possible that the Council may seek approval from the Secretary of State to use capital receipts in this flexible manner in future.

## **9. FINANCIAL & RESOURCE APPRAISAL**

- 9.1 The CIP as proposed remains balanced to forecast capital resources up to and including 2021-22. Projects beyond that period will require the identification of resources such as capital receipts from the sale of Council owned assets, additional and specific funding or invest to save borrowing. The latter would have revenue budget implications.



## **10. RISK MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE ISSUES**

- 10.1 The uncertainties regarding the funding that will be available to the Council and the control of the capital programme are considered within the Assistant Director, Finance & Procurement Section 151 Budget Report.
- 10.2 The inclusion of contingencies within the CIP means that there is some scope for meeting additional unforeseen and unfunded capital expenditure that may arise.
- 10.3 The existing governance arrangements for controlling the capital programme remain appropriate.

## **11. LEGAL APPRAISAL**

- 11.1 The legal issues are set out in the body of the report. Legal Services will provide further advice on the implementation of the Capital Programme as required.

## **12. OTHER IMPLICATIONS**

- 12.1 Equality and diversity, sustainability, greenhouse gas emissions impacts, community safety, Human Rights Act, Trade Union and Ward Implications will be considered on an individual project basis.

## **13 NOT FOR PUBLICATION DOCUMENTS**

- 13.1 None.

## **14 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 14.1 The Executive requests Council to approve:
  - a) The Capital Investment Plan as set out at Appendix 2 is adopted. Commitments against reserve schemes and contingencies can only be made after a business case has been assessed by the Project Appraisal Group and approved by Executive.
  - b) Approve the £2m Property Programme Essential Maintenance Programme, to be funded from Reserves and Contingencies (See 4.10).
  - c) The Chief Executive, Strategic Directors and Directors enter into commitments on capital schemes within the Capital Investment Plan subject to approval of business cases by Executive up to the approved amounts each year except that, where it is indicated that schemes are funded or partly funded from specific resources such as capital grants or contributions, revenue or capital receipts, the approved amount will be subject to the securing of those resources and be adjusted to reflect the amounts actually received.
  - d) Where necessary, the payments arising under the Capital Investment Plan are met from loans.
  - e) In order to provide the flexibility necessary to effectively manage the Capital

Investment Plan, the Chief Executive, Strategic Directors and Directors be specifically empowered to advance or defer approved schemes subject to consultation with the Assistant Director Finance and Procurement and the availability of resources.

- f) Additional capital schemes shall only commence where the scheme is wholly funded from specific resources on the approval of the Section 151 Officer – the Assistant Director, Finance & Procurement.
- g) The Borrowing Limits and Prudential Indicators as set out in Appendix 1 are adopted by the Council.
- h) The Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy as set out in paragraph 7.4 of this report is approved and adopted by the Council.
- i) The development of the Capital Strategy in Appendix A is noted.

## **15 APPENDICES**

- Appendix A – Capital Strategy
- Appendix 1 – Borrowing Limits and Prudential Indicators
- Appendix 2 – Proposed Capital Investment Plan for 2018-19 to 2021-22

## **16. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

- Proposed Financial Plan 2018-19 – 2021-22 – Executive Report 5 December 2017 (Doc AJ)
- The Council's Revenue Estimates for 2018-19 – Executive Report 20 February 2018 (Doc AZ)
- Section 151 Report – Executive 20 February 2018 (Doc BC)

## **Appendix A**

### **1 BACKGROUND TO THE CORPORATE CAPITAL STRATEGY**

- 1.1 The Corporate Capital Strategy sets out the principles to be used to guide the allocation of capital expenditure within the Capital Investment Plan (CIP).
- 1.2 Capital expenditure is expenditure on the acquisition, creation or enhancement of assets that have a useful life of more than one year.
- 1.3 Capital expenditure is a significant and fundamental part of what the Council does. For example, it has led to the Council holding 5,812 separate items on its Corporate Asset register, with a balance sheet value of £1.022 billion, at 31 March 2017. These assets are prerequisites to achieving the Council's overall vision. For example, school buildings enable education to be delivered.
- 1.4 The items in the Corporate Asset Register include £48.6m of investment assets to deliver regeneration. They also generate an income stream for the Council from rental payments, which funds other service expenditure.
- 1.5 The overall aim of the Capital Strategy is to set out the principles that underlay capital expenditure decisions.

### **2 GUIDING PRINCIPLES**

- 2.1 Capital expenditure is prioritised according to long term affordability. A framework for prioritisation is set out below:
  - i. Contributes to the achievement of the Council's vision.
  - ii. Financial criteria including whether the scheme has a payback, produces a positive net present value, the funding, affordability and financial impact on the Council overall.
  - iii. The deliverability of the scheme and its benefits.
  - iv. Delivers Value for Money
  - v. Risk assessment – an assessment of the risk involved in the scheme.
  - vi. It is an invest to save scheme that achieves compensatory savings in Revenue Estimates
  - vii. Promotes sustainable services to Bradford District residents.
  - viii. Enables a corporate approach to the use of assets
  - ix. Regenerates the district
  - x. Partners with other organisations to use of assets efficiently across the public sector and the district.
  - xi. Provides income streams to support the revenue estimates
- 2.2 Prioritisation of capital expenditure according to an ability to create an income stream is a new criteria (see xi). This is due to a recent Council decision to consider investment in property to generate an income stream (9 January 2018 Executive; A strategy for Growth in income from Council Tax, Business Rates and Investment).

2.3 Latest Government guidance is that the principles of security, liquidity and yield are applied to investments in property but Local Authorities can determine their relative importance (Consultation on the proposed changes to the prudential framework on capital finance, summary of consultation responses and Government response – February 2018). However, the guidance also states that to purchase Investment Property solely to generate a profit is not prudential. This guidance has been reflected in a new proposed framework to assess any investment in property. This framework is an expanded version of the principles set out in a report to Executive (4 April 2017 Executive, Progress report on the Property Programme and Council’s proposed property investment strategy). The framework is set out below:

- I. Risks associated with the investment
- II. The likelihood of being able to sell the investment in extremis
- III. Whether the location is attractive for selling or letting and whether the location is easy to travel to so that it can be inspected without specialist agents
- IV. The preference for the location of the investment to be firstly in the district and secondly in the Leeds City Region
- V. The security of rental payments, with consideration given to the reliability of tenants
- VI. The prospective length of any lease period for which rental payments are received
- VII. The income stream from the investment
- VIII. The potential to increase both the income stream and the capital value of the investment
- IX. The likelihood of the capital value of the investment exceeding any outstanding debt
- X. The value of the investment
- XI. Management costs
- XII. The sector in which the investment is made, for example, retail or warehouses.
- XIII. Any prospective tenants or partners in the investment must not be involved in commercial activities that conflict with the Council’s values.
- XIV. The latest Government investment guidance

2.4 Also any property investment will be subject to a detailed business case, disclosing the Council’s gross debt and reliance on income from property.

2.5 The proposed CIP includes £10m for property investment, called Strategic Acquisitions, in each year from 2018-19 to 2021-22.

### **3 LOANS FOR A CAPITAL PURPOSE**

3.1 Subject to a business case and appropriate approval, the Council will provide loans for a capital purpose to a third parties. Such loans will be included on the Council’s official record of capital expenditure (The Capital Financing Requirement) and financed from the loan repayments. However, if there is an indication that the loan will not be repaid, an amount will be set aside from revenue to finance the loan.

3.2 Such an amount set aside would constitute a Minimum Revenue Payment (MRP) to fund the unpaid loan. This would be calculated according to the Council’s MRP policy.

3.3 Any interest received from the third party in relation to the loan will be receipted into

the Council's revenue account, in accordance with accounting rules.

#### **4 APPROACH TO BORROWING**

- 4.1 The Council has to adhere to CIPFA guidance in which all borrowing is prudent and affordable.
- 4.2 In accordance with the concept of prudence, before using borrowing, the Council uses all alternative funding sources. These options are limited by statute and some are only available for a specific scheme. For example, the Council applies for available capital grants wherever possible for specific schemes. The Council also receives capital grants on the condition that they are used for schemes in specific service areas. For example, the largest capital grants are for schools, such as the Basic Needs and Capital Maintenance grant. This strategy sets out the principle that all grant conditions will be followed automatically.
- 4.3 Any sales of land or buildings intrinsic to a new capital expenditure scheme are immediately used in its funding. In addition, the Council also estimates that it will receive £3.5m in general capital receipts each year. These arise from the Council's ongoing Property Programme which sells unused land and property and has the added benefit of reducing repair and running costs. Other significant capital receipts have arisen from the disposal of houses built under the Council's Affordable Homes Programme. General capital receipts are used to fund capital expenditure and reduce the borrowing requirement.
- 4.4 Similarly, the Council has an ongoing budget within the Revenue Estimates of £2.7m to directly fund capital expenditure. Again this budget is used to reduce the borrowing requirement. The Council also has an earmarked reserve to directly fund capital expenditure.
- 4.5 Some capital contributions are given by private developers to fund the community infrastructure needed to support their developments. Examples include funding for access roads and playing areas for new housing. Such contributions are collectively called a Community Infrastructure Levy, previously referred to as Section 106 contributions. Recently, the Council has more discretion over which schemes to support with this funding. The principle set out in this strategy is to passport this increased discretion to decision makers and stakeholders. In line with this principle, the funding will be held corporately and be available to allocate to a choice of schemes.
- 4.6 The Council is able to borrow money from the Public Works Loan Board, the money market or its own cash balances to fund capital expenditure. This is the option of last resort, after alternative funding has been considered. This is because borrowing leads to ongoing Capital Financing costs in the revenue estimates, comprising the repayment of principal and interest. Schemes that can self-finance the principal and interest cost (Invest to Save Schemes) are prioritised.
- 4.7 However, the Council will borrow to fund Capital expenditure that is not self-financing (Corporate Borrowing). The key guiding principle in assessing these schemes is contribution to the Council's overall vision prioritised according to the affordability of the additional Capital Financing costs in the Revenue Estimates.

Such borrowing is subject to a detailed business case.

4.8 As part of the Capital Strategy, new measures to test the affordability of the proposed borrowing in the Capital Investment Plan are being used. These measures are shown in the table below:

**Table 1: Affordability measures**

Measure	Current Position	Potential Position
Total Borrowing related to long term assets	As at 31/03/2017 £332m total borrowing is 32% of long term assets as at 31/3/17 of £1,023m	If £121m of Corporate Borrowing and £126m of Invest to Save borrowing totalling £247m is assumed, borrowing could rise to £579m. Assuming this increases long term assets also by £579m to £1,602m, this is 36% of long term assets
Total Borrowing costs as a percent of net budget	For 2018-19 borrowing costs of £32m plus Invest to Save gross borrowing costs of £4m, totalling £36m are 10% of net budget	At 2021-22 borrowing costs of £39m plus Invest to Save gross borrowing costs of £13m, totalling £52m are 14.5% of net budget
Contribution Investment Properties make to core functions	Estimated rental income for 18/19 for only purchases to date is £3.5m which is only 1% of net budget	If an additional £50m invest, with a 6 % return, could rise to £6.5m, which is only 1.8% of budget.

4.9 The measures show borrowing costs potentially rising to 14.5% of net budget. However, about half the new borrowing will be financed from additional compensatory savings or increased income from the Revenue Estimates.

4.10 Another key part of any business case for Corporate Borrowing and Invest to Save Schemes is risk and the assessment against the Council's overall vision.

## 5 APPROACH TO RISK

5.1 The Council has to manage the risk of interest rates rising. An increase in interest rates increases Capital Financing costs. Further the Council has to manage the risk of construction inflation rising in excess of the assumptions used to budget for the scheme.

5.2 Interest rate risk will be managed with forward cash flow projections, contingency in the Capital Financing cost projections, the employment of Treasury Manager advisors and a Treasury management strategy.

5.3 Inflation risk will be managed by using fixed price contracts wherever possible. Further the CIP includes a £2m annual contingency.

## 6 GOVERNANCE

- 6.1 The Capital Investment Plan (CIP) sets out the individual schemes that deliver the Council's overall vision. All schemes in the CIP are approved by Executive. The schemes are further approved by Full Council, unless the scheme is wholly funded from capital grants or Direct Revenue Financing separately approved within Revenue Estimates.
- 6.2 Capital proposals will initially be assessed by the Project Appraisal Group (PAG). Again the only exception is if the scheme is funded from capital grants or Direct Revenue Financing. In these cases, the scheme can be progressed directly by the Section 151 Officer.
- 6.3 PAG is a corporate officer group that appraises proposed capital bids and makes recommendations to Executive and Council. Its membership is made up of finance, legal, procurement, project management and property expertise. The proposed scheme is scored against set criteria based on the guiding principles outlined in 2.1.
- 6.4 An Investment Appraisal Group will also review proposed property investments. This is in accordance with the recommendation to set up such a group to oversee investment activity and manage risk (9 January 2018 Executive: A Strategy for Growth in Income for Council Tax, Business Rates and Investment).
- 6.5 All capital expenditure must be carried out in accordance with financial regulations, the Council's Constitution and the Council's Contract Procedure Rules.
- 6.6 The expenditure must comply with the statutory definition of capital purposes as defined within this document and wider financial standards. This definition is that expenditure meets a de minimus of £10,000 and gives benefits to the Council over one year.
- 6.7 The annual CIP, which is updated for new proposed schemes, revised profiling, slippage and changes in expenditure projections, is presented to Full Council every year. Council approval of the programme gives authorisation to budget managers to spend. Separate approval is required in line with financial rules to spend in line with their budget envelopes.
- 6.8 A governance issue in managing the CIP is the variances between the budget and actual spend. The aim of quarterly monitoring is to identify, project and understand such variances. Quarterly monitoring identifies overspends. However, understanding the reasons for the variances, enables underspend to be distinguished from a scheme delay, called slippage. Underspends allow the total scheme budgets to be lowered, therefore reducing Capital Financing costs.
- 6.9 Scheme delays are managed by changing the proportion of total budget allocated between different financial years, called reprofiling. To enable accurate monitoring, such reprofiling will mostly be proposed in the Outturn report to Executive at the end of the financial year. However, exceptionally, PAG will approve the reprofiling of budgets.



- 6.10 All schemes must be approved by Executive via the procedures outlined in this document and the wider documentation available within the Council.
- 6.11 Officers are not authorised to commit expenditure without prior formal approval as outlined.
- 6.12 Each scheme must be under the control of a nominated budget/project manager and a nominated project sponsor (a senior responsible officer (SRO)).
- 6.13 A separate Executive report is required for any capital scheme(s) which have a capital expenditure value of £0.5m or above.
- 6.14 Any funding from private developers which contractually commit to procure capital schemes (such as school builds) will need to follow the same approval process as other capital expenditure before they can formally be entered into the Council's Capital Programme. Schemes of this type valued at £0.5m or above will also need a separate Executive report.
- 6.15 The performance of the capital programme is also measured by the prudential indicators which are reported to Council as part of the Treasury Management Strategy, the Treasury Management half-yearly review, and the annual review.

## **7 COUNCIL'S OVERALL VISION**

- 7.1 The Council is aiming to take a strategic view to capital investment so that it can be directed to make a real and demonstrable impact on the district. The Capital Strategy aims to deliver projects that focus on delivering long term benefits to the district such as economic growth, regeneration and or financial returns in the form of:
  - i. Spend to save
  - ii. Spend to earn income or other financial returns
  - iii. Deliver budget options
  - iv. Attract significant third party or private resources
- 7.2 The programme areas in the CIP will deliver a wide range of benefits to the District including:
  - I. New and replacement affordable housing
  - II. New improved leisure, adult social care and education facilities
  - III. Improved public spaces, transport and other infrastructure to ensure the continued success of the District as a business, leisure and heritage destination
  - IV. Improved public realm and pedestrian environment to accommodate safe and efficient travel in the District
  - V. Well-maintained, efficiently managed infrastructure, allowing residents, businesses and visitors to enjoy clean, high quality streets

- 7.3 As the Council has repeatedly signalled over preceding years, the financial pressures arising from reducing budgets, increasing demand and rising costs mean that some areas of activity will no longer be viable in their current form. Some will have to be scaled back or cease entirely. Even priority activities will see budget reductions and will have to be run differently.
- 7.4 Under these circumstances, resources must be targeted increasingly on the activities, areas and people where investment will make the biggest difference to the District's future well being and prosperity. The Capital Strategy is therefore aligned to the priority outcomes and activities identified in the Bradford District and Council Plans. This approach is consistent with previous years and progress across priority outcomes is summarised below.
- 7.5 The Bradford Council Plan sets out the long-term ambitions for the district. In relation to the performance on these outcomes the broad direction of travel is outlined below.

- **Better Skills, More Good Jobs and a Growing Economy**

A growing and inclusive economy offering opportunities to all is the key to the District's future prosperity and well being and to sustaining our ability to pay for good public services.

- I. City Centre Growth Zone
- II. Leeds City Region Revolving Investment Fund
- III. Strategic Transport Investment
- IV. Markets and City Centre schemes
- V. St Georges Hall
- VI. Highways and Planning (Current CIP includes a number of West Yorkshire Combined Authority funded schemes)

- **A Great Start and Good Schools for All Our Children.**

In the UK's youngest city nothing is more important than ensuring that all our children and young people have the chance to achieve their potential.

The Council continues to meet its statutory commitment to meet the needs of the District for the provision of school places despite a challenging financial environment and uncertainty over Government policies. This is being achieved through schemes such as the Primary Schools Expansion Programme, such as Silsden Primary School and Special Education Needs.

- **Better Health, Better Lives**

The Great Places to Grow Old programmes seeks to modernise residential care provision within the District.

Further the Council is developing Sports facilities.

- **Safe, clean and active communities**

Bradford District is home to around 1,500 community groups and 100,000 active citizens who collectively represent one of our most significant assets. The Council has long worked closely in partnership with our communities to deliver good outcomes across the District and this continues to be the case, for example, through the People Can initiative.

- I. The Carbon Programme
- II. Waste collection
- III. Parks and woodlands
- IV. Bereavement Strategy
- V. Sports pitches

- **Decent Homes That People Can Afford to Live In**

The District requires significant numbers of new homes in order to meet demand. While overall housing stock has been increasing and Bradford is a high performer in terms of bringing empty homes back into use – rates remain above average – a rapid acceleration in supply is needed. With the Local Plan now agreed, priority areas for investment and growth include the canal road corridor and the city centre.

The CIP supports the provision of decent homes that people can afford to live in through a number of programmes. This includes the Affordable Housing Programme which seeks to build affordable housing for rent and sale and the provision of disabled facilities grants to enable people to live independently in their own home for longer.

The Council currently has three contracts with the Homes & Communities Agency (HCA) for the provision of affordable housing within the district 2018-19.

- **A well run council**

The financial environment continues to demand that savings are identified and delivered and the Council seeks to ensure that all its resources are used effectively and that it identifies opportunities for innovation and creative collaboration with partners, business and communities so that together we can maximise the impact of all of the District's assets on priority outcomes.

Other objectives of the capital strategy include the essential maintenance of the Council's stock, to exploit 'invest to save' opportunities to generate revenue savings or additional incomes and to enable alternative methods of service delivery to be utilised.

The Property Programme is a ten year 'invest to save' strategy to deliver a well-managed and fit for purpose estate that enables staff to work in a more agile way through New Ways of Working (NWOW). It was agreed by Executive in October 2009. The programme is based on a financial model that generated revenue savings and

capital receipts from reducing the Council's operational estate and then using those revenue savings and capital receipts to improve the Council's retained estate.

The Capital Strategy also seeks to understand the potential sources of funding and how they can be maximised to better achieve the corporate goals.

The examples above show some of the ways that capital investment will contribute to the key strategic aims of the Council.

The above is taking place against a background of austerity and significant reductions in central funding for local government. It is therefore a key aim of the Council's capital strategy that it delivers a return on investment which is financial, such as capital receipts or new revenue streams, or delivering key strategic priorities.

## **8 CONCLUSION**

- 8.1 Overall the Capital Strategy, sets out the key guiding principles and the approach to borrowing, risk and Governance, as well as demonstrating how the proposed CIP fits with the Council's vision.

## Appendix 1

### BORROWING LIMITS AND PRUDENTIAL INDICATORS

In compliance with the Council's duty under Section 3 of the Local Government Act 2003 to set an affordable borrowing limit and in accordance with Regulation 2 of The Local Authorities (Capital Finance and Accounting) (England) Regulations 2003 and the Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities the Council makes the following determinations.

(a) The capital expenditure (all of which is non-Housing Revenue Account (HRA)) in each of the following financial years will be:

2017/18	Estimate	£90.436m
2018/19	Estimate	£176.179m
2019/20	Estimate	£172.870m
2020/21	Estimate	£98.092m
2021/22	Estimate	£49.303m

(b) The capital financing requirement at the end of each of the following financial years will be:

2018/19	Estimate	£745m
2019/20	Estimate	£804m
2020/21	Estimate	£821m
2021/22	Estimate	£810m

(c) In the medium term external borrowing will only be for capital purposes and will not (except in the short term) exceed the capital financing requirement in 2018/19, 2019/20, and 2020/21 as determined in (b) above.

(d) The ratio of capital financing costs to the net revenue stream in each of the following financial years is forecast to be:

2018/19	Estimate	16%
2019/20	Estimate	17%
2020/21	Estimate	17%
2021/22	Estimate	17%

(e) The actual external debt of the authority at 31 March 2017 was £332 million in external borrowing and £182 million in Other Long Term Liabilities (including PFI and other finance leases, excluding pension liabilities) and the authorised limit for external debt in future years will be:

Financial Year	Borrowing £m	Other Long Term Liabilities £m
2018/19	420	220
2019/20	490	220
2020/21	520	200
2021/22	530	200

(f) The operational boundary for external debt in future years will be:

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Borrowing £m</b>	<b>Other Long Term Liabilities £m</b>
2018/19	400	200
2019/20	470	200
2020/21	500	180
2021/22	510	180

(g) In relation to the borrowing limits set at (f) and (g) above the Strategic Director Corporate Resources is authorised to amend the separately identified figures for borrowing and for other long term liabilities provided that the total limits remain unchanged and subject to such action subsequently being reported to Council.

(h) The authority has adopted the CIPFA Code of Practice for Treasury Management in the Public Services.

(i) The upper limit for fixed interest rate exposure in 2018/19, 2019/20 and 2020/21 will be +175% of net outstanding principal sums.

(j) The upper limit for variable interest rate exposure in 2018/19, 2019/20 and 2020/21 will be +20% of net outstanding principal sums.

(k) The upper and lower limits for the amount of fixed rate borrowing maturing in each of the periods below expressed as a percentage of total estimated fixed rate borrowing will be:

<b>Maturing in:</b>	<b>Upper Limit</b>	<b>Lower Limit</b>
Under 1 year	20%	0%
1 to 2 years	20%	0%
2 to 5 years	50%	0%
5 to 10 years	75%	0%
10 years and above	90%	20%

(m) There is a limit of £20 million for the Council to invest sums for periods longer than 364 days.

## Appendix 2 Proposed Capital Investment Plan

Scheme No	Scheme Description	Budget 2018-19	Budget 2019-20	Budget 2020-21	Budget 2021-22	Budget 2022-23	Budget Total	Specific grants, capital receipts, reserves	Invest to Save Funding	Corporate Borrowing
		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Health and Wellbeing</b>										
CS0237	Great Places to Grow Old - Adult Residential Strategy	0	9,138	0	0	0	9,138	0	0	9,138
CS0237	Keighley Road Extra Care	5,870	488	0	0	0	6,358	690	1,000	4,668
CS0237	Keighley Road Residential Care	2,645	89	0	0	0	2,734	0	2,400	334
CS0373	BACES DFG	443	443	443	443	0	1,772	0	0	1,772
CS0239	Community Capacity Grant	1,452	516	0	0	0	1,968	1,968	0	0
<b>Total - Health and Wellbeing</b>		<b>10,410</b>	<b>10,674</b>	<b>443</b>	<b>443</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>21,970</b>	<b>2,658</b>	<b>3,400</b>	<b>15,912</b>
<b>Children's Services</b>										
CS0030	Capital Improvement Work	27	0	0	0	0	27	27	0	0
CS0240	Capital Maintenance Grant	3,331	0	0	0	0	3,331	3,331	0	0
CS0244	Primary Schools Expansion Programme	1,409	6,919	0	0	0	8,328	8,256	0	72
CS0244	Silsden Sch	2,979	4,088	130	0	0	7,197	7,197	0	0
CS0244	SEN School Expansion	2,391	0	0	0	0	2,391	2,391	0	0
CS0362	Secondary School Expansion	5,876	10,801	956	0	0	17,633	17,633	0	0
CS0377	LA SEN Free Schools	500	7,000	5,350	100	0	12,950	12,950	0	0
<b>Total - Children's Services</b>		<b>16,513</b>	<b>28,808</b>	<b>6,436</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>51,857</b>	<b>51,785</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Department of Place - Economy &amp; Development</b>										
CS0134	Computerisation of Records	10	0	0	0	0	10	10	0	0
CS0136	Disabled Housing Facilities Grant	2,028	2,028	5,753	2,028	0	11,837	11,837	0	0
CS0137	Development of Equity Loans	1,000	1,300	1,200	1,195	0	4,695	1,288	0	3,407

Scheme No	Scheme Description	Budget 2018-19	Budget 2019-20	Budget 2020-21	Budget 2021-22	Budget 2022-23	Budget Total	Specific grants, capital receipts, reserves	Invest to Save Funding	Corporate Borrowing
		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
CS0144	Empty Private Sector Homes Strategy	662	0	0	0	0	662	0	0	662
CS0308	Affordable Housing Programme 2015-2018	8,600	1,383	0	0	0	9,983	693	9,290	0
CS0250	Goitside	0	0	177	0	0	177	0	0	177
CS0335	Bfd Cyrenians 255 - 257 Manningham Ln	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
CS0084	City Park	205	0	0	0	0	205	0	0	205
CS0085	City Centre Growth Zone	1,699	4,451	0	0	0	6,150	0	0	6,150
CS0189	Buck Lane	75	0	0	0	0	75	0	0	75
CS0228	Canal Road	100	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	100
CS0241	Re-use Fmr College Bldng Keighley	506	60	0	0	0	566	0	0	566
CS0266	Superconnected Cities	907	0	0	0	0	907	0	0	907
CS0291	Tyrils	4,800	0	0	0	0	4,800	4,800	0	0
CS0285	Strategic Development Fund	1,167	0	0	0	0	1,167	0	0	1,167
CS0345	Dvlpmnt of Land at Crag Road, Shply	573	0	0	0	0	573	573	0	0
<b>Total – Department of Place - Economy &amp; Development</b>		<b>22,336</b>	<b>9,222</b>	<b>7,130</b>	<b>3,223</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>41,911</b>	<b>19,201</b>	<b>9,290</b>	<b>13,420</b>
<b>Department of Place - Planning, Transportation &amp; Highways</b>										
CS1000	Countances Way - Bridge grant	0	30	0	0	0	30	30	0	0
CS0071	Highways S106 Projects	100	356	0	0	0	456	456	0	0
CS0293	West Yorkshire & York Transport Fund	19,383	26,145	34,062	27,014	0	106,604	106,604	0	0
CS0306	Strategic Transport Infrastructure Priorities	90	2,600	0	0	0	2,690	0	0	2,690
CS0306	Connectivity Project	1,196	400	0	0	0	1,596	0	0	1,596
CS0329	Damens County Park	60	0	0	0	0	60	0	0	60
CS0350	Street Lighting Invest to Save	825	0	0	0	0	825	0	0	825
CS0353	Strategic Land Purch Hard Ings Kghly	4,415	3,176	0	0	0	7,591	3,176	0	4,415
CS0355	Strategic Land Purch Harrogate Rd / New Line	154	3,557	1,733	0	0	5,444	5,290	0	154



Scheme No	Scheme Description	Budget 2018-19	Budget 2019-20	Budget 2020-21	Budget 2021-22	Budget 2022-23	Budget Total	Specific grants, capital receipts, reserves	Invest to Save Funding	Corporate Borrowing
		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
CS0370	LTP IP3 One Syst Public Transp	779	779	0	0	0	1,558	1,558	0	0
CS0371	LTP IP3 Places to live and work	300	0	0	0	0	300	300	0	0
<b>Total –Department of Place - Planning, Transportation &amp; Highways</b>		<b>27,302</b>	<b>37,043</b>	<b>35,795</b>	<b>27,014</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>127,154</b>	<b>117,414</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9,740</b>
<b>Department of Place - Other</b>										
CS0060	Replacement of Vehicles	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	0	12,000	0	12,000	0
CS0066	Ward Investment Fund	35	0	0	0	0	35	0	0	35
CS0151	Building Safer Communities Capital Proj	47	0	0	0	0	47	47	0	0
CS0063	Waste Infrastructure and Recycling projects	204	0	0	0	0	204	204	0	0
CS0132	Community Hubs	25	0	0	0	0	25	0	0	25
CS0340	St George's Hall	5,889	0	0	0	0	5,889	0	0	5,889
CS0129	Scholemoor Project	0	0	83	0	0	83	0	0	83
CS0229	Cliffe Castle Restoration	52	0	0	0	0	52	52	0	0
CS0347	Park Ave Cricket Ground	20	0	0	0	0	20	20	0	0
CS0367	King George V Playing Fields	1,096	0	0	0	0	1,096	700	0	396
CS0349	Chellow Dene	8	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	8
CS0356	Sedburgh SFIP	8,865	7,035	49	0	0	15,949	0	0	15,949
CS0354	Squire Lane Sports Facility	0	5,000	4,400	0	0	9,400	0	0	9,400
CS0107	Markets	35	0	0	0	0	35	35	0	0
CS0363	Markets Redevelopment - City Centre	2,219	7,606	5,400	0	0	15,225	1,132	0	14,093
<b>Total – Department of Place - Other</b>		<b>21,495</b>	<b>22,641</b>	<b>12,932</b>	<b>3,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>60,068</b>	<b>2,190</b>	<b>12,000</b>	<b>45,878</b>
<b>Corporate Resources - Estates &amp; Property Services</b>										
CS0094	Property Programme (bworks)	609	0	0	0	0	609	0	0	609

Scheme No	Scheme Description	Budget 2018-19	Budget 2019-20	Budget 2020-21	Budget 2021-22	Budget 2022-23	Budget Total	Specific grants, capital receipts, reserves	Invest to Save Funding	Corporate Borrowing
		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
CS0366	Property Programme 17/18	750	0	0	0	0	750	0	0	750
CS0230	Beechgrove Allotments	274	0	0	0	0	274	150	0	124
CS0050	Carbon and Other Management Efficiencies	1,000	820	0	0	0	1,820	0	0	1,820
CS0305	Healthy Heating Scheme	77	0	0	0	0	77	0	0	77
CS2000	DDA - monies to RCNA	50	50	50	62	0	212	0	0	212
CS0378	Cust Serv Strategy	299	0	0	0	0	299	49	0	250
CS0361	Strategic Acquisitions	576	0	0	0	0	576	0	576	0
<b>Total – Corporate Resources – Estates &amp; Property Services</b>		<b>3,635</b>	<b>870</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4,617</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>576</b>	<b>3,842</b>
<b>Reserve Schemes &amp; Contingencies</b>										
1	General Contingency	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	0	8,000	0	0	8,000
CS0277	Wyke Manor Ph2 Sports Dev	493	0	0	0	0	493	0	0	493
2	Essential Maintenance Provision (Moved to Property & Economic Development)	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	0	8,000	0	0	8,000
3	Bradford City Centre Townscape Heritage	2,000	0	0	0	0	2,000	1,750	0	250
4	Strategic Acquisitions	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	0	40,000	0	40,000	0
5	Keighley One Public Sector Estate	10,000	5,000	3,000	0	0	18,000	0	15,000	3,000
6	Depot strategy	3,000	0	0	0	0	3,000	2,500	500	0
CS0306	Stategic Acq - Highways	550	0	0	0	0	550	0	0	550
7	Canal Road Land Assembly	450	0	0	0	0	450	0	0	450
8	Bereavement Strategy	8,500	8,500	0	0	0	17,000	0	0	17,000
19	National Productivity Investment Fund	3,500	0	0	0	0	3,500	2,330	0	1,170
	New Schemes excluding additional funding St Georges Hall & Markets	31,995	36,112	18,306	1,461	0	87,874	24,929	44,745	18,200
<b>Total - Reserve Schemes &amp; Contingencies</b>		<b>74,488</b>	<b>63,612</b>	<b>35,306</b>	<b>15,461</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>188,867</b>	<b>31,509</b>	<b>100,245</b>	<b>57,113</b>

Scheme No	Scheme Description	Budget 2018-19	Budget 2019-20	Budget 2020-21	Budget 2021-22	Budget 2022-23	Budget Total	Specific grants, capital receipts, reserves	Invest to Save Funding	Corporate Borrowing
		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>TOTAL - All Services</b>		<b>176,179</b>	<b>172,870</b>	<b>98,092</b>	<b>49,303</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>496,444</b>	<b>224,956</b>	<b>125,511</b>	<b>145,977</b>

Less General Capital Receipts	-14,000
Less Direct Revenue Financing	-10,804
	<u>(1)224,956</u>
	<u>125,511</u>
	<u>121,173</u>

- (1) Comprises £208.223m capital grants, £11.874m specific capital receipts, £4.859m earmarked reserves.
- (2) £145.977m of Corporate borrowing will be reduced by £14m of general capital receipts and £10.804m of Direct Revenue Financing.
- (3) The additional new schemes totalling £98.024m comprise the "New schemes excluding additional funding for St Georges Hall & Markets" totalling £87.874 as well as additional funding for markets and St Georges Hall.



## **Report of the Assistant Director Finance and Procurement to the meeting of Executive to be held on 20 February 2018 and Council to be held on 22 February 2018**

---

**Document Q**

### **Subject:**

2018/19 Budget Proposals and Forecast Reserves – S151 Officer Assessment

### **Summary statement:**

This report assesses the robustness of the proposed budget for 2018/19, the adequacy of forecast levels of reserves and associated risks.

It concludes that the estimates are sufficiently robust for the Council to set the budget. It also concludes that unallocated reserves should be maintained in the range of £12-15m over the period of the current financial strategy to ensure the continued financial resilience of the Council.

---

Andrew Crookham  
Assistant Director Finance and Procurement

**Portfolio: Leader of Council and Corporate**

Report Contact: Andrew Crookham  
Assistant Director Finance and Procurement  
Phone: (01274) 433656  
E-mail: [andrew.crookham@bradford.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.crookham@bradford.gov.uk)

**Overview & Scrutiny Area: N/A**



## **1. SUMMARY**

This report assesses the robustness of the proposed budget for 2018/19, the adequacy of the forecast levels of reserves and associated risks in the context of the Council's financial outlook up to 2020/21.

The Council is setting its budget for 2018/19, and making decisions about savings for 2019/20, which will require implementation action to be undertaken during 2018/19.

It should be noted that the process aligns with years two and three of the four year financial strategy constructed this time last year that sought to align our finances to the outcomes in the Council Plan 2017-2021.

For the past two budget rounds, the Council's S151 Officer has concluded that unallocated reserves in the range of £12-15m is adequate and this report concurs with that view. That said, where opportunities arise to exceed this level, these should be exploited given the continued uncertainty in the local government finance environment.

The report concludes that the estimates are sufficiently robust, in the context of its £358m net expenditure and available contingencies, for the Council to set the budget for 2018/19. However, it should be clearly noted that there remains risk around the delivery of some major savings programmes, in particular related to Demand Management in Adult Social Care, and organisational focus is required to ensure these deliver the required financial savings, as well as the desired outcomes for service users.

## **2. BACKGROUND**

Under Section 25 of the Local Government Act 2003, when the Council sets the budget, the Council's S151 Officer is required to report on:

- the robustness of the estimates made for the purposes of the calculations, and
- the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves.

This report comments on the revenue and capital estimates in the proposed budget. The assessment is informed by extensive personal involvement in the development of the proposed budget.

## **3. OPTIONS**

This report does not set out alternative options. Legislation requires Council to have regard to this report and the assessment when setting the budget.

## **4. FINANCIAL & RESOURCE APPRAISAL**

The financial appraisal underpinning this assessment is set out in the separate reports to this Executive on planned revenue and capital spending.

## 2018/19 Onwards Budget Appraisal

### Context

- In setting a four year plan this time last year, the organisation signalled its intent on managing the longer term financial sustainability of the authority, reducing the recurrent cost base within anticipated resources by 2020/21. This would see £110m of savings delivered over the four years, set against modest increases in Council Tax and Business Rates and a projected zero Revenue Support Grant (RSG) in the final year. The £110m of savings would be on top of £218m delivered during the period from 2011/12 to 2016/17.
- The following sections seek to highlight the changes since the plan was adopted, the risks of those changes and how they impact on the delivery of the 2018/19 budget and our longer term financial and reserve strategies.

### 2017/18 Projected Position

- The Q3 monitoring report presented to Executive on 6 February 2018 forecasts a £0.6m overspend for 2017/18, with the working intention that further mitigating actions will result in expenditure being contained within budget by the year end.
- The Council has well established procedures for measuring progress against agreed savings plans and these are reported in the quarterly monitoring reports. In previous years, we have typically reported no more than 15% of the total value of savings off target for a given year. 2017/18 has seen a marked increase in this figure with 51% of savings (£23.5m) reported off track, which presents a cause for concern should non-delivery of this magnitude become a recurring theme.
- Mitigations in year include one off funding, slippage on the capital programme and associated revenue budgets and full application of corporate contingencies.

### Funding and Resources

- The financial plan is still predicated on the council receiving zero Revenue Support Grant (RSG) in 2020/21. This may be subject to change given the announcement of the move to a 75% Business Rates scheme in the December 2017 settlement. However, a number of risks inherent in the operating environment remain, including historic damping, the transfer of further responsibilities and the impact of Brexit on overall public finances to move away from this assumption at this time.
- The successful bid for the Leeds City Region Business Rates Pool to become a 100% pilot was welcome, and whilst it is only for one year at this time, it has unlocked resources that will help the Council meet short term expenditure pressures outlined in further detail below. Whilst the pool pilot has been provided on a 'no detriment' basis, i.e. no council should be worse off as a result of its involvement in a pilot, business rates remains the more volatile of our local taxation revenue streams with significant resources applied to provisions for backdated valuation appeals.
- With the anticipated removal of RSG and the volatility of business rates, Council Tax remains our most stable and reliable revenue stream. It will account for 52% of

our net expenditure requirement in 2018/19, up from 35% in 2010/11. As a historically low taxing authority, it is important to maximise the ongoing benefit of increases in the Band D rate as and when they are available and this budget proposes maximum increases in both the general and social care precept element (5.99% in total). The budget also makes provision for growth of £750k which includes investment in a Housing and Development Delivery team, designed to unlock stalled sites and accelerate growth, above and beyond the assumed annual growth in the taxbase of 750 Band D properties.

- The national Fair Funding review, stage one of which is now open for consultation, presents the opportunity to address some of the deficiencies in the current funding system. Key to the Council will be ensuring our historic underfunding, economic deprivation and demand led pressures in both Adults and Children's services are appropriately accounted for. Future reports to Council will provide feedback on the developing themes of the review and how they may affect our funding outlook.

### Expenditure Pressures

- The original four year plan was predicated on 1% year on year pay increases, which was the right assumption at the time, given the pattern of pay offers from 2010 onwards. Since the June 2017 election, and after we prepared our annual Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) refresh, public sector pay has come to the fore, particularly in the health sector, with higher than average pay offers reported. The Local Government sector has followed suit with a 2 year pay offer which signals that the era of below inflation pay increases may be drawing to a close. This creates structural cost pressures for the Council given each 1% in pay equates to c.£2.1m. In addition, the move to the National Living Wage locks in further cost both to our budget and the wider supply chain on which we rely. Both of these issues will require further assessment at the next MTFP refresh in July 2018, as we set out the scale of the fiscal challenge up to 2024/25.
- The estimates make provision for total inflationary increases to our cost base of c.£13.9m, which have also increased from the time we set the original plan, and careful monitoring of external forces on prices will become a theme of our financial planning, in particular as the impacts of Brexit become known.
- Managing demand remains a key issue. The budget makes annual provision of £3.6m year on year growth for support for our most vulnerable residents. We have seen a sharp increase in the Looked After Children population during 2017/18, and our future financial planning needs to be mindful of whether this growth will be repeated in future years.
- The issue of demand is not confined to Bradford, with most if not all social care authorities reporting strain in Adults or Children's care, or both. The challenge for this Council, with its comparatively low taxbase and strong efficiency performance, will be in maintaining discretionary services whilst managing this demand and the existing savings delivery programme.
- The amendment tabled by Executive on 20 February makes provision for ongoing investment of £450k in Children's Social Care and a further use of £1m of one off funding to further support frontline Children's Services. These proposals are



affordable within the scope of the overall financial plan and should be subject to detailed business cases on their usage prior to committing to expenditure.

### Savings Plans

- Earlier sections of this paper refer to the 2017/18 in year challenge related to savings delivery. In order to present a balanced budget for 2018/19, we have been required to reprofile and in some cases write off proposals where they are no longer deemed to be deliverable in 2018/19 or beyond. This isn't unusual in managing a longer term financial plan and clearly forms part of producing a credible budget in any given year. These actions equate to £24m and it has been made possible by bringing forward other savings, making one-off adjustments to our capital financing budget in 2018/19, based on the current projected pace of delivery on the programme, as well as reducing some central contingencies to a still acceptable level. It should be reiterated that these measures have been used to reduce the 2017/18 overspend and would therefore not be available to mitigate unforeseen cost pressures in 2018/19.
- Whilst these actions have been acceptable and proportionate in this budget, the organisation cannot reasonably afford to repeat this in future budget cycles. Continued use of one off resource to mitigate non delivery of savings in order to balance budgets, which in turn erodes the financial health of an organisation, is clearly bad practice and is the prime reason for the severe financial strain being reported elsewhere in the sector at this time.
- The current savings programme, up to 2020/21, contains sizeable proposals that need to be delivered in their entirety over the remaining three years of the plan, including changes to our Early Help offer, alternative delivery models for our Place based services and most notably Demand Management in Adult Social Care.
- The latter, which is projected to deliver £32m in savings over the plan, and which we have reprofiled as part of the measures outlined above is crucial in the context of its proportionality to the overall savings we need to deliver by 2020/21. Managing demand in the care system and ensuring the right care is provided at the right time and place is clearly a sound strategy and firm organisational focus will be required to ensure the projected financial quantum is aligned to those improved outcomes for our residents.
- The full list of savings proposals have been developed with Executive members and management teams, which building on the extensive outcome led work in 2016, started in early summer 2017.
- All savings are allocated to a Strategic Director and progress measured through departmental Budget Delivery Boards and the overall Council Plan Delivery Board.
- In presenting two years of proposals, there is currently a projected gap of £4m in 2019/20 requiring further mitigation. This structural pressure will ultimately need to be met by ongoing savings.

### Other Considerations

- The proposed allocation of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) has been the

subject of extensive and detailed development, scrutiny and ratification by the Schools Forum and its working groups. As part of this process, the Forum has recommended adopting the new National Funding Formula for the allocation of formula funding to primary and secondary schools from April 2018.

- In terms of Capital, the budget makes provision for a modest and affordable increase in our capital financing budget to cover the cost of a number of new significant regeneration projects designed to stimulate the local economy.
- Continuing developments in the integration of health and social care, which will likely be further impacted by the Green Paper due in summer 2018, may bring consequences to our longer term financial planning assumptions not currently factored in.
- Building on this last point, it is important to acknowledge the growing interdependencies in public sector finances, and in particular Health, and the way that we use our funds, and partners use theirs, will have an increasing bearing on outcomes in the district.

### Summary

Given the remedial measures applied to the financial plan in 2018/19, it is concluded that the budget estimates are sufficiently robust in the context of an overall net expenditure requirement of £358m and available contingencies. However, given the experience in 2017/18 of non delivery of savings, careful and regular monitoring of the revised savings delivery programme will be required so that appropriate actions can be made including the identification of replacement recurring cost reductions where necessary.

### **Reserves**

The Council's financial strategy during the period of austerity has been to maintain the strength of the balance sheet in order to provide resilience in a turbulent environment, whilst reducing the recurrent net cost base. The Council adopted and has adhered to a policy on the use of reserves which has served it well.

The balance sheet includes:

- Unallocated Corporate Reserves
- reserves set aside for designated purposes and for specific liabilities and risks.

Previous budget decisions, including setting aside funding for transformation, means that Unallocated Corporate Reserves currently sit at £14m (3.9% of the proposed net expenditure budget for 2018/19), and these are not projected to change over the remaining three years of the plan. Recent policy has suggested a balance of between £12-15m is acceptable and this remains a reasonable assumption.

As can be seen in the Budget Appraisal above, the financial challenges facing the Council are significant. To reiterate, non delivery of savings of the magnitude seen in 2017/18 on a continued basis, coupled with rising demand and further reduced resources could ultimately create a financially unsustainable organisation.

In this context, the projected Unallocated Corporate Reserves for 2018/19 and beyond remain adequate **only if**

- the significant risks to the delivery of the proposed savings from previous and new decisions can be managed
- the indicative spending plans in future years are developed, agreed and implemented
- The amount of contingency in the annual base budget remains adequate
- Potential liabilities are manageable within the balance sheet's provisions and reserves
- Local sources of taxation and other income turn out as planned (with particular focus on Business Rates volatility).

It is therefore concluded that:

- the reserves are adequate for the 2018/19 proposed budget
- the Council has a clear reserves plan for the medium term
- the key to financial resilience now lies firmly in successfully implementing plans.

## **5. RISK MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE ISSUES**

The potential impacts of the identified risks have been modelled in Appendix 1 to this paper. This risk analysis will be used to inform management action during the year. The existing and proposed governance mechanisms to manage the budget are examined as part of the risk assessment.

## **6. LEGAL APPRAISAL**

This assessment is made in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Acts 1972 and 2003. The Council's Constitution provides that each year, before the budget is determined the S151 Officer will produce a report for the Executive showing ongoing commitments and a forecast of the total resources available to the Council to enable the Executive to determine any financial strategy guidelines.

## **7. OTHER IMPLICATIONS**

The Equality and Diversity issues arising from the new budget proposals are analysed in the reports accompanying the budget documentation presented to Executive on 6 February and 20 February 2018, plus addenda presented at the meeting. The Interim Trade Union feedback on the budget proposals is documented and reported in a similar way. The Trade Union feedback and the feedback from the public engagement and consultation programme on the proposals previously approved by Budget Council in February 2017 was fully considered by Council at that time.

## **8. RECOMMENDATIONS**

That Members have regard to this report in setting the budget, and in particular note the conclusions that:

- the estimates presented to Council are sufficiently robust, in the context of the overall £358m net expenditure requirement and available contingencies
- the reserves are adequate for the 2018/19 proposed budget, and will be drawn on in accordance with proposed plan and reserves policy, recognising that estimates will be subject to review as part of the rolling planning cycle
- the projected corporate reserves to 2020/21 would, on current estimates, be adequate, subject to the implementation of the rest of the proposed financial plan.

As with all budgets there is the potential for amendments to be proposed/agreed which could change the overall package of proposals. In that respect, it should be highlighted that this statement would be amended or added to if a decision was proposed that lead to the Council's reserves falling below their recommended level. In addition, any other amendments would be considered against the scale of the overall budget and depending upon the extent and nature, may result in a revised statement.

## **9. APPENDICES**

### **9.1 Appendix 1: Risk-Based Assessment**

## **10. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

- Proposed Financial Plan updated 2018/19 – 2020/21 - Executive Report 5 December 2017 (Doc AJ)
- 2018/19 Budget Update– Executive Report 6 February 2018 (Doc AT)
- Consultation Feedback and Equality Assessments for the 2018/19 and 2019/20 Council Budget Proposals – Executive Report 6 February 2018 (Doc AV) and the addendum to that report circulated to Executive on 6 February 2018
- Interim Trade Union Feedback on the Council's Budget Proposals for the 2018/19 and 2019/20 Council Budget - Executive Report 6 February 2018 (Doc AW) and the addendum to that report circulated to Executive on 6 February 2018
- The Council's Revenue Estimates 2018/19 – Executive report 20 February 2018 (Document AZ)
- Allocation of the Schools Budget 2018/19 Financial Year – Executive Report 20 February 2018 (Document BA)
- Council's Capital Investment Plan 2018/19 to 2021/22 – Executive report 20

February 2018 (Document BB)

- The Council's Revenue Estimates 2018/19 (as amended) – Executive Report 20 February 2018 (Document P)

### Risk-Based Assessment of Potential Events Affecting the Proposed 2018/19 Budget and Beyond

The table outlines: the risk event that could occur and cause the plan to vary; the mitigations that are in place; and an assessment of the potential quantified impact of the individual risk materialising, together with the additional mitigating factors.

Risk Event	Description and Mitigation in Place	Residual Risk Rating (Likelihood/Impact) and Contingency
		Likelihood: Low <20% <Medium < 50%< High<70% Impact: Low <£2m< Medium < £3m < High < £5m
Taxation streams are unstable	Collection Rates, bad debt provisions, appeals provisions, rateable property and the cost of the Council Tax Reduction Scheme are all volatile and are regularly monitored. Business Rates performance continues to be more volatile than Council Tax, with the outcome of appeals significantly reducing the tax yield. In year losses and gains can be handled through the Collection Fund, while variances can be dealt with in future years plans.	High/Medium  Contingency provided through adjustment of plans for subsequent years.
Other income streams unstable	Non-taxation income streams remain less volatile than in previous years. NHS funding streams may be at risk in the wake of current financial control difficulties. Past performance suggests that unplanned income may materialise, offsetting generally the risks against the aggregate net revenue budget. The Council is becoming more successful a securing competitive grants.	Low/Low  Contingency provided through in-year budget control.  Continuous dialogue with NHS partners over funding flows  More active bidding for external funds  Close monitoring of trading
Member support for the budget diminishes	The Executive and individual Portfolio Holders, have been involved at a very detailed level in the development of the proposals. The financial plan reflects the Council Plan which has also had significant member input.	Low/Low  Contingency provided through adjustment of plans for subsequent years
Plans for implementation of	Each savings proposal is required to be accompanied by a project plan setting out the implementation path. The impact of the plans	Medium/Low

Risk Event	Description and Mitigation in Place	Residual Risk Rating (Likelihood/Impact) and Contingency
		Likelihood: Low <20% <Medium < 50%< High<70% Impact: Low <£2m< Medium < £3m < High < £5m
changes are not robust	has been tested in consultation. The degree of risk in each individual proposed change varies, and requires continuous project management. The proposals in Adult Services require changes in staff attitudes to assessing and meeting needs, client behaviour, and supply side response. In Children's Services, the changes are wide-reaching and comprehensive, and external resource has already been procured to assist. Implementation requires dedicated project management resource (which continues to be funded in the budget). Lessons learned from previous years suggest that not having fully worked up plans at the beginning of the year hampers delivery- this risk is not yet fully mitigated at the time of this assessment.	Mitigation provided through continuous improvement of plans.
Planning is insufficiently flexible to respond to unexpected events	Governance arrangements allow Strategic Directors, under delegated authorities, and in consultation with Portfolio Holders, to flex plans during the year. If necessary, recourse can be had to the Executive to approve changes within the overall agreed budget envelope	Low/Low
Implementation of change is poorly controlled, or compromised by insufficient internal capacity	<p>From 2011/12 to 2017/18, the Council has managed to implement savings of around £233m. Looking at performance in 2017/18, 49% of specific savings plans are forecast to convert into actual savings on time (compared with 87% in 2016/17). Given the cumulative impact of the savings since 2010, it will be increasingly hard to find mitigating savings. The degree of risk varies across Departments.</p> <p>The standard "7 Keys" programme and project management method, which has been adopted across Departments, will continue.</p> <p>There is a risk that the multiple impact of discrete changes on individuals or single organisations is not apparent until implementation, with unintended consequences that may need addressing.</p>	<p>Medium/High</p> <p>Compensating action to reduce net costs</p> <p>Non-recurrent funds are available to pay for change management, to reduce the risk of insufficient capacity</p> <p>Contingency in base budget.</p>

Risk Event	Description and Mitigation in Place	Residual Risk Rating (Likelihood/Impact) and Contingency
		Likelihood: Low <20% <Medium < 50%< High<70% Impact: Low <£2m< Medium < £3m < High < £5m
Risks to timely implementation of changes to packages of care in adults and children services	The programme of change for Adult Services continues to be risk-laden in view of: the proportionate value of savings in relation to the overall savings programme to 2020/21; the interconnectedness of the changes; the number and range of stakeholders to be consulted and managed; the statutory framework; the close links between local decisions and nationally-sponsored policy and thinking on new models of health and social care; the financial challenges faced by businesses in the social sector; and recent actual experience of managing change. The package of proposals to reform entitlements to and methods of transporting children with high needs to and from school has not yet yielded the intended financial benefits. The proposals from Children's Services will require a significant project management effort, with a package of reforms that include a fundamental rethink about care arrangements for children with needs for specialist services; the rapid move to school-led improvement; and new ways of working with schools to deliver some special educational needs services. These risks will be monitored through project management.	High/High  Use of dedicated programme management resource  Continued collaboration with NHS and other partners  Learning from developments in other local authorities  Adoption of higher risk appetite in the assessment of individual cases  Use of external support/expertise
Uncertainties over the integration of health and social care, including delays in developing new models of care to support changes to service delivery	The future of adult social care is heavily influenced by national policy on integration. Work to develop "accountable care systems" could run slower than is necessary to inform/support local changes, with potential adverse financial and client impacts. Governance mechanisms including the Health and Wellbeing Board and supporting bodies are in place, allowing shared planning with NHS partners, and joint participation in nationally led initiatives. Negotiations continue over the distribution of the Better Care Fund. Financial pressures in the NHS could trigger higher degrees of organisational change, which divert leadership attention away from job of managing client demand which lies at the heart of the adult services changes required to deliver the budget.	High/Medium  The Council may have to make unilateral changes if the pace of change is too slow
Changes related to	Consultation with Trade Unions commenced on 27 November 2017,	Low/Low



Risk Event	Description and Mitigation in Place	Residual Risk Rating (Likelihood/Impact) and Contingency
		Likelihood: Low <20% <Medium < 50%< High<70% Impact: Low <£2m< Medium < £3m < High < £5m
staff cannot be implemented to plan	and has continued since. Implementation will focus on avoiding compulsory redundancy. The voluntary redundancy framework has proved to be effective, though there is a need to ensure that the skill base of the workforce is maintained. The total number of staff that could be at risk from this proposed budget is 85 FTE for 2018/19, and 68 for 2019/20 (in addition to 107 FTE for 2018/19 arising from decisions of 2017 Budget Council). Staff related changes account for c 1.5m, or 31% of total net budget changes in 2018/19.	Compensating action to reduce net costs  Vacancy Management  Contingency provided in base budget
Changes related to external suppliers cannot be implemented to plan	The new budget proposals foresee a reduction to spending with external suppliers of £2.2m or 43% of total net budget changes in 2018/19. Past experience suggests that through individual contract negotiation budgets can be managed through a combination of volume and price; and increasingly through re-commissioning for revised levels of service. Suppliers of adult social care continue to show signs of financial stress, including from the anticipated impact of the National Living Wage. Additional funding for Adult Services will be available from the extra 3% increase in Council Tax.	Low/Medium  Compensating action to reduce net costs  Additional 3% Council Tax rise to support adult social care costs  Contingency provided in base budget
Changes related to income generation cannot be implemented to plan	The proposed budget assumes aggregate income from non-taxation sources rises by c 0.5% annually as a result of inflation. Targeted increases in income in 2018/19 are £1.3m or 26% of total net budget changes in 2018/19. The revised policy for social care charges is subject to an extended consultation period, resulting in delays in implementation.	Low/Low  Compensating action to reduce net costs  Contingency provided in base budget
Customer/ citizen behaviour is inconsistent with plan	Some budgets require significant degrees of change in behaviour and expectations on the part of service users and their representatives; and continuing consultation processes may pose risks to implementation. Experience to date says the most sensitive areas are in Adult Services; in Children's specialist services, and in local everyday services such as parking, public conveniences, and community amenities.	Medium/Medium  Compensating action to reduce net costs  Contingency provided in base budget

Risk Event	Description and Mitigation in Place	Residual Risk Rating (Likelihood/Impact) and Contingency
		Likelihood: Low <20% <Medium < 50%< High<70% Impact: Low <£2m< Medium < £3m < High < £5m
External stakeholder groups resist and delay change	Experience over the last 5 years suggests that where change affects groups who have the capacity to organise challenge to the implementation of agreed budget decision, the result can be delay, which inhibits the timely delivery of savings	Medium/Low Stakeholder management as part of implementation  Contingency planning
Demographic changes place unplanned burden on resources	The proposed budget has been increased to account for £2.9m of demographic growth in Adult Services, and £0.6m from Looked After Children. The Schools budgets (funded by the DSG) reflect the latest pupil census. It is expected that demographic growth and changes in the composition of the population will continue to lead to service pressures, which may need to be factored into future plans.	Low/Low  Contingency provided through adjustment of plans for subsequent years
Insufficient inflation allowance is provided in the plan	Expenditure budgets have been selectively inflated at indices appropriate for the relevant line. Where appropriate, budget managers will need to absorb unfunded inflation through reducing consumption of goods and services. Pay budgets have been inflated to reflect the current status of negotiation on national pay awards. The impact of potential greater inflationary pressures in the economy on the medium term outlook will need to be managed.	Low/Low  Compensating action to reduce net costs
Capital investment is poorly controlled	The level of contingency in the capital plans is in line with historically consistent levels. Some individual projects have yet to reach full business case stage, so their cost will need to be monitored. Recent experience suggests that capital projects take longer to implement than implied by the financial plan; but the revenue budget implications tend to be favourable. That said, we have calculated a one-off sum related to capital financing in order to allow us to reprofile agreed savings.	Low/Low  Close monitoring is required to ensure that schemes do not overspend  Contingency provided through adjustment of plans for subsequent years
Sources of funds for capital investment do not materialise	In addition, to the capital receipts expected to be released as a result of specific schemes, the Capital Investment Plan assumes £3.5m of general capital receipts from emerging sales of Council property.If they do not materialise, the plan (or individual projects	Low/Low  Contingency provided through adjustment of plans for subsequent years

Risk Event	Description and Mitigation in Place	Residual Risk Rating (Likelihood/Impact) and Contingency
		Likelihood: Low <20% <Medium < 50%< High<70% Impact: Low <£2m< Medium < £3m < High < £5m
	within in which are dependent on receipts) will need to be reviewed.	
Interest Rates are higher than anticipated over the life of the plan	Should there be sharp rate rises, this would have a corresponding impact on the capital financing budget as external borrowing becomes more expensive. This may in turn have an impact on the affordability of the capital programme, in particular in later years. Interest Rates assumed in the budget are based on the latest available information from professional treasury management advisors. Regular updates are received and form part of our monitoring processes.	Medium/Medium  Compensating action to reduce net costs  Reprofiling and reprioritisation of the capital plan
The baseline budget is structurally compromised	The proposed budget is set using the 2017/18 baseline as amended for specific changes. The 2017/18 outturn shows a combination of overspend pressures and compensating underspends. Not all these variances have been adjusted for in the 2018/19 budget, in order to maintain financial discipline.	Medium/Medium  Strategic Directors can use their delegated budgets flexibly
Changes in school funding and in school structures created unforeseen and unfunded liabilities	Three factors could lead to financial stress in schools, which, under some circumstances, could create liabilities for the Council's budget: the increasing gap between funding and inflation-driven costs; the impact of the National Funding Formula on individual schools; conversions to academies. No additional provision has been made in the budget for these risks	Medium/Medium  Support for/intervention in individual schools On-going dialogue with Regional Schools Commissioner Engagement with Bradford Schools Forum
Internal governance arrangements are not fit for purpose	Constitutional arrangements, internal delegations, and the financial control environment are in place and, from audit testing, are effective. The Schools Forum and the supporting mechanisms are likewise effective at enabling a mature discussion about the use of local authority and DSG funds to support schools and pupils. Governance arrangements for health and social care are also well established. Internal governance supporting change management also reduces the risk of departmental silo mentality.	Low/low
Governance arrangements with	Governance arrangements at District level were re-tuned during 2016. Reforms continue in the education governance landscape.	Low/Low

Risk Event	Description and Mitigation in Place	Residual Risk Rating (Likelihood/Impact) and Contingency
		Likelihood: Low <20% <Medium < 50%< High<70% Impact: Low <£2m< Medium < £3m < High < £5m
external parties are not fit for purpose	The Health and Wellbeing Board and supporting arrangements are in place, though the pace of development is often overtaken by national NHS developments. At regional level, Combined Authority governance is bedded in, though further changes may evolve in the wake of the fluid devolution agenda. These factors do not increase financial risk as much as absorb leadership and management attention.	

## Report of the Assistant Director, Office of the Chief Executive to the meeting of Executive to be held on 6 February 2018.

**AV**

### Subject:

Consultation feedback and equality assessment for the 2018-19 and 2019-20 Council budget proposals.

### Summary statement:

On 5 December 2017 the Executive approved new budget proposals for consultation as required with the public, interested parties, staff and the Trade Unions. This report and appendices provide feedback from the public engagement and consultation programme and sets out a summary of the equality assessments carried out on the Executive's Budget proposals for 2018-19 and 2019-20. There is particular reference to the Council's responsibilities under equality legislation to enable the Executive to have due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty when considering its recommendations to Council on a budget for 2018-19 and 2019-20.

Alison Milner Assistant Director: Office of the Chief Executive	Portfolio:  Corporate
Report Contact:  Kathryn Jones, Policy Officer Phone: (01274) 433664 E-mail: <a href="mailto:k.jones@bradford.gov.uk">k.jones@bradford.gov.uk</a>	Overview & Scrutiny Area:  Corporate

## 1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 On 5 December 2017 the Executive approved new budget proposals for consultation as required with the public, interested parties, staff and the Trade Unions. This report and appendices provide feedback from the public engagement and consultation programme and sets out a summary of the equality assessments carried out on the Executive's Budget proposals for 2018-19 and 2019-20. There is particular reference to the Council's responsibilities under equality legislation to enable the Executive to have due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty when considering its recommendations to Council on a budget for 2018-19 and 2019-20.

## BACKGROUND

### 2. Best Value and the Equality Act

- 2.1 Statutory guidance on Best Value introduced in September 2011 and reaffirmed in March 2015 reminds local authorities that they are under a duty to consult service users and potential service users, local voluntary and community organisations, and small businesses. This duty applies at all stages of the commissioning cycle, including whenever authorities are considering the decommissioning of services.
- 2.2 There should also be opportunities for organisations, service users and the wider community to put forward options on how to reshape the service or project. Local authorities should assist this engagement by making available all appropriate information in line with the Government's transparency agenda.
- 2.3 The Equality Act 2010 protects people from unlawful discrimination on the basis of 'protected characteristics'. The Equality Act 2010 defines protected characteristics as age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, marriage and civil partnership, race, religion or belief, sex, and sexual orientation. The Council's approach to equalities goes beyond this, by looking at equality more broadly and taking into account the impact of our decisions on people on low income or with a low wage.
- 2.4 The 2010 Act also introduced a specific Public Sector Equality Duty which requires local authorities, in the exercise of their functions, including when making decisions, to have *due regard* to the need to:
- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct prohibited by the Act;
  - advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it; and
  - foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.
- 2.5 In discharging this duty, local authorities not only need to understand how different people will be affected by their activities, proposals and decisions, they also need to demonstrate that they have given due regard by publishing information that shows they have consciously discharged their responsibilities as part of the decision-making process.

- 2.6 In January 2013 the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) published Technical Guidance on the Public Sector Equality Duty to assist the bodies that are subject to the duty, to understand the duty and meet their responsibilities. This notes that a public body will only be able to comply with the general equality duty in relation to a decision, if the ultimate decision maker:
- understands the body's obligations under the general equality duty.
  - has sufficient information.
  - demonstrably takes this information fully into account throughout the decision-making process.
- 2.7 The EHRC emphasises the importance of ensuring that the duty is complied with before a decision is taken, while options are being developed and appraised, as well as at the time of the actual decision. The duty cannot be used retrospectively to justify a decision.

## **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

### **3. Supporting the 2018-19 and 2019-20 Budget Setting Process**

- 3.1 The public engagement and consultation programme in relation to the budget proposals for 2018-19 and 2019-20 was agreed by the Executive at its meeting on 5 December 2017. At the meeting the Executive reaffirmed its commitment to a public engagement and consultation programme designed to meet the legislative duties and to fulfil the following objectives:
- support the 2018-19 and 2019-20 budget setting process in as fair and as transparent a way as possible.
  - ensure that the Council meets its specific duties under equality legislation, in particular that the potential impact of the proposals on groups or individuals who share protected characteristics are considered, assessed and consulted upon. This would also be extended to those on low income/low wage.
  - ensure that Trade Unions and staff are consulted appropriately and in a timely manner.
  - meet Best Value Statutory Guidance regarding the way local authorities should work with Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) organisations and small businesses when facing difficult funding decisions.
  - comply with the principles on consulting and engaging with the VCS contained in Bradford District Partnership's Compact.
  - ensure the Council complies with all other legal duties to consult.
- 3.2 While the Council is not required under statute to produce or publish equality impact assessment (EIA) forms specifically, a local decision has previously been taken to continue to use EIA forms. Equality impacts are considered by officers and elected members as part of the development of the budget proposals, with assessments recorded through an EIA form. The forms can then assist members of the public and other interested parties to view potential equality impacts. This will show where a disproportionate impact has been identified, or where an impact affects a number of people or particularly vulnerable groups. Mitigations will have also been considered, and where these have been possible, they have also been captured on the EIA form.

- 3.3 Case law has confirmed that in order to fulfil the duty under S149 of the Equality Act 2010, Elected Members need to have considered equality impacts and given due regard to the three aims of the equality duty as part of their decision making processes.
- 3.4 EIA forms outlining identified equality impacts on the new budget proposals agreed by the Executive at their meeting on 5 December 2017 have been available on the Council's web site since that time. <https://www.bradford.gov.uk/your-council/council-budgets-and-spending/budget-eias-2018-19/>
- 3.5 Following a review and assessment of the consultation feedback EIA forms will be updated then republished at the same time as the papers for the Executive meeting on 20 February 2018.

#### **4. Cumulative Equality Impacts on the 2018-19 and 2019-20 Budget Proposals**

- 4.1 An analysis of the equality assessments was undertaken to identify any cumulative impacts and/or high levels of impact across all the proposals agreed at the Executive meeting on 5 December 2017 for consultation. This analysis was shared with Executive members at the time. Detail of the analysis is described below, alongside the summary presented at Appendix 1.
- 4.2 A review of all equality impact assessments demonstrates that some proposals are more likely to impact on some people than others, and that certain protected characteristic groups will also be impacted more greatly than others. The equality assessments will continue to be reviewed as the proposals are implemented and further consulted on.
- 4.3 Individual proposals that have more than one high level impact on different number of protected characteristic groups are listed below.
- A prepared and skilled workforce (4C3)
  - WYCA Transport Levy reduction – Percentage annual reduction (4R2)
  - Gullikson, drainage, pavements (4R6)
  - Accommodation, gateways, subway, signing, lining, winter (4R7)
  - Sustrans promotes young people travelling to school actively and/or sustainably (4R20)
  - Oral Health Improvement (4PH1 Pt a)
  - Sexual Health (4PH3)
  - Homestart (4PH5 Pt a)
  - Injury Minimisation Programme (IMPs) (4PH5 Pt b)
  - Worksafe (4PH5 Pt c)
  - Physical Activity, Food and Nutrition (Health Improvement) (4PH6)
  - Warm Homes Healthy People (4PH8)
  - Review of Respite Provision after the introduction of personalised budget (5C1)
- 4.4 The protected characteristic of age is very high for both young people and older people. This is seen primarily through the Better Health, Better Lives outcome proposals which will have a high impact on a smaller number of people, and Better Skills, Jobs, Economy which will affect a large number of people. 37 of the total 81 proposals undergoing consultation show impact on age.



- 4.5 Likewise for disability, there are fewer proposals showing high impact, but still 32 showing impact across all proposals, with the areas of most concern being public realm management, respite provision and Public Health's funding of warm homes and accident prevention.
- 4.6 It is also acknowledged that any early intervention funding reductions across Public Health proposals might have a further knock on effect on some protected characteristic groups who may then have a greater dependency on health and social care services.
- 4.7 Again across all proposals 35 show impacts on people with low income and low wage. Most high impacts will be felt through the range of Public Health proposals in the Better Health, Better Lives outcome, transportation and skills development support for young people.
- 4.8 Another protected characteristic being affected by a larger number of proposals, 26 in total, is race through a possible cessation of provision of early intervention measures from Public Health and skills development and support.
- 4.9 Pregnancy/maternity also features with proposals supporting the health and wellbeing of mothers of young children (e.g. Homestart and sexual health).
- 4.10 In summary the outcome area showing the most impacts across protected characteristic groups is principally Better Health, Better Lives, and to a lesser but still significant extent Better Skills, More Good Jobs and a Growing Economy.

## **5. Consultation Process**

- 5.1 The consultation programme for the budget proposals for 2018-19 and 2019-20 is part of an open, on going conversation between the Council and citizens, VCS, businesses, Council employees and trade unions about the future of local services.
- 5.2 The consultation programme opened with the publication of the report the 'Proposed financial plan updated 2018-19 to 2020-21' on 28 November 2017 which the Executive approved for consultation on 5 December 2017.
- 5.3 The consultation and engagement programme has included the promotion of the open public consultation to groups, networks and individuals throughout the district. This has primarily been via the website with a supporting freepost address for those people wishing to write to us. There have also been regular posts promoting the consultation through the Council's corporate social media accounts and Stay Connected e-mail newsletters for residents. The consultation has been promoted to:
- Partners within the Bradford District Partnership – Producer City, Health and Wellbeing Board, Children's Trust, Safer and Stronger Communities Partnership
  - The Strategic Disability Partnership engagement network
  - Parish and Town Councils
  - Citizens Panel
  - Members of Parliament
  - Business community – via forums, networks and the Chamber

- Voluntary and Community Sector – through the full Bradford District Assembly and its networks. This included two VCS run events, one in Bradford and one in Keighley, and a Young Lives consultation.
  - Communities of interest (covering protected characteristic groups)
- 5.4 Engagement and consultation is an on going process and there will be further specific consultation with service users and other interested parties on specific proposals as appropriate following the approval of the budget for 2018-19 and 2019-20 at the Council meeting on 22 February 2018.
- 5.5 It is worth noting that a separate consultation has been taking place on the Children's Services Prevention and Early Help proposal for a new model to support families and communities for the future. This consultation closes on 12 February 2018 with full independently commissioned feedback due to be reported to Executive at its meeting on 3 April 2018. This report however includes a brief status on the Prevention and Early Help consultation as it impacts on the Council's budget. This separate consultation has so far included 25 public events, 25 sessions for affected teams, 12 partner sessions including two with Young Lives, 10 sessions for Elected Members (including Area Committee meetings), and 28 partnership meetings. Consultation material has been available through numerous online platforms, and leaflets, posters and flyers distributed extensively.

## **6. Consultation Feedback - Level of Responses**

- 6.1 This report provides information on feedback received at the date of submitting this report for publication on 26 January 2018. Any feedback received after this date and before the consultation closes on 28 January 2018 be provided as an addendum to the Executive meeting on 6 February 2018.
- 6.2 A number of proposals for 2018-19 and 2019-20, were already consulted on in 2017/18, but have been included in this year's consultation due to further reductions being proposed. As such Appendix 3 of this report also includes some relevant feedback from last year, as those comments continue to be valid and helpful to decision makers in understanding the opinions of partner organisations, groups and individuals.
- 6.4 From the views shared since 28 November 2017 as part of the current consultation, as of 26 January 2018 the Council had received 1129 comments from people or groups. Of this, 1082 were in direct relation to the different budget proposals for 2018-19 and 2019-20, including the proposed increases to Council Tax. A further 47 comments are made that are not specific to particular proposals for the next two years. These comments were received from the online questionnaire, postal questionnaire, letters and emails.
- 6.6 Monitoring of the corporate social media accounts and Stay Connected newsletters on the budget consultation has shown over 1626 click-throughs to the online consultation pages. It is worth noting that overall activity on the corporate social media accounts around the consultation has however been far greater than that in terms of reach and posts shared, and not all responses represented feedback on the overall budget proposals or an individual proposal.
- 6.7 Some proposals receive a very high number of comments, but it is noted that decisions

are not made based on volume. This is because some proposals have a big impact on a very small number of people and as such may lead to only a small number of consultation responses. It is the content of all the information received that influences decisions, not the level or volume of that response.

6.8 However the proposals generating most comments were:

- Children's Services Prevention and Early Help – 700 (as of 26 January, with consultation on this open until 12 February)
- Libraries (4E9) – 189 responses
- The raise in council tax – 116 responses
- Adults overall demand management strategy (4A1) – 29 responses
- Review of respite provision (5C1) – 16 responses
- Youth service (5E2) – 16 responses
- Home from hospital, integrated care (5PH1) – 12 responses
- Museums and galleries (5E1) – 12 responses
- Street cleansing (4E5) – 8 responses
- Reducing de-trunked road maintenance budget (5R1) – 7 responses

6.9 A further 26 proposals received six or fewer comments.

6.10 A session was held with disability groups and their representatives to gather views on 11 January 2018. 35 people were in attendance, with views captured as part of this report.

6.11 Two sessions were also held with representatives from the Voluntary and Community Sector on 24 and 25 January 2018, with approximately 35 organisations represented. There was also a dedicated session on 18 January 2018 with the Young Lives Forum focussing on the proposal for youth services (5E2) with representatives from 12 different organisations.

## **7. Consultation - Specific Feedback on Proposals**

7.1 The following provides some of the headline comments made on both specific budget proposals for the next two years and also other areas of Bradford Council's work and consequent spending. These comments have come through the online/postal questionnaire, social media, emails, letters, meetings and events.

7.2 Listed below are the feedback headlines on some of the budget proposals identified for the next two years (2018-19 and 2019-20). Further detail is presented in Appendix 2.

- Libraries (4E9) – the opportunities provided by libraries are very welcomed, though some people do accept that change is needed. The shared community space they provide is seen as very valuable along with the many services and educational opportunities that run from them. Some alternative models were suggested such as York Explore and charitable trusts. From an equality perspective it was felt that the more vulnerable people in the district would be affected the most by closure or reduced services, especially those on low incomes and older people.
- Council tax increases – it was felt by some that Council tax should not increase at any greater rate than cost of living. Many people don't have wages increasing at this same rate, so state that they will be worse off as a consequence. Suggestions

were made about increasing charges for empty homes and unused land, and also dealing with any fraud more effectively.

- Adults overall demand management strategy (4A1) – much concern was raised in relation to reducing or changing social care support. It was suggested that less funding will lead to poorly trained and paid staff, leading to worsening support for vulnerable people. It was felt those with multiple needs are going to suffer disproportionately. More lobbying of government and local MPs was suggested.
- Review of respite provision (5C1) – concern was raised over the health impacts (including mental health) on carers not getting any respite. Levels of current provision were seen as too low, without any further budget reductions.
- Youth service (5E2) – it was highlighted the role that the VCS plays in providing a service to particular groups of young people, and concern that young people would become disengaged with society. It was suggested that further analysis was needed on the impact of these proposals. Small grants to the VCS can leverage in a lot more money to the district.
- Home from hospital, integrated care (5PH1) – concern over the impacts this would have on hospital bed space. It was felt that the people this would affect most, are the least likely to have a voice in consultation activities.
- Museums and galleries (5E1) – It was suggested that museums could be operated as private enterprises, though there was concern about loss of artefacts and with its history and education. It was felt that more volunteers could be used, but that they would need appropriate training.
- Street cleansing (4E5) – it was suggested that a reduction in take away restaurants just outside of Bradford city centre, would alleviate litter, and allow a more focused resource of the city centre. It was felt that more work could be done with community groups to educate people about the impacts of littering.

7.3 Though the Children's Services Prevention and Early Help consultation is on going, the following provides some early views and comments that have been shared. This doesn't however represent the scale and breadth of comments that have been received, and is simply a few headlines at this stage of that consultation.

- There is broad level of agreement to the 0-19 and think family approach. There are some concerns to ensure that focus is maintained on specialisms, particularly early years and school readiness.
- The importance has been stressed of services such as 'stay and play' sessions which build people's confidence. This has arisen though concerns about cutting out some of these programmes in an area and having to travel to access services. Have we proposed the right balance between prevention and early help?
- Details on the future offer have been sought. The broad proposed model and key outcomes have been outlined, but implementation of detailed pathways cannot be undertaken until after Executive meet on 3 April 2018.
- It is felt that the relationships and trust between the family, services and key workers is absolutely critical.
- It was suggested that less money, less resource, and higher caseloads means more families potentially falling through the gap and families feeling isolated.
- It was suggested that more buildings could be closed now to keep staff and resources.

7.4 Throughout the rest of the budget consultation there were also a number of general comments relating to the budget but not linked to a specific proposal. It was suggested

that more pressure should be put on central government to increase funding available locally to help reduce the potential increases in poverty. Comment was made around the disparity between the messages senior Council management and Elected Members are making around prevention and community led development, with the budget reductions being proposed. Other issues mentioned were the apparent increases in homeless people, geographic proportionality of the budget reductions, a suggested reduction in the number of Councillors and the future of small community organisations who are unable to measure impact and therefore maintain funding.

7.4 Consultation has also taken place with the Voluntary and Community Sector with two dedicated engagement sessions taking place on 24 and 25 January 2018. There was also a dedicated session on 18 January 2018 with the Young Lives Forum focusing on the proposal for youth services (5E2). All these comments are incorporated into the wider feedback but the headlines are presented below to ensure clarity on the VCS perspective.

- A whole systems approach was suggested, rather than looking at budget lines in isolation. This means looking across all sectors, investing locally and aligning procurement processes to allow for this. Sustainability and continuity needs building in. Local organisations keep more Bradford money in Bradford. This is also an opportunity to realise the ambition of co-production with communities at an early stage of developing services/ways of working. The conversation should be about making best use of remaining budgets, not an annual conversation about difficult cuts. VCS can also provide a different perspective and contribute to innovation.
- There should be a joint point in the year where the VCS and council can horizon scan for new opportunities and the potential to mobilise external resources strategically into the district.
- It was suggested that impact assessments, especially on equalities needs to be addressed cross sector as well across organisation so that impacts are better understood.
- It was strongly felt that the Bfunded investment (Economic Development Service, 4R13) should remain as through this support a very large amount of money is brought in to the district. The impact can be demonstrated through figures from West Yorkshire Community Accounting Service (WYCAS). This shows that in 2016/17 they supported 128 Bradford district organisations with their finances. This led to 402 separate grants and contracts being received in the district, with a value of £1.8m coming from the local authority and £4.1m coming from other sources. The need for more measures of impact from the VCS themselves was recognised.
- It is worth continuing to fund the VCS even if with just small amounts of money. The VCS can use this to match fund and bring a lot more money to the district that the public sector could not otherwise access. Some funds are needed to enable volunteers to be supported.
- It was felt that the impacts on different groups of people when taken in isolation were extensive across all proposals – be that young people, older people or disabled people.
- It was suggested that funding opportunities are being missed, and that the Council ought to identify resource for bringing in more investment to the district through funding streams.

- It was suggested that more work needs to be done to raise the profile of the changes to public services due budget reductions to the public.
- The reliance on the VCS finding alternative funding sources is not always realistic as many bids are not successful. Where activities are targeted, then evidencing the need is easier and funding easier to acquire. However these grants are used for match funding which would also no longer be an option.
- A cost benefit analysis should be done to realise the impacts of not supporting the VCS in running youth work. It is primarily preventative or early help activity which saves the whole 'system' money.
- The reliance on using volunteers as a solution is not fully realistic without support for them being in place.
- Suggestion of splitting the reduction over two years, rather than all in one year. There was concern that this meant that the Council wouldn't be meeting its statutory duties.
- Access to the National Citizens Service is limited, not all can engage, leaving a gap in support. Suggest a local version is developed with a wider reach.
- There needs to be a 'think local' approach and greater use of varied community assets. Centralising services doesn't mean stopping local delivery. The VCS often have empty space which could be used by others.
- Discussions about future provision needs to happen at early stage and to be issue based in order to generate interest and solutions from local communities. There are also opportunities to engage in different ways beyond events and meetings, such as web based platforms.
- The VCS acknowledged that they need to do more work on connecting up their sector, thereby making it easier for public services to work in partnership with them and communities.

## **8. FINANCIAL & RESOURCE APPRAISAL**

- 8.1 The financial impact of decisions arising from the consultation will be considered at the Executive meeting on 6 February 2018 and will be evaluated and incorporated into the final budget proposals from Executive to Council on 22 February 2018.

## **9. RISK MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE ISSUES**

- 9.1 Equality assessments have been carried out on the initial proposals and will continue to be updated alongside mitigations being considered.

## **10. LEGAL APPRAISAL**

- 10.1 S149 of the Equality Act 2010 (the Public Sector Equality Duty) provides as follows :

- (1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions have due regard to the need to;
- a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act 2010
  - b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it
  - c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it

- (3) Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to;
- a) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;
  - b) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;
  - c) encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.
- (4) The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.
- (5) Having due regard to the need to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to;
- a) tackle prejudice, and
  - b) promote understanding.
- (6) Compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others; but that is not to be taken as permitting conduct that would otherwise be prohibited by or under this Act.

- 10.2 The Council must ensure that it has sufficient information to enable it to identify whether a proposal, if implemented, would disproportionately affect particular groups with relevant protected characteristics and if so whether any such adverse impact can be avoided or mitigated.
- 10.3 The courts have established a number of principles which the Council should take into account in making decisions:
- the duty means that the potential impact of a decision on people with different protected characteristics must always be taken into account as a mandatory relevant consideration
  - where large numbers of vulnerable people, many of whom share a protected characteristic, are affected, consideration of the matters set out in the duty must be very high
  - even if the number of people affected by a particular decision may be small, the seriousness or the extent of discrimination may be great. The weight given to the aims of the duty is not necessarily less when the number of people affected is small.
- 10.4 There is also a duty on all Best Value authorities to consult when making changes to services or ending service provision.
- 10.5 In addition to these specific legal duties, the Council has put out its proposals for

public consultation and accordingly must have regard to the responses before making budget decisions.

- 10.6 In summary it is necessary to ensure that Executive have comprehensive information when considering the recommendations to make to Council on a budget for 2018-19 and 2019-20. Case law has confirmed that, in order to fulfil the duty under S149 Equality Act 2010, Elected Members need to read in full the EIA forms and consultation feedback as it is a legal requirement that Elected Members have regard to all the relevant information and accordingly Elected Members are referred to all the information in this report including appendices and to the [equality assessments](#).

## **11. OTHER IMPLICATIONS**

### **11.1 EQUALITY & DIVERSITY**

Where specific equality and diversity issues have been raised as a result of consultation, they are considered in the appendices of this report and through the equality impact assessment forms.

### **11.2 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS**

None

### **11.3 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS IMPACTS**

None

### **11.4 COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

The Council has a legal obligation under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 to consider any community safety implications of its decisions.

### **11.5 HUMAN RIGHTS ACT**

None

### **11.6 TRADE UNION**

The Trade Union consultation feedback received to date on the proposals is subject to a separate report to this meeting of the Executive.

### **11.7 WARD IMPLICATIONS**

At this stage the proposals suggest district wide impact and are not specific to particular wards. As implementation plans are developed for the delivery of any budget decisions following 22 February 2018, the detail of which wards will be affected will become apparent.

## **12. NOT FOR PUBLICATION DOCUMENTS**

None



### **13. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 13.1 That in accordance with Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, the Executive has regard to the information contained in this report, appendices and equality assessments when considering the recommendations to make to the Council on a budget for 2018-19 and 2019-20 on 22 February 2018.

### **14. APPENDICES**

Appendix 1 - Equality Impacts for budget proposals (2018-19 and 2019-20) as agreed on 5 December 2017 for consultation

Appendix 2 – New consultation feedback (service related and equalities)

Appendix 3 – Consultation feedback gathered in 2016/17 on proposals being consulted on again in 2017/18 due to further proposed reductions.

### **15. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

Report to Executive on 5 December 2017: Proposed Financial Plan 2018/19-2020/21 – document AJ with accompanying appendices

[Bradford Metropolitan District Council - Agenda for Executive on Tuesday, 5th December, 2017, 10.30 am](#)

Equality Impact Assessments (for budget proposals 2018-19 and 2019-20)

<https://www.bradford.gov.uk/your-council/council-budgets-and-spending/budget-eias-2018-19/>

**Appendix 1 - Equality impacts for budget proposals (2018-19 and 2019-20), as agreed on 5 December 2017 for consultation**

**1. Level of impact by outcome (priority)**

Theme	High	Medium	Low	None
Better Skills, Jobs, Economy	13	17	27	113
Decent Homes	0	0	0	0
Better Health, Better Lives	25	18	47	49
Great Start, Good Schools for all Children	2	15	14	15
Safe, Clean & Active Communities	1	8	26	55
Well run Council	0	0	6	4

**2. Total level of impacts across each protected characteristic group**

Protected Characteristic	Impact Levels			
	High	Medium	Low	TOTAL
Age	12	11	14	37
Disability	7	12	13	32
Gender reassignment	0	2	11	13
Race	5	4	17	26
Religion/belief	0	6	12	18
Pregnancy/Maternity	3	7	13	23
Sexual Orientation	1	1	9	11
Sex	3	6	8	17
Marriage & Civil Partnership	0	0	7	7
Low Income/Low Wage	10	9	16	35

### 3. Proposals with multiple high impacts

Areas of Multiple High Impacts									
Theme	EIA Ref	EIA Heading	Age	Disability	Race	Pregnancy & Maternity	Sexual Orientation	Sex	Low income/ low wage
Better Skills, Jobs, Economy	4C3	A prepared and skilled workforce	H	H	H	H			H
	4R2	WYCA Transport Levy reduction – Percentage annual reduction	H	H					
	4R6	Gullikson, drainage, pavements	H	H					
	4R7	Accommodation, gateways, subway, signing, lining, winter	H	H					
	4R20	Sustrans promotes young people travelling to school actively and/or sustainably	H						H
Great Start, Good Schools for all Children	4PH1 Pt a	Oral Health Improvement	H						H
Better Health, Better Lives	4PH3	Sexual Health	H			H	H	H	
	4PH5 Pt a	Homestart	H		H	H		H	H
	4PH5 Pt b	Injury Minimisation Programme (IMPs)	H		H				H
	4PH5 Pt c	Worksafe	H	H	H				H
	4PH6	Physical Activity, Food and Nutrition (Health Improvement)			H				H
	4PH8	Warm Homes Healthy People (WHHP)	H	H				H	H
	5C1	Review of Respite Provision after the introduction of personalised budget	H	H					

## Appendix 2 – Consultation feedback – service and equalities

(Where proposals have received no comment through the consultation, these have not been included in the table below.)

### Appendix 2: Budget Proposals 2018/19 & 2019/20 Consultation Feedback

NEW PROPOSALS FOR 2018/19 AND 2019/20					
Ref	Proposal for Change	Equalities impact	Mitigation	Feedback on service impacts	Feedback on equality impacts
		As published in December 2017			
<b>OUTCOME: Better Health Better Lives</b>					
5PH1	A Home From Hospital Service – BRICCS Integrated Care & Support – review and redesign of the service.	This service is designed to support people who are homeless or in unsuitable accommodation, and who are at risk of staying longer than necessary in hospital. Homeless populations are more likely to have ill health and long term disabling conditions; some from age specific groups such as 16-25 year olds and 35 to 55 year olds. They are also more likely to be male.	Mitigation may be possible should the provider be able to secure alternative funding. This review and redesign will help identify other funding streams over the next two years as part of the bigger programme of out of hospital redesign.	It was felt that the funding should be maintained as a 'spend to save' initiative and in order to free up hospital bed spaces. The council should ensure other funding for appropriate support is secured before making a decision to withdraw this service. There is lack of clarity on what the remaining other funding might be and how effective it can be. Concern that the people this affects won't have a say on the proposal.	This could reduce the level of support available to some of the most vulnerable in society and in addition could put this group of people at risk of homelessness. This would also put pressure on housing providers to rehouse individuals where we do not have the resource or skills to meet their care and support needs. This would put the individual at risk of being rehoused into inadequately and potential returning to hospital or becoming homeless. It was suggested that this EIA needs more data to support the assessment.
5C1	Review Respite Provision after the introduction of personalised budgets	At this stage of the proposal development it is unclear what the impacts on protected characteristic groups would be. However as the proposal is developed the people it impacts upon will be considered as a means of helping to shape the proposal. However at this stage it is anticipated that the impacts could be high on age and disability.	Considerations to date include further developments of personalised budgets and to develop a process to buy services with personalised budgets from the Council and the Voluntary Sector.	There's a need to ensure sufficient help for people to understand and be supported through this change. It was felt there aren't enough existing places, even before any reductions. There is a risk that carers will be unable to continue to care because the impact upon their physical and mental health. More training is needed to help people manage their own budgets.	More data is needed on this EIA, such as how many people are currently managing their own budget? There is a clear impact upon many protected characteristics (age, disability, women more likely to be carers etc). Further assessment is needed to understand the impact on BME people. With reduced respite vulnerable people will end up in the Assessment and Treatment Unit/ Higher risk of abuse/Children taken into care.
<b>OUTCOME: Better Skills, More Jobs and a Growing Economy</b>					
5E1	Museums and Galleries – Review of service to include potential for income generation, service efficiency and integration and remodelling of operational delivery	No impacts identified	N/A	Particular concern for Red House. If museums close history and artefacts will be lost, along with education and knowledge for the next generation. Museums bring history alive. Alternative to closure would be to set up memberships (like National Trust) and run events which could be charged for (thematic evenings, weddings etc). Exhibitions and events should be charged for as an income generator to support other services. It is suggested that museums shouldn't be run by the Council, but by the private sector. The Council should stick to core services of social care, cleansing, road maintenance and education. There was agreement by some that health services should take priority over museums, if it has to come to down to a choice. Opportunity for more volunteer involvement, with the right	

**NEW PROPOSALS FOR 2018/19 AND 2019/20**

Ref	Proposal for Change	Equalities impact	Mitigation	Feedback on service impacts	Feedback on equality impacts
		As published in December 2017			
				training. People benefit from such venues for education, social stimulation or to counter social isolation.	
5R1	Reducing de-trunked (previously Highway Agency controlled) road maintenance budget	A reduction in the overall allocation of revenue maintenance would lead to a reduction in the numbers of maintenance cycles undertaken for each aspect of maintenance in any given year. (e.g. reducing litter picking activities from 4 times per year to 2 times).  Any reduction in highway maintenance will impact most people the same, but will possibly have slightly greater impact on people who are more elderly, disabled or pregnant.	Priority would be given to any maintenance activities which have a 'life or death' consequence on users of the highways network. However as the scope, nature and therefore impact of specific maintenance requirements is not known, it is not possible to propose measures to fully mitigate or eliminate the possible disproportionate impacts.	Consideration needs giving to any long term impact (including injuries, legal claims, damage to highways and therefore more costly repairs later).	The impact on mobility of disabled and older people because of the state of the roads and pavements is massive.
Page 5R1	Increasing percentage level of staff capital recharges to external projects/ customers	No impacts identified	N/A	This was seen as a good idea, and that increases in charges for using council staff skills needs to be looked at in other areas.	

**OUTCOME: Safe Clean Active**

5E2	Youth Service – All commissioned grants will be reviewed during 2018, with grants to VCS groups providing youth work ceasing from April 2019.	There will be a disproportionate impact on young people in the district. Some of the grants made support a particular protected characteristic group. Whilst the grants are relatively small, and will not address the needs of the entire protected characteristic group, they do benefit a smaller number of people within it.  There will be an impact on other protected characteristics but this would be proportionate to the overall youth population.  It is not possible to predict how the loss of grants to the voluntary, community and faith sector would impact on youth work jobs within organisations currently funded under the grant scheme.	Last year the Youth Work Grant Scheme was reconfigured to give 2 streams to the grants, one was for sessional / week in week out youth work activity, the other was for developmental grants for groups to develop self sustaining youth work initiatives. As these will have been funded for the year, build sustainability into their plans for the work, these should now be at a stage of being able to operate without the renewal of the grant. Further consideration to mitigating the impact will be made in terms of sessional youth work by working with the local authority Youth Services to ensure they support local voluntary, community and faith sector groups in shared initiatives that develop and enhance skills, volunteering opportunities and People Can initiatives to respond to locally identified needs.  The work of the Youth Offer	The VCS have an essential role in supporting the growing BME youth population. A reduction in support will be counterproductive, leaving youth disengaged from society.  Ensure that there is sound analysis of the impact of the changes in funding, and that the outcomes from grant are evaluated to ensure the impact is maximised.  The reliance on the VCS finding alternative funding sources is not always realistic as many bids are not successful. Where activities are targeted, then evidencing the need is easier and funding easier to acquire. However these grants are used for match funding which would also no longer be an option. A cost benefit analysis should be done to realise the impacts of not supporting this work. It is primarily preventative or early help activity which saves the whole "system" money. Innovation will be lost. The alternative of using volunteers is not realistic without support for them. Suggestion of splitting the reduction over two years, rather than all in one year. There was concern that this meant that the Council wouldn't be meeting its statutory duties. Access to the National Citizens Service is limited, not all can engage, leaving a gap in support. Suggest a local version is developed with a wider reach. Suggestion of redesigning the whole system of youth support and engagement.	The EIA states that the Youth Offer Working Group will continue to identify priorities and needs but they must also consider how reduced funding may affect communities.  Any impacts need to take into consideration the wider cumulative impacts across the whole budget on young people.  The VCS reach many young people who are not known to specialist services, more vulnerable young people such as Asian young women who can be marginalised (forced and coerced marriages).  Concern was expressed for young disabled people if services are reduced/taken away.  There was a suggestion that groups in more disadvantaged areas have less opportunity to access alternative sources of funding & support therefore increasing inequality.
-----	---	--	--	---	--

**NEW PROPOSALS FOR 2018/19 AND 2019/20**

Ref	Proposal for Change	Equalities impact	Mitigation	Feedback on service impacts	Feedback on equality impacts
		As published in December 2017			
			<p>Working Group will continue to identify priorities and needs in relation to the districts youth offer and explore ways of building capacity within the Voluntary, Community and Faith youth sector.</p> <p>As there is a 12 month lead in time to implementation, further work (and the grant funding) can be applied to building sustainable solutions and mitigating impacts.</p>	<p>The VCS contributed to a lot of youth work in the lead up to the EDL demonstrations. The ability to react to this sort of situation would be harder without that additional support.</p> <p>Bradford Youth Development Partnership can show that that for every £10 'granted' by the council, it has attracted an extra £30. This must be an extremely strong argument for the value of support by means of a grant?</p>	
<b>OUTCOME: Well Run Council</b>					
5FM2	School Catering and Cleaning – increased sales, price review and administrative efficiencies.	No impacts identified	N/A	There is a concern over increased costs for schools in areas with higher levels of deprivation	
5F2	Revenues and Benefits – General efficiency savings – combination of cost and staffing reductions	No impacts identified	N/A	There is concern with these efficiencies when the benefits system is so complex with people struggling to navigate through it. If people don't get the right support to access universal credit (and other funding they are entitled to) this creates more dependency and more cost to the Council.	
5F3	Procurement Supplies and Services Budget – overall net savings subsequent to a review of the Procurement function as a whole	No impacts identified	N/A	When reviewing procurement , consideration should be given to the impacts on the local community – social value and supporting and building relationships with local businesses.	
5X1	Reduce total cost of top management - the scope is the senior management (Strategic and Assistant Directors) and their PA structure	No impacts identified	N/A	It is felt that top management need to be able to undertake multiple roles, in some case both political and officer. There also needs to be general reduction in managers and a reduction in senior management salaries.	

**PROPOSALS ALREADY CONSULTED ON IN 2016/17, FOR FURTHER CONSULTATION**

Ref	Proposal for Change	Equalities impact	Mitigation	Feedback on service impacts	Feedback on equality impacts
		As published in December 2017			
<b>OUTCOME: Better Health Better Lives</b>					
4PH1	<b>School Nursing and Health Visiting</b> - service based efficiencies – primarily management, back office and vacancy control <i>Please note this proposals affects both Better Health, Better Lives and Great Start, Good Schools but for clarity is shown here</i>	The services will be re-commissioned as part of the proposed Prevention and Early Help which was outlined in the Executive paper in November 2017. There is potential to impact on children and families across some protected characteristics but these will be mitigated wherever possible by focusing on identifying children at risk and targeting services on more vulnerable families and their children. The consultation for this model completes in Feb 2018.	Using a phased approach will help to plan and prepare any emerging risks which can then be managed through the proposed Prevention and Early Help approach for a more integrated model for children and young people and the service will continue to provide statutory services.	It was suggested that local organisations would be able to better provide these services, keeping money in Bradford and providing a better quality service. One large local contract should be set up, with localised grants to smaller providers.	
4PH2	<b>Substance Misuse Service</b> – combination of redesign, re-commissioning and ceasing recovery service, dual diagnosis service, supervised medication programme, inpatient detoxification services.	Impact assessments have identified that this range of proposals could have impacts on a wide range of service users across the range of protected characteristics.	Any new contracts will continue to have the same equality requirements of the Provider under the Equality Act 2010 as the current tender. The new service specification being commissioned requires that the service is provided through various types of provision and that the service is integrated throughout providing continuity for service users. Services will be more community based with access points in multiple sites in non-substance misuse specific services making it easier for all sections of society to access them.	The option of community based services may neither be popular with users or others using centres. More details are needed on the type of centres to be used.	
4PH3	<b>Sexual Health</b> - combination of redesign, review and ceasing services Health development with young people, sex and relationship education in schools, emergency hormonal contraception	Some of the services are designed specifically for parts of the population who share a protected characteristic. Therefore services are provided disproportionately to those parts of the population and the impact will reflect this.	The SRHS that is commissioned is part of a wider Sexual Health economy with GPs providing oral contraception and STI testing which is commissioned by NHSE from GP practices as part of their core service offer.  Bradford residents would still be able to access SHRS (oral contraceptives and STI screening) within their community through their GP practice and Long Acting Reversible Contraceptives (coils and implants) and STI testing and treatment, through the SHRS that would stay situated centrally within the city centre making it accessible to all.		One of the mitigation factors for this area is that it will be delivered through schools. However those most in need of this provision are the very young people who do not engage in school or who have poor relationships with them, therefore resulting in a lack of access to those who most need the service. As a result you will see more young people needing higher cost specialist services, for example and increase in teen pregnancy.
4PH6	<b>Physical Activity, Food and Nutrition</b> - cessation of grants to VCS organisations delivering range of activities including 'cook and eat', physical activity, food growing and breastfeeding support.	Services are currently commissioned from a variety of BME organisations and groups based in low income areas to ensure positive outcomes for all parts of the community. The race equality impact is judged to be high, because of the high BME take up of VCS services.	The Health Improvement Team will support providers/organisations and service users proactively with advice and sign-posting as opportunities are identified		
4PH8	<b>Warm Homes Healthy People</b> – reduction in the	Service supports a range of vulnerable	In 2016/17 support to develop a new	The council has already explored	

	short term winter activity based programme	householders, many of whom share particular protected characteristics. Removing the programme's main funding reduces the breadth of service offered and may disadvantage some people.	approach to funding was granted to partners, which allowed the creation of a crowd funding website which plans to raise £25k this year. This will be built upon to enable core services such as fuel poverty and food poverty work streams to be maintained. Other independent fund raising by existing partners such as Ground Works/ Family Action will join in the programme each winter.	developing a new funding approach, however exploring options around voluntary organisations who offer similar support may be beneficial e.g. stepchange, CAB, CHAS St Vincents, foodbanks etc and having an effective signposting and partnership working will assist customers who benefit from the WHHP if funding needs to be reduced.	Housing Associations are able to offer some support similar to the WHHP scheme for tenants (e.g. food parcels, debt advice) however people living in the private rented sector do not get the same level of support. The number of households in the private rented sector is growing and cutting this service further is likely to put vulnerable households at risk.
4A1	<b>Adults - Overall Demand Management Strategy</b> - moving from a dependency model to one that promotes independence and resilience (e.g. reducing numbers coming in to care, care system culture change, speeding up integration, redesign enablement, reviewing financial needs, continued personalisation).	<p>Older people and people with Mental Health &amp; Learning Disabilities will predominantly be affected by this proposal but the focus will be on personalised services for people so the impact on protected characteristics will be mitigated at individual level.</p> <p>As part of the Strategy to reduce residential and nursing places it is intended that more extra care schemes are developed, which will help to improve people's lives and reduce expenditure across all groups.</p> <p>As the proposal is developed, the detail of impacts will be further assessed to ensure any potential implications on protected characteristics are minimised.</p>	<p>Our approach will seek to focus on people's strengths and enabling people to manage properly understood, proportionate and positive risks in living their lives. We will undertake individual assessments and carry out extensive engagement with service users, carers and advocates to ensure seamless transitions for any service users affected. This will enable us to meet our duty under the Care Act 2014 and mitigate against any disproportionate negative impact on any person with a protective characteristic.</p> <p>By offering other options for people in terms of housing and care support, people will have the opportunity to access appropriate services that meet their assessed needs and be in a position to maintain their independence and to continue to have a positive contribution and be inclusive in their local community. This will ensure where possible people with particular characteristics are not disproportionately affected. We will further review the potential impact on protected characteristics as part of the development of the delivery programme.</p>	<p>Concern over the cuts with the increasing elderly population. We should embrace the private sector ideas and bring more in house as you don't see private care bankrupt. More cross council cooperation to share resources and skills. It is suggested that MPs should be lobbied regarding the issue with underfunded social care as well as Jeremy Hunt. Social care should be paid by government not local tax payers. Concern that lack of funding will have a detrimental affect on the NHS. There is concern that poorly funded social care, will lead to poorly trained staff and very poorly paid staff, which ultimately leads to a very poor service. It is suggested that all social care is run directly by the council. Children, Adults and Elderly are already the most vulnerable group in terms of support required. If these groups then have additional needs like any disabilities, disease, housing, transport, Medical Services then their vulnerability is further enhanced and compromised. More transparency is needed on this proposal. Invest in local VCS - keep the money within the district and be wary of larger organisations who have a notional presence but little local knowledge but are in a position to undercut local organisations where the skills/contacts/trust and knowledge has taken years to achieve. There was concern as to how much support people would get to allow them to be independent. With less care hours, people can do fewer activities which reduces their independence. More training and support for providers is needed. Clearer and simpler pathways are needed to help reduce waiting times. It was felt that the VCS could do a lot more to help mitigate especially around accountable care and mental health. Closer working with GPs for example.</p>	The cuts are taking us backwards in terms of the Social Model: Less choice & control and integration leading to more safeguarding issues.



				Concern that there is no clear plan or strategy to address the budget shortfalls in this area.	
4C3	<b>Children's Services</b> – staffing, restructure, reduction in the Connexions contract with longer term service brought back in to Council, investigate regional data centre, cessation of Employment Opportunities Fund (EOF).	This proposal in regard to the Connexions Service contract will have a negative impact on people who share a protected characteristic. This service directly supports young people who are NEET, the cohort being comprised of young people with complex and multiple needs related to the protected characteristics and long-term low-income unemployed adults	To mitigate the potential disproportionate impact of the Connexions Service proposal, there will be a re-design of the Connexions type activity to provide a minimum statutory service with a greater reliance on the Bradford Pathways approach that will be underpinned with more effective information, advice and guidance framework. Greater linkages and working with other front line staff working with young people will also be explored. It is not feasible to fully mitigate the impact of the proposals given proposed funding levels	Some felt that this should remain within the Local Authority or with further education establishments, as these organisations are better connected and therefore can deliver a better service. Others felt this was an opportunity to have different partners engaged, therefore adding to the richness of any support services, and opportunities for additional funding. Services should not be centralised, as many people wont access them if they have to travel. Concern that this loss will impact the support for young people and the consequent future of the district. The EOF scheme has been extremely beneficial for many of the individuals on the scheme; supporting them off benefits and back into work, bringing in additional funding into the district as a result of them working and the payment of lower benefits and spending more money within our district. Without this fund it will impact on those who through it would be back in employment	
4C4	<b>Child Protection management restructure</b> – reduction in teams by four to ten with potential reduction in team managers plus review other overall budgets	No impacts identified	N/A	Concern that a reduction in numbers of staff will leave children even more vulnerable.	
<b>OUTCOME: Better Skills More Jobs and a Growing Economy</b>					
4E8	<b>Events and Festivals</b> – review to develop a more sustainable and balanced events programme	Potential for greater impact on people of low income / low wage. The events are primarily free to attend and any reduction in their delivery could reduce the opportunity for people to attend cultural activities.	Review of Events and Festivals framework is on going and will take into account the protected characteristics to mitigate any disproportionate impacts.	Council seems to fund activities in city park which have no bearing on the well being of the people and council does not get any revenue from this activity. There needs to be a critical examination of events held around the Mirror Pool. They are aesthetically pleasing but can no longer be a priority. The council festivals on offer throughout the year are wonderful family events where families from all cultures and backgrounds are able to integrate in a safe and friendly environment and learn about each others cultures and celebrations. It would be such a shame to lose these events and the impact on integration could be huge.	
4E9	<b>Libraries</b> – reduction in the number of libraries directly provided by CBMDC. Further investigation of potential for alternative delivery models	Potential reduction in the number of libraries directly managed by the Council may impact on those groups, young and old or low income/low wage that have no alternative access to information or educational/reading materials though other sources (eg on-line, purchased) or use libraries as social gathering points.	Consultation with and support for communities to help develop proposals and implementation of models of community management outside Council control.	More detail on the expected changes is needed. At the very least keep the larger libraries and improve these. Libraries are now running very low on professional input making it harder to develop and diversify. Libraries need to continue to provide management of Bookstart scheme (gifting books). Concern that community run libraries wont be able to meet the national plans set out	Elderly people will struggle to get to a central library and this will lose any village feel. Not all are able and this is limiting their ability to use this service. The most vulnerable in society that don't have a voice who use our libraries to access the internet to pay bills sort out job applications, those that need a quiet space to read and relax to help people with invisible disabilities. People are encouraged to read and write to help their mental

page 1

				<p>by Society of Chief Librarians. More information is needed on how existing community run libraries are doing. It was felt that consultation on libraries changes was hidden and not engaging people enough.</p> <p>There is an opportunity to make libraries shared community spaces, but they need to be run by professionals, as relying on volunteers is not effective enough – issues of confidentiality and knowledge for example.</p> <p>More work could be done on finding alternative funding streams, and alternative models such as York Explore, trusteeships, charitable trusts.</p> <p>It was felt that community run models work in affluent areas but not in areas of greater deprivation. It was also suggested that schools are struggling to purchase books, so limited lending will add a further burden. It was suggested that libraries could be run from community halls. This is already happening successfully in many areas.</p> <p>Concern that legislative duties to provide a service will not be met.</p> <p>Bring community facilities such as halls and libraries up to a modern standard and in good states of repair before transferring to community ownership.</p> <p>The service that libraries provide cuts across all the Council's priority areas as outlined in the Council Plan and should therefore continue to be supported.</p> <p>Most feedback related to libraries in general but some comments mentioned Bingley, Ilkley, Keighley, Wike and Wibsey in particular.</p>	<p>health. People on low incomes don't have easy internet or purchased materials access.</p> <p>There was concern that the home library service would be cut, effecting older more vulnerable people.</p> <p>There is concern that the cuts will impact on communal activities such as activities for children during school holidays, or societies such as family history societies that hold monthly meetings, short courses on historical research or classes in IT literacy.</p> <p>Disabled people are keen that the home delivery service continues for disabled people. This has a knock-on effect on the Home First agenda: People at home having nothing to do/isolation/depression. There is great value in the act of someone popping in with the library books – it may be their only visitors that day (social contact) and is a good check to spot if people need more help (every contact counts).</p>
4R2	<b>West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA) Transport Levy</b> – proposed reduction in the levy	This proposal could have an adversely disproportionate impact on both the young (under 18's) and elderly sectors of the community as the funding which is being reduced is specifically used to fund schemes/programmes which are delivered for these groups.	<p>The negative impacts would need to be considered within the wider West Yorkshire context in consultation with WYCA with whom the ultimate decisions on which aspects of their budgets to reduce would rest.</p> <p>Some aspects of expenditure of the Transport Levy are protected by national regulation and hence are likely to remain largely unaffected by any reductions as a consequence of this proposal. It is therefore anticipated that those elements of expenditure which are discretionary are likely to bear the majority of any agreed levy reduction.</p>		There is concern that the provisions over and above that granted to ENCS holders will be lost or reduced eg the benefit that is afforded to the blind/VI community that allows them to use trains and buses at all times
4R6	<b>Planning, Transportation and Highways</b> - options related to discretionary budgets for highway maintenance works including minor drainage improvements, pavement repairs and footpath and snicket maintenance	Whilst the cost of the works delivered through the local area maintenance budgets may be relatively small, the impact of non-action could have a disproportionate impact on the lives of the districts citizens. Some footpaths and	As the scope of the impact arising from this Proposal could be wide ranging and dependent upon the nature of any specific maintenance requirements, it is not possible to propose measures to fully mitigate or eliminate the impacts.	Cuts to traffic and road budgets will increase costs for motorists and cause damage to vehicles, potentially leading to a higher rate of accidents.	Failure to maintain footpaths, in particular, will present significant risk of injury to elderly, infirm and disabled. Consider low maintenance surfaces rather than traditional paving stones where possible.

		snickets are currently impassable due to lack of maintenance which is a consequence of the current reduced budget allocation	However, the nature of the prioritisation framework (which is still to be developed), which would be used to assess the priority for action of any requests, could incorporate appropriate consideration of the characteristic of the person needing action (e.g. include age and/or disability criteria).		
4R7	<b>Planning, Transportation and Highways</b> - reduction in Highways Services operational budgets associated with operational transport gateway and subway maintenance	Reduced maintenance of gateways and subways will lead to these assets deteriorating and over time potentially becoming impassable. This could therefore impact on some of the protected characteristics.  This could therefore impact on some of the protected characteristics.	Replacement of any subway facility which is removed as a consequence of this proposal with a surface level controlled crossing could be considered to ensure that the negative impacts on severance are mitigated. However such works would lead to an increased maintenance liability on the Council's traffic signal infrastructure and such crossings are inherently more dangerous than segregated crossings on major arterial routes like Wakefield Road.	Traffic calming measures need to be applied to all parts of the district, not targeting particular neighbourhoods.	
4R11	<b>Planning, Transportation and Highways</b> - introduction of limited lighting hours / switch off of street lighting on non-principal road network	Introduction of this proposal in additional areas of the district will have a disproportionately negative impact on some protected characteristics.  Fear of crime amongst the elderly will increase where back streets and residential roads are unlit during the early hours of the morning and it is from this characteristic group that the greatest impact is anticipated.  Similarly fear of crime on unlit streets could adversely impact the protected characteristic groups of disability, race, religion/belief and sex who may all experience increased levels of concern about the proposal.	The Council has developed a set of criteria which are used to select streets where limited lighting hours are introduced. These criteria assess road safety statistics, criminal activity records, infrastructure condition and involve consultation with the local community on any proposals being prepared.  Any streets which are considered appropriate to be included in the programme of limited lighting operation will be fully appraised using this model before a decision is taken on whether or not to implement the limited lighting hours infrastructure is taken. Those streets with high criminal activity and/or poor road safety records will not be included in the project beyond their initial assessment.  To avoid any undue distress to local residents only those streets which "pass" the desktop assessment will be consulted upon with the local community.	Despite the council stating they have developed a set of criteria that include criminal activity records, we are aware that a lot of crime goes unreported to the police which could potentially mean that the data on which decisions are based is not robust. If not already part of the criteria consultation with housing providers at an early stage regarding reports of anti-social behaviour in the area as Housing Associations operating in the district have a detailed knowledge of the problems faced by communities in the neighbourhoods they manage. There is concern about the continued reduction in street lighting and how that leads to people not feeling safe and not going out at night time. However it was also suggested that more street lighting could be reduced between midnight and 6am. Concern for late night worker's safety, and the increase in social isolation.	
4R13	<b>Economic Development Service</b> – reduction in City Park sinking fund (fund set aside to fund future expense), matched funding for European Strategic Investment Fund programmes. Remove support for B-funded community funding information website	The savings may have a low impact on low wage/low income people where job opportunities are impacted.	Targeting areas of economic under performance, and by prioritising target groups in service promotion and skills development.	It was strongly felt that the Bfunded investment should remain as through this support a very large amount of money is brought in to the district. The impact can be demonstrated through figures from West Yorkshire Community Accounting Service (WYCAS). This shows that in 2016/17 they supported 128 Bradford district organisations with their finances. This led to 402 separate grants and contracts being received in the district, with a value of £1.8m coming from the local authority and £4.1m coming from other sources.	
<b>OUTCOME: Safe Clean and Active Communities</b>					
4E1	<b>Parks and Bereavement</b> management	Impact on clubs with lower level of	There is a growing interest from local	There is concern over the use of the digital	

	<p>rationalisation; withdrawal from direct management of sport pitches and bowling greens; raise prices of bereavement services.</p>	<p>membership / players and/or financial resources at their disposal which could ultimately result in some clubs to merge or disband</p> <p>With regard to bereavement service proposals, any increase in charges, particularly at a rate above inflation, will by definition have a disproportionate effect upon those on low incomes for a service that cannot be viewed as discretionary.</p> <p>Given that cremation charges are currently lower than burial charges, particularly should a new grave be required, any percentage price rise will generate a higher cash increase in the cost of burials than that of cremations. This could represent a disproportionate effect for those religious/faith communities that due to their beliefs have no choice between funeral types. The Muslim and East European communities fall in this latter group.</p> <p>The implementation of a flat rate cash increase to both cremations and burials would however have increased the cremation charge to a level disproportionate to that of the burial charge in terms of comparator values of neighbouring Councils.</p>	<p>communities, residents, Parish/Town Councils and sports clubs to become more involved in the operation of public assets, particularly where the opportunity exists to develop community use. Such as having direct access to a range of grant funding bodies whilst 'ownership' allows increased sponsorship and fund raising opportunities.</p> <p>The Service would seek to support individuals/groups of clubs both directly and through the National Governing Bodies to take overall responsibility and would consider an incremental approach over a defined period. Prior investment in the assets to transfer together with elements of seed funding and appropriate rent will allow financially sustainable organisations to develop.</p> <p>The most deprived/low income communities receive support for the cost of funerals from the Council through Adult Services.</p> <p>The proposed above inflation increase in charges for funerals will result in local service users continuing to pay less than the average within West Yorkshire for all services.</p> <p>It is intended to introduce a reduced rate for the walling of graves to coffin height which will mitigate the effect of the increases for those faith groups that adopt such a requirement</p>	<p>body scanner for autopsies. It is felt not to be essential.</p> <p>In relation to sports pitches, there continues to be concern about the capacity and capabilities of volunteers and some groups to take on the responsibilities of maintaining grounds and facilities.</p> <p>Parks need to be seen as a community asset. A small amount of council maintenance leads to greater involvement by communities to keep the park in a good state and make use of the space.</p>	
4E2	<p><b>Waste Collection and Disposal Services</b> – Full year effect of introduction of alternate weekly collection and associated round reduction, improved recycling, reduction in residual waste and improved efficiencies.</p>	<p>Alternate weekly collections fully implemented with the exception of rural rounds (in hand) with no adverse impacts identified.</p> <p>The proposal is likely to have no or a low impact on everyone so it is considered that there is no disproportionate impact on any group who share protected characteristics. It is however recognised that a move to alternate weekly collection could result in the residual waste bin being heavier to move around.</p>	<p>The Council already provides assisted bin lifts for residents where mobility or accessibility issues arise. In this circumstance the resident can call the Contact Centre and a home visit will be arranged to assess how the Council can help.</p>	<p>Concern over fly tipping, over flowing bins (for families in particular) and the imposed difficulties to use recycling centres - we need passes but these are not automatically sent to residents. Menston residents can't use the nearby Ellar Ghyll site as it's in LCC jurisdiction, and Ilkley is 20 min drive away. So there is an exchange of weekly bin collections for car emissions, fly tipping and hassle.</p>	
4E5	<p><b>Street Cleansing and Public Conveniences</b> – reduction to street cleansing resources for 2019/20</p>	<p>The street cleansing proposal has the potential to have a low impact on predominantly inner city highly densely populated areas. The people who live in these areas are in the main white people on low incomes and communities from BME backgrounds.</p> <p>In terms of closure of the toilets there is likely to be a disproportionate impact on older people, pregnant women, parents requiring access to baby changing facilities, young children, transgender community, and disabled people,</p>	<p>Increased waste awareness and anti litter/education campaigns in affected areas and the new robust enforcement model for targeting those people that drop litter, will mitigate the impact.</p> <p>The department have approached relevant Parish Councils, Friends of Groups and other interested community groups whether they would be interested in taking over the running of toilets. The discussions surrounding takeover and Community Asset Transfers are progressing well</p>	<p>It was felt that all late night licensing of takeaways outside of the City Centre should cease, stopping the ribbon development of takeaways and fast food establishments in the inner city. The focus on cleansing can then be focused on the city centre with rigorous enforcement and expanded teams - warning letters are ineffective. Allow local community groups access to anti-litter posters for grot spots. CCTV should be put in areas with high levels of fly tipping (e.g. Thornton Road). Any proposal which increases the likelihood of litter on our streets and roads will have a</p>	<p>There was concern on the workforce profile as it was suggested that there are quite few disabled people who work in this service. If jobs are cut the Council must support these people to find alternative work.</p>

		particularly those with complex needs, and people who, because of their physical condition, may need to visit the toilet more regularly.		direct effect upon peoples health and safety. It was also felt that vermin has already increased due to increase fly tipping. There are more opportunities for community litter picks which happen successfully and community run around the district. Less clean environments lead to poorer health of residents including mental health. More enforcement is needed. Some continued concern over the future of public conveniences.	
4E6	<b>Pest Control</b> – cessation of the pest control service	This proposal could have an adverse impact on people on low incomes as it removes the facility to pay for treatments in instalments although the equality assessment carried out indicated that this proposal is likely to have no or a low impact on everyone.	The most common request for treatment is to deal with rats and mice and there is at least one company in Bradford which is able to provide the service cheaper than the Council	There was concern that this proposal meant that the service was going to be outsourced, with increased costs as a consequence.	

Topic	General comments – not proposal specific
Council Tax	<p>Can't afford the increases. Wages and cost of living increases are far lower than the suggested CT increase.</p> <p>There is still an issue with fraud on single occupancy households.</p> <p>Owners of empty properties and unused land should be charged higher rates to force maintenance and if not lead to low level compulsory purchase for LA income generation.</p> <p>Reinvest CT in areas where it is generated from.</p> <p>It was suggested that some businesses could run some services more efficiently and should therefore be transferred which in turn would increase business rates received.</p> <p>The affordability of council tax needs addressing, so that people pay what they can afford according to their situation – families, or single income households should pay a bit less than those with double incomes for example.</p> <p>There was the suggestion of changing the CT system for something like a local income tax or a poll tax.</p> <p>Concern that those areas with parishes are being very hard hit due to increases in both precepts.</p> <p>The council tax reduction scheme helps the most vulnerable and economically disadvantaged in our community. This reduction will penalise these people beyond breaking point. There are vulnerable people with unmanageable debt who rely on budgets which are supported by CT.</p> <p>Look at keeping support for those who need it regarding their income or if they are vulnerable. By making it harder for them, the bills still won't get paid but it will push people into debt which creates far worse problems.</p>
General administration	<p>Reduce the number of Councillors.</p> <p>More pressure needs to be put on central government to provide the funding needed, with Yorkshire local authorities creating an alliance to strengthen the argument.</p> <p>The Council could look more to philanthropy to support what will be lost.</p> <p>Concern that the vulnerable are being affected by the proposal leading to more people being in poverty.</p>
Efficiencies	<p>There was a suggestion that the removal of Essential Lump sums for car users would cost more in the long run through use of taxis and public transport.</p> <p>It was suggested that communities could do their own garden/grit/cleaning. Also Renting council office spaces could be rented to other organisations.</p>
Revenues and Benefits	<p>With universal credit coming in, more staffing is needed in revenues and benefits.</p>
Health (general)	<p>It is felt that contracting and procurement arrangements are not in line with the pledges around prevention and community led development. VCS work is being hampered by this, especially as it is hard to demonstrate impact and scalability. Would like to see more co-design and joint working.</p> <p>It was suggested that patient groups should be used to help get the message out about changes in public health and the way services are delivered.</p>
Other	<p>There is concern that there aren't sufficient or appropriate jobs available for people with disabilities. Increases in costs of living, be it from Council Tax, transport costs etc just makes their situations worse.</p> <p>There are concerns over increases in homeless people and the lack of funding/investment for them. A bigger proportion of expenditure should be spent on them with a vision for housing and homelessness in Bradford.</p> <p>It is felt that service reductions haven't been proportionally applied, with outlying areas suffering (e.g. Queensbury).</p> <p>Recent FOI requests have shown that union officials receive funding and time, this should be stopped as union subs should pay union funding.</p> <p>In relation to VCS funding cuts - Often value of small community organisations is overlooked because of their historic inability to measure their impact and the scalability of their work, however, this is also at odds with the clear commitment from the Council's senior management to asset based community approaches.</p> <p>Expression of sympathy for the cuts that the Council have been forced to make, and the dismay at the inevitable deterioration of Social provision for those who most need it.</p> <p>There is concern that those who shout the loudest will have their voices heard when the final decisions are made.</p> <p>There is concern about the amount of cuts to advocacy services and how that is making it harder for disabled people to have a voice including for issues like housing and access to the criminal justice system.</p> <p>There needs to be more publicity and information sharing about the assisted bin service as it is felt many do not know about it.</p> <p>The council could be more proactive in finding people and groups who are willing to put their energies behind running services – promoting the opportunity for a conversation.</p> <p>There was suggestion that social impact bonds could be better used – such as the Sheffield model.</p> <p>Concern over the money the Council might be spending on the Odeon, when apparently more important services are being substantially cut.</p>
Overall equality impacts	<p>The proposals have a regressive impact upon disabled and older people.</p> <p>There is a feeling that the cuts are more likely to hit people who are unlikely to complain, vote, have a say. This doesn't necessarily fit with equality duties and the Brown Principles</p>

**Appendix 3 – Consultation feedback from consultation undertaken in 2016/17, on proposals undergoing consultation again in 2017/18 due to further proposed reductions.**

Ref	Budget Proposal or budget area:	Equality Assessment	Mitigation	Feedback on service and equality impacts
		As published in December 2016		
<b>OUTCOME: Better health, better lives</b>				
4A1	Adults - Overall Demand Management Strategy - moving from a dependency model to one that promotes independence and resilience (e.g. reducing numbers coming in to care, care system culture change, speeding up integration, redesign enablement, reviewing financial needs, continued personalisation).	Older people and people with Mental Health & Learning Disabilities will predominantly be affected by this proposal but the focus will be on personalised services for people so the impact on protected characteristics will be mitigated at individual level. As part of the Strategy to reduce residential and nursing places it is intended that more extra care schemes are developed, which will help to improve people's lives and reduce expenditure across all groups. As the proposal is developed, the detail of impacts will be further assessed to ensure any potential implications on protected characteristics are minimised.	Our approach will seek to focus on people's strengths and enabling people to manage properly understood, proportionate and positive risks in living their lives. We will undertake individual assessments and carry out extensive engagement with service users, carers and advocates to ensure seamless transitions for any service users affected. This will enable us to meet our duty under the Care Act 2014 and mitigate against any disproportionate negative impact on any person with a protective characteristic. By offering other options for people in terms of housing and care support, people will have the opportunity to access appropriate services that meet their assessed needs and be in a position to maintain their independence and to continue to have a positive contribution and be inclusive in their local community. This will ensure where possible people with particular characteristics are not disproportionately affected. We will further review the potential impact on protected characteristics as part of the development of the delivery programme.	<p>Concern over the future of dementia care and that the elderly needed more support. There was a suggestion that more money should be sought from the government in the same way that the North Yorkshire authority did. It was also suggested that a focus on reducing waiting times between referral and support was needed. More money going to support the increasing numbers of elderly people was felt to be important, with more help with home care.</p> <p>The suggestion of closure of any care homes causes concern, especially those supporting people with dementia.</p> <p>More dynamic and creative support is needed e.g. supporting someone to become more independent by helping them learn to cook. To begin with they will need more support but less as time goes on. People need to be in homes they can maintain themselves and have the additional support to remain independent as long as possible.</p> <p>Concern over reductions in social care will lead to more bed blockages in hospitals.</p>
4A7	Early Help - Management restructure - review structures in early help for children and families commissioned from VCS, youth offending team, crime prevention, family centres, families first.	This service works with a higher percentage of children and families from disadvantaged households and any reduction in service may result in a disproportionate affect on low income groups needing this support.	The review will ensure that resource is most effectively targeted at areas of need, with careful mapping of service needs and outcomes. This process will be done alongside the VCS to ensure that impact is mitigated where possible. Where possible, resources will be reduced in back office and management functions.	It was felt that investment in pre- school children was vital for the future.
<b>OUTCOME: Better skills, more good jobs and a growing economy</b>				
4E7.	Remodel of Visitor Information & frontline service - reduce the number and/or size of Visitor Information Centres (VICs), moving to a more digital basis promoting the district to target audiences, with the potential for VIC information points as co-located provision.	The potential closure of VICs could have a disproportionate impact on older customers unable to access information electronically.	Alternative options are being explored including seasonal visitor information centres in destinations such as Saltaire, Haworth and Ilkley with support from local groups.	It was felt that visitor information centres work well due to their personalised approach to the service. Resources including VICs should also not just be focused on Bradford city centre, but support given to outlying areas too. There was also concern over the impact on tourism and consequent economic benefits from any loss of VICs.
4E8.	Events and Festivals -review to develop a more sustainable and balanced events programme. Direct funding to	Equality assessment carried out indicated that this proposal is likely to have no or a low impact on everyone, and so there is no disproportionate impact on any group who share protected characteristics	n/a	<p>Some feel that greater cuts should be implemented, others feel more support should remain with arts programmes.</p> <p>Support for continued funding to arts project was also received, with the view that they contribute economically and culturally to communities. It promotes tourism and attracts new businesses and provides employment opportunities.</p> <p>Some felt that private enterprises should be responsible for events.</p>
4E9.	Libraries - reduction in the number of libraries directly provided. Investigate potential for alternative delivery models.	Equality assessment carried out indicated that this proposal is likely to have no or a low impact on everyone, and so there is no disproportionate impact on any group who share protected characteristics	n/a	It was felt that volunteers would need an intensive training programme should libraries move into community ownership. There was also support for libraries being part of community hubs to focus community resources to a single location. There was concern that areas of

				deprivation would not have the community capacity to run a local library. The libraries facilities, such as computers and photocopiers as well as books, are a vital resource. Where libraries already reside in community halls there is further concern as the Community Halls are under review as well.
4C3	Children's Services - a prepared and Skilled Workforce - staffing, restructure, reduction in the Connexions contract with longer term service brought back in to Council, investigate regional data centre, cessation of Employment Opportunities Fund (EOF).	This proposal in regard to the Connexions Service contract will have a negative impact on people who share a protected characteristic. This service directly supports young people who are NEET, the cohort being comprised of young people with complex and multiple needs related to the protected characteristics and long-term low-income unemployed adults.	To mitigate the potential disproportionate impact of the Connexions Service proposal, there will be a re-design of the Connexions type activity to provide a minimum statutory service with a greater reliance on the Bradford Pathways approach that will be underpinned with more effective information, advice and guidance framework. Greater linkages and working Page 52 with other front line staff working with young people will also be explored. It is not feasible to fully mitigate the impact of the proposals given proposed funding levels.	There are many concerns over the loss of work provided by the Connexions service. Face to face support is vital. It provides advice and support on careers, training, housing, drugs, alcohol, domestic violence, social care referrals. The help is received by people with a range of issues including mental health, behaviour, attendance, families.  It was suggested that funding for young people could be centralised through Connexions, picking up services provided through housing support and families first.  There is a lack of support for both prevention and resolution of young people's problems.  Concern over loss of funding for the EOF and the likely impact on increased young people not in employment or training.
4R7	Reduction in Highways Services operational budgets associated with operational accommodation, transport gateway and subway maintenance.	Failure to undertake any maintenance of gateways and subways will very rapidly lead to these assets deteriorating and potentially becoming impassable. Winter maintenance operations would be significantly impacted by the reduction in DLO operational bases meaning longer times being necessary to grit the routes in the district, Page 57 potentially meaning that areas in the north of the district may be untreated in periods of inclement weather. This could therefore impact on some of the protected characteristics	Any loss of a subway/underpass facility could be offset through the introduction of a crossing. Research has shown that these types of crossing are more attractive to pedestrian users than subways as they are generally perceived as reducing the fear of attack/crime for pedestrian users. However, such facilities on major corridors are problematic as they need to cross six lanes of traffic and therefore their design can lead to increased delays for general traffic and increased frustration for drivers. The impact of the closure of the depot at Stocksbridge and the consequent impact on winter maintenance operations will need to be carefully considered within the context of winter gritting routes and treatment programmes. Consideration of more proactive treatment regimes for areas in the north of the district will need to be developed in order to ensure that problems associated with reactive maintenance are mitigated.	The existing and proposed reductions in gritting is causing problems especially in the Keighley area.
4R11	Introduction of limited lighting hours / switch off of street lighting on non-principal road network	Introduction of this proposal in additional areas of the district will have a disproportionately negative impact on some protected characteristics. Fear of crime amongst the elderly will increase where back streets and residential roads are unlit during the early hours of the morning and it is from this characteristic group that the greatest impact is anticipated. Similarly fear of crime on unlit streets could adversely impact the protected characteristic groups of disability, race, religion/belief and sex who may all experience increased levels of concern about the proposal.	The Council has developed a set of criteria which are used to select streets where limited lighting hours are introduced. These criteria assess road safety statistics, criminal activity records, infrastructure condition and involve consultation with the local community on any proposals being prepared. Any streets which are considered appropriate to be included in the programme of limited lighting operation will be fully appraised using this model before a decision is taken on whether or not to implement the limited lighting hours infrastructure is taken. Those streets with high criminal activity and/or poor road safety records will not be included in the project beyond their initial assessment. To avoid any undue distress to local residents only those streets which "pass" the desktop assessment will be consulted upon with the local community.	Reduction in street lighting could encourage anti social behaviour and crime.
<b>OUTCOME: Safe clean and active communities</b>				
4E2	Waste Collection and Disposal Services -introduction of co-mingled recycling enabling more plastic recycling.	The proposal is likely to have no or a low impact on everyone so it is considered that there is no disproportionate impact on any group who share protected characteristics. It is however recognised that a move to alternate weekly collection could result in the residual waste bin being heavier to move around.	It is recognised that the elderly and disabled could be impacted upon by a heavier bin where there are mobility or accessibility issues. The Council already provides assisted bin lifts for residents in such circumstances. If this service is required, residents can call the Council Contact Centre and a home visit will be arranged to see how the Council can help.	It was felt more investment was needed in tackling fly tipping. More fines are needed to help the enforcement of people dropping litter and fly tipping.
4E4	Environment and Sport - Customer Services - redirect	The Council recognises that any move toward	To mitigate the potentially disproportionate impact the Council	It was felt that digital access is not suitable for many



	face to face contact towards self service and telephone services will see a continuing decline in contact resulting in staffing efficiencies. Automated services will increase with fewer options for people to speak to a customer services advisor. More people will be expected to 'self serve' using on line services.	increasing dependency on digital/online access to Services or information may potentially have a detrimental impact on residents who do not have English as a first language or who don't/can't access IT. Making services available electronically could impact on those unable to access due to ability or lack of available technology. Those with a preference or requirement to deal with a person may feel anxious and vulnerable. The majority of current face-to-face customer service and an increasing proportion of telephony work is with low wage/low income groups, including people with disabilities, and older people although there has been a significant increase in enquiries from customers from Eastern Europe who have language barriers. Customer service teams carry out some home visits to customers who are unable to access Council services in other ways. However, in the context of the number of enquiries handled by the Council each year, the relative numbers of people adversely impacted by the proposed change is small.	remains committed to the Five Principles of Producing Better Information for Disabled People, and will also continue to make sure the Council website is accessible. Greater self service access will provide the majority of citizens with a more efficient service; thereby freeing up the limited resources to focus on those who need the additional support. By minimising avoidable face-to-face and telephone contact with the council, officer time can be better directed to those customers who require it.	gypsy and travellers.
4E5 Page 139	Street Cleansing and Public Conveniences - reduction in number of ward based clean teams and mechanical sweepers	The proposal has the potential to have a low impact on predominantly inner city highly densely populated areas. The people who live in these areas are in the main white people on low incomes and communities from BME backgrounds. In terms of closure of the toilets there is likely to be a disproportionate impact on older people, pregnant women, parents requiring access to baby changing facilities, young Page 69 children, transgender community, disabled people, particularly those with complex needs, and people who, because of their physical condition, may need to visit the toilet more regularly.	Increased waste awareness and anti litter/education campaigns in affected areas and the new robust enforcement model for targeting those people that drop litter, will mitigate the impact the street cleansing proposals. In the case of public toilets work will take place to ascertain whether Parish/Town Councils, community or other voluntary groups could take over the running of those blocks proposed for closure. Consideration will also be given to whether local businesses, cafes, restaurants etc. would allow people to use their facilities.	There was concern about cleansing (alongside kerb side collections including recycling), and that a universal service is not appropriate as needs vary greatly across the district. Others were concerned about future driving conditions if the environment was affected. It was suggested that more community work was needed to raise awareness of littering and fly tipping.
<b>OUTCOME: A well run council</b>				
4H2	Human Resources - Terms & Conditions - Removal of non contractual overtime payments and removal of essential car allowance lump sum payments.	n/a	n/a	Concern that staff will have to use their own cars instead of pool cars/public transport.

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Addendum to the Report of the Assistant Director, Office of the Chief Executive to the meeting of the Executive to be held on 6 February 2018 (Document 'AV')**

---

### **Subject:**

**Consultation feedback and equality assessment for the 2018-19 and 2019-20 Council budget proposals - report addendum.**

---

### **1. Summary**

- 1.1 The report (Document AV) of the Assistant Director, Office of the Chief Executive was published on 29 January 2018 to be presented to the Executive at the meeting to be held on 6 February 2018. The report includes information from the public engagement and consultation programme in relation to the budget proposals for the 2018-19 and 2019-20 budget.
- 1.2 The public consultation and engagement programme however continued until 28 January 2018 meaning that there is a requirement to provide details of further information and comments received from 26 January when the report was submitted to the end of the consultation. This addendum therefore provides an update on feedback received during these additional few days.

### **2. Updates to the feedback received through the consultation**

- 2.1 By the end of the consultation on 28 January 2018, the Council has received comments from 1239 people or groups (an increase from 1129 as outlined in the report document AV). Of this, 1183 were in direct relation to the different budget proposals for 2018-19 and 2019-20, including the proposed increases to Council Tax. A further 53 comments were made that were not specific to particular proposals for the next two years.
- 2.2 Monitoring of the corporate social media accounts and Stay Connected newsletters on the budget consultation has shown over 1699 click-throughs to the online consultation pages. It is worth noting that overall activity on the corporate social media accounts around the consultation has however been far greater than that in terms of reach and posts shared, and not all responses represented feedback on the overall budget proposals or an individual proposal.

2.2 The proposals generating most comments at the end of the consultation were:

- Children's Services Prevention and Early Help – 700 (consultation on this open until 12 February)
- Libraries (4E9) – 219 responses
- The raise in council tax – 116 responses
- Adults overall demand management strategy (4A1) – 30 responses
- Review of respite provision (5C1) – 16 responses
- Youth service (5E2) – 17 responses
- Home from hospital, integrated care (5PH1) – 12 responses
- Museums and galleries (5E1) – 12 responses
- Street cleansing (4E5) – 9 responses
- Reducing de-trunked road maintenance budget (5R1) – 8 responses

A further 37 proposals received seven or fewer comments.

2.3 Further correspondences have also been received from public and voluntary sector partner organisations which have been shared directly with decision makers and headline comments incorporated into the overall feedback.

2.4 Appendix 1 has been updated to include further comments received on each proposal over the last three days of the consultation, and include comments received through the online survey, postal questionnaires and emails from the general public and voluntary and public sector partner organisations.

## Appendix 1 – Consultation feedback – service and equalities

(Where proposals have received no comment through the consultation, these have not been included in the table below.)

**Additional comments since publication of 6 February 2018 Executive report have been highlighted in bold below – these have been received through the online survey, postal questionnaires, emails and letters from the general public and public and voluntary sector partners.**

NEW PROPOSALS FOR 2018/19 AND 2019/20					
Ref	Proposal for Change	Equalities impact	Mitigation	Feedback on service impacts	Feedback on equality impacts
		As published in December 2017			
<b>OUTCOME: Better Health Better Lives</b>					
5PH1 Page 143	A Home From Hospital Service – BRICCS Integrated Care & Support – review and redesign of the service.	This service is designed to support people who are homeless or in unsuitable accommodation, and who are at risk of staying longer than necessary in hospital. Homeless populations are more likely to have ill health and long term disabling conditions; some from age specific groups such as 16-25 year olds and 35 to 55 year olds. They are also more likely to be male.	Mitigation may be possible should the provider be able to secure alternative funding. This review and redesign will help identify other funding streams over the next two years as part of the bigger programme of out of hospital redesign.	It was felt that the funding should be maintained as a 'spend to save' initiative and in order to free up hospital bed spaces. The council should ensure other funding for appropriate support is secured before making a decision to withdraw this service. There is lack of clarity on what the remaining other funding might be and how effective it can be. Concern that the people this affects won't have a say on the proposal.	This could reduce the level of support available to some of the most vulnerable in society and in addition could put this group of people at risk of homelessness. This would also put pressure on housing providers to rehouse individuals where we do not have the resource or skills to meet their care and support needs. This would put the individual at risk of being rehoused into inadequately and potential returning to hospital or becoming homeless. It was suggested that this EIA needs more data to support the assessment.
5C1	Review Respite Provision after the introduction of personalised budgets	At this stage of the proposal development it is unclear what the impacts on protected characteristic groups would be. However as the proposal is developed the people it impacts upon will be considered as a means of helping to shape the proposal. However at this stage it is anticipated that the impacts could be high on age and disability.	Considerations to date include further developments of personalised budgets and to develop a process to buy services with personalised budgets from the Council and the Voluntary Sector.	There's a need to ensure sufficient help for people to understand and be supported through this change. It was felt there aren't enough existing places, even before any reductions. There is a risk that carers will be unable to continue to care because the impact upon their physical and mental health. More training is needed to help people manage their own budgets. <b>There is concern that this may lead to more hospital admissions.</b> <b>Concern that there may be impacts on Children's Centres and the support provided to new parents and vulnerable families.</b>	More data is needed on this EIA, such as how many people are currently managing their own budget? There is a clear impact upon many protected characteristics (age, disability, women more likely to be carers etc). Further assessment is needed to understand the impact on BME people. With reduced respite vulnerable people will end up in the Assessment and Treatment Unit/ Higher risk of abuse/Children taken into care. <b>Any additional hospital admissions are most likely to affect children and young people who have more complex conditions.</b>
<b>OUTCOME: Better Skills, More Jobs and a Growing Economy</b>					
5E1	Museums and Galleries – Review of service to include potential for income generation, service efficiency and integration and remodelling of operational delivery	No impacts identified	N/A	Particular concern for Red House. If museums close history and artefacts will be lost, along with education and knowledge for the next generation. Museums bring history alive. Alternative to closure would be to set up memberships (like National Trust) and run events which could be charged for (thematic evenings, weddings etc). Exhibitions and events should be charged for as an income generator to support other services. It is suggested that museums shouldn't be run by the Council, but by the private sector. The Council should stick to core services of social care, cleansing, road maintenance and education. There was agreement by some that health services	

**NEW PROPOSALS FOR 2018/19 AND 2019/20**

Ref	Proposal for Change	Equalities impact	Mitigation	Feedback on service impacts	Feedback on equality impacts
		As published in December 2017			
				should take priority over museums, if it has to come to down to a choice. Opportunity for more volunteer involvement, with the right training. People benefit from such venues for education, social stimulation or to counter social isolation.	
5R1	Reducing de-trunked (previously Highway Agency controlled) road maintenance budget	A reduction in the overall allocation of revenue maintenance would lead to a reduction in the numbers of maintenance cycles undertaken for each aspect of maintenance in any given year. (e.g. reducing litter picking activities from 4 times per year to 2 times).  Any reduction in highway maintenance will impact most people the same, but will possibly have slightly greater impact on people who are more elderly, disabled or pregnant.	Priority would be given to any maintenance activities which have a 'life or death' consequence on users of the highways network. However as the scope, nature and therefore impact of specific maintenance requirements is not known, it is not possible to propose measures to fully mitigate or eliminate the possible disproportionate impacts.	Consideration needs giving to any long term impact (including injuries, legal claims, damage to highways and therefore more costly repairs later).	The impact on mobility of disabled and older people because of the state of the roads and pavements is massive.
5R1	Increasing percentage level of staff capital recharges to external projects/ customers	No impacts identified	N/A	This was seen as a good idea, and that increases in charges for using council staff skills needs to be looked at in other areas.	

**OUTCOME: Safe Clean Active**

5E2	Youth Service – All commissioned grants will be reviewed during 2018, with grants to VCS groups providing youth work ceasing from April 2019.	There will be a disproportionate impact on young people in the district. Some of the grants made support a particular protected characteristic group. Whilst the grants are relatively small, and will not address the needs of the entire protected characteristic group, they do benefit a smaller number of people within it.  There will be an impact on other protected characteristics but this would be proportionate to the overall youth population.  It is not possible to predict how the loss of grants to the voluntary, community and faith sector would impact on youth work jobs within organisations currently funded under the grant scheme.	Last year the Youth Work Grant Scheme was reconfigured to give 2 streams to the grants, one was for sessional / week in week out youth work activity, the other was for developmental grants for groups to develop self sustaining youth work initiatives. As these will have been funded for the year, build sustainability into their plans for the work, these should now be at a stage of being able to operate without the renewal of the grant. Further consideration to mitigating the impact will be made in terms of sessional youth work by working with the local authority Youth Services to ensure they support local voluntary, community and faith sector groups in shared initiatives that develop and enhance skills, volunteering opportunities and People Can initiatives to respond	The VCS have an essential role in supporting the growing BME youth population. A reduction in support will be counterproductive, leaving youth disengaged from society.  Ensure that there is sound analysis of the impact of the changes in funding, and that the outcomes from grant are evaluated to ensure the impact is maximised.  The reliance on the VCS finding alternative funding sources is not always realistic as many bids are not successful. Where activities are targeted, then evidencing the need is easier and funding easier to acquire. However these grants are used for match funding which would also no longer be an option. A cost benefit analysis should be done to realise the impacts of not supporting this work. It is primarily preventative or early help activity which saves the whole 'system' money. Innovation will be lost. The alternative of using volunteers is not realistic without support for them. Suggestion of splitting the reduction over two years, rather than all in one year. There was concern that this meant that the Council wouldn't be meeting its statutory duties. Access to the National Citizens Service is limited, not all can engage, leaving a gap in support. Suggest a local	The EIA states that the Youth Offer Working Group will continue to identify priorities and needs but they must also consider how reduced funding may affect communities.  Any impacts need to take into consideration the wider cumulative impacts across the whole budget on young people.  The VCS reach many young people who are not known to specialist services, more vulnerable young people such as Asian young women who can be marginalised (forced and coerced marriages).  Concern was expressed for young disabled people if services are reduced/taken away.  There was a suggestion that groups in more disadvantaged areas have less opportunity to access alternative sources of funding & support therefore increasing inequality.  <b>The mitigation suggests that the youth service can support and encourage VCS activity. It is unclear whether the youth service has capacity to do this. Furthermore some of the activity that they have currently stimulated is in existence because of the youth grant funding, so it may be more difficult to stimulate such activity without such funding existing.</b>
-----	---	--	--	--	---

**NEW PROPOSALS FOR 2018/19 AND 2019/20**

Ref	Proposal for Change	Equalities impact	Mitigation	Feedback on service impacts	Feedback on equality impacts	
		As published in December 2017				
Page 145			<p>to locally identified needs.</p> <p>The work of the Youth Offer Working Group will continue to identify priorities and needs in relation to the districts youth offer and explore ways of building capacity within the Voluntary, Community and Faith youth sector.</p> <p>As there is a 12 month lead in time to implementation, further work (and the grant funding) can be applied to building sustainable solutions and mitigating impacts.</p>	<p>version is developed with a wider reach. Suggestion of redesigning the whole system of youth support and engagement. The VCS contributed to a lot of youth work in the lead up to the EDL demonstrations. The ability to react to this sort of situation would be harder without that additional support. Bradford Youth Development Partnership can show that that for every £10 'granted' by the council, it has attracted an extra £30. This must be an extremely strong argument for the value of support by means of a grant?</p> <p><b>The youth offer model was based on a co-delivery model with the voluntary sector and youth service approved by the Council's Executive. This budget proposal seems to significantly change this strategic direction. This proposal seems to go against broader activity to involve the voluntary sector more in delivery and co design. There appears to have been no analysis of alternative models of supporting young people.</b></p> <p><b>The proposal to remove youth grants undermines existing activity and will reduce preventative provision just when it will become more important with the reduction in the children's Early Help offer.</b></p>		
	<b>OUTCOME: Well Run Council</b>					
	5FM2	School Catering and Cleaning – increased sales, price review and administrative efficiencies.	No impacts identified	N/A	There is a concern over increased costs for schools in areas with higher levels of deprivation	
	5F2	Revenues and Benefits – General efficiency savings – combination of cost and staffing reductions	No impacts identified	N/A	There is concern with these efficiencies when the benefits system is so complex with people struggling to navigate through it. If people don't get the right support to access universal credit (and other funding they are entitled to) this creates more dependency and more cost to the Council.	
	5F3	Procurement Supplies and Services Budget – overall net savings subsequent to a review of the Procurement function as a whole	No impacts identified	N/A	When reviewing procurement , consideration should be given to the impacts on the local community – social value and supporting and building relationships with local businesses.	
5X1	Reduce total cost of top management - the scope is the senior management (Strategic and Assistant Directors) and their PA structure	No impacts identified	N/A	It is felt that top management need to be able to undertake multiple roles, in some case both political and officer. There also needs to be general reduction in managers and a reduction in senior management salaries.		

**PROPOSALS ALREADY CONSULTED ON IN 2016/17, FOR FURTHER CONSULTATION**

Ref	Proposal for Change	Equalities impact	Mitigation	Feedback on service impacts	Feedback on equality impacts
		As published in December 2017			
<b>OUTCOME: Better Health Better Lives</b>					
4PH1	<p><b>School Nursing and Health Visiting</b> - service based efficiencies – primarily management, back office and vacancy control</p> <p><i>Please note this proposals affects both Better Health, Better Lives and Great Start, Good Schools but for clarity is shown here</i></p>	<p>The services will be re-commissioned as part of the proposed Prevention and Early Help which was outlined in the Executive paper in November 2017. There is potential to impact on children and families across some protected characteristics but these will be mitigated wherever possible by focusing on identifying children at risk and targeting services on more vulnerable families and their children. The consultation for this model completes in Feb 2018.</p>	<p>Using a phased approach will help to plan and prepare any emerging risks which can then be managed through the proposed Prevention and Early Help approach for a more integrated model for children and young people and the service will continue to provide statutory services.</p>	<p>It was suggested that local organisations would be able to better provide these services, keeping money in Bradford and providing a better quality service. One large local contract should be set up, with localised grants to smaller providers.</p> <p><b>There is a strong economic case for investing heavily in prevention, particularly for children as economic benefits continue to accrue over a lifetime. Health visitors are often the only health professionals in contact with families when children are very young. Any cuts to this budget will put further pressure on the service that health visitors deliver and will have a devastating impact on health outcomes for our young people. <a href="http://www.1001criticaldays.co.uk">http://www.1001criticaldays.co.uk</a> This invaluable preventative work keeps hospital attendances and admissions down. There is also concern on the impact of safeguarding.</b></p>	
4PH2	<p><b>Substance Misuse Service</b> – combination of redesign, re-commissioning and ceasing recovery service, dual diagnosis service, supervised medication programme, inpatient detoxification services.</p>	<p>Impact assessments have identified that this range of proposals could have impacts on a wide range of service users across the range of protected characteristics.</p>	<p>Any new contracts will continue to have the same equality requirements of the Provider under the Equality Act 2010 as the current tender. The new service specification being commissioned requires that the service is provided through various types of provision and that the service is integrated throughout providing continuity for service users. Services will be more community based with access points in multiple sites in non-substance misuse specific services making it easier for all sections of society to access them.</p>	<p>The option of community based services may neither be popular with users or others using centres. More details are needed on the type of centres to be used.</p>	
4PH3	<p><b>Sexual Health</b> - combination of redesign, review and ceasing services Health development with young people, sex and relationship education in</p>	<p>Some of the services are designed specifically for parts of the population who share a protected characteristic. Therefore services are provided disproportionately to those parts of the population and the impact</p>	<p>The SRHS that is commissioned is part of a wider Sexual Health economy with GPs providing oral contraception and STI testing which is commissioned by NHSE from GP practices as part of their core service offer.</p>	<p><b>There was concern that there will be no specialist services for people with combined substance misuse and mental health problems once this reduction is made. Mainstream health professionals aren't trained to support such complex cases. This could lead to increases in hospitalisation and homelessness. This may lead to an increase in unwanted</b></p>	<p>One of the mitigation factors for this area is that it will be delivered through schools. However those most in need of this provision are the very young people who do not engage in school or who have poor relationships with them, therefore resulting in a lack of access to those who most need the service. As a result you will see more young people needing higher cost specialist services, for example and increase in teen pregnancy.</p>



	schools, emergency hormonal contraception	will reflect this.	Bradford residents would still be able to access SHRS (oral contraceptives and STI screening) within their community through their GP practice and Long Acting Reversible Contraceptives (coils and implants) and STI testing and treatment, through the SHRS that would stay situated centrally within the city centre making it accessible to all.	<b>pregnancies impacting other services.</b>	
4PH5	<b>Homestart, Worksafe, Injury Minimisation Programme</b> - phase out of these services providing support for vulnerable parents and children age 0-5 years.	Potential to Impact on children and families across the range of protected characteristics particularly age, disability, race and low income families.	Some of the key activities will be mainstreamed into the wider proposed Prevention and Early Help approach for children and young people and families in the District. This is currently under separate consultation until February 2018. In order to manage any negative affects a phased approach will be adopted in the first year.	<b>Concern over increases to hospital admissions and attendances as a consequence of reduced education and support to families.</b>	
4PH6	<b>Physical Activity, Food and Nutrition</b> - cessation of grants to VCS organisations delivering range of activities including 'cook and eat', physical activity, food growing and breastfeeding support.	Services are currently commissioned from a variety of BME organisations and groups based in low income areas to ensure positive outcomes for all parts of the community. The race equality impact is judged to be high, because of the high BME take up of VCS services.	The Health Improvement Team will support providers/organisations and service users proactively with advice and sign-posting as opportunities are identified	<b>As public services withdraw from delivering this sort of service, it is felt that the VCS will have to pick it up. However without any funding this is going to prove difficult.</b>	
4PH8	<b>Warm Homes Healthy People</b> – reduction in the short term winter activity based programme	Service supports a range of vulnerable householders, many of whom share particular protected characteristics. Removing the programme's main funding reduces the breadth of service offered and may disadvantage some people.	In 2016/17 support to develop a new approach to funding was granted to partners, which allowed the creation of a crowd funding website which plans to raise £25k this year. This will be built upon to enable core services such as fuel poverty and food poverty work streams to be maintained.  Other independent fund raising by existing partners such as Ground Works/ Family Action will join in the programme each winter.	The council has already explored developing a new funding approach, however exploring options around voluntary organisations who offer similar support may be beneficial e.g. stepchange, CAB, CHAS St Vincents, foodbanks etc and having an effective signposting and partnership working will assist customers who benefit from the WHHP if funding needs to be reduced.	Housing Associations are able to offer some support similar to the WHHP scheme for tenants (e.g. food parcels, debt advice) however people living in the private rented sector do not get the same level of support. The number of households in the private rented sector is growing and cutting this service further is likely to put vulnerable households at risk.
4A1	<b>Adults - Overall Demand Management Strategy</b> - moving from a dependency model to	Older people and people with Mental Health & Learning Disabilities will predominantly be affected by this proposal but the focus will be on personalised	Our approach will seek to focus on people's strengths and enabling people to manage properly understood, proportionate and positive risks in	Concern over the cuts with the increasing elderly population. We should embrace the private sector ideas and bring more in house as you don't see private care bankrupt. More cross council cooperation to share resources and	The cuts are taking us backwards in terms of the Social Model: Less choice & control and integration leading to more safeguarding issues.

	<p>one that promotes independence and resilience (e.g. reducing numbers coming in to care, care system culture change, speeding up integration, redesign enablement, reviewing financial needs, continued personalisation).</p>	<p>services for people so the impact on protected characteristics will be mitigated at individual level. As part of the Strategy to reduce residential and nursing places it is intended that more extra care schemes are developed, which will help to improve people's lives and reduce expenditure across all groups.</p> <p>As the proposal is developed, the detail of impacts will be further assessed to ensure any potential implications on protected characteristics are minimised.</p>	<p>living their lives. We will undertake individual assessments and carry out extensive engagement with service users, carers and advocates to ensure seamless transitions for any service users affected. This will enable us to meet our duty under the Care Act 2014 and mitigate against any disproportionate negative impact on any person with a protective characteristic.</p> <p>By offering other options for people in terms of housing and care support, people will have the opportunity to access appropriate services that meet their assessed needs and be in a position to maintain their independence and to continue to have a positive contribution and be inclusive in their local community. This will ensure where possible people with particular characteristics are not disproportionately affected. We will further review the potential impact on protected characteristics as part of the development of the delivery programme.</p>	<p>skills. It is suggested that MPs should be lobbied regarding the issue with underfunded social care as well as Jeremy Hunt. Social care should be paid by government not local tax payers. Concern that lack of funding will have a detrimental affect on the NHS. There is concern that poorly funded social care, will lead to poorly trained staff and very poorly paid staff, which ultimately leads to a very poor service. It is suggested that all social care is run directly by the council. Children, Adults and Elderly are already the most vulnerable group in terms of support required . If these groups then have additional needs like any disabilities, disease, housing, transport, Medical Services then their vulnerability is further enhanced and compromised. More transparency is needed on this proposal. Invest in local VCS - keep the money within the district and be wary of larger organisations who have a notional presence but little local knowledge but are in a position to undercut local organisations where the skills/contacts/trust and knowledge has taken years to achieve. There was concern as to how much support people would get to allow them to be independent. With less care hours, people can do fewer activities which reduces their independence. More training and support for providers is needed. Clearer and simpler pathways are needed to help reduce waiting times. It was felt that the VCS could do a lot more to help mitigate especially around accountable care and mental health. Closer working with GPs for example. Concern that there is no clear plan or strategy to address the budget shortfalls in this area.</p> <p><b>There was concern over the current assessment process for people needing care, and the approach to carers themselves.</b></p> <p><b>There are potential additional pressures from these cuts to District Nurses and them needing to deal with personal care.</b></p>	
4C3	<p><b>Children's Services</b> – staffing, restructure, reduction in the Connexions contract with longer term service brought back in to Council, investigate regional data centre, cessation of Employment Opportunities Fund (EOF).</p>	<p>This proposal in regard to the Connexions Service contract will have a negative impact on people who share a protected characteristic. This service directly supports young people who are NEET, the cohort being comprised of young people with complex and multiple needs related to the protected characteristics and long-term low-income unemployed adults</p>	<p>To mitigate the potential disproportionate impact of the Connexions Service proposal, there will be a re-design of the Connexions type activity to provide a minimum statutory service with a greater reliance on the Bradford Pathways approach that will be underpinned with more effective information, advice and guidance framework. Greater linkages and working with other front line staff working with young people will also be explored. It is not feasible to fully mitigate the impact of the proposals given proposed funding levels</p>	<p>Some felt that this should remain within the Local Authority or with further education establishments, as these organisations are better connected and therefore can delivery a better service. Others felt this was an opportunity to have different partners engaged, therefore adding to the richness of any support services, and opportunities for additional funding. Services should not be centralised, as many people wont access them if they have to travel. Concern that this loss will impact the support for young people and the consequent future of the district. The EOF scheme has been extremely beneficial for many of the individuals on the scheme; supporting them off benefits and back into work, bringing in additional funding into the district as a result of them working and the payment of lower benefits and spending more money within our district. Without this fund it will impact on those who through it would be back in employment</p>	
4C4	<p><b>Child Protection management</b></p>	<p>No impacts identified</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Concern that a reduction in numbers of staff will leave</p>	

	<b>restructure</b> – reduction in teams by four to ten with potential reduction in team managers plus review other overall budgets			children even more vulnerable.	
4C13	<b>Drugs and Alcohol Team</b> – review of the work of the team and all other services that support young people with alcohol and drug issues	No impacts identified	N/A	<b>This proposal could adversely impact on A&amp;E departments and other hospital services.</b>	

**OUTCOME: Better Skills More Jobs and a Growing Economy**

Page 149	4E8	<b>Events and Festivals</b> – review to develop a more sustainable and balanced events programme	Potential for greater impact on people of low income / low wage. The events are primarily free to attend and any reduction in their delivery could reduce the opportunity for people to attend cultural activities.	Review of Events and Festivals framework is on going and will take into account the protected characteristics to mitigate any disproportionate impacts.	<p>Council seems to fund activities in city park which have no bearing on the well being of the people and council does not get any revenue from this activity.</p> <p>There needs to be a critical examination of events held around the Mirror Pool. They are aesthetically pleasing but can no longer be a priority.</p> <p>The council festivals on offer throughout the year are wonderful family events where families from all cultures and backgrounds are able to integrate in a safe and friendly environment and learn about each others cultures and celebrations. It would be such a shame to lose these events and the impact on integration could be huge.</p>	
	4E9	<b>Libraries</b> – reduction in the number of libraries directly provided by CBMDC. Further investigation of potential for alternative delivery models	Potential reduction in the number of libraries directly managed by the Council may impact on those groups, young and old or low income/low wage that have no alternative access to information or educational/reading materials though other sources (eg on-line, purchased) or use libraries as social gathering points.	Consultation with and support for communities to help develop proposals and implementation of models of community management outside Council control.	<p>More detail on the expected changes is needed. At the very least keep the larger libraries and improve these. Libraries are now running very low on professional input making it harder to develop and diversify. Libraries need to continue to provide management of Bookstart scheme (gifting books). Concern that community run libraries wont be able to meet the national plans set out by Society of Chief Librarians. More information is needed on how existing community run libraries are doing. It was felt that consultation on libraries changes was hidden and not engaging people enough. There is an opportunity to make libraries shared community spaces, but they need to be run by professionals, as relying on volunteers is not effective enough – issues of confidentiality and knowledge for example. More work could be done on finding alternative funding streams, and alternative models such as York Explore, trusteeships, charitable trusts. It was felt that community run models work in affluent areas but not in areas of greater deprivation. It was also suggested that schools are struggling to purchase books, so limited lending will add a further burden. It was suggested that libraries could be run from community halls. This is already happening successfully</p>	<p>Elderly people will struggle to get to a central library and this will lose any village feel. Not all are able and this is limiting their ability to use this service.</p> <p>The most vulnerable in society that don't have a voice who use our libraries to access the internet to pay bills sort out job applications, those that need a quiet space to read and relax to help people with invisible disabilities. People are encouraged to read and write to help their mental health. People on low incomes don't have easy internet or purchased materials access.</p> <p>There was concern that the home library service would be cut, effecting older more vulnerable people.</p> <p>There is concern that the cuts will impact on communal activities such as activities for children during school holidays, or societies such as family history societies that hold monthly meetings, short courses on historical research or classes in IT literacy.</p> <p>Disabled people are keen that the home delivery service continues for disabled people. This has a knock-on effect on the Home First agenda: People at home having nothing to do/isolation/depression. There is great value in the act of someone popping in with the library books – it may be their only visitors that day (social contact) and is a good check to spot if people need more help (every contact counts).</p>

				<p>in many areas.          Concern that legislative duties to provide a service will not be met.          Bring community facilities such as halls and libraries up to a modern standard and in good states of repair before transferring to community ownership.          The service that libraries provide cuts across all the Council's priority areas as outlined in the Council Plan and should therefore continue to be supported.          Most feedback related to libraries in general but some comments mentioned Bingley, Ilkley, Keighley, Wike and Wibsey in particular.</p>	
4R2	<p><b>West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA) Transport Levy</b> – proposed reduction in the levy</p>	<p>This proposal could have an adversely disproportionate impact on both the young (under 18's) and elderly sectors of the community as the funding which is being reduced is specifically used to fund schemes/programmes which are delivered for these groups.</p>	<p>The negative impacts would need to be considered within the wider West Yorkshire context in consultation with WYCA with whom the ultimate decisions on which aspects of their budgets to reduce would rest.</p> <p>Some aspects of expenditure of the Transport Levy are protected by national regulation and hence are likely to remain largely unaffected by any reductions as a consequence of this proposal. It is therefore anticipated that those elements of expenditure which are discretionary are likely to bear the majority of any agreed levy reduction.</p>		<p>There is concern that the provisions over and above that granted to ENCS holders will be lost or reduced eg the benefit that is afforded to the blind/VI community that allows them to use trains and buses at all times</p>
4R6	<p><b>Planning, Transportation and Highways</b> - options related to discretionary budgets for highway maintenance works including minor drainage improvements, pavement repairs and footpath and snicket maintenance</p>	<p>Whilst the cost of the works delivered through the local area maintenance budgets may be relatively small, the impact of non-action could have a disproportionate impact on the lives of the districts citizens. Some footpaths and snickets are currently impassable due to lack of maintenance which is a consequence of the current reduced budget allocation</p>	<p>As the scope of the impact arising from this proposal could be wide ranging and dependent upon the nature of any specific maintenance requirements, it is not possible to propose measures to fully mitigate or eliminate the impacts.</p> <p>However, the nature of the prioritisation framework (which is still to be developed), which would be used to assess the priority for action of any requests, could incorporate appropriate consideration of the characteristic of the person needing action (e.g. include age and/or disability criteria).</p>	<p>Cuts to traffic and road budgets will increase costs for motorists and cause damage to vehicles, potentially leading to a higher rate of accidents.</p>	<p>Failure to maintain footpaths, in particular, will present significant risk of injury to elderly, infirm and disabled. Consider low maintenance surfaces rather than traditional paving stones where possible.</p>
4R7	<p><b>Planning, Transportation and Highways</b> - reduction in Highways Services</p>	<p>Reduced maintenance of gateways and subways will lead to these assets deteriorating and over time potentially becoming impassable.</p>	<p>Replacement of any subway facility which is removed as a consequence of this proposal with a surface level controlled crossing could be considered to</p>	<p>Traffic calming measures need to be applied to all parts of the district, not targeting particular neighbourhoods.</p>	

	operational budgets associated with operational transport gateway and subway maintenance	This could therefore impact on some of the protected characteristics. This could therefore impact on some of the protected characteristics.	ensure that the negative impacts on severance are mitigated. However such works would lead to an increased maintenance liability on the Council's traffic signal infrastructure and such crossings are inherently more dangerous than segregated crossings on major arterial routes like Wakefield Road.		
4R11	<b>Planning, Transportation and Highways</b> - introduction of limited lighting hours / switch off of street lighting on non-principal road network	Introduction of this proposal in additional areas of the district will have a disproportionately negative impact on some protected characteristics.  Fear of crime amongst the elderly will increase where back streets and residential roads are unlit during the early hours of the morning and it is from this characteristic group that the greatest impact is anticipated.  Similarly fear of crime on unlit streets could adversely impact the protected characteristic groups of disability, race, religion/belief and sex who may all experience increased levels of concern about the proposal.	The Council has developed a set of criteria which are used to select streets where limited lighting hours are introduced. These criteria assess road safety statistics, criminal activity records, infrastructure condition and involve consultation with the local community on any proposals being prepared.  Any streets which are considered appropriate to be included in the programme of limited lighting operation will be fully appraised using this model before a decision is taken on whether or not to implement the limited lighting hours infrastructure is taken. Those streets with high criminal activity and/or poor road safety records will not be included in the project beyond their initial assessment.  To avoid any undue distress to local residents only those streets which "pass" the desktop assessment will be consulted upon with the local community.	Despite the council stating they have developed a set of criteria that include criminal activity records, we are aware that a lot of crime goes unreported to the police which could potentially mean that the data on which decisions are based is not robust. If not already part of the criteria consultation with housing providers at an early stage regarding reports of anti-social behaviour in the area as Housing Associations operating in the district have a detailed knowledge of the problems faced by communities in the neighbourhoods they manage. There is concern about the continued reduction in street lighting and how that leads to people not feeling safe and not going out at night time. However it was also suggested that more street lighting could be reduced between midnight and 6am. Concern for late night worker's safety, and the increase in social isolation.	
4R13	<b>Economic Development Service</b> – reduction in City Park sinking fund (fund set aside to fund future expense), matched funding for European Strategic Investment Fund programmes. Remove support for B-funded community funding information website	The savings may have a low impact on low wage/low income people where job opportunities are impacted.	Targeting areas of economic under performance, and by prioritising target groups in service promotion and skills development.	It was strongly felt that the Bfunded investment should remain as through this support a very large amount of money is brought in to the district. The impact can be demonstrated through figures from West Yorkshire Community Accounting Service (WYCAS). This shows that in 2016/17 they supported 128 Bradford district organisations with their finances. This led to 402 separate grants and contracts being received in the district, with a value of £1.8m coming from the local authority and £4.1m coming from other sources.	
<b>OUTCOME: Safe Clean and Active Communities</b>					
4E1	<b>Parks and Bereavement</b> management	Impact on clubs with lower level of membership / players and/or	There is a growing interest from local communities, residents,	There is concern over the use of the digital body scanner	

	<p>rationalisation; withdrawal from direct management of sport pitches and bowling greens; raise prices of bereavement services.</p>	<p>financial resources at their disposal which could ultimately result in some clubs to merge or disband          With regard to bereavement service proposals, any increase in charges, particularly at a rate above inflation, will by definition have a disproportionate effect upon those on low incomes for a service that cannot be viewed as discretionary.          Given that cremation charges are currently lower than burial charges, particularly should a new grave be required, any percentage price rise will generate a higher cash increase in the cost of burials than that of cremations. This could represent a disproportionate effect for those religious/faith communities that due to their beliefs have no choice between funeral types. The Muslim and East European communities fall in this latter group.          The implementation of a flat rate cash increase to both cremations and burials would however have increased the cremation charge to a level disproportionate to that of the burial charge in terms of comparator values of neighbouring Councils.</p>	<p>Parish/Town Councils and sports clubs to become more involved in the operation of public assets, particularly where the opportunity exists to develop community use. Such as having direct access to a range of grant funding bodies whilst 'ownership' allows increased sponsorship and fund raising opportunities.          The Service would seek to support individuals/groups of clubs both directly and through the National Governing Bodies to take overall responsibility and would consider an incremental approach over a defined period. Prior investment in the assets to transfer together with elements of seed funding and appropriate rent will allow financially sustainable organisations to develop.          The most deprived/low income communities receive support for the cost of funerals from the Council through Adult Services. The proposed above inflation increase in charges for funerals will result in local service users continuing to pay less than the average within West Yorkshire for all services.          It is intended to introduce a reduced rate for the walling of graves to coffin height which will mitigate the effect of the increases for those faith groups that adopt such a requirement</p>	<p>for autopsies. It is felt not to be essential.           In relation to sports pitches, there continues to be concern about the capacity and capabilities of volunteers and some groups to take on the responsibilities of maintaining grounds and facilities.           Parks need to be seen as a community asset. A small amount of council maintenance leads to greater involvement by communities to keep the park in a good state and make use of the space.</p>	
<p>4E2</p>	<p><b>Waste Collection and Disposal Services</b> – Full year effect of introduction of alternate weekly collection and associated round reduction, improved recycling, reduction in residual waste and improved efficiencies.</p>	<p>Alternate weekly collections fully implemented with the exception of rural rounds (in hand) with no adverse impacts identified. The proposal is likely to have no or a low impact on everyone so it is considered that there is no disproportionate impact on any group who share protected characteristics. It is however recognised that a move to alternate weekly collection could result in the residual waste bin being heavier to move around.</p>	<p>The Council already provides assisted bin lifts for residents where mobility or accessibility issues arise. In this circumstance the resident can call the Contact Centre and a home visit will be arranged to assess how the Council can help.</p>	<p>Concern over fly tipping, over flowing bins (for families in particular) and the imposed difficulties to use recycling centres - we need passes but these are not automatically sent to residents. Menston residents can't use the nearby Ellar Ghyll site as it's in LCC jurisdiction, and Ilkley is 20 min drive away. So there is an exchange of weekly bin collections for car emissions, fly tipping and hassle.</p>	

4E5	<b>Street Cleansing and Public Conveniences</b> – reduction to street cleansing resources for 2019/20	The street cleansing proposal has the potential to have a low impact on predominantly inner city highly densely populated areas. The people who live in these areas are in the main white people on low incomes and communities from BME backgrounds. In terms of closure of the toilets there is likely to be a disproportionate impact on older people, pregnant women, parents requiring access to baby changing facilities, young children, transgender community, and disabled people, particularly those with complex needs, and people who, because of their physical condition, may need to visit the toilet more regularly.	Increased waste awareness and anti litter/education campaigns in affected areas and the new robust enforcement model for targeting those people that drop litter, will mitigate the impact. The department have approached relevant Parish Councils, Friends of Groups and other interested community groups whether they would be interested in taking over the running of toilets. The discussions surrounding takeover and Community Asset Transfers are progressing well	It was felt that all late night licensing of takeaways outside of the City Centre should cease, stopping the ribbon development of takeaways and fast food establishments in the inner city. The focus on cleansing can then be focused on the city centre with rigorous enforcement and expanded teams - warning letters are ineffective. Allow local community groups access to anti-litter posters for grot spots. CCTV should be put in areas with high levels of fly tipping (e.g. Thornton Road). Any proposal which increases the likelihood of litter on our streets and roads will have a direct effect upon peoples health and safety. It was also felt that vermin has already increased due to increase fly tipping. There are more opportunities for community litter picks which happen successfully and community run around the district. Less clean environments lead to poorer health of residents including mental health. More enforcement is needed. Some continued concern over the future of public conveniences.	There was concern on the workforce profile as it was suggested that there are quite few disabled people who work in this service. If jobs are cut the Council must support these people to find alternative work.
4E6 Page 153	<b>Pest Control</b> – cessation of the pest control service	This proposal could have an adverse impact on people on low incomes as it removes the facility to pay for treatments in instalments although the equality assessment carried out indicated that this proposal is likely to have no or a low impact on everyone.	The most common request for treatment is to deal with rats and mice and there is at least one company in Bradford which is able to provide the service cheaper than the Council	There was concern that this proposal meant that the service was going to be outsourced, with increased costs as a consequence.	
<b>Topic</b>		<b>General Comments</b>			
Council Tax		<p>Can't afford the increases. Wages and cost of living increases are far lower than the suggested CT increase. There is still an issue with fraud on single occupancy households. Owners of empty properties and unused land should be charged higher rates to force maintenance and if not lead to low level compulsory purchase for LA income generation. Reinvest CT in areas where it is generated from. It was suggested that some businesses could run some services more efficiently and should therefore be transferred which in turn would increase business rates received. The affordability of council tax needs addressing, so that people pay what they can afford according to their situation – families, or single income households should pay a bit less than those with double incomes for example.</p> <p>2.3 There was the suggestion of changing the CT system for something like a local income tax or a poll tax. Concern that those areas with parishes are being very hard hit due to increases in both precepts. The council tax reduction scheme helps the most vulnerable and economically disadvantaged in our community. This reduction will penalise these people beyond breaking point. There are vulnerable people with unmanageable debt who rely on budgets which are supported by CT. Look at keeping support for those who need it regarding their income or if they are vulnerable. By making it harder for them, the bills still wont get paid but it will push people into debt which creates far worse problems.</p> <p><b>A rise in CT could harm the local economy. Bradford is a low income city, with little disposable funds. Further increases, whilst seeing continued inflation will lead to even less disposable funds which would also impact businesses.</b></p>			
General administration		<p>Reduce the number of Councillors. More pressure needs to be put on central government to provide the funding needed, with Yorkshire local authorities creating an alliance to strengthen the argument. The Council could look more to philanthropy to support what will be lost. Concern that the vulnerable are being affected by the proposal leading to more people being in poverty.</p>			

Efficiencies	There was a suggestion that the removal of Essential Lump sums for car users would cost more in the long run through use of taxis and public transport. It was suggested that communities could do their own garden/grit/cleaning. Also Renting council office spaces could be rented to other organisations.
Revenues and Benefits	With universal credit coming in, more staffing is needed in revenues and benefits
Health (general)	It is felt that contracting and procurement arrangements are not in line with the pledges around prevention and community led development. VCS work is being hampered by this, especially as it is hard to demonstrate impact and scalability. Would like to see more co-design and joint working. It was suggested that patient groups should be used to help get the message out about changes in public health and the way services are delivered.
Other	There is concern that there aren't sufficient or appropriate jobs available for people with disabilities. Increases in costs of living, be it from Council Tax, transport costs etc just makes their situations worse. There are concerns over increases in homeless people and the lack of funding/investment for them. A bigger proportion of expenditure should be spent on them with a vision for housing and homelessness in Bradford. It is felt that service reductions haven't been proportionally applied, with outlying areas suffering (e.g. Queensbury). Recent FOI requests have shown that union officials receive funding and time, this should be stopped as union subs should pay union funding. In relation to VCS funding cuts - Often value of small community organisations is overlooked because of their historic inability to measure their impact and the scalability of their work, however, this is also at odds with the clear commitment from the Council's senior management to asset based community approaches. Expression of sympathy for the cuts that the Council have been forced to make, and the dismay at the inevitable deterioration of Social provision for those who most need it. There is concern that those who shout the loudest will have their voices heard when the final decisions are made. There is concern about the amount of cuts to advocacy services and how that is making it harder for disabled people to have a voice including for issues like housing and access to the criminal justice system. There needs to be more publicity and information sharing about the assisted bin service as it is felt many do not know about it. The council could be more proactive in finding people and groups who are willing to put their energies behind running services – promoting the opportunity for a conversation. There was suggestion that social impact bonds could be better used – such as the Sheffield model. Concern over the money the Council might be spending on the Odeon, when apparently more important services are being substantially cut.
Overall equality impacts	The proposals have a regressive impact upon disabled and older people. There is a feeling that the cuts are more likely to hit people who are unlikely to complain, vote, have a say. This doesn't necessarily fit with equality duties and the Brown Principles



## **Report of the Interim Director of Human Resources to the meeting of Executive to be held on 06 February 2018**

**AW**

---

### **Subject:**

Interim Trade Union feedback on the Council's budget proposals for the 2018/19 and 2019/20 Council budget.

### **Summary statement:**

This report and appendices provide interim feedback from the Council's Trade Unions on the Council's budget proposals for the 2018/19 and 2019/20 Council Budget for consideration by Executive.

---

Michelle Moverley  
Interim Director of HR

### **Portfolio Holder:**

Leader of Council and Corporate

Report Contact: Michelle Moverley  
Interim Director of HR  
Phone: (01274) 437883  
E-mail: [michelle.moverley@bradford.gov.uk](mailto:michelle.moverley@bradford.gov.uk)

### **Overview & Scrutiny Area:**

**Corporate**

## 1. SUMMARY

This report and appendices provide interim feedback from the Council's Trade Unions on the Council's budget proposals for the 2018/19 and 2019/20 Council budget for consideration by Executive.

## 2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 On 28 November 2016 the Council issued a letter under Section 188 Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992 ("TULRCA") notifying the Trade Unions about the potential impact on the workforce because of the need to achieve additional savings in the financial year 2017/18 and 2018/19 from those approved by Budget Council in February 2016. This potential impact also included staffing reduction proposals for 2018/19. This commenced a period of consultation under TULRCA. Consultation on these proposals is ongoing.
- 2.2 On 27 November 2017 the Council issued a further letter under Section 188 TULRCA notifying the Trade unions about the potential impact on the workforce in 2018/19 and 2019/20 because of the need to achieve additional savings in those years. The issuing of the Section 188 letter on 27 November 2017 commenced a statutory minimum 45 day consultation period with the Council's Trade Unions which includes consultation about ways of avoiding dismissals, reducing the numbers of employees to be dismissed and mitigating the consequences of the dismissals. This includes considering feedback received from the Trade Unions and any alternative proposals they may have to try and minimise the impact of the proposed budget reductions on the workforce. Consultation with the Trade Unions will continue beyond the minimum 45 day period where necessary particularly focusing on the impact of any proposed budget reductions on the workforce with a view to seeking ways to avoid and/or reduce the potential number of job losses and minimise any adverse impact in terms of job losses.
- 2.3 Consultation has been taking place with the relevant Trade Unions since 27 November 2017 on the proposals, in order for final proposals to be prepared for Budget Council on 22 February 2018.
- 2.4 The Trade Unions were notified of the following key issues within the S188 letter on 27 November 2017:
  - The Report of the Strategic Director Corporate Services to the meeting of the Executive on the 5 December 2017 provided the financial plan for the Council for the financial years 2018/19 to 2020/21.
  - The Council estimates that the total number of employees within the Council that are potentially at risk of redundancy as a consequence of the proposals detailed in the letter dated 27 November 2017 is 85 Full Time Equivalents (FTE's) in 2018/19 and 68 FTE's in 2019/20.
  - These proposed reductions of 85 Full Time Equivalents (FTE's) in 2018/19 and 68 FTE's in 2019/20 are in addition to those proposals currently subject to separate consultation processes under Section 188 TULRCA 1992 which commenced on 28 November 2016 relating to the proposed 107 FTE reductions for 2018/19.
  - These proposed reductions are also in addition to those proposals currently subject to separate consultation processes under section 188 TULRCA 1992 about which the Council commenced consultation on 30<sup>th</sup> October 2017 by its letter " proposed

Council changes in Prevention and Early Help and the potential impact on staff employed by the Council Section 188 Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992

- That the Council will look at every aspect of its operation to make the savings. In relation to employees, if savings can be suggested which mean that there will be fewer or no redundancies then the Council will carefully consider such possibilities.
- That the Council will continue to examine the current terms and conditions of employment to see if savings can be made there, but regrettably it does look likely that dismissals by reason of redundancy may have to be made.

### **3. THE PROCESS**

- 3.1** Following the issuing of the S188 letter on 27 November 2017 consultation has taken place with the Council's Trade Unions.
- 3.2** An initial corporate consultation was held with the following Trade Unions on the Council's proposals through the S188 process: Unison, GMB, UNITE, UCATT,
- 3.3** Consultation is on-going at departmental level with Unison, GMB, UNITE and UCATT.
- 3.4** Consultation has also taken place with Teachers/ Education Trade Unions at Departmental level. Other Trade Unions have been consulted on a Departmental basis where appropriate.
- 3.5** Trade Union consultation meeting on the potential workforce implications of the budget proposals took place at a corporate level on 7 December 2017. Consultation will continue up to the Full Council meeting on 22 February 2018 and subsequently in relation to any impacts on the workforce following budget decisions being made.
- 3.6** Departmental Trade Union consultation meetings have taken place to discuss the proposals in more detail, and feedback from these meetings is recorded in the appendices.
- 3.7** The feedback and the management responses given in this report are interim and consultation with the Trade Unions continues.

The Council is currently consulting with the Trade Unions on:

- The financial position of the Council.
- Possible strategies for making savings and the projected implications for workforce reductions if such strategies, following consultation, are implemented.
- Potential impact of proposed changes to certain terms and conditions of employment.
- The continuation of strategies to minimise the impact of workforce reductions (voluntary expressions of interest, bumped redundancies, vacancy control, controlling agency spend and maximising non workforce savings etc).
- Potential reduction of services in some areas of the Council

### **3.8** In terms of consultation:

- The size of cuts that the Council is facing—creates very considerable demands on the Council and its resources.
- The Council is consulting and will continue to consult about ways of avoiding any dismissals, reducing the numbers of employees to be dismissed, and mitigating the consequences of the dismissals, and will be doing so with a view to reaching agreement.
- The Council serves the S188 letter at an early stage of a very lengthy and complex process, which undergoes a number of adjustments and changes as it goes forward through consultation and Executive approval.
- The Council consults over a far longer period than the minimum required by S188.
- The Council values the contribution of the Trade Unions in this process of consultation.

**3.9** Additional feedback received from the Trade Unions following this report being circulated will be tabled at Executive on the day of the meeting as an Addendum to the report.

**3.10** The industrial relations implications will become clearer once detailed discussion about implementation of the decisions begins following any budget decision. Much will depend on the number of vacancies and voluntary redundancies agreed, together with the opportunities for redeployment which will all help to mitigate against the overall FTE reductions and the potential number of compulsory redundancies.

## **4. KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM THE TRADE UNION FEEDBACK ON THE COUNCIL'S BUDGET PROPOSALS FOR 2018/19 and 2019/20**

### **4.1 Feedback on the Departmental Budget Proposals**

The Trade Unions' feedback received to date in relation to the Council's budget proposals for 2018/19 and 2019/20 together with management's responses to that feedback is outlined in the attached documents on a departmental basis (Appendices 1-8).

The feedback documents are lengthy due to the number of budget proposals being considered and to ensure all feedback received from the Trade Unions has been recorded and is considered.

**4.2** At the Corporate Consultation meeting on 7 December, the following general summary issues were raised by the trade unions in relation to:

- The need for a recruitment freeze
- All secondments to end
- All Fixed term contracts to end
- All use of agency staff to cease
- Focus on revenue raising

Management have responded that all the above matters will be addressed within Departmental consultation process and provision of the workforce information. The impact on continuation of delivery of the service during the consultation has to be considered.

## **5. FINANCIAL & RESOURCE APPRAISAL**

- 5.1 The Strategic Director of Corporate Services reports to the Executive meetings on 05 December 2017 and the report of the Assistant Director Finance and Procurement to the Executive meeting on 06 February 2018 set out the background to the Council's financial position and the need for expenditure reductions.

## **6. RISK MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE ISSUES**

- 6.1 All risks in relation to the budget proposals and workforce implications are being managed through the Council's Risk Management Strategy with governance through Council Management Team.

## **7. LEGAL APPRAISAL**

- 7.1 Pursuant to Section 188 Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992 (TULRCA 1992) the Council as employer is required to consult the recognised Trade Unions where there is a potential to dismiss by reason of redundancy 20 or more employees. If 100 or more employees are at risk of dismissal by reason of redundancy the consultation period is a minimum of 45 days.

- 7.2 Under Section 195 TULRCA 1992 "dismissal as redundant" is defined as all dismissals "for a reason not related to the individual concerned". As a consequence the Council is also consulting the recognised Trade Unions pursuant to s188 in relation to proposals to change certain terms and conditions of employment.

- 7.3 Such consultation with the Trade Unions is continuing and includes consultation about ways of avoiding dismissals, reducing the numbers of employees to be dismissed and mitigating the consequences of the dismissals.

## **8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS**

### **8.1 EQUALITY & DIVERSITY**

A Corporate Staffing Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) is being produced on the Council's Budget proposals. This will be tabled with the Trade Unions. Feedback from the Trade Unions on the Equality Impact Assessment will be taken and will be fed into future feedback addendums. Departmental EIA's on proposals with all workforce implications are consulted on in departmental consultation meetings. All EQIA's with regards to Workforce implications will be subject to review as proposals are developed and amended as a consequence of continuing consultation.

### **8.2 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS**

None

### **8.3 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS IMPACTS**

None

#### 8.4 **COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

None

#### 8.5 **HUMAN RIGHTS ACT**

None

#### 8.6 **TRADE UNION**

Consultation with the Trade Unions on the Council's Budget proposals for 2018/19 and 2019/20 is ongoing.

The issues raised by the Trade Unions at the Corporate Consultation meeting on 7<sup>th</sup> December 2017 and Departmental consultation are reflected in the attached spreadsheets, which are continuing to be updated as consultation continues.

The Trade Unions have provided the following statements:

##### **Unison and GMB**

In response to the latest section 188 proposals, UNISON and GMB recognise the immense financial difficulties that Local Authorities such as Bradford are facing and that these are being driven by deeply unfair central government cuts.

Council employees are having to work harder than ever before to keep the services running that the people of Bradford rely upon, but there is only so much that anyone can do. The government's austerity programme is wrecking communities and the huge job cuts that the Council are proposing over the next few years will undoubtedly have a negative impact on the range and quality of services that it is able to offer.

However, whilst it would be unfair to lay the blame at the door of Bradford Council for the financial difficulties it is facing, UNISON and GMB have a duty to challenge the Council where we believe it is not doing all it possibly can to mitigate the consequences of the government funding cuts. In this respect, we have particularly serious concerns about the proposals relating to Prevention and Early Help in Children's Services where 240 full time posts are at risk – not least because we have yet to be provided with full details about the proposals without which we cannot engage in meaningful consultation.

We also believe that the Council needs to do more to ensure that, where jobs are at risk, workers are offered alternative posts and/or retraining to ensure that their skills are retained and that they do not face the awful prospect of compulsory redundancy. This is something that the unions can never be in agreement with. We have raised this issue a number of times with the Council and we are hopeful that we will be able to make some progress on getting a more robust redeployment procedure in the near future.

Finally, whilst both unions recognise that the Council needs good management in order to function properly, we have lately seen a move towards the creation of additional upper layers of management – including the return of some posts that had already been deleted in previous years. We have aired our concerns about this and will continue to challenge the Council where there appears to be any drift towards the creation of new highly paid management posts at the expense of other workers and the

services they deliver.

## **Unite**

Consultation with the Trade Unions on the Council's initial Budget proposals have not been very constructive. It has become a process of management indicating a way forward and there is no other alternative.

The proposed budget cuts put forward attack the most vulnerable members of our society who need our support the most. The continuous attack on the young within Bradford places lives at risk in our view.

The cuts put forward attack the very core of the Council's Plan.

The Council have attempted to choose who can or cannot attend consultation meetings that is unacceptable to Unite. Our elected S188 Officer for SEND and Early Years has not been allowed to attend the consultation meetings. The Council have also chose to implement changes to SEND and Early Years without the full scrutiny of full council despite the consultation being flawed and Unite will challenge this in the necessary arena.

In the last financial year Unite took part in a 2 year budget setting process and 12months on are required to consider further cuts resulting in a funding gap this despite some services failing to deliver cuts from previous years totalling over £20 million. The external Peer Review highlighted this issue of accountability for this area of decision making yet next year the same situation will arise. Management are quite quick to carry out the staffing cuts but reluctant to deliver the difficult decisions.

It is also becoming a trend that Councillors, Strategic Directors and Assistant Directors who have chosen to leave the authority are allowed to put forward cuts that affect the very existence of people in the district without any accountability as they ride off into the sunset. That appears to be immoral to our Union.

Whilst understanding the current financial climate we vigorously oppose any attack on our employees terms and conditions and any compulsory redundancies. It's with regret we see cuts to both services provided by the Council and the transfer of public services to the private sector or transferred to a voluntary sector that may not have the necessary skills or resources to deliver.

The impact on the local economy, service users and staff affected is immeasurable. The continued decimation of Local Authority funding and consequential cuts to services to the most vulnerable in society cannot be described as good. Austerity is not solely to blame, we have a choice on how we spend the money given to us and we should do that wisely and fairly.

### **8.7 WARD IMPLICATIONS**

None

### **9. NOT FOR PUBLICATION DOCUMENTS**

None

## **10. RECOMMENDATIONS**

That Executive considers and has regard to the interim feedback received from the Council's Trade Unions in relation to the budget proposals when considering its recommendations to Council on the Council's budget for the financial years 2017/18 and 2018/19.

## **11. APPENDICES**

Appendix 1	Department of Children's Services proposals
Appendix 2	Department of Place proposals
Appendix 3	Department of Health and Wellbeing proposals
Appendix 4	Department of Corporate Services
	(a) Human Resources
	(b) Estates and Property
	(c) IT Services
	(d) Legal Services and Committee Secretariat
	(e) Financial Services, Revenues Benefits and Payroll and Estates and Property

## **12. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

- Section 188 TULCRA 1992 Letter to Trade Unions - 27 November 2017.
- Strategic Director – Corporate Services Budget Update Report for Executive – 05 December 2017 – Document “AJ”



**Appendix 1 - Department of Children's Services**

Appendix 1 - Department of Children's Services															
Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	Saving				Reduction	Employees					VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
			2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total £'000	%		Current		Likely FTE Reductions		Vacs.			
								FTE's	Head count	2018-19	2019-20				
4C1	Education Services	Education Services – From 2017 part of the Dedicated Schools Grant will be passed directly to schools. There will therefore be a reduction in Council spending but no reduction in base budget. The proposal is included here as there could be staffing implications.	0.0	0.0	0.0		202.0	244.0	27.0	0.0	31.0	1	<b>Level 1 - 7.12.17</b> - no questions.	<b>Level 1 - 7.12.17</b> - continuation of this proposal. SEND review - going to Exec on 9 Jan - was out to public consultation during the summer - further consultation required with further work to revise proposal and back to Exec in Jan 18. High increase in need for SEN services - working on a locality model which is also driving the proposal in addition to achieving budget savings.	
													<b>Level 2 - 21/12/17</b> NEU asked for a list of affected staff.	Management to respond	
													NEU noted the likely FTE reduction of 27 – were TU's aware of this.	Management confirmed this and that it was part of the SEND proposals. The Chair confirmed that there were no proposed cuts in Children's which had not already been announced. There will be some savings in the Complex Health and Disabilities Team but no detail is available yet.	
Page 163													<b>Joint Level 3 - 04/01/18</b>  A further request was made from Union colleagues for the list of SEND affected staff to be issued ASAP.	Management noted the requested and JK advised that the list of staff will be issued.	
													<b>Level 2 - 11/01/18</b>  As above NASUWT advised list of staff not received.	Chair asked that this is provided by close of play Friday 12 January.  Circulated on 12/01/18.	
													Unison noted a SEND report was going to Council next week. Have any dates been set up to brief affected staff.	Staff were briefed on 13 December 2018, prior to the publication of the Council Executive Report on the 0-25 SEND Transformation on 29 December 2017. A report was presented at Council Executive on 9 January 2018 seeking approval for an extended period of formal consultation and this was approved to run from 17 January - 28 February 2018. A presentation on the 0-25 Consultation was also shared at Schools Forum on 10 January 2018. A manager briefing was held on 16 January prior to the formal consultation re-commencing. The O-25 Transformation will be presented for comment at Overview and Scrutiny on 14 February 2018.	

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total £'000	%	FTE's	Head count	2018-19	2019-20	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
													NEU asked if the Complex Health and Disabilities Team was the same as the Physical and Medical Team.	The Complex Health and Disabilities Team are part of Children's Social Care. The Physical and Medical Team are a teaching support service and are part of the education teams within Education Employment and Skills.
4C2	Education Services	Prevention and Early Help – detailed proposals form part of the Executive report Doc AC -7th November 2017 Early Years - From 2017 part of the Dedicated Schools Grant will be removed. Plans are being formulated to develop a coherent and targeted suite of early years' services including early help, family centres and early years' including Children's Centres. The proposal is included here as there could be staffing implications.	0.0	3,000.0	3,000.0		430.8	553.0	240.0	0.0	42.6	14	<b>7.12.17 - Level 1</b> Unite - need to update figures on spreadsheet to avoid confusion	<b>7.12.17 - Level 1</b> - Separate S188 declared for this proposal in Nov 17 - detail of this to be discussed at Level 2 in afternoon of 7.12.17. Need to cross reference with Health & Wellbeing due to link with budget lines.  Management will update.
Page 164													Trade Unions asked for details on the structure and implications for staff; clarity on the budget (£3m on the attached) – what is the budget reduction (including the Public Health element). They also commented on the comms and consultation around the proposals; people are finding it difficult to log on – can we make this easier for people to access?	Management have provided further detail on the structure and staff numbers at the Level 2 Meeting held on the 7 December and the Level 3 Meeting held on the 14 December. However, we agreed with Unions this would go to staff after Christmas; week commencing of 2 January 2018.  Clarity on the budget is available in the report presented to Executive on the 7 November.  Action has been taken to make sure the website is accessible and an easy read version of the booklet has been produced.
													<b>Joint Level 3 - 14/12/17</b>  A query was raised in relation to the caseloads of workers at present and whether this will increase/decrease.	It was agreed that current caseload information will be shared with Union colleagues.
													A query was raised in relation to assimilation rights for staff	HR advised that this would be looked at nearer the time but it would be in line with managing workforce change but due to the vast number of varying posts; it would be done in conjunction with Union colleagues
														Management asked for views from Union colleagues on the forthcoming meeting with staff and it was felt that Unions had not received enough detail and therefore they were not in a position to be able to answer queries from staff or support them sufficiently. It was agreed that the meeting would be postponed and re-arranged for the New Year.

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total £'000	%	FTE's	Head count	2018-19	2019-20	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
													<u>Level 2 - 21/12/17</u>  NEU had requested the JD's in draft form; for the 0-25 Key Worker role specifically and asked if these were available.	Management confirmed these were being worked on and would be available shortly.
													Unison noted a general concern about whether the target would be met in terms of the savings. For example, the 50% reduction in referrals and whether that would happen and if not, would the Early Help referrals transfer to Children's Social Care, who are already struggling with workloads. This is also impacted by whether the Council is receiving the right funding.	Management noted the concern.
Page 165													<u>Joint Level 3 - 04/01/18</u>  Unison asked when the consultation would be closing and whether questions from staff are being monitored and responded to promptly.	Management advised that the consultation would close on 12 February and that colleagues were monitoring and responding to questions from staff through the 'questions' mailbox. Management also advised that FAQ document is constantly being updated and this will be shared with Unions.
													NASUWT asked whether there would be a change to the dates for the SEND consultation and whether this would be being extended.	JK advised that the SEND Transformation report is due to go to Executive on 09 January, there will be 5 days for call in and the consultation period will commence from 17 January 2018.
													TB asked whether the consultation period would be extended to ensure that staff feedback and engagement was adequate and that full discussions could take place regarding roles/responsibilities.	HR advised that it is currently due to on 12 February but due to the extent of the proposals; this may be reviewed depending on staff feedback. The consultation is about the proposed structure and not about individual posts. There needs to be a balance on moving forward on the proposals but maintaining good working relationships with staff.

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total £'000	%	FTE's	Head count	2018-19	2019-20	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
													<p><b>Joint Level 3 - 18.01.18</b></p> <p>Unison sought response to request for caseload information.</p> <p>Unison asked if this information could be expanded to include Family and Children's Centres.</p>	<p>Management are progressing this and information will be shared.</p> <p>Management will look into.</p>
													Unison asked if a preliminary grade could be given.	HR advised a clear grade would need to be given following initial comments on profiles by the 12 February.
													Unison had been asked by a member of the range of grades so staff can see what they may have rights to.	If comments received back on job profiles can set up a grading panel quickly including the 3 outstanding but dependent on comments they may need looking at again.
													Unison queried the business case; where the teams in scope and number of occupied and proposed posts are listed – what are the proportion of staff to grades (raised in Level 2 on 11 January). Could we have post numbers by name.	Management advised could put posts in there.
Page 166													Chair asked if there had been many questions about the job profiles.	Management advised that there had been little that required any change to job profiles.
													Unison requested that if the staff consultation was to be extended could a new date be set today.	Management advised the proposal would go to Executive in April and we are asking People Too to analyse feedback and do a report so that it is independent. We would have to look at timescales for going to Executive. Mark Anslow advised that this linked to the SEND consultation too and we would have to close the consultation with the public and staff on the model but that we can continue to consult with staff on proposed structures and job profiles. Chair noted there was some confusion with both consultations and staff not sure which consultation they were in scope for. Management agreed to provide an overview of information given to date to go to teams and TUs.
													NASUWT noted in the last set of minutes the SEND consultation was due to finish on 12 February but 2 events have been arranged after that.	Management advised that following Executive the two consultations were brought into alignment. Public consultation on P & EH will end on 12 February. SEND will run until 28 February. Both SEND & P & EH will be reported back to Executive on the 3 April 2018.

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total £'000	%	FTE's	Head count	2018-19	2019-20	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
													Unison asked in terms of the public consultation, how many sessions had been attended. There seem to be 2/3 different processes mixed up; the Prevention and Early Help model, LAC numbers going up, CP numbers going up and referrals increasing. Management are trying to save £13m but there is a £200m shortfall in social care and we don't have enough information.	<p>Management took on board the comments. Simultaneous processes have caused confusion and recognised the need to make it clear there were 2 consultations. Staff in scope for both consultations had been provided but it was noted Management needed to clarify matters for staff misinformed.</p> <p>It was agreed to send individual e-mails may cause more concern so agreed to send a briefing using the two slides from the staff briefing presentation which clearly state which teams are in scope along with a note sharing when the consultation close, when structures would be shared and if anyone is unsure of their position to speak to their line manager.</p> <p>Management agreed to provide an overview of information given to date to go to teams and TUs.</p>
													Unison felt that a lot of time and money had been given to advertise the Early Help proposals but for SEND there didn't appear to be the same input.	HR noted SEND did have staff briefings before Christmas which were well attended and it was clear about which staff were in scope. Structures were not available for today. SEND proposed structure and job profiles will be presented by 1 February for comment by the end of February.
Page 167													Unison asked when the structure would be shared.	<p>Management advised this would be shared at the Level 3 meeting on the 1 February.</p> <p>Management will present the following draft structures and profiles by the 1 February for comments by the end of February:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learning Environments including traded service teams and targets</li> <li>• Service support across EES</li> <li>• SEND</li> </ul>
													Unison asked when the SEND consultation would close.	Management confirmed 28 February.
													Unison noted some education staff want to know if they have a future role, e.g. Education Safeguarding reduction in staff. Which posts will be going?	<p>Management felt staff should be able to recognise their post. HR noted TU's were taking about people but Management are talking about structures and functions. If staff have a document to say the Family Information Service they would know there were in scope.</p> <p>Management agreed to provide an overview of information given to date to go to teams and TUs.</p>
													NAHT asked if the title on the job profiles would make it clear.	Management advised there are some singular job profiles which may not be clear and some staff think their service is indispensable so will not affect them, e.g. Employment/Licencing roles are a statutory responsibility and staff may not think this is scope but it is.

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total £'000	%	FTE's	Head count	2018-19	2019-20	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
													Unison advised they could not access the shared drive and it was easier to e-mail.	Management noted that all TU's should have been given passwords to access SharePoint. Will follow this up to ensure all can access.
													NASUWT raised the issue of Faith Tutors and what will happen to them as they are on teachers terms and conditions.  NEU also added Teaching and Learning Consultants as they are not a traded service but it is expected they will be and they are worried.	Management advised that posts for accessing education such as those mentioned are proposed to go to the traded learning environment.  Management will present the following draft structures and profiles by the 1 February for comments by the end of February: Learning Environments including traded service teams and targets
													Unison asked if that meant that they will still be employed by the Council on teachers terms and conditions.	Management will present the following draft structures and profiles by the 1 February for comments by the end of February: Learning Environments including traded service teams and targets.
													NEU noted the Teaching and Learning Consultants were expected to be 100% traded from a position on 0% traded. How much income is needed.	Management advised an officer had worked with teams and structures to be tabled on 1 February will have the detail.
Page 168													NEU asked if the trading amount was not met who would bridge the gap – the Council or would we lose staff.	Management advised that teams were not spinning out into separate organisations; they will still be Council staff.
													NASUWT asked how many Teaching and Learning Consultants were on the structure.  NEU thought there were 2 part time and NASUWT noted there were 7 Faith Tutors.	Management to confirm.
													Unison asked how the public consultations had gone.	Management advised these had picked up with really good turnouts at some sessions; 35 at Carlisle Business Centre and 23 at Shipley Library.  The survey had 560 responses to date.
													Unison asked if these had been done in different languages and how we were communicating with communities with different languages.	Management advised translators had been at some sessions and if we are aware of a need for this, translators will be made available. BSL, audio and easy read have been published on-line.

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total £'000	%	FTE's	Head count	2018-19	2019-20	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
													Unison asked if the survey had been done in other languages.	Management advised it hadn't but hard copies were available and staff could complete with the public on a 1:1 basis if needed. The Youth Service were also doing this with young people.
													Unison asked about the independent report.  Unison asked if they were local.	Management confirmed this would be done by People Too and will look at how staff work, what they feel works, how we could improve services, etc.  Management advised they were and that they had undertaken the BDP Review into Early Help.
													Unison noted the consultation focussed on Early Help and Prevention but in terms of future work what was the direction with, e.g. mental health, dental health.	Management advised there would be 1 plan for 1 person and would include early years but also talk about access to other services, e.g. domestic violence. There would be a good range in conversations.
													Unison asked where the Community Play and Development Team would sit and there role.	Management advised this would be in the Learning Environment but would go into the traded service section. Judith Kirk will be sending a communication to all traded services teams.
													Unison asked about the Prevention Co-ordinators – at Level 3 which is the same level as the Prevention Worker – should it be higher.	Management will look at this but not always as it depends on their experience and this will need to be considered as part of the grading process.
													Unison noted that the post sits alongside these at Level 3 but says a professional qualification is needed. Some staff will not have a qualification but will have been doing the role for 20 years.	HR noted that during the assimilation process Management would look at qualifications but also experience and if staff have been doing the job for a considerable period this will be considered. Staff will not be disadvantaged. The usual assimilation principles will apply.
													Unison asked for the rationale for the Access and Take Up Workers (8 posts).	Management advised this had been received as a FAQ and information would be provided.

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total £'000	%	FTE's	Head count	2018-19	2019-20	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
													<p>Unison noted that Management were going to the Early Help model and there will be a cost to run some of the programmes with, for example, the VCS. Have these costs been taken into consideration. Has this been thought through and what programmes will be in place.</p> <p>Unison noted that every pound spent can save money in referrals but is that cost effective and will you deliver this. What are the training needs.</p>	<p>Management advised a multi-agency group has been mapping all programmes across the 7 clusters and evidence and the next step will be to look at what has been delivered well.</p> <p>Management noted there are a large array of programmes and we will look at what works. We don't think we will put new programmes in place but would have a pool of staff trained to go and staff assimilated would be able to deliver.</p>
													<p>Unison asked about thresholds and how Management would decide which families to target. There has to be a corporate responsibility for what will happen.</p>	<p>Management advised if there were less programmes then less families would be targeted. This isn't something we want to do but we believe it is the least worst option. This takes out the money but we will mitigate the impact.</p>
Page 170													<p>Unison noted that Bradford has a young population and are referrals going up because of the young population growth.</p>	<p>Management noted this was because of growth but also because of the increase in poverty. We have to do this because of the money we have and we believe this is the best way to do this. There are question about the impact on the front door but we understand this and it is really difficult.</p>
													<p>Unison queried the 3 Nursery Schools which staff were TUPE'd to in August 2015 and this will finish in August 2018. What will happen to those staff; are they in scope.</p>	<p>HR advised that these staff were not TUPE'd to the three clusters, they are still Council employees – the management of the staff was devolved to the Governing Body of those schools. In August 2018 they will come back into scope as the funding comes from the Children's Centre budget and staff have been included in the figures.</p> <p>Chair noted that staff spoke at Overview and Scrutiny and were confused about their status so this needs to be clarified and included in the briefing to staff in scope.</p> <p>Management agreed to provide an overview of information given to date to go to teams and TUs.</p>



Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total £'000	%	FTE's	Head count	2018-19	2019-20	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
													<p>Unison asked if they could engage with these staff or would it have to wait until August 2018.</p> <p>Unison asked if they could have names of staff in scope.</p>	<p>Management advised this could be done now but through the leadership of the school.</p> <p>Staff briefings have been done for nursery school clusters. What we need to be clear about is that posts are funded through the Children's Centres budget.</p> <p>Management will provide when we have identified who we are paying for from the affected budget</p>
													<p>Unison asked if the consultation can be extended to end of February.</p>	<p>Management advised the 3 job profiles would be sent on Monday and the public Prevention and Early Help consultation would close on the 12 February but we can continue discussions regarding proposed structures and draft profiles. The remaining structures will be brought to the meeting on 1 February.</p> <p>Management will present the remaining draft structures and profiles by the 1 February for comments by the end of February:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learning Environments including traded service teams and targets</li> <li>• Service support across EES</li> <li>• SEND</li> </ul>
Page 171													<p>Unison asked for more detail on what we will and will not be providing.</p>	<p>Management to respond.</p>
													<p><b>Level 2 - 11/01/18</b></p> <p>NEU asked for a copy of the outstanding JD for the Sufficiency Officer following the presentation last week.</p>	<p>Management to follow up. UPDATE - draft profile released on 23.01.18</p>
													<p>UNISON asked if current workload information has been shared.</p> <p>UNISON expanded that if staff want to consider where they would want to work they would need to know what is there in the first place and consider issues such as case loads, etc.</p>	<p>Management advised this hadn't and would feed into the consultation. Any actions from Joint Level 3 will also be picked up too.</p>

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total £'000	%	FTE's	Head count	2018-19	2019-20	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
													NEU requested that staff have their contracts checked to make sure their start date or continuous service and pensions information is correct. It is also important to ensure that current JD's reflect accurately the staff are doing during the consultation period. We are asking managers to check with their staff. Unison agreed that some staff are picking up extra work and have been doing this a long time and it is not in their JD. Noted that a lot of JD's are out of date and it is unfair to staff if they are doing a job to help the service. NASUWT agreed the pension contributions need to be checked whilst in the employment of the Council as it is more difficult to do this after they have left the Council.	Management to log with Mark Anslow to ensure Managers confident this is in order. Managers would be unable to check every current JD but if staff feel there is a genuine issue then they need to take this up with their manager to look into. UPDATE - managers were asked before Christmas to ensure ESS/MSS information was updated. Mark Anslow to reinforce.
													Unison requested clarity on what will no longer be happening in the proposed model so they can consult with members.	Management to respond.
													Unison asked for clarity on when the rest of the structure will be circulated on Central Services and for more information on the proposed learning environment.	Management to check when this will be released and update. UPDATE - agreed at Joint L3 that these would be available by the 1 February. Central Services Manager draft profile was released on 23.01.18
													NASUWT asked about Faith Tutors who are on Teachers Terms and Conditions and are a traded service. How will the proposals affect them; it has not been explained what this will mean.	Management to respond. UPDATE - this will be confirmed as part of draft structures for Learning Environments to be shared by 1 February 2018.

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total £'000	%	FTE's	Head count	2018-19	2019-20	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
													UNISON had a query on the 'Key Elements from Proposed Area Based Model – Structure Report to OJC Level 3'. On page 3 and 4 it lists the posts in present teams in scope and gives the number of occupied and proposed posts, e.g. Practitioners - 72 FTE (band 4 – SO1) to 28 FTE. Asked for a breakdown of how many Band 4, SO1, etc. are being kept..	Management to respond. UPDATE - this was provided to TU's and uploaded to SharePoint on 23.01.18
													UNISON concerned around Education Safeguarding element; what will not be done and what has to be done as a statutory duty.	Management noted concern and will respond. UPDATE - it is proposed that oversight for both educational safeguarding and attendance will be incorporated within the early help gateway. This will include oversight of children missing education, home education and fixed penalty. the overview of data etc. will then inform targeting of work by the area teams.
Page 173													UNISON had Admin staff asking lots of questions about what it means from them but there is no detail.	Management to respond. UPDATE - given scale of savings we need a collective review of service support. This has been clarified in consultation update across P&EH and SEND. A draft Service Support structure and job profiles will be provided by the 1 February 2018.
													UNISON had a general observation; having looked at the work of North Yorkshire, some of the areas identified the priority of families. What will the priorities be in families that we will target, e.g. issues like poverty, numbers of disadvantaged children, number of children in trouble with the Police, number of NEET's, number of children with mental health issues. North Yorkshire do have figures and it would be good to have those for Bradford.	Management noted the comments and will respond. UPDATE - the Executive report refers to the Families Needs Assessment - detailed data is provided and analysed in this document - 10 wards for highlights for larger groups with poorer outcomes. The report also outlines the elements of services to be delivered by the proposed teams. they will continue to prioritise workless families, school attendance and those affected by DV, substance misuse and parental mental health. The recommissioned public health service and new proposed team would focus together on delivery of the High Impact Areas as outlined in the report. we will continue to deliver the mandated HV checks.

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total £'000	%	FTE's	Head count	2018-19	2019-20	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
													UNISON noted in the Child Death Overview Panel report that 69 children had died in Bradford and had gone to Panel. These figures will include cot death, smoking cessation, etc. but this figure could go higher.	Management noted the comments.
													UNISON noted conversations were happening with Barnardos and Action for Children but asked if these staff would be TUPE'd back into the Council and if so, would that affect the 54% figure of potential job cuts.	Management's understanding was that the figures had been factored into calculations but will check. UPDATE - yes, both were included in the FTE/headcount of affected teams.
4C3	Childrens/Regen	Children's Services – staffing, restructure, reduction in the Connexions contract with longer term service brought back in to Council, investigate regional data centre, cessation of Employment Opportunities Fund (EOF).	150.0	50.0	200.0		80.0	95.0	12.8	0.0	22.0	1	<p><b>Level 1 - 07/12/17</b></p> <p>TU's asked for more information on the proposals.</p>	Management responded that although they are for a new financial year, these are not new savings and the changes to the structure and the service to secure the £150k saving in FY 18/19 have already been put into place as part of the process to reduce the FY 17/18 value (also by £150k). As a result no further reductions in FTE are expected at this time. Although the FTE working on the contract has reduced not all the reduction relates to staff having left the organisation delivering the Connexions Service (Prospects), as they hold multiple contracts across the region and some staff have been re-deployed to work on other contracts. The remainder of the staff reduction has been achieved through natural wastage and not backfilling vacant posts and voluntary redundancy - no member of staff working on this contract has been made compulsorily redundant as a result of the reduction to our budget.
													<p><b>Level 2 - 21/12/17</b></p> <p>NEU asked for paperwork in relation to this.</p>	There is no specific paperwork relating to proposal. Management would refer back to the public budget consultation last year as this is where the changes were raised. The reduction in Connexions value has been via a contract variation with the service provider. We are unable to provide this documentation as it is commercially sensitive. What was EOF is now being delivered as part of the ESF funded STEP programme which runs until December 2019.
													<p><b>Level 2 - 11/01/18</b></p> <p>See matters arising above.</p>	

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total £'000	%	FTE's	Head count	2018-19	2019-20	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
4C5	Social Care - Management savings	Children's Social Care management restructure – review of management structure leading to proposed reduction of two service manager posts and one team manager	85.0	0.0	85.0		30.0	30.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	1	<u>Level 2 - 21/12/17</u>  Unison noted this fit with the current restructuring and the Early Help proposals.	Management advised this was separate but will have to fit with any realignment.
													<u>Level 2 - 11/01/18</u>  UNISON asked who the service manager was.	Management advised this was tied into taking out on of the Team Managers going into locality teams.
													UNISON did recall Gani Martins saying that she would reduce service managers some time ago and unclear what happened to that. It would be useful to have structure of where Service Managers are at the moment.	Management to circulate new structure.
4C6	Social Care - Early Help	Early Help –review structures in early help for children and families commissioned from VCS, youth offending team, crime prevention, family centres, families first	120.0	660.0	780.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	<u>Level 2 - 21/12/17</u>  No matters raised.	
													<u>Level 2 - 11/01/18</u>  No issues raised.	
4C7	Social Care - Looked After Children	Looked After Team – review of staffing and non staffing budgets	19.0	19.0	38.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	<u>Level 2 - 21/12/17</u>  Unison asked how staffing would fit with reduced LAC.	Management advised that LAC would not reduce – there is an increase across the country. The £19k savings to be made now will be made on transport. It is predicted children in care numbers will grow. The other make or break will be whether there are enough foster care places in-house and through family and friends rather than external placements but for every 20 foster carers we need 1 new member of staff.
													NEU noted that this would take out the £19k saving.	Management confirmed this but would be better to pay them than independent foster agency fees; although there is a need for a mixed market.
													NEU asked if we were benchmarked against other LA's.	Management advised that Bradford does well and 50 new family and friends foster carers have been recruited since April and 22 are new foster carers. There may be opportunities for staff affected by the Early Help proposals to consider fostering.
													Unison asked if this was being discussed with affected staff.	Management noted this was difficult but if staff are motivated and don't go into it with rose tinted glasses it might be something they have not considered before. We could also look to see if applications could be fast tracked.

Page 175

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total £'000	%	FTE's	Head count	2018-19	2019-20	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
													NEU advised schools are restructuring and losing support staff so that might also be a fertile recruitment source.	The Chair felt most foster carers enjoyed what they do and they can earn the national average wage. It is how do we spread that message without being insensitive.
													<b>Level 2 - 11/01/18</b>  UNISON noted that Jim Hopkinson had sent an e-mail to Social Workers today and can understand what Management are trying to do about reducing LAC but what to acknowledge the big impact this will have. The central point is that you have to look at thresholds when looking at EH or Managers and the Council will be taking bigger risk in not accommodating children. Within that people need to be inventive and innovative with these children by using families. This is a corporate responsibility and the risk will have to be taken rather than removing child. There is research available.	Management noted comments and would say that it is anticipated the reductions coming from the Be Positive Pathways and teenagers going back home and UNISON are right re evidence. Management will ensure any return home is safe.
4C8	Social Care - Fostering and Adoption	Fostering and Adoption – review team manager structure with potential reduction of one team manager post	50.0	0.0	50.0		51.0	62.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	0	<b>Level 2 - 21/12/17</b>  Unison asked if this would tie in with the increase of foster carers.	Management advised if foster carers increased it will be an issue but there are a number of teams and some short term could move to long term.
													<b>Level 2 - 11/01/18</b>  UNISON asked if there was any movement on this yet or timescale.	Management advised not at moment.
4C11	Social Care- Leaving Care Service	Leaving Care – to review staffing and non staffing budgets to achieve a saving of 2% in yr 1 and a further 1% in yr 2	34.0	0.0	34.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	<b>Level 2 - 21/12/17</b>  No matters raised.	
													<b>Level 2 - 11/01/18</b>  UNISON asked if the rationale of reducing children coming into the care system would reduce this.	Management noted this proposal was looking at reducing costs with care providers for accommodation.

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total £'000	%	FTE's	Head count	2018-19	2019-20	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
4C12	Education Employment & Skills	Early Years and School Readiness –reduction in grants to small providers undertaking community based activity to help prepare children for school.	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	<u>Level 2 - 21/12/17</u> No matters raised.	
													<u>Level 2 - 11/01/18</u> UNISON acknowledged how this affects the Prevention and Early Help programme and will target families and communities so there are links and want to make sure this is not lost within the EH proposals.	Management noted.
4C13	Social Care - Drug and Alcohol Team	Drugs and Alcohol Team – review of the work of the team and all other services that support young people with alcohol and drug issues	50.0	0.0	50.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	<u>Level 2 - 21/12/17</u> Unison asked who managed the Team	Management advised they are managed by the Problem Solving Court Team.
													Unison asked how many staff were in the Team.	Management advised there were 2 at the moment and an advert was out – 6 staff at the most.
													NEU asked if there were any people suitable in redeployment.	Management advised the Problem Solving Court is a hybrid adaptation of a licensed programme which was expensive and at the end of the funded period it was agreed that it was a great programme but we could not afford it so we are taking aspects of the model and continuing the work. Staff work intensively on the ground with people and the Court can be a motivating factor and keep families together. This work is done across West Yorkshire and we think we can achieve the saving.
													<u>Level 2 - 11/01/18</u> No issues raised.	
5C1	Social Care	Review of respite provision after the introduction of personalised budgets	0.0	400.0	400.0		84.0	94.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	0		<u>7.12.17 - Level 1</u> - Further £400k reductions to be achieved - project team looking at efficiencies - longer lead in time .
													<u>Level 2 - 21/12/17</u> NEU asked how close we were to marketing this.	Management advised that we already are and 2 beds are currently commissioned to Calderdale and we are trying to expand that and sell at full cost. We have also bought one bed from Leeds and part of our solution is also to try to buy beds from other LA's.
													Unison asked if the number of children with complex health needs were increasing.	Management advised that we have more children with a disability than the national average. Health care improvements mean children are surviving longer with complicated health needs. They need our respite as and when parents can't cope. Some beds can cost up to £9k per week for 1 child.

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total £'000	%	FTE's	Head count	2018-19	2019-20	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
													Unison asked if Bradford had any families displaced from other communities and whether this had a knock on.	Management advised that Bradford does have a problem with families displaced to cheaper housing. The Chair highlighted a case of a family from London being placed here in cheaper accommodation but once they have been here 3 months they become our responsibility.
													NEU asked if cases such as this were centrally funded.	Management advised that if they arrived in the district on a child protection plan the other LA would pay but if they become children in need whilst here it would be our responsibility.
													<b>Level 2 - 11/01/18</b> NEU queried the use of wording, i.e. marketing.	Management agreed it was 'promoting'.
													Unison noted respite provision stops at age 19. In North Yorkshire this was a 0-25 service.	Management advised this would be one of the things they will look at as part of the review.
<b>Total</b>			<b>508.0</b>	<b>4,129.0</b>	<b>4,637.0</b>		<b>877.8</b>	<b>1078.0</b>	<b>281.8</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>107.6</b>	<b>17</b>		



**Appendix 2 - Department of Place**

Appendix 2 - Department of Place													Issue 4 - 25.1.18
Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total	%	Employees					TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
							Current		Potential FTE Reductions		Vacs.		
							FTE's	Head count	2018/19	2019/20			
4E1	Sport & Culture	Parks and Bereavement - management rationalisation; withdrawal from direct management of sport pitches and bowling greens; raise prices of bereavement services.	160.0	60.0	220.0		72.0	74.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	0	<p><b>OJC Level 1 - 7.12.17</b> The £60K is a further continuation of this proposal</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> ID said that work relating to sports pitches and bowling greens is on-going. Some savings will be achieved by increased income with bereavement service changes rising above inflation, and addressing the management structure.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 11.1.18</b> Unite asked what the position is in relation to the 3 posts identified as being at potential risk.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 11.1.18</b> ID said that the figure is predicated on the transfer of sports pitches and bowling greens but may be mitigated by turnover or vacancies elsewhere.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Following the meeting management confirmed that the number of posts is 2, not 3.</p>
4E2	Waste & Transport Services	Waste Collection and Disposal Services - Full year effect of introduction of alternate weekly collection and associated round reduction, improved recycling, reduction in residual waste and improved efficiencies.	807.0	-84.0	723.0		199.0	170.0	12.0	0.0	4.0	10	<p><b>OJC Level 1 - 7.12.17</b> Alternate weekly collections now in place, 19/20 figure some funding coming back in as result re-routing which is settling down</p> <p><b>Unison -</b> Are agency staff still being used in this area? Management to check current position on agency staff in this area.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> JM said that the savings will be achieved through a continuation of the savings from AWC. Additional monies have been allocated to cover increased costs in waste disposal. JM confirmed that the service will not be reducing the number of domestic rounds by a further 3. The Service will be looking to take out a trade, transit and rural round to compensate.</p>

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total	%	FTE's	Head count	2018/19	2019/20	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
					0.0								<p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> GMB asked about the number of agency staff being used in Waste Services.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> GMB asked whether the expectation was to reduce the FTE by 12 and what the position was regarding a reduction in the number of managers in the structure.</p>	<p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> JM confirmed that there are currently 19 agency staff working on refuse collection – 6 contingency; 5 covering staff seconded as waste advisors; 1 for management support; 1 rural; 4 vacancies and 2 covering long term sick. It is anticipated that the majority of these will not be employed in the new financial year. 15 agency staff are working on disposal – 9 at the MRF; 2 covering long term sick and 4 walking contaminated waste. Again this number will reduce by the end of the financial year. It has proved difficult to get permanent staff to work at the MRF; currently looking at redeployment opportunities for other staff displaced within the Department. JM said that the FTE establishment is 174 but currently operating with 4 vacancies which will be recruited to.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> JM said that he will backfill to the establishment. The position of the number of managers will be addressed through re-structure proposals which will be discussed with the Unions in the near future.</p>
													<p><b>Level 2 - 11.1.18</b> GMB asked what the position is in relation to the VR requests received.</p>	<p><b>Level 2 - 11.1.18</b> JM said that the service is recruiting to vacant posts and may have to delete up to 6 posts which would be done through natural wastage or VR. He said that he understood the sensitivities around this issue.</p>
4E3	Waste & Transport Services	Trade Waste – process and service improvements including back office, round efficiencies and business development opportunities.	0.0	43.0	43.0		199.0	170.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0	<p><b>Unite</b> - Is it possible to have a breakdown of proposals</p>	<p><b>OJC Level 1 - 7.12.17</b> - Need to check the figure of "2.0" in the 19/20 reduction column. <b>Management</b> - any future proposals will come to Level 2</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> JM said that the additional savings will be achieved through a process review and increased income through business development.</p>

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total	%	FTE's	Head count	2018/19	2019/20	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
4E4	Neighbourhoods & Customer Services	Customer Services – redirect face to face contact towards self service and telephone services will see a continuing decline in contact resulting in staffing efficiencies. Automated services will increase with fewer options for people to speak to a customer services advisor. More people will be expected to 'self serve' using on line services	50.0	50.0	100.0		120.0	102.0	2.0	0.0	12.0	0		<p><b>OJC Level 7.12.17</b> - continuation of moving from face to face services to online/automated services</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> ID said that the saving was the equivalent of 2 members of staff which he anticipated would be managed through staff turnover. There are a number of changes which will affect the way the service is delivered including the impact of the introduction of Universal Credit, reduced number of contacts and risk based verification. Will look at alternative ways of working which will reduce the number of staff required.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> ID said that would not be the case; management will work with Trade Unions and staff to identify the best way of achieving the required savings.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 11.1.18</b> ID said that it was anticipated that the required staff reductions would be achieved through vacancy management.</p>
4E5	Neighbourhoods & Customer Services	Street Cleansing and Public Conveniences - reduction street cleansing resources for 2019/20	336.3	1004.5	1340.8		129.7	137.0	28.0	0.0	8.0	0	<p><b>Unison</b> - raised concerns about street cleanliness specifically around Neal Street area - locals dumping rubbish and neighbourhood deteriorating.</p> <p><b>Unite</b> - Confirmed their position that they will not accept any proposals where there is a reduction of jobs</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> GMB said that again this budget proposal will hit the lowest paid the hardest and suggested redefining management posts and keeping front line staff.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> GMB said the Unions would support management on the positivity of this approach.</p>	<p><b>OJC Level 1 - 7.12.17</b> - £1m in 19/20 large reduction will need to look at restructuring cleansing teams to be completed by 31/3/19</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> ID said that this budget proposal will have a significant impact on staff and cannot be achieved without reducing the number of staff in the service. Management will work with the Trade Unions to look at how to mitigate the impact and support as many staff as possible through retraining and moving to other vacancies where the opportunities are available.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> ID said that management and the Trade Unions need to think and work together to find a way of making the savings, looking at opportunities for staff where possible.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> SH said management know this is a difficult budget saving and that management will use vacancy control to re-configure the service.</p>

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total	%	FTE's	Head count	2018/19	2019/20	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
													<p><b>Level 2 - 21.12.17</b> Unite asked if the toilet attendant posts were included in this budget proposal.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 11.1.18</b> Unite asked for more meaningful consultation on the proposal as it affects street cleansing.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 11.1.18</b> Unite said that the cleansing service is already understaffed and said that they did not believe that the proposal fits with the objectives of the Safe, Clean and Active programme board.</p>	<p><b>Level 2 - 21.12.17</b> ID said that they were not.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 11.1.18</b> ID said that the Council is near to reaching agreement on the transfer of public toilet facilities to Town and Parish Councils. One member of staff has asked, and been accepted for, VR.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 11.1.18</b> ID said that management are aware of the impact this proposal will have on the cleansing teams. He is working with Damian Fisher to look at proposals for achieving a saving of 25% of the total budget which will then be discussed at level 3.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 11.1.18</b> SH said it was a very difficult decision and management are aware of the impact it will have on the cleansing service and individual staff members.</p>
4E6	Neighbourhoods & Customer Services	Pest Control – cessation of the pest control service	36.2	0.0	36.2		3.0	3.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0		<p><b>OJC Level 1 - 7.12.17</b> - this proposal has already been completed and nothing new to add to this.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> ID said that opportunities had been offered to the two remaining staff which were not taken up. One has left on VR and management believe the other is considering this option.</p>
4E7	Sport & Culture	Remodel of Visitor Information & frontline service - reduce the number and/or size of Visitor Information Centres (VICs), moving to a more digital basis promoting the district to target audiences, with the potential for VIC information points as co-located provision.	50.0	50.0	100.0		11.1	13.0	8.5	0.0	5.0	0	<p><b>Level 2 - 21.12.17</b> GMB asked whether staff meetings were being arranged with VIC staff.</p>	<p><b>OJC Level 1 - 7.12.17</b> - this is work in progress - looking at other options of delivering VIC services to be consulted on further due to staffing imptions. Further details to be brought to future Level 2/3's</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> SH introduced PM as the Interim AD covering Culture. PM said that this budget saving is being addressed through the Destination Management Plan. Management have had positive discussion with other providers for the out of Bradford offices and the Bradford VIC will remain open until 2019. A revised structure and job descriptions will be consulted on shortly.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 21.12.17</b> Management to confirm these arrangements.</p>

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total	%	FTE's	Head count	2018/19	2019/20	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
														<p><b>Level 2 - 11.1.18</b> TT gave an update on consultation with Ilkley Parish Council and the Bronte Society. Ilkley Parish Council has agreed to fund the VIC in Ilkley for 2 years. The Council is still in negotiation with the Bronte Society in relation to Haworth VIC; this may involve TUPE transfers. A new structure and proposed job profiles were issued on 18 December, 2017 and staff briefed. No comments have been received to date. The structure cannot be implemented until discussions with the Bronte Society are complete.</p>
4E8	Sport & Culture	Events and Festivals – review to develop a more sustainable and balanced events programme	150.0	150.0	300.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0		<p><b>OJC Level 1 - 7.12.17</b> - now have less money available to spend on events, looking at how we buy in. BML generated £200K this year to run again in 2018</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> PM confirmed that the savings will be found from within the budget and have no staffing implications.</p>
4E9	Sport & Culture	Libraries – reduction in the number of libraries directly provided by CBMDC. Further investigation of potential for alternative delivery models	100.0	950.0	1050.0		73.8	107.0	8.5	17.0	6.0	0		<p><b>OJC Level 1 7.12.17</b> - Already been through a period of change - Volunteers now run some resource - further work to do over the next 6 months which will be a major piece of work</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> PM said that this proposal may have significant impact on staff numbers. Management are looking at how to deliver the service differently while still complying with the Libraries Act.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> PM said he would provide this information.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 11.1.18</b> PM said he believed that there was some confusion among Libraries staff about the proposals. He confirmed that they are for the 2019/20 financial year and that management are working on proposals which will then be consulted on with staff.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> Unison asked how many casual staff are being used in Libraries.</p>
4E10	Sport & Culture	Theatres and Community Halls – Halls to be transferred through Community Asset Transfer. Theatres to generate greater income	130.0	130.0	260.0		3.0	4.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0		<p><b>OJC Level 1 - 7.12.17</b> - work in progress on Halls (CATS). Once St Georges Hall comes back on line should generate income.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> PM confirmed that management anticipate mitigating any job losses through increased income.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> SH said that it is proposed that the Odeon will be leased to the NEC and Bradford Live and that it will not be run by the Council.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> Unison asked whether the Odeon will be included in this budget proposal.</p>

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total	%	FTE's	Head count	2018/19	2019/20	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
4E11	Sport & Culture	Sport and Physical Activity – investigate all methods of future operational service delivery	150.0	50.0	200.0		147.0	206.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0	<b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> Unison asked whether the Odeon will be included in this budget proposal.	OJC Level 1 - 7.12.17 - increased income/commercial deals - review of sports provision - opening of Sedbergh facility coming on line.  Level 2 - 14.12.17 SH said that there will be a review of the whole service to look at reducing the cost base, increasing income and addressing historical budget issues where costs have been higher than budget.
4E12	Sport & Culture	Ministry of Food – cessation of the service teaching people how to cook, eat and improve their long term health	96.0	0.0	96.0		1.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	0.5	0		<b>OJC Level 7.12.17</b> - this item now completed.  <b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> SON confirmed that a redundancy dismissal hearing has been held and one member of staff is now on the redeployment register.  <b>Level 2 - 11.1.18</b> SON confirmed that this proposal affects one member of staff who is currently in the redeployment process.
4E13	Neighbourhoods & Customer Services	Car Parking - remove xmas carparking concessions, amend tariffs in little Germany & other car park changes.	108.0	0.0	108.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0		<b>OJC Level 1 - 7.12.17</b> - this item now completed  <b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> There are no new budget savings. Parking in the Bradford District remains competitive compared to other Cities.
5E1	Sport & Culture	Museums & Galleries - Review of service to include potential for income generation, service efficiency and integration and remodelling of operational delivery.	0.0	260.0	260.0		48.8	55.0	0.0	3.0	1.0	0	<b>Unite</b> - Request for a breakdown of costs/staffing for this service  <b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> GMB asked what the costs for this work would be.  <b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> Unison asked how the Rugby Museum would fit and the staffing of it.	<b>OJC Level 1 - 7.12.17</b> - Review of the whole provision to look at possible income generation - significant piece of work to be undertaken  <b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> PM said that these were not yet known. SH confirmed that funding would be available from the Implementation Fund set up for projects like this.  <b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> PM said that the Council has pledged to open a Rugby Museum by 2021. The plans will open the ground floor of City Hall to the public and incorporate the Police Museum and become a Bradford Museum. The Council is looking for external grants to fund the capital works. Running costs are already in the budget through the current use of City Hall. It is anticipated that the museum will be staffed heavily by volunteers.

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total	%	FTE's	Head count	2018/19	2019/20	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
													<p><b>Level 2 - 21.12.17</b> GMB asked how much would be spent on bringing in consultants to advise on the commercialisation of photography sales.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 21.12.17</b> GMB asked whether resources were available within the Council to undertake the review of the Museums and Galleries service in order to save the costs of consultants.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 11.1.18</b> GMB asked what the anticipated cost of the consultants would be.</p>	<p><b>Level 2 - 21.12.17</b> ID said that this may relate to the specialist nature of the proposition, that it is unlikely that costs would be known at present and this would be referred to Pete Massey for response at a future meeting.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 21.12.17</b> Management to respond to these issues.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 11.1.18</b> PM said that the commercialisation of museums and galleries was much more than the selling of photographs and would include catering and retail offers. There is no in-house expertise to lead on this. He anticipated that an initial investment would lead to increased income and saving posts.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 11.1.18</b> PM said that he believed it would be in the region of £30,000 and similar advice in other authorities had lead to significantly increased income.</p>
5E2	Neighbourhoods & Customer Services	Youth Service - All commissioned grants will be reviewed during 2018, with grants to VCS groups providing youth work ceasing from April 2019.	0.0	311.0	311.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0		<p><b>OJC Level 1 - 7.12.17</b> - Commissioned grants in this area will cease - Heather Wilson in childrens services is already working on this item.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> ID confirmed that there are no staff implications for this proposal. The voluntary sector is being helped to build capacity to operate without grant funding from the Council. It is not anticipated to have significant staffing implications for the voluntary groups as the largest grant given this year is £10,000 and the majority are much smaller.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 21.12.17</b> ID said the budget for this proposal sits within Childrens Services. JC confirmed that it was not a saving that was being considered by Childrens Level 2.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 11.1.8</b> ID confirmed that this proposal has not staffing implications.</p>

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total	%	FTE's	Head count	2018/19	2019/20	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
4R2	Planning Transportation & Highways	West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA) Transport Levy – proposed reduction in the levy	1234.1	750.0	1,984.1		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			<p><b>OJC Level 1 - 7.12.17</b> - continuing work ongoing on this issue.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> JJ confirmed that transport levy negotiations are on-going.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 11.1.18</b> JJ confirmed that this proposal has no staffing implications. The WYCA levy will be discussed at the Transport Committee and then consulted on at member and officer level from April 2018.</p>
4R3	Planning Transportation & Highways	Commercialise Highway Delivery Unit (HDU) – to increase the range of services provided by the HDU through increasing involvement in existing capital works programmes and delivery of services which are externally funded	223.0	0.0	223.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			<p><b>OJC level 1 - 7.12.17</b> - no further info - no staffing implications</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> JJ confirmed that there no further savings required and no staffing implications from these budget savings.</p>
4R5	Planning Transportation & Highways	Planning, Transportation and Highways – increase in discretionary charges	44.1	0.0	44.1		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			<p><b>OJC level 1 - 7.12.17</b> - no further info - no staffing implications</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> JJ confirmed that there no further savings required and no staffing implications from these budget savings.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 21.12.17</b> JJ said that management are reviewing current charges and looking at the possibility of introducing new ones. He confirmed that charges are reviewed annually.</p>
4R6	Planning Transportation & Highways	Planning, Transportation and Highways - options related to discretionary budgets for highway maintenance works including minor drainage improvements, pavement repairs and footpath and snicket maintenance	(6.4)	0.0	(6.4)		29.0	29.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0		<p><b>OJC Level 1 7.12 17</b> - no further info</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> JJ confirmed that there no further savings required and no staffing implications from these budget savings.</p>
4R7	Planning Transportation & Highways	Planning, Transportation and Highways - reduction in Highways Services operational budgets associated with operational transport gateway and subway maintenance	2.5	0.0	2.5		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			<p><b>OJC level 1 - 7.12.17 - no further info - no staffing implications</b></p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> JJ confirmed that there no further savings required and no staffing implications from these budget savings.</p>
4R8	Planning Transportation & Highways	Planning, Transportation and Highways - Robust administration of the Yorkshire Common Permit Scheme on the Highways	70.0	0.0	70.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			<p><b>OJC level 1 - 7.12.17</b> - no further info - no staffing implications</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> JJ confirmed that there no further savings required and no staffing implications from these budget savings.</p>



Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total	%	FTE's	Head count	2018/19	2019/20	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
4R9	Planning Transportation & Highways	Planning, Transportation and Highways - reduce area committee support and stop processing/charge for all requests for service delivery for non casualty led projects	124.0	0.0	124.0		13.0	14.0	4.0	0.0	10.0	0		<p><b>OJC Level 1 - 7.12.17</b> - the reduction for 19/20 has been reduced to 0 - the 10 figure originally shown was the vacancy number within this service area.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> JJ confirmed that the staffing impact will be managed through vacancy control.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 21.12.17</b> GMB asked whether the vacancies showing against this budget proposal were going to be filled. If not could they be used to allow for bumped redundancies in other areas.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 21.12.17</b> JJ said he was currently reviewing the vacancies and felt that some would be filled, and that it may be by apprentices. Management confirmed that VRs and bumps would be looked at across the Department. Management will work to minimise the number of job losses.</p>
													<p><b>Level 2 - 11.1.18</b> GMB asked about the vacancies in this area.</p>	<p><b>Level 2 - 11.1.18</b> JJ said that there would be recruitment to the areas which need resourcing. This will be dealt with through the restructure currently being considered.</p>
4R10	Economy & Development	Education Capital Team – combination of vacancy control, reduction in facilities management and other charges	50.0	0.0	50.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			<p><b>OJC level 1 - 7.12.17</b> - no further info - no staffing implications</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> SON confirmed that this budget saving is being dealt with through the Legacy Budget.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 11.1.18</b> SON confirmed that the notes should read legacy budgets, not the Legacy Budget.</p>
4R11	Planning Transportation & Highways	Planning, Transportation and Highways - introduction of limited lighting hours / switch off of street lighting on non-principal road network	60.0	60.0	120.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			<p><b>OJC Level 1 - 7.12.17</b> - continuation of this approach.</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> JJ confirmed that work is on-going to reduce the street lighting hours across the District.</p>
4R13	Economy & Development	Economic Development Service – reduction in City Park sinking fund, matched funding for European Strategic Investment Fund programmes. Remove support for B-funded community funding information website	0.0	26.0	26.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			<p><b>OJC level 1 - 7.12.17</b> - no further info - no staffing implications</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> SON confirmed that neither of these budget proposals have staff implications.</p>
4R19	Economy & Development	Housing Operations – increase income generation from agency fees	44.0	0.0	44.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			<p><b>OJC Level 1 7.12.17</b> - no further info - no staffing implications</p> <p><b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> SON confirmed that neither of these budget proposals have staff implications.</p>

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total	%	FTE's	Head count	2018/19	2019/20	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
4R20	Planning Transportation & Highways	Regeneration – no longer accept new schools onto the Active School Travel programme with existing provision being phased out over the following years of this budget process	28.0	28.0	56.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			<b>OJC Level 1 - 7.12.17</b> - continuation of this approach.  <b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> JJ confirmed that the Active School Travel programme is being phased out and that this saving has no staff implications.
4R21	Planning Transportation & Highways	Regeneration – reduction in the funding for the Road Safety Team	62.5	62.5	125.0		6.2	9.0	1.0	7.0	0.0	0		<b>OJC Level 1 - 7.12.17</b> - funding for this programme came from Public Health - to cease completely.  <b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> JJ confirmed that the staff implications of this proposal are being looked at.  <b>Level 2 - 21.12.17</b> JJ confirmed that this is already being considered.  <b>Level 2 - 21.12.17</b> Unison asked whether it would be possible to sell our Road Safety service to other Local Authorities.
5R1	Planning Transportation & Highways	Reducing (previously Highway Agency controlled) de-trunked road maintenance budget.	224.8	0.0	224.8		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			<b>OJC Level 1 - 7.12.17</b> - to reduce budget for these highways e.g. Bingley by-pass  <b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> JJ said that this saving is a reduction in the maintenance budget for trunk roads. There are no staff implications.
5R2	Planning Transportation & Highways	Increased charges for activities on the highway – review of charging schedule.	25.0	0.0	25.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			<b>OJC Level 1 - 7.12.17</b> - continue to review this activity  <b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> JJ said that this proposal would be achieved through increased income. There are no staff implications.
5R3	Planning Transportation & Highways	Increasing percentage level of staff capital recharges to external projects/ customers	250.0	0.0	250.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			<b>OJC level 1 - 7.12.17</b> - no further info - no staffing implications  <b>Level 2 - 14.12.17</b> JJ said that this proposal would be achieved through increased income. There are no staff implications.
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4609.1</b>	<b>3901.0</b>	<b>8510.1</b>		<b>0.0</b>	<b>1055.7</b>	<b>1094.0</b>	<b>79.0</b>	<b>29.0</b>	<b>48.5</b>	<b>10</b>	

Appendix 3 - Department of Health & Wellbeing

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	Saving			Reduction	Employees					VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
			2018-19	2019-20	Total		Current		Likely FTE		Vacs.			
			£'000	£'000	£'000		% FTE's	Head count	2018/19	2019/20				
4A1	Adult and Community services	Adults - Overall Demand Management Strategy - moving from a dependency model to one that promotes independence and resilience (e.g. reducing numbers coming into care, care system culture change, speeding up integration, redesign enablement, reviewing financial needs, continued personalisation)	8000.0	8000.0	16000.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			
													14.12.17 - Unions requested more clarity on the details of the savings,	Management advised that a whole system remodel is required. We need more frontline input in order that savings are made to care packages and a more person centred approach taken.
													11.01.18 - Cancelled by Unions no issues to discuss	
													18.01.18 - Cancelled as key attendees unable to attend (Unions and HR)	
4PH1	Public Health - School Nursing & health Visitors	School Nursing & Health Visiting - service based efficiencies- primarily management, back office and vacancy control. Please note this proposal is split between better health better lives and Great Start, Good Schools	1390.0	1959.0	3349.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			
													14.12.17 Unions raised no issues.	Management explained these are primarily management, back office and vacancy control.
													11.01.18 - Cancelled by Unions no issues to discuss	
													1.01.18 - Cancelled as key attendees unable to attend (Unions and HR)	
4PH2	Public health - Substance Misuse	Substance Misuse Service – combination of redesign, re-commissioning and ceasing recovery service, dual diagnosis service, supervised medication programme, inpatient detoxification services.	1634.0	625.0	2259.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			
													14.12.17 Unions queries on-going changes and contractors changes.	Management explained the re-commissioning process and ceasing recovery service, as well as dual diagnosis service and supervised medication.
													11.01.18 - Cancelled by Unions no issues to discuss	
													18.01.18 - Cancelled as key attendees unable to attend (Unions and HR)	
4PH3	Public health - Sexual Health	Sexual Health - combination of redesign, review and ceasing services Health development with young people, sex and relationship education in schools, emergency hormonal contraception	25.0	0.0	25.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			
													14.12.17 Unions raised no issues.	
													11.01.18 - Cancelled by Unions no issues to discuss	
													18.01.18	
4PH4	Public Health - Tobacco	Tobacco – combination of redesign, review and ceasing services	59.2	2.0	61.2		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			
													14.12.17 Unions raised no issues.	
													11.01.18 - Cancelled by Unions no issues to discuss	
													18.01.18 - Cancelled as key attendees unable to attend (Unions and HR)	

4PH5	Public Health - Homestart, Worksafe and Injury Minimisation Programme	Homestart, Worksafe, Injury Minimisation Programme - phase out of these services providing support for vulnerable parents and children age 0-5 years.	93.0	0.0	93.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			
												14.12.17 Unions raised no issues.	
												11.01.18 - Cancelled by Unions no issues to discuss	
												18.01.18 - Cancelled as key attendees unable to attend (Unions and HR)	
4PH6	Public Health - Physical Activity, Food and Nutrition	Physical Activity, Food and Nutrition - cessation of grants to VCS organisations delivery range of activities including 'cook and eat', physical activity, food growing and breastfeeding support.	250.0	0.0	250.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			
												14.12.17 Unions raised no issues.	
												11.01.18 - Cancelled by Unions no issues to discuss	
												18.01.18 - Cancelled as key attendees unable to attend (Unions and HR)	
4PH8	Public Health - Warm Homes Healthy People Programme	Warm Homes Healthy People – reduction in the short term winter activity based programme	40.0	20.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			
												14.12.17	
												11.01.18 - Cancelled by Unions no issues to discuss	
												18.01.18 - Cancelled as key attendees unable to attend (Unions and HR)	
4PH9	Public Health - Back office CCG funding transfer	CCG Rebasng – to redesign services as part of an accountable care system, involving health, social care and other providers	499.0	0.0	499.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			
												14.12.17 Unions raised no issues.	
												11.01.18 - Cancelled by Unions no issues to discuss	
												18.01.18 - Cancelled as key attendees unable to attend (Unions and HR)	
4PH10	Public Health - Staffing and operational cost reductions	Public Health – reduction in staffing in line with redirecting investment profile towards reducing demand and maintaining health and wellbeing	350.0	310.0	660.0	87.0	98.0	9.0	7.0	0.0			
												14.12.17 Unions raised no issues.	
												11.01.18 - Cancelled by Unions no issues to discuss	
												18.01.18 - Cancelled as key attendees unable to attend (Unions and HR)	
4PH11	Public Health - Environmental Health Restructure	Environmental Health – management restructure	40.0	0.0	40.0	44.0	48.0	2.0	0.0	0.0			
												14.12.17 Unions raised no issues.	
												11.01.18 - Cancelled by Unions no issues to discuss	
												18.01.18 - Cancelled as key attendees unable to attend (Unions and HR)	
5PH1	A Home From Hospital Service - BRICCS Integrated Care & Support - review and redesign of the service.	This service is designed to support people who are homeless or in unsuitable accommodation, and who are at risk of staying longer than necessary in hospital. Homeless populations are more likely to have ill health and long term disabling conditions; come from age specific groups such as 16-25's year olds and 35 to 55 year olds and are more likely to be male.	0.0	170.1	170.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			



This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 4a - Department of Corporate Services - Human Resources

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	Saving				Reduction %	Employees					TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
			2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total £'000	Current		Likely FTE Reductions		Vacs.	VR Req.			
						FTE's		Head count	2018/19			2019/20		
4H1	Human Resources	Human Resources – reduce HR transactional support, to reduce volume of service specific training	204.0	0.0	204.0		43.0	52	7.0	0.0	2	3	11.10.18 - See below	11.10.18 - See below
5H1	Human Resources	Workforce Development reprioritised to focus on use of more specialist ad-hoc external delivery. Review of Occupational Safety.	250.0	0.0	250.0		25.1	28	7.0	0.0	2	3	11.01.18 - AR raised the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questioned the role of the Corporate Support Officer</li> <li>• Questioned the proposal for the new apprenticeship post – did this take on work of the posts that were being deleted</li> <li>• Concerns that the structure is too top heavy</li> <li>• Concerns around whether the service could function without an admin team</li> <li>• Job vacancies being held</li> </ul>	11.01.18 - Feedback from staff regarding alternative proposals and a proposal for income generation. These will be considered by management. SD responded that all feedback and alternative proposals will be considered. SD confirmed that where possible suitable alternative vacancies were identified elsewhere in the council, requests were being made for these to be held where possible for affected staff. SD confirmed that the new apprenticeship post does not replace an existing job. Consultation will continue led by the Head of Workforce Development, due to the HR Director leaving the organisation on 19 January.
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>454.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>454.0</b>		<b>68.1</b>	<b>80.0</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>			

Page 193

Cross Cutting Consultation

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	Saving				Reduction %	Employees					TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
			2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total £'000	Current		Likely FTE Reductions		Vacs.	VR Req.			
						FTE's		Head count	2018/19			2019/20		
4H2	Human Resources	Terms and Conditions – removal of non contractual overtime payments and removal of essential car allowance lump sum payments	120.0	90.0	210.0		0.00	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	11.01.18 - No Comment	11.01.18 - No Comment
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>120.0</b>	<b>90.0</b>	<b>210.0</b>		<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>		

This page is intentionally left blank



Appendix 4b - Estates & Property

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total £'000	%	Employees		Likely FTE Reductions		Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
							Current FTE's	Head count	2018/19	2019/20				
4R1	Estates & Property	Industrial Services Group (ISG) – reduce the staffing structure to suit the present workloads	43.3	0.0	43.3		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0		131217. Management reported that there would be no further reductions in the workforce if the workload continues. ISG will break even this year and have been successful in winning a number of new contracts for delivering fire doors, especially around Newcastle
													100118. TU's asked that Management clarify point "no further reductions in the workforce if the workload continues".	100117. Management confirmed that there will be no further reductions of staff. The £43.3K is to come off next year but cuts have been taken this year because ISG have seen an improvement in trade and will break even
4R12	Estates & Property	School Catering and Cleaning – increased sales and price reviews	35.0	0.0	35.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0		131217. Management reported that this has been dealt with through increased prices, there are no staffing implications
4R14	Estates & Property	Asset Management – make the best use of the Council's and public sector partners' estate working with the Voluntary and Community Sector Also seek to invest in non-operational property to generate surplus income	360.0	200.0	560.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0		131217. Management reported that the challenge is to continue to acquire and create investments that generate a surplus revenue and to maximise the existing investment portfolio. This year is well ahead of target. The NCP will generate 165k per year surplus income.
Page 195													100118. TU's stated that they need to see some proposals.	100118. Management stated that they are sharing accommodation but have not identified with the third parties yet.
													100118 TU's asked what the contribution will be from the third parties who we end up sharing with, how much will they be paying.	100118. Management agreed to provide the information
													100118. TU's asked that management provide a list of organisations who are using Council accommodation and are not paying for it. This includes the Police Museum and Ghost Trips	100118. Management agreed to provide the information.
4R15	Estates & Property	Facilities Management – operational cost reductions reflecting the continued contraction of the organisation	100.0	200.0	300.0		75.0	191.0	1.0	2.0	8.0	0		131217. Management stated that they are looking at savings in 2018/19 of £100k and a further £200k in 19/20 by reducing the number of buildings occupied and managed. Part of that is Jacobs well. There is likely to be a staff reduction of 1FTE in the first year and 2FTEs the year after but this would be managed
													100118. TU's asked if "reducing the number of buildings occupied" is a capital scheme and if asked for a breakdown of operational costs including maintenance and utilities.	100118. Management stated that they have been tasked to save money through the reduction of the estate and will provide the TU's with details of buildings which have been closed and are to be closed.

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total £'000	%	FTE's	Head count	2018/19	2019/20	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
													100118. TU's stated that Jacobs Well was vacated around July 2017.	100118. Management stated that staff moved out at the end of 2017 but the majority moved out in July. The building is still being used for storage but the intention is to demolish it to get the rates saving as we are still paying a big chunk in utilities. Any demolition costs will be offset by savings.
4R16	Estates & Property	Facilities Management – reduction in the maintenance budget as the size of the operational estate shrinks	100.0	780.0	880.0		259.0	267.0	3.0	6.0	39.0	2		131217. Management reported that there would be a reduction of 3FTE's next year through natural wastage/retirement. More savings would be made through closing buildings and Community Asset Transfers of which Richard Dunn is included.
4R17	Estates & Property	Facilities Management – reduction in the size of the estate together with energy efficiency measures	147.5	0.0	147.5		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0		131217. Management reported that there would be no staff a risk, there would be a reduction in the amount of money spent on utilities through the closure of buildings.
5FM1	Estates & Property	Residential Catering - budget reduced in line with current requirement and cost, no change in service levels	80.0	0.0	80.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0		131217. Management reported that they had had a surplus for the last 2 years and would be reducing the budget in line with operating costs
5FM2	Estates & Property	School Catering and Cleaning – increased sales, price review and administrative efficiencies.	200.0	0.0	200.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0		131217. Management reported that they had introduced Parent Pay in 80 out of the 150 schools and removed the school meal administrator which achieved a saving of 450 man hours per week (term time) with the balance to be found in April. It is
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,065.8</b>	<b>1,180.0</b>	<b>2245.8</b>		<b>334.0</b>	<b>458.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>47.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>		

Appendix 4c - Department of Corporate Services - IT Services

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	Saving		Total £'000	Reduction %	Employees					VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
			2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000			Current		Likely FTE Reductions		Vacs.			
							FTE's	Head count	2018/19	2019/20				
4S1	ICT	Information Technology Services – reduction in costs associated with device support, licences and infrastructure. Switching technology solutions where better value can be achieved and rationalising the number of existing IT applications to simplify the technology in use	700.0	690.0	1,390		143.0	148.0	2.0	10.0	11.0	6	20.12.17 - UNITE requested further, more detailed information on the proposals. UNITE also stated that although any questions and queries, views and concerns can be discussed at level III, only UNITE Representatives at Level II meetings will make decisions regarding proposals. No decisions will be made at Level III by UNITE.	20.12.17 - Wording and further details on the proposal 4S1 will be provided at the next meeting. Further, more detailed current workforce information will be sent to TU's by 22.12.17 by 12.00.
													03.01.18 - Meeting cancelled at TU request	03.01.18 - Management agreed as no further information will be available at this date.
												7	10.01.18 - UNISON asked that management reassure staff that compulsory redundancy will be avoided wherever possible.	10.01.18 - Management stated that it will always avoid compulsory redundancy when there is an alternative. However, no guarantees can be made. All staff across the Authority were given the same message at the initial briefing on 27 November 2017.
													10.01.18 - UNITE asked for a timeline on more detailed proposals being made available.	10.01.18 - Management stated that proposals are being worked on now and the proposed reductions for 2018/19 being prioritised. As soon as further details are available they will be shared with Trade Unions.
													10.01.18 - UNITE asked if requests for voluntary redundancy can be brought forward and approved.	10.01.18 - Management will consider these at management team and feedback as soon as possible.
													10.01.18 - UNISON asked whether £1.04m of income for 2017/18 has been considered against the savings in the proposals.	10.01.18 - Management stated that the assumption is that it has and the savings are additional to the generated income. If the generated income falls, further savings may be required, or if generated income is higher than predicted, savings may be reduced. The savings amounts have been provided by Finance.
													17.01.18 - Meeting cancelled at TU request	17.01.18 - Meeting cancelled at TU request
		<b>TOTAL</b>	700.0	690.0	1,390.0	0.0	143.0	148.0	2.0	10.0	11.0	0		

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 4d - Department of Corporate Services - Legal Services & Committee Secretariat

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total	Reduction %	Employees					VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
							Current		Likely FTE Reductions		Vacs.			
							FTE's	Head count	2018/19	2019/20				
4L1	Legal & Democratic Services	Legal and Democratic Services – to reflect the reduced size and scope of the Council, reductions to Civic, Legal and Committee Services, including Overview and Scrutiny are proposed	40.0	75.0	115.0		108.0	124.0	1.5	2.5	18.0	1.0	15.12.17 - UNITE stated that they do not agree with the use of agency staff and it feels that the problem with attracting permanent staff is that the salaries offered in some posts are not competitive. All TU's agreed that the next meeting would be on 26.01.18.	15.12.17 - Proposal to combine two scrutiny committees into one. A proposal to delete the post of Deputy Lord Mayor has now been rejected, so will not now go ahead. No further details will be available for consultation until after 25.01.18.
5L1	Legal & Democratic Services	Register Office - Net additional contribution from increased fees	15.0	0.0	15.0		0.0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0.0	15.12.17 - No comment on this at present.	15.12.17 - Plans have been made to decommission the Marriage Room. The Priestley Suite, which can be hired at additional cost for marriages will be made available to generate additional income. Marriages will also continue to take place in the Marriage Room which is now been created in the old Waiting Room.
5L2	Legal & Democratic Services	Reduction of member support budget following pension changes - specific budget contribution no longer required.	149.2	0.0	149.2		0.0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0.0	15.12.17 - No comment on this at present.	15.12.17 - No details of proposals available to be shared at this stage.
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>204.2</b>	<b>75.0</b>	<b>279.2</b>		<b>108.0</b>	<b>124.0</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>		

This page is intentionally left blank

**Appendix 4e - Department of Corporate Services - Financial Services, Revenues Benefits and Payroll, Estates and Property**

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	Saving		Total	Reduction %	Employees		Likely FTE Reductions		Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
			2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000			Current		2018/19	2019/20				
							FTE's	Head count						
4F1	Financial Services	Financial Services – reduction in function reflecting reduced emphasis on retrospective reporting, more self service by budget managers and targeting staffing resources at highest risk, most complex issues	130.0	0.0	130.0		42.6	45.0	3.0	0.0	1.0	1		
4F2	Financial Services	Insurance – reduce the total cost of insurance, including premiums paid to the Council's insurer, the cost of maintaining and internal insurance fund for self-insured risks and the cost of meeting claims	300.0	300.0	600.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0		
4F3	Revs & Bens	Revenues and Benefits – reduce significantly the amount of cash used by and within the organisation and reduce the cost of cash management functions through the increased digitalisation of customer payment options. Also consider if transactional functions across the Department will be more efficient and sustainable by bringing them together	160.0	0.0	160.0		329.8	371.0	4.0	0.0	36.0	2		
4F4	Financial Services	West Yorkshire Joint Committees – cap contribution to Joint Committees at £1.1m which will require concerted action with other Councils	35.0	35.0	70.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0		
4R1	Estates & Property	Management reported that there would be no further reductions in the workforce if the workload continues. ISG will break even this year and have been successful in winning a number of new contracts for delivering fire doors, especially around Newcastle.											13.12.17 - TU's asked if the workforce could have some input with regards to suggestions for raising/saving money	Management stated they would welcome this.
4R12	Estates & Property	Management reported that this has been dealt with through increased prices, there are no staffing implications											13.12.17 - TU's wanted to minute the fact that they would not agree to any staff being made redundant	Management noted this.
4R14	Estates & Property	Management reported that the challenge is to continue to acquire and create investments that generate a surplus revenue and to maximise the existing investment portfolio. This year is well ahead of target. The NCP will generate 165k per year surplus income.											13.12.17 - TU's asked if the casual workers were doing more hours than full time workers	Management agreed to look into this.

Page 201

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total	%	FTE's	Head count	2018/19	2019/20	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
4R15	Estates & Property	Management stated that they are looking at savings in 2018/19 of £100k and a further £200k in 19/20 by reducing the number of buildings occupied and managed. Part of that is Jacobs well. There is likely to be a staff reduction of 1FTE in the first year and 2FTEs the year after but this would be managed through natural wastage.											13.12.17 - TU's asked where the casual workers had been working	Management responded saying that this was possibly City Hall Catering
4R16	Estates & Property	Management reported that there would be a reduction of 3FTE's next year through natural wastage/retirement. More savings would be made through closing buildings and Community Asset Transfers of which Richard Dunn is included.												
4R17	Estates & Property	Management reported that there would be no staff a risk, there would be a reduction in the amount of money spent on utilities through the closure of buildings.												
5FM1	Estates & Property	Management reported that they had had a surplus for the last 2 years and would be reducing the budget in line with operating costs												
5FM2	Estates & Property	Management reported that they had introduced Parent Pay in 80 out of the 150 schools and removed the school meal administrator which achieved a saving of 450 man hours per week (term time) with the balance to be found in April. It is proposed that there would be a 5p increase on paid meals from January 2019.												
5F1	Financial Services	Revenues and Benefits – Review and release of budget relating to external contractor system,	200.0	0.0	200.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0		
5F2	Financial Services	Revenues and Benefits - General efficiency savings – combination of cost and staffing reductions	100.0	0.0	100.0		329.8	371.0	3.0	0.0	36.0	2		
5F3	Financial Services	Procurement Supplies and Services Budget – overall net savings subsequent to a review of the Procurement function as a whole	100.0	0.0	100.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0		
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1025.0</b>	<b>335.0</b>	<b>1,360.0</b>		<b>702.2</b>	<b>787.0</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>73.0</b>	<b>0</b>		



Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Total	%	FTE's	Head count	2018/19	2019/20	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
-----	---------	---------------------	------------------	------------------	-------	---	-------	---------------	---------	---------	-------	------------	-------------	---------------------------------

This page is intentionally left blank

**Addendum 1 as at 5 February 2018 to DOCUMENT “AW”**

**Department of Childrens Services:**

	<u>Service Area</u>	<u>Budget line detail</u>	<u>Trade Union Feedback</u>	<u>Management response</u>
4C2	Education Services	Prevention and Early Help – detailed proposals form part of the Executive report Doc AC -7th November 2017 Early Years - From 2017 part of the Dedicated Schools Grant will be removed. Plans are being formulated to develop a coherent and targeted suite of early years’ services including early help, family centres and early years’ including Children’s Centres. The proposal is included here as there could be staffing implications.	<u>Level 2 - 25/01/18</u>  Re 4C2 – NEU raised the issue of Faith Tutors and Teaching and Learning Consultants and the proposal they move to a traded service and they don’t know what this means for them.	Management advised that the funding streams had been looked at. Diversity and Cohesion as a function is not fully traded but is moving in that direction."
Page 205			NASUWT according to figures there at 6 FTE Faith Tutors and 1.5 FTE Teaching and Learning Consultations – are they being grouped together.	Management to look at this and advise.
			NEU asked what would happen if the funding target was not met.	As they move to a traded service there will be income generation targets (full cost recovery). If the service is on a trajectory to meet the target then that is positive and we will support the service to meet the target. If they don’t start to make progress to achieving the target the matter will be brought back here for a discussion along with HR.
			NEU asked how far down the road will it be for that to happen. Do Management have a figure for how much schools will pay.	Costs will include the cost of running the service. Management will review progress and if service are not far enough along the journey or there is no interest in the service it will be discussed further.
			NASUWT noted the Faith Tutors and Teaching and Learning Consultants were on teachers terms and conditions and previous discussions held agreed to keep them on these conditions but staff feel that it is being raised again and they don’t know what is happening.	"Management were not aware of any proposals to change their terms and conditions.  It is worth noting that if staff move to a traded service it will be a different way of working and we will look at providing training and support for marketing/sales, etc. Staff will not be expected to go into this model without the necessary support. "

			Unison advised staff were not aware of the proposed changes and thought this was new in the restructure and that it had not been brought here. Surprised by the shortfall and potential job losses.	Management felt that wasn't the case but will look at next week in Level 3. Will be looking at skills moving forward. We do not envisage job losses as it is not part of the process.
			NASUWT asked if any work had been done with schools to see if they were prepared to buy in as they also have to do more with their money.	Management advised there have been conversations with schools re the SEND work. Would need to check re other services but would have thought this had happened to make sure that they can cover the costs. Management believed the service was marketable.
			ATL felt schools would buy in for Faith Tutors but why would schools buy into EHE and travel.	Management advised that some of these services offer best practice and a centre of excellence for travellers. EHE and education safeguarding are a part of that core function. There is guidance on EHE but there is no statutory function but the bottom line is that we have to safeguard children.
Page 206			Unison asked for information on what are statutory functions and what is not so can identify what functions are being removed. Are services for travellers statutory.	"Management advised that there are no statutory rights for the LA regarding EHE and the only reason the Council can intervene is if there is a safeguarding issue. It would be irresponsible if we did not have this on the agenda though; if there is a peak in EHE we need to follow up and we wouldn't say we would do because it's not statutory.  Statutory services are Admissions and making sure every child has a school place. When it comes to other strands like the Traveller Service and Diversity and Cohesion they are not statutory but it is good practice so are included in the mix. The Play Service is traded and not statutory but again is valued. It is a fine balance between what we need to do and also good practice. "
			Unison noted their concerns that some families may slip through the net and there needs to be corporate responsibility.	Management met with the VCS yesterday and they have looked at the cumulative budget cut including the Youth Service. The savings to be made are £13.3m but the actual figures is greater given other proposals in the system. The depths we are going to are more than we would choose to do but getting the right frontline workers in is the challenge we have. One partner has submitted an alternative proposal as part of the consultation and we will be considering that.

			Unison noted that an alternative proposal had been received; have the unions had sight of this.	"Management advised this had only just been received and when the consultation closes on the 12 February it will be looked at then. This will come through in the feedback and will be shared with you to aid decision making going forward.  A session is taking place tomorrow to look at where we are up to, including what is emerging and can update at Level 3 next week." "
			NASUWT advised that although it had been agreed no permanent appointments would be made during this period it had been noted that a permanent Visual Impairment Teacher had been appointed permanent and remainder of team were on temporary contracts.  Unison also noted that 5 permanent appointments had been made in the Gateway (3 started in post and 2 starting in February).	"Management to clarify and advise.  HR noted that any recruitment across the Council should only be advertised on a temporary basis." "

### Department of PLACE

4E2	Waste & Transport Services	Waste Collection and Disposal Services - Full year effect of introduction of alternate weekly collection and associated round reduction, improved recycling, reduction in residual waste and improved efficiencies.		<b><u>Level 2 - 25.1.18</u></b> JM confirmed that management will present proposals for a restructure of Waste Services at Level 3 today. The proposal include a reduction in the number of management posts.
4E5	Neighbourhoods & Customer Services	Street Cleansing and Public Conveniences - reduction street cleansing resources for 2019/20		<b><u>Level 2 - 25.1.18</u></b> ID said that some VR requests are being received and acknowledged. He asked Union reps to assure members that the requests would be considered post budget Council.
5E2	Neighbourhoods & Customer Services	Youth Service - All commissioned grants will be reviewed during 2018, with grants to VCS groups providing youth work ceasing from April 2019.		<b><u>Level 2 - 25.1.18</u></b> This proposal affects commissioning of youth service provision rather than Council staff. Two consultation events are being held with the Voluntary and Community Sector to engage with them regarding the impact on the sector of the budget proposals.
4R2	Planning Transportation & Highways	West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA) Transport Levy – proposed reduction in the levy		<b><u>Level 2 - 25.1.18</u></b> SH said that the proposed savings would not now be at the level of £1.2m in 2018/19. Colleagues in Finance are working to establish the reporting of a more realistic saving.

## Department of Health & Wellbeing

Trade Unions requested to cancel future weekly meetings and have requested that these revert to monthly meetings to address any issues within Health & Wellbeing. The next Level 2 meeting is scheduled for the 27 February 2018.

## Department of Corporate Resources – Human Resources

Page 208	5H1 Human Resources	Workforce Development reprioritised to focus on use of more specialist ad-hoc external delivery. Review of Occupational Safety.	<b>31.01.18 - Feedback from UNITE to</b> management; a request that the proposed restructure of the HR Service is put on hold until the appointment of a new HR Director. Concerns were raised about the diversion of resources from other areas of HR into the Workforce Development Area. UNITE expressed concern whether sufficient resources are available within HR to deliver the plans and objectives in the future. UNITE stated that it wishes to work with HR management to achieve this.	
----------	------------------------	---	---	--

## Department of Corporate Resources – Estates & Property

4R14	Estates & Property	"Asset Management – make the best use of the Council's and public sector partners' estate working with the Voluntary and Community Sector Also seek to invest in non-operational property to generate surplus income"	<b>24.1.18. – Level 3</b> At the previous meeting TU's asked what the contribution will be from the third parties who we end up sharing with, and also a list of organisations who are using Council accommodation and are not paying for it	<b>24.1.18. Level 3 -</b> Management are still putting this information together and will send out to TU's once completed.
4R15	Estates & Property	Facilities Management – operational cost reductions reflecting the continued contraction of the organisation	<b>24.1.18 – Level 3.</b> At the previous meeting TU's asked if "reducing the number of buildings occupied" is a capital scheme and asked for a breakdown of operational	<b>24.1.18 Level 3.</b> Management are currently producing this list and will send out to TU's once completed.

			costs including maintenance and utilities	
				<b>24.1.18 – Level 3</b> Management stated that Jacobs Well will be demolished after some Fibre Optic Cables have been moved, the area will then be landscaped over (car park will remain). It is currently been used for storage, any fixtures and fittings from Jacobs Well that can be re-used are been recycled into other buildings.
4R16	Estates & Property	Facilities Management – reduction in the maintenance budget as the size of the operational estate shrinks		<b>24.1.18 – Level 3.</b> Management stated that Richard Dunn leisure centre is anticipating to be closed in July / August 2019, subject to the current construction programme for Sedbergh Fields being achieved and the intention is to demolish the property following its closure to deliver Utilities and Back-log maintenance savings.

### Department of Corporate Resources – ICT

4S1	ICT	Information Technology Services – reduction in costs associated with device support, licences and infrastructure. Switching technology solutions where better value can be achieved and rationalising the number of existing IT applications to simplify the technology in use	<b>24.01.18 - UNITE</b> advised that they are having a branch meeting before the next Level III so will be in a better position to feedback their position and any comments then.	<b>24.01.18</b> - Management proposed to meet the budget savings for 2018/19 via the deletion of one vacant post of ISP Data Analyst and as an alternative to one further reduction in headcount will make the remaining budget savings via cost savings in the service/supplies budget. Management are continuing to review how the budget savings for 2019/20 can be achieved and will feedback as soon as possible.
			<b>24.01.18 - UNITE</b> asked whether VR requests could be brought forward and agreed at this point.	<b>24.01.18</b> - Management said this wouldn't be possible until a firm proposal is made to the staff and Trade Unions, which identifies which area the headcount reductions can be made.
			<b>31.01.18</b> - No representation from Trade Unions in attendance.	<b>31.01.18</b> - Management present at meeting.

### Department of Corporate Resources – Legal & Democratic Services

No further consultations meetings held after 15 December 2017.

### Department of Corporate Resources – Financial services, Revenues & Benefits and Payroll

4F1	Financial Services	Financial Services – reduction in function reflecting reduced emphasis on retrospective reporting, more self service by budget managers and targeting staffing resources at highest risk, most complex issues	<b>22.01.18</b> -No comment in response.	<b>22.01.18</b> -No proposals for headcount reductions.
-----	--------------------	---	--	---

4F2	Financial Services	Insurance – reduce the total cost of insurance, including premiums paid to the Council's insurer, the cost of maintaining and internal insurance fund for self-insured risks and the cost of meeting claims	<b>22.01.18</b> -No comment in response.	<b>22.01.18</b> -No proposals for headcount reductions.
4F3	Revs & Bens	"Revenues and Benefits – reduce significantly the amount of cash used by and within the organisation and reduce the cost of cash management functions through the increased digitalisation of customer payment options. Also consider if transactional functions across the Department will be more efficient and sustainable by bringing them together"	<p><b>19.12.17</b> - TU asked if the saving made by merging the posts together would be covered by VR</p> <p><b>19.12.17</b> - TU asked if Management were confident that they would retain sufficient expertise to ensure subsidy claim is correct</p> <p><b>19.12.17</b> - TU raised the point that at Level 1 it had been agreed that there would be a recruitment freeze.</p> <p><b>19.12.17</b> - TU asked if the saving made by merging the posts together would be covered by VR</p> <p><b>19.12.17</b> - TU asked if there was a formal mechanism to inform new starters about the S188 notices</p> <p><b>19.12.17</b> - TU asked that whilst looking at people who are displaced, can management hold posts back as there may be people in the redeployment pool after the S188 process is complete.</p>	<p>Management responded stating that they were confident that VR would be accepted and that it does fit within the financial envelope.</p> <p>Management responded stating that they were confident as a lot of the processes are automated and we have a lot of expertise particularly in the Benefits area. About 40% of the caseload represent 90% of the risk.</p> <p>Management confirmed that the Director of HR, S Dunkley stated that there is not a recruitment freeze as such, recruitment to go ahead in normal way. All vacancies need to go to M Moverley every week.</p> <p>Management responded stating that they were confident that VR would be accepted and that it does fit within the financial envelope.</p> <p>HR were unsure but agreed to obtain a response for the next meeting.</p> <p>Management stated that they would have thought there will be a Corporate Line to be followed in which case then it would be followed, the challenge that brings is that if there are any critical posts then management may be asking for agency staff to bridge the gap. Management to find out what the Corporate steer is and report back next week.</p> <p>Management also need to be more explicit as to where the vacancies are and what position they are at, i.e. interviewed, offered etc.</p>
			<b>19.12.17</b> - TU's asked if there were any honoraria within the service.	<p>Management reported that there were 27 vacant posts which equates to 24 ¼ FTE's.</p> <p>Management stated that there were currently two honorariums being paid to two people who are covering for a member of staff in Service Support who is due to be returning to work shortly.</p>
4F4	Financial Services	West Yorkshire Joint Committees – cap contribution to Joint Committees at £1.1m which will require concerted action with other Councils	<b>22.01.18</b> -No comment in response.	<b>22.01.18</b> -No proposals for headcount reductions.



**Office of the Chief Executive**

4X1	Office of the Chief Exec	Office of the Chief Executive – restructure of the Office of the Chief Executive to improve coherence and integration of core corporate functions		Restructure completed and implemented in relation to this proposal. No further comments on this at this time.
5X1	Office of the Chief Exec	Reduce total cost of top management - the scope is the senior management (strategic & Assistant Directors) and their PA structure.		This proposal will be subject to further discussion once proposal is available.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Addendum as at 19 February 2018**

**Department of Childrens Services:**

	<u>Service Area</u>	<u>Budget line detail</u>	<u>Trade Union Feedback</u>	<u>Management response</u>
4C2	Education Services	Prevention and Early Help – detailed proposals form part of the Executive report Doc AC -7th November 2017 Early Years - From 2017 part of the Dedicated Schools Grant will be removed. Plans are being formulated to develop a coherent and targeted suite of early years’ services including early help, family centres and early years’ including Children’s Centres. The proposal is included here as there could be staffing implications.	<p><b><u>"Level 2 - 08/02/18</u></b></p> <p>Unison raised concerns about the consultations being mixed up and asked if some communication could be circulated to separate it out. Felt the restructure needed to be slowed down as staff are struggling to understand.</p> <p>Staff don’t understand where they are.</p> <p>NEU also had concerns from staff about not understanding how they were affected so had not been asking questions, e.g. traded services, children’s centres."</p>	<p><b><u>Level 2 - 08.02.18</u></b></p> <p>Management advised SEN and Behaviour are part of the assessment and achievement services. Early Help is about meeting needs early on. These are the two strands and across the top of this are the enabling and business functions. It is proposed the Faith Tutors move to a traded service and sit in that arm and staff are aware of this. Some work has been done around working to a traded service model."</p>
			<p>NASUWT are receiving questions from the Faith Tutors. A meeting was held with them today and NASUWT had not been advised.</p> <p>Unison noted staff were at the briefing today who thought they were in scope and they were not. Meetings are also arranged at short notice.</p> <p>NEU raised concerns from the Manager of the New Communities and Travellers Team. There are 1.5 Teaching and Learning Consultations listed when there are 2.5 and the Manager and another</p>	<p>Management advised that meetings are put in with as much notice as possible but also when trying to respond to specific issues swiftly.</p> <p>Management advised that when the list was produced the Manager wasn’t in post so wouldn’t be on the list; this would also be the case for the Diversity and Cohesion Manager. It was a snapshot at that time and will need to be worked on as we move forward.</p>

member of staff are not on the list. When the end of the consultation is reach we need to be sure that the groups/staff are correct for assimilation – if this went ahead today it wouldn't be right.

"Unison noted the same position for Governor Services – list 2.5 staff and there is a Manager and 4 staff.

Unison noted the response but felt time was running out.

Unison noted the same position for Governor Services – list 2.5 staff and there is a Manager and 4 staff.

Unison noted the response but felt time was running out.

NEU asked for information on who was entitled to which post as no information available.

"Unison noted Social Care staff were going to managers to see if they were in scope – if don't have any planned job profiles how will they know.

Concerned with the drip feed of information and surprises such as the Faith Tutors which TU's weren't aware of. How do Management know which families to target and what the thresholds will be? Research in Sheffield and Huddersfield has shown a link between budgets and support to families. Need a separation between SEN and EH.

Management noted that in terms of co-ordination of the FTE lists we have to make sure it is right and it is Managers' responsibilities to make sure it is.

Management felt there were two clear issues. Irrespective of cuts, there are serious decisions to be made about risk. The other side is making the most of the financial envelope available.

Where did the £13.3m figure come from?

"Unison advised if Management go to the EH model, yes this will lead to savings but need evidence of the programmes to be in place and that information isn't there.

The crux is what will you deliver and what won't be. Understand what Management are doing but what will you deliver with 50% less staff.

"Unison noted that staff cannot do the same job if they can't deliver. Cases won't be less but there will be less staff – how will this work. What won't you be doing?

NASUWT agreed that if you are consulting we need to know what staff will be doing in the future.

Unison noted the comments would be captured but wanted an answer to the question.

Unison asked in terms of the SEN proposals that members are raising concerns on workloads and the number of staff presented is incorrect.

"NEU noted that if members don't get information then we can say that we won't close the consultation. The business case is simple and we don't have the detail. For example the Portage Team are proposed to reduce from 6 to 3 with a workload of 143 cases – how will that be managed.

Management noted if you have 10 staff for 2 strands; 1 manager and 4 staff each – can't join those teams to give more. There will be a targeted service and preventative work but not for as many people.

Management advised that we cannot provide what we have done previously and noted the comments.

Management said that if there are a cut in numbers we will work through the finite number of cases staff take on. If the Portage Team can work with 30 families, other families will not receive the support they did and that will be the harsh reality.

NASUWT asked which families we would no longer support and who would you help. How can you decide when it may not be a need now?

NEU noted that those 143 cases may need a visit and you may offer less but will those families be signposted elsewhere.

Unison said this will be based on the premise that there is somewhere to signpost families to. It goes back to the earlier request of what will be needed in each area and who will take responsibility when it goes wrong. The structure is not wrong but the consultations are being mixed up.

NEU said that at the point the consultation closes you might say you can't cut the Portage workers. It's having that final sum.

Unison asked why the cut is £13.3m – why can't half of this be taken from the £24m reserves. Unison asked why the cut is £13.3m – why can't half of this be taken from the £24m reserves.

Unison noted the public consultation would close on 12 February and asked if there was opportunity to extend the consultation. Why does the structure have to be in place by October?

Unison asked why the two consultations were together.

Unison felt that the SEN proposals could go through

Management advised these challenges need to go through to Council. That cut was what Children's were given and we have had to work with that. We are also concerned re the numbers, however, with the new model staff will work to the family footprint so there is mitigation but there will be a reduction. If we can cut management posts we will but we have to fit in the envelope given and there is no approval for any more funding.

Management advised that savings have to be in place by 2020/21. If looking at protected salaries and the fulls savings of the structure wouldn't come in until September 2020. If there is a delay and the position remains as it is, there is the potential that cuts may have to go deeper to meet target savings.

Management advised that if it had gone to plan the SEN arrangements would have been implemented by now but following representation from the Deaf Society the proposals were reconsidered so has brought these two together.

but the EH proposals would take longer as would also need to work with HR on how assimilation would work.

Unison asked if the EH proposals could move to January so that SEN could be dealt with first.

Unison asked if it could be put back 2 months.

Unison asked if they could put in a request for extra funds to cover this.

NEU asked for information from Mark Anslow line by line on the pool staff will be put into and what posts will be available. If there is a costed model this information should be available.

Unison want clearer information and ideas of who we will be targeting so that can ask questions. Some of the information is vague saying 1- workers but how many people will they deal with, what programmes will run. If there are 1,400 cases – how many children is that.

"NASUWT asked what would happen to traded services if they didn't meet the target.

NEU noted that schools are not necessarily the clients but families are and need to look at the misnomer that families will pay and get into the detail.

Management advised the SEN proposals are set against the HNB and not core funding but would still have the issue of not making savings.

Management advised it wouldn't be until September given the summer term. It would wipe out any teachers terms and conditions and any form of consultation would be put back by around 6 months and if still working to the £13.3m savings would have deeper cuts from not meeting the window.

Management agreed to pick up with Mark Anslow and Julie Cowell and ask Mark to attend Level 2 next week.

"This would be reviewed. A support structure is in place to support them to meet the target. We have good practice in the Music Service and they have been working with teams. We have to move to a marketable service and indications are that it is a good service to sell but if there is no client base this will be reviewed but we believe they can operate effectively.

			<p>Unison noted the law of unintended consequences that a service can be cut if not trading and the knock on effects make this in danger of making into pounds, shilling and pence and families don't operate in that way.</p> <p>"Unison felt if we got the model right but doing over the future as a 5-10 year programme and slow down the process.</p> <p>It was felt that the model needed more time to see if it would work and it felt rushed.</p>	<p>Management do not want to do this and would want to expand service and all agree with that but the budget is what the budget is.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

Page 218

4C	Social Care - Fostering and Adoption	Fostering and Adoption – review team manager structure with potential reduction of one team manager post.	<p><b><u>Level 2 - 01/02/18</u></b></p> <p>Unison will raise this at Level 3 as the number of children hasn't gone down so savings haven't been made.</p>	<p><b><u>Level 2 – 1/2/18</u></b></p> <p>Management advised if foster carers increased it will be an issue but there are a number of teams and some short term could move to long term.</p>
----	--------------------------------------	---	---	---

**Department of PLACE**

4E5	Neighbourhoods & Customer Services	Street Cleansing and Public Conveniences - reduction street cleansing resources for 2019/20	<p><b><u>Level 2 - 8.2.18</u></b></p> <p>Unite made a statement which:  - outlined the changes in the Mechanical Sweeping shift system from 4x4 shifts and cleaning every day to now working a normal shift patter with one weekend in 6 without overtime opportunities. This has had a significant impact on the cleanliness of the District  - outlined the increased risks in flooding, as drains and gullies are not being regularly swept. The leafing season is October to December and leaves are still down due to the reduction in staff numbers.</p>	<p><b><u>Level 2 - 8.2.18</u></b></p> <p>SH stressed that management and Councillors are not keen to make any cuts to the budget and understand that the proposal for Street Cleansing is particularly large and will affect both service delivery and staff numbers. Cuts have to be made in order to produce a balanced budget within the finance available which has reduced significantly from central government over recent years. Management appreciate the hard work being done by colleagues working with reduced resources.</p>
-----	------------------------------------	---	--	---



			<p>- suggested that there had been a massive increase in fly tipping since the introduction of charges for bulky waste collections and alternate weekly refuse collections which has resulted in side waste which is classed as fly tipping.</p> <p>- one of the Council's corporate priorities is Cleaner and Safer but the budget proposals area contradiction to that.</p>	
			<p><b><u>Level 2 - 8.2.18</u></b> Unite asked by Waste is getting a budget increase of £3m whereas Cleansing is being cut by £1m and proposed that the budget increase be reduced to £2m with no cut to Cleansing.</p> <p><b><u>Level 2 - 8.2.18</u></b> GMB said that Cleansing resources are not shared across the District which leads to some teams working with reduced resources while others are at fully capacity. This is very demoralising for staff. A proposal to reduce the number of Councillors was made.</p> <p><b><u>Level 2 - 8.2.18</u></b> Unite said that they did not believe that routing would work and asked whether a decision would be taken not to clean town centres every day.</p>	<p><b><u>Level 2 - 8.2.18</u></b> SH advised that the increase in budget for Waste is to cover increased costs over the period of the recently negotiated Waste Contract with AWM. Whilst recycling tonnages are increasing thereby reducing the amount of waste to landfill, the cost of landfill has increased. Details of these figures to be provided to the Unions within the bounds of commercial confidentiality. The tonnes sent to AWM per week will also be provided.</p> <p><b><u>Level 2 - 8.2.18</u></b> ID said that it is a political decision where the cuts are made and agreed that every decision will have a knock-on effect. What management needs to do is to look at mitigating the impact on service delivery and staff. Consideration will include looking at initiatives which have increased efficiency such as Smart Bins, the external littering enforcement contract and volunteer support from Members for cleansing initiatives.</p> <p><b><u>Level 2 - 8.2.18</u></b> ID confirmed that management will talk to Unions, staff and managers about what can be done to best achieve the budget cut. He said he is always happy to listen to good ideas which may improve efficiency.</p>
			<p><b><u>Level 2 - 8.2.18</u></b> GMB advised that management worked with Unions and staff regarding the introduction of routing and that staff opinions are noted. This had worked well in Waste.</p>	<p><b><u>Level 2 - 8.2.18</u></b> SH said that management are committed to working with staff and unions to do the best that can be done with the resources available. He confirmed that management understand the importance of a clean district.</p>
4E7	Sport & Culture	Remodel of Visitor Information & frontline service - reduce the number and/or size of Visitor Information Centres (VICs), moving to a more digital basis promoting the district to		<p><b><u>Level 2 - 8.2.18</u></b> Management confirmed that discussions are on-going with the Bronte Society about the TUPE of staff. Updated to be provided at Level 3.</p>

		target audiences, with the potential for VIC information points as co-located provision.		
4E12	Sport & Culture	Ministry of Food – cessation of the service teaching people how to cook, eat and improve their long term health		<b><u>Level 2 - 8.2.18</u></b> SON confirmed that no suitable redeployment opportunity had been found for the member of staff at the Ministry of Food. Management still working with the staff member.
5E1	Sport & Culture	Museums & Galleries - Review of service to include potential for income generation, service efficiency and integration and remodelling of operational delivery.		<b><u>Level 2 - 8.2.18</u></b> SH confirmed that a commission had been advertised. No response to date.
5E2	Neighbourhoods & Customer Services	Youth Service - All commissioned grants will be reviewed during 2018, with grants to VCS groups providing youth work ceasing from April 2019.		<b><u>Level 2 - 11.1.18</u></b> ID confirmed that this proposal has not staffing implications.
4R21	Planning Transportation & Highways	Regeneration – reduction in the funding for the Road Safety Team	<b><u>Level 2 - 8.2.18</u></b> Unison asked whether any progress had been made on selling the Road Safety service to other authorities.	<b><u>Level 2 - 8.2.18</u></b> CE confirmed that no progress had been made to date.

**Steve Hartley provided the following to TU's at the conclusion of the level 2 on the 8 February 2018:**

SH said that he fully understood the Union position and that he would be happy to listen to alternative proposals. He stressed that large cuts are not just being made in the Department of Place but across the Council. He confirmed that all Strategic Directors are fighting to retain as many as possible of their current services at a sustainable level.

SH stressed the importance of management working with the Unions to understand their position and hoped that the good working relationship would continue.

**Department of Health & Wellbeing**

Trade Unions requested to cancel future weekly meetings and have requested that these revert to monthly meetings to address any issues within Health & Wellbeing. The next Level 2 meeting is scheduled for the 27 February 2018.

**Department of Corporate Resources – Human Resources**

5H1	Human Resources	Workforce Development reprioritised to focus on use of more specialist ad-hoc external delivery. Review of Occupational Safety.	<b><u>31.01.18 - Feedback from UNITE</u></b> to management; a request that the proposed restructure of the HR Service is put on hold until the appointment of a new HR	<b><u>31.1.18 - Management Information/Response</u></b> - management will raise this feedback with Parveen and acknowledged that the Chief Executive was aware of the feedback. However management stated that HR are still left with a saving of £250k which must be made.
-----	-----------------	---	--	---

			Director. Concerns were raised about the diversion of resources from other areas of HR into the Workforce Development Area. UNITE expressed concern whether sufficient resources are available within HR to deliver the plans and objectives in the future. UNITE stated that it wishes to work with HR management to achieve this.	
			<b>01.02.18</b> - No response	<b>01.02.18</b> - An alternative proposal submitted at Level III. A Q and A document is being drawn up which will be shared with staff and Trade Unions. A meeting is scheduled on 09.01.18 to present to staff a second draft of the structure and any changes. A staff meeting with the Occupational Safety Team is also being held w/c 05.02.18 regarding questions raised by the team.

### Department of Corporate Resources – Estates & Property

4R14	Estates & Property	"Asset Management – make the best use of the Council's and public sector partners' estate working with the Voluntary and Community Sector Also seek to invest in non-operational property to generate surplus income"	<b>08.2.18 – Level 3.</b> At the previous meeting TU's asked what the contribution will be from the third parties who we share accommodation with and also a list of organisations who are using Council accommodation and are not paying for it.	<b>08.2.18 – Level 3.</b> Management stated that there were no organisations who are using Council accommodation apart from the Police who are not charged for occupying our buildings as Council staff occupy theirs as a reciprocal arrangement. This arrangement is continually being reviewed.
4R15	Estates & Property	Facilities Management – operational cost reductions reflecting the continued contraction of the organisation	<b>08.2.18 – Level 3.</b> At the previous meeting TU's asked if 4R15 "reducing the number of buildings occupied" is a capital scheme and asked for a breakdown of operational costs including maintenance and utilities.	<b>08.2.18 – Level 3.</b> Management stated that £100K related to residual saving on Jacobs Well. In 18/19, Bank House £38K, Kershaw House £20K. In 19/20 £400K for Richard Dunn and £50K for Queensbury Pool Staff have moved out of Kershaw House now and staff in Bank House will be moving into Sir Henry Mitchell House by the end of March.
4R16	Estates & Property	Facilities Management – reduction in the maintenance budget as the size of the operational estate shrinks	<b>08.2.18.- Level 3</b> Unite asked if the potential savings on energy costs involved in moving the CPU had been taken in to account.	<b>08.2.18 – Level 3.</b> Management confirmed that they had not as they timescales had yet to be determined.

**Department of Corporate Resources – ICT**

No further meetings after 5 February 2018

**Department of Corporate Resources – Legal & Democratic Services**

No further consultations meetings held after 15 December 2017.

**Department of Corporate Resources – Financial services, Revenues & Benefits and Payroll**

No further consultation meetings held after 5 February 2018

**Office of the Chief Executive**

No further consultation meetings held after 5 February 2018

**A balanced budget: Bradford Council Executive's Budget and Council Tax Proposals for 2018/19 and 2019/20**

**Amended Budget Recommendation to Full Council**

**20 February 2018**

## Leader's Message

The Government's cuts continue to be hard on the people of Bradford District and this budget inevitably reflects that position. In 2013/14, the government gave Bradford a core grant of £183 million to fund local services across the district. By 2020, they will have cut that to zero. Every resident has been affected in one way or another, wherever they live.

Despite this, as a council we remain committed to maintaining the best possible services that we all rely on. We want to make the best use of our shrinking funds to support local people and to provide the best environment for businesses to grow, prosper and employ people.

We have a track record of delivering value for money. A recent independent study of local authorities by Impower rated Bradford Council as tenth best in the country for achieving value for money. We will continue to spend every penny wisely and well for the district.

As in previous years, our consultation process has been genuinely useful in listening to everyone's views about how we, as a district, should face up to the government cuts. And as in previous years we've heard from many residents. All care passionately about services important to them. We have also heard from partner organisations who play such a valuable role in the success of this district. We have considered each and every comment.

In any other era in local government we wouldn't be suggesting cuts to these services. However these are unprecedented times of Government austerity. After seven years there is no corner that has not been cut or restructured to save money. At the same time as the cuts, we face rising demands on services and rising inflation. Standing still is simply not an option.

Alongside its ongoing funding cuts, the government has again told us that we can increase council tax. The vast majority of councils in the country are set to propose the maximum permitted rise of 2.99% plus a 3% precept ringfenced for adult social care. Few of us have any other choice. It brings us no satisfaction to do this. We are well aware that household budgets are stretched as we head towards a full decade of government austerity. We also believe that council tax is a regressive tax.

It's wrong that richer parts of the country can raise much more for their services by increasing council tax than we are able to – a 1% council tax rise in Bradford generates just £1.8m but in wealthier areas it raises several times that. We will continue to call on the government for an equitable system which places less burden on the council tax payer.

In the days when this council had more significant core funding from government, social care was a lesser element of our budget. However our vital support for vulnerable children and adults has now proportionately increased to account for almost half of our spending. This leaves less and less funding for all the other "visible" council services people have rightly come to expect and rely on.

I am determined that we will overcome these obstacles. Bradford District is a rich, diverse place with a young population located in the heart of the north of England. We have all the right ingredients to succeed. I want us to strive for inclusive economic growth, not simply preside over cuts enforced on us.

That's why we are taking a number of actions designed to get the district moving and the local economy thriving. We have now implemented our new Social Value policy, which could increase the council's spend with local businesses by over £40m and stimulate more economic activity while rewarding good corporate social responsibility. This is an example of how the council can show leadership and shape the place in a positive way.


Through this budget we are also investing an additional £750,000 to boost the local economy, which includes setting up a new housing and development team to speed up the delivery of development in the right areas, with a primary focus on brownfield sites. This will help to create jobs and do more locally to address the national housing crisis. There's a great social purpose in ensuring everyone has a decent affordable home to live in and we are committed to tackling that issue head on while boosting the economy in an inclusive way. We are going for growth.

The importance of a thriving local economy is more important than ever as the government withdraws its funding. It was pleasing when Bradford was recently named by Barclays Bank as the best place in the country to start a business and we must build on that growing reputation. It's vital that we build strong business growth. We have enjoyed recent notable successes in this area since we published our initial budget proposals in December: firstly we were successful in our bid for a Leeds City Region business rates retention pilot which will generate new one-off business rates income for the next year; in addition to that we have also raised more in Bradford from business rates than projected. Together this has generated additional funding for us to invest this year in areas which are most in need.

As we are in receipt of this improved business rates income, today therefore we are proposing to invest £1m in Early Help to support this important area of work should it transition to a new way of working, and we are going to make a significant further investment in children's services with £450,000 a year for children's social work to provide for the growing numbers of children who need care and support. We're showing that where Government have failed to listen, we will listen. We are putting our money where our mouth is investing these additional monies in the priority areas of children's and adults social care.

We have huge ambitions for the district. We have lots to look forward to including major regeneration and infrastructure projects, growing arts and cultural opportunities and this year we launch a major new economic strategy for the district.

Through the People Can campaign and our Education Covenant we are asking local people and businesses to join with us in building resilience against the public sector cuts we are all faced with. We, in the Bradford District, have a pioneering history and we will use our pioneering spirit to build our future. We will move forward together with confidence.



**Councillor Susan Hinchcliffe, Leader of Bradford Council**

## **1. Introduction**

This document is the Executive's amendment to the budget proposals detailed in Document AZ. The Executive makes these recommendations in light of developments since our initial proposals were published, including our careful consideration of the consultation feedback and the changes to local government finance outlined in the Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement announced by the government on 19 December 2017.

We would like to thank everyone who has taken time to comment on the proposals during the consultation period. We have listened to all comments and taken that feedback on board when considering these difficult decisions we are confronted with due to the ongoing government cuts.

We understand that local people and businesses value council services and they quite rightly expect services of the highest standard. We understand that ceasing, reducing or changing services can have a significant impact on residents, businesses and partner organisations and we have paid due regard to the equality impact assessments for all proposals. In particular we have received a large number of comments relating to children's services and early help (a proposal which is subject to separate consultation), libraries and the proposed council tax increase. We have received a lesser number of comments relating to a wide range of other proposals, such as adult and respite services, the youth service, museums and galleries and street cleansing services, to name a few. All comments have been taken into consideration.

The cumulative impact of so many years of central government funding cuts means we have ever reducing options. However, through our proposals and these amendments we are making every effort to mitigate against the worst impacts of the government cuts and to support our high ambitions for the district.

## **2. Financial context**

Bradford Metropolitan District Council delivers vital public services to people across the Bradford District. The council provides universal services for all residents and targeted services for children and adults in need of support wherever they live in the district.

Central government has cut its funding to the council every year since it started its national austerity programme some seven years ago. This austerity continues to this day and still shows no sign of ending. The government's Revenue Support Grant to the council was £183m in 2013/14 and is being cut down to zero by 2020. Bradford Council's net budget in 2020 will be around half what it was in 2010 in real terms.

As a result Bradford Council has had to announce cuts of £262m since 2011 up to and including 2018/19. More than half of the total has related to cuts in management and administration costs, improving efficiency and renegotiating contracts.



Through our People Can campaign, the council has focused on working in partnership with communities. Wherever possible we aim to empower local communities to have a greater say, involvement in and control over the running of the services they value.

The government's long-running policy to spend less on funding our local services has coincided with rising demand for those services, due to factors such as a growing and ageing population and an increasing number of children needing care. This is a trend seen across the country. The Local Government Association (LGA) has warned that the pressures facing children's services are becoming unsustainable nationally with a £2bn funding gap expected by 2020.

As an Executive we are aware that austerity itself has also fuelled the rising demand for public and third sector services across the country. The council has worked hard to mitigate the effects of national austerity cuts and this Executive will continue to explore ways of doing so.

Council tax has historically formed a smaller proportion (around 35%) of the council's income, with government funding having covered the majority of the council's budget for delivering services. However the council is increasingly reliant on council tax and business rates income to fund the public services it delivers as central government funding is taken away. This represents a challenging situation for a place like the Bradford District with lower council tax than many more affluent areas of the country which are able to raise more to fund their services.

Overall the current national picture is challenging, as seen with productivity growth and wage growth having been revised down in recent months and the government putting back its target to clear the deficit by 2015 to 2016, then 2017, then 2020 and most recently 2025. The Resolution Foundation said last year that Britain is facing the longest period of falling living standards since records began in the 1950s, while the Institute for Fiscal Studies said that the tax paid in the UK will reach its highest level in 30 years but funding for services continues to fall.

Brexit is of course another major event which is causing uncertainty in the economy. While assessing the significant risks and opportunities, we are already stating the case for current European funding to our district to be replaced directly by government. We need funding to be transferred from Brussels to Bradford, not Brussels to Westminster.

### **3. Council tax and social care precept**

In 2018/19 we propose a council tax rise of 2.99% plus a social care precept of 3%: a total increase of 5.99% for Bradford Council services.

The 5.99% increase amounts to an additional cost of £4.19 a month for a Band A council tax payer.

In 2019/20 the proposed 1.99% increase (as there is currently no Government instruction for a social care precept from 19/20 onwards, nor has the Government said a rise above 1.99% will be permitted) will mean a further monthly increase of £1.47 in Band A.

At the Executive committee of 9<sup>th</sup> January 2018, we introduced new support to ease the burden of council tax for care leavers. From 1<sup>st</sup> April 2018, care leavers up to the age of 21 are exempted from paying council tax. Also from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2018, care leavers up to the age of 21 are not counted for the purpose of assessing the number of adults in a property for calculating council tax.

We will use the ringfenced monies raised from the 3% social care precept in 2018/19 solely for adult social care. The 3% social care precept will generate approximately £5.3m in our district in 2018/19. It will be ringfenced to fund adult social care only, but we are clear that it is nowhere near what is needed.

In the meantime, alongside many other local authorities across the country we will repeat our calls for the government to deliver a sustainable national plan for social care that does not hinge solely on council tax rises and which pools risk more effectively to best protect the most vulnerable in our society in the fairest possible way.

To date, the government's policy for addressing the huge shortfall in funding for local services is to continue to shift the burden over to council tax payers. The money generated through council tax rises is considerably less than the funding it is designed to replace. The effect of this approach nationally is that people are paying more while seeing local services continue to reduce. This is a particular risk in less affluent parts of the country with fewer high value properties, where the council tax income falls well short of filling the shortfall. For example, a 1% council tax rise in Surrey generates over £6m; in Bradford with our lower council tax it generates just £1.8m.

Comparing ourselves to the other metropolitan district councils, our current council tax is £321 per person compared to the average of £347 per person. If our tax were at the average level, the council would have £14m more to fund services. We do not think it should be that people for example living in Solihull with £449 council tax per head of population, or Bury at £395 per head, could potentially enjoy better funded services than people living in Bradford when the government withdraws its grant. We will continue to take up that case with government and explore all possible funding opportunities. We would welcome the government working with us to address this challenge.

The government is currently holding a consultation on its new 'Fair Funding Review' for local government. We urge partners, residents and businesses to join us in our call for the Bradford District to secure the increased funding and investment required to match our growing needs, so that we have sustainable funding into the future for the high quality local services we all value and rely on.

#### **4. Principal amendments**

Since we published our initial budget proposals on 5 December 2017, several events have taken place changing the levels of our income and expenditure and therefore the size of our available budget for next year. These changes are described in section 2.2 of the Assistant Director's Revenue Estimates report ('AZ') and Budget Update document ('AT' – Executive, 6<sup>th</sup> February 2018).

It must be noted that the vast bulk of this net change results from a one-off income from the Leeds City Region business rates retention pilot, which is currently in place for one year only. This significant benefit is partly offset by other new costs, in particular the increased pay offer for local authority staff which was announced after we published our initial budget proposals.

In summary, the net effect of the new incomings and outgoings amounts to an additional £3.3m in 2018/19, but followed by increased cost pressures in the next two years to 2021.

##### £1 million to Early Help

Through this amendment the Executive proposes a £1m investment into Prevention and Early Help over two years subject to an appropriate detailed business case. Large amounts of feedback are being received during the consultation and the Executive wishes to give some support to this important area of work should it transition to a new way of working. This money will only be made available should the consultation result in a change in delivery model. If the change does not go ahead then the additional monies will return to the Transition and Risk Reserve which we believe is a prudent step especially given that adult social care is clearly continuing to face unprecedented pressures and national funding uncertainties.

##### £1.35 million to Children's Social Work over three years

The Executive is also proposing an ongoing investment into children's social work (recurrent £450,000 a year funded by the ongoing increase in business rates income). This is only possible because Bradford District's business rates growth has been higher than predicted. This shows that it is right to focus on growth. If we grow our income base as a council we can spend additional money received on the things people value most, in this case our most vulnerable children. The Government has not listened to the call nationally for more funding for Children's Social Care but we in Bradford will not ignore the call. Investing in our vulnerable children is obviously the right thing to do.

With the £1.8m remaining for 2018/19, the Executive proposes to replenish the Transition and Risk reserve, which we believe is a prudent step especially given that adult social care is clearly continuing to face unprecedented pressures and national funding uncertainties.

## **Use of reserves**

In making these proposals the Executive remains keenly aware of the need to use Council reserves prudently on behalf of the District, especially in such uncertain times for local authorities up and down the country. That is why in setting out this budget the Council's unallocated reserves will remain within the range of £12 to £15m for contingency against risks not accounted for. Local government finances continue to face unprecedented risks and as our reserves over time have inevitably been reduced, we must remain mindful to ensure they stay at a viable level. Our aim is to allocate the right amount of reserves in the right way and to retain them at a prudent level for unforeseen risks. We propose that this budget strikes that difficult balance and ensures our unallocated reserves remain well within the range recommended in the section 151 officer's report.

## **5. Social care**

We have long argued that a national plan for social care is needed in order to improve people's lives and ease pressures on the NHS.

Before last year's Autumn Budget, alongside the LGA and many other councils we made our latest submission to the Chancellor to call for more funding for social care. However his Budget did not allocate new funds. A broad consensus of local authorities and MPs from across the political spectrum, health professionals, charities and others have reiterated their concerns after the Chancellor decided not to provide new funding.

Former cabinet ministers were among 90 MPs of all parties who wrote to the Prime Minister before the Budget to call for a cross-party solution to social care funding, an immediate £4bn in the Budget and a long-term plan.

Speaking after the Budget, Cllr Izzi Seccombe, Leader of Warwickshire County Council and Chair of the LGA's Community Wellbeing Board, described it as "a completely false economy" to put money into the NHS while ignoring the crisis in social care. She said the government must "tackle the chronic underfunding of care and support services in the community, which are at a tipping point" and she also urged the government to reverse its cuts to councils' public health budgets which fund prevention work.

In our previous budgets we spoke in particular about the challenges in adult social care. That has not subsided however it is now joined by a growing pressure in children's social care, with increasing numbers of vulnerable young people throughout the country needing support. That picture is reflected here in Bradford too.

As we continue our calls for better government funding to support these vulnerable children and adults, we remain committed to pursuing our strategies locally to ensure the best possible levels of care within the funding constraints. We are committed to ensuring that people get the services they rightly expect and we are continuing with our strategy to focus

resources on frontline social work and to encourage new and innovative ways of supporting people.

We are continuing with our adult social care plans published last year to increase the level of preventative support for people, with a focus on what they can do rather than what they can't do. Our strategy is to offer people more choice and control in their own lives and the support they need. Earlier and better interventions will help people to stay independent in their own homes for longer, reduce the need for costlier interventions after challenges have multiplied and ease the pressure on our NHS partners.

## **6. Our plan for inclusive growth**

We cannot simply cut our way out of this situation as a country, let alone as Bradford District. Growth in the country at large is sluggish but here in Bradford we're going to go for growth by making the right investments.

We need to grow our council tax base, grow our business rates base and make the money we do have work harder for us so that we can locally fund more public services for all. So in these proposals we are announcing three strands of investment:

- 1) Housebuilding and development – in line with the great economic and social purpose of aiming to build good quality housing and jobs for all, we will be investing in a team of specialists to help deliver housing sites such as in the city centre and the Canal Road corridor so that we can get more high quality housing and development completed more quickly.
- 2) Encouraging the growth of more business premises – we will invest more funds to stimulate business growth and inward investment in our district. Currently Baildon Business Park generates up to £250,000 in business rates a year and that will rise to up to £400,000 a year when it's completed, with businesses bringing quality jobs, many new to the district. We now have three designated Enterprise Zones in Bradford where we need to accelerate growth. We'll focus on delivering these quickly.
- 3) We will pursue a more focused strategy to invest in assets to generate income to help fund services. We recently invested in buying the NCP car park which has proven to be a shrewd investment, as the lease brings in more money than it costs which in turn helps to fund council services. We will actively look for other attractive and prudent investments.

Meanwhile our "Bradford Pound" social value policy will significantly increase the amount of money the council spends with local businesses, which is 47% currently but we have ambitions to increase this to 60%. This could mean another £45m spent with businesses in the district. We'll be talking more to local businesses about how they can tender for council contracts and putting on workshops to give them the skills to bid for them. We'll be tasking all businesses who contract with the council to deliver social value to the Bradford District. We will ask them to fulfil this commitment in a number of ways, for example by taking on

more apprentices, by providing meaningful work experience, by spending more on training their workforce and by committing to spending more of their expenditure in the local supply chain. All these asks of our suppliers are designed with the express aim of making sure a wider number of Bradford District residents benefit from growth created.

In addition through our capital investment programme, as set out in Document BB, we are aiming to drive sustainable growth that will repay the district for many years to come in line with our vision. Not only must the capital programme ensure we continue to have modern, high quality and more efficient facilities that are fit for the future, it can also support better productivity - for example by improving transport links and easing congestion - and it can stimulate wider economic and cultural activity to benefit residents and businesses. Improving the district's cultural attractions and facilities brings a significant economic benefit while also helping to make this an excellent place in which to live, visit and invest.

To name just a few examples, our funding for Cliffe Castle in Keighley and St George's Hall in Bradford city centre show our commitment to invest in our heritage assets and protect them for future generations. Our plan shows that we will make other significant investments in other vital areas such as school places and infrastructure, for example at Hard Ings in Keighley and Harrogate Road/New Line in east Bradford.

Our support for the former Odeon also demonstrates our commitment to culture as a driver of growth, as its redevelopment and re-opening can be a game changer in cultural and economic terms for the city and district. Our investment in new and more efficient sports and leisure facilities, which are cheaper to run, also shows that we are committed to providing residents with opportunities to enjoy active and fulfilling lifestyles for many years to come.

## **7. Support for all our residents**

We continue to support all communities in the district even in difficult times and we work hard to mitigate the impact of national austerity on low income groups. We do not take any decisions lightly to increase council tax or other charges as we recognise that they are an additional burden on local people, in particular those with the lowest incomes. We have again considered this impact in making the proposals.

In line with our belief that education, skills and employment are key to supporting people out of poverty, we are continuing to invest significantly in these important areas within our shrinking budgets. We have hugely successful local skills and employment programmes which outperform their national equivalents in supporting people into employment. The Get Bradford Working programme recently passed the milestone of helping 3,000 people into work in our district. Get Bradford Working incorporates a number of acclaimed schemes focusing on different sectors, including the Industrial Centres of Excellence and SkillsHouse which supports people into retail and hospitality careers and has proved particularly successful for example with the new jobs provided in the Broadway development.

Through our Education Covenant we are also extending our joint work with schools and other education providers, the voluntary sector, communities and a growing number of businesses to support education and skills development and to improve links between education and employment. The Education Covenant is an example of the council using its leverage and influence in line with the People Can initiative to build links, strengthen partnerships and unlock wider social value from economic activity. By reinforcing the fact that education starts at birth and continues for life, that it takes place outside as well as inside the school gates, we can help to support a positive cycle in which education, skills and employment opportunities are stimulated and shared as widely as possible.

Through our plans for growth we aim to stimulate housing, business and development activity which can benefit all residents. There is a great social purpose as well as an economic one to help ensure that the younger generation and others who are excluded from the housing ladder can actually have a decent home to live in and well-paid jobs. People on low incomes will continue to have access to various services aimed at easing the burden on top of the universal services. The council continues to support the Bradford District Credit Union, for example, which offers an alternative to high interest lenders for people who need reliable and manageable credit, loans, saving and budgeting services. Its model, which is one of members rather than customers, its support for the local economy, its lower interest rates and transparent fees all mean that it supports our wider aims of encouraging inclusive growth and high standards of corporate responsibility to benefit all residents and communities. We will continue to look at all options for mitigating the impact of austerity cuts on our lowest earning residents in these challenging times as far as we can. We have requested a paper on local welfare assistance which is being brought to the Executive in March to see what we can do within existing resources to support people who can little afford rising living costs.

## **8. Working with the voluntary and community sector**

We value our partnership with the voluntary and community sector (VCS), which benefits local people. We want to continue working closely with the VCS in future as together we can maintain valued services for residents. We will also enjoy mutual benefits through our close partnership in terms of evolving to stay sustainable into the future in the face of the severe funding cuts we face.

As we stated in previous years, the central government funding cuts are inevitably also felt by the VCS. We have considered this impact in making these proposals and we are committed to doing all we can to mitigate it. With shrinking resources and as part of our budgeting process which is focused on outcomes, we have had to review all the activities we fund to date, assess the scale of their impact and ensure they are delivered in the most efficient way possible.

As part of our ongoing dialogue we have welcomed the views of the VCS on these proposals during the consultation process and we are clear that this mutually beneficial dialogue and

joint working should continue on an ongoing basis. We are committed to continuing our close work with the VCS to achieve the best for our residents, businesses and communities.

## **9. Staff and trade unions**

We have worked hard to protect frontline services and avoid compulsory redundancies, but with each passing year of government cuts the situation is increasingly difficult with fewer places left to go.

The Council has had to cut 2,247 jobs over the past seven years. This includes 148 compulsory redundancies up to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2017.

This year again there will have to be job losses. 153 new job losses are outlined in these budget proposals across 2018/19 and 2019/20, in addition to the potential loss of approximately 240 full-time equivalent jobs in the Early Help proposals which are subject to separate consultation.

The Executive is grateful to Council staff for their ongoing commitment to the organisation and to the wider public in such challenging circumstances. Our staff are key to the Council's success and its innovation while the central funding cuts continue.

Similarly the Executive has listened to the feedback from Trade Unions, who have played a vital role in engaging with the council's leadership and supporting the council's relations with staff in these challenging times. Our constructive engagement with the Trade Unions has crucially helped us to maintain effective industrial relations while delivering change on a huge scale and mitigating the negative impact on staff as best we can.

This Executive reiterates its expectation that officers will continue to speak and negotiate with the Trade Unions during the implementation of these proposals and beyond.

While the Trade Unions are aware that we can offer no guarantees around compulsory redundancies given the scale of the government cuts, they can also be assured that compulsory redundancies continue to be a last resort and this Council will continue to work constructively with staff and unions.

As an Executive we are determined to work together with staff, trade unions, communities and partner organisations to lead this council through these challenging times. Together we can achieve our shared vision of a more prosperous future in a Bradford District that works for everyone.