



**Brighton & Hove  
City Council**

**Report of the Overview and  
Scrutiny Commission**

**January 2012**

**Budget Scrutiny Panel**

## **Chair's Introduction**

We live in difficult economic times and Brighton & Hove City Council, like all local authorities, has to ensure it lives within its means and will have to take some difficult decisions regarding the balancing of its priorities against what is possible.

This scrutiny panel has been tasked with the difficult job of reviewing the administration's draft budget proposals, critiquing them and making recommendations for improvements.

This report highlights that getting cross-party agreement on one of the most political of all decisions the council takes has proved to be very challenging.

We have had a number of excellent evidence gathering sessions where Cabinet Members and senior officers put their budget areas forward for cross-examination which was a testing but worthwhile process. I think they all survived!

I must thank all our witnesses along with fellow panel members for their time and effort. The recommendations we have come up with do not focus on specific budget lines but rather some key overarching themes. I would draw your attention to the summaries of each of the meetings which provide a guide to some of the areas where we had most concern over what was being proposed.

Cllr Ken Norman  
Chair Budget Scrutiny Panel

## 1. **Background and Process**

- 1.1 The scrutiny panel was chaired by Cllr Ken Norman and comprised Councillors Mears, Mitchell, Pissaridou, Summers and Sykes, with Jo Martindale representing the community and voluntary sector.
- 1.2 The panel agreed that it would seek:
  - To provide cross-party challenge to the budget proposals brought forward by the administration
  - To understand the cumulative affect of budget cuts across the council and city, for service users and providers
  - To begin looking at public service budgets across the piece – fire, police, health
  - To make recommendations to Cabinet as to how to improve the budget
- 1.3 The panel heard from each Cabinet Member supported by senior officers. This is the first time each member of the Cabinet has been cross-examined by scrutiny members in this way which adds to the accountability of the budget process. The list of witnesses and timetable of meetings is attached to this report as **Appendix 1**.
- 1.4 The minutes of each of the scrutiny panel evidence gathering sessions are appended to the report to provide a narrative of the scrutiny process (**Appendices 2-6**). These, along with the summaries contained later in this report, highlight the areas of questioning and Members concerns regarding specific budget proposals.
- 1.5 Written answers promised to questions asked at the meetings are attached as **Appendix 8**. **Appendix 8A** provides details of staffing implications and **Appendix 8B** regarding the impact on the third sector.
- 1.5 The scrutiny panel itself forms part of the budget consultation process and ensures a greater degree of accountability than would otherwise be the case.
- 1.6 The involvement of the community and voluntary sector has been a positive step forward, allowing for broader scrutiny and a wider knowledge base from which to examine proposals. The sector is a major partner of the council delivering a wide range of services and is directly, and indirectly, impacted upon by changes to the council budget.
- 1.7 The Community and Voluntary Sector Forum (CVSF) has produced a position statement which is appended in full to this report. (**Appendix 7**). The panel were also presented with statements from various groups relating to community transport and the music service.

- 1.8 The fees and charges that were publicly available were presented to Members along with the summary documents from the different consultations the council has undertaken to date on the draft budget.
- 1.9 The findings of this report, its recommendations, lines of questioning and comments from members will be reported to the Overview and Scrutiny Commission for agreement on the 31<sup>st</sup> January 2012.
- 1.10 The report will be provided to Cabinet to inform a revised set of proposals that will be presented at Cabinet on 9 February 2012. These will take into consideration the feedback from further consultation, the scrutiny recommendations and the most up to date financial information.
- 1.11 The final responsibility for agreeing the council's budget for 2012/13 rests with all elected members at the meeting of Full Council on 23 February 2012. This will be done in the light of the plans for 2013/14 but the final decision on the budget for 2013/14 will not be taken until the following year.
- 1.12 Feedback from members of the scrutiny panel indicates that the scrutiny process represents a further improvement from last year. Having a single group of members reviewing all the proposals improves continuity and allows for cross-cutting lines of questioning to be developed.
- 1.13 However the panel hasn't really been able to fully develop the partnership approach to budget scrutiny, understanding how the budgets of different public sector bodies interrelate; this is something that should be developed in future years.
- 1.14 Whilst the budget scrutiny process has rarely brought forward concrete resolutions, it allows cabinet members to test assumptions and enables considerable questioning of proposals.

## **2. Budget Context**

- 2.1 The budget scrutiny process has been based on the information in the budget papers presented to Cabinet on the 9<sup>th</sup> December 2011. This report will not re-present all of the information tabled at Cabinet in December which can be accessed from the council website. However there are some parts that bear repeating to provide context for the scrutiny process.
- 2.2 The stated principles upon which the budget has been developed are:
- To prioritise services for the young, elderly and vulnerable
  - To promote efficient use of public money
  - To support partnership working with public, private and third sector organisations
- 2.3 All service areas were asked following the report to Cabinet in July 2011 to produce options for working within budget allocations over the next two years of -5%, -10% and -15% based on their 2011/12 adjusted budget. This process was designed to ensure that decision making is for the medium term, not just the short term. It also enabled consideration to be given to allowing longer lead in times for delivery of savings in some areas if this would result in better long term outcomes. The options developed considered not only reductions in expenditure, but also measures to manage growth in service demand and opportunities for generating additional income. The Value for Money Programme also remains at the heart of the overall budget strategy.
- 2.4 Formula Grant**  
The final settlement for 2011/12 announced by the Department of Communities and Local Government (CLG) in February 2011 contained indicative grant figures for 2012/13 and it is unlikely that these figures will change significantly. The forecasts therefore assume that the council will receive £101.4m formula grant in 2012/13; a reduction of £10.5m or 9.4% from this year.
- 2.5 Council Tax Freeze Grant**  
The council will continue to receive a grant of £3m per annum for 2012/13, 2013/14 and 2014/15 following the council tax freeze in 2011/12. Government has announced that £805m had been found nationally to fund a council tax freeze for 2012/13 only. CLG has recently confirmed that the council would be entitled to a further £3m grant in 2012/13 equivalent to a council tax increase of 2.5% should the council agree to freeze council tax next year. CLG also confirmed that this grant would cease after 2012/13.
- 2.6 Full Council on 23 February 2012 will determine both the budget and council tax for 2012/13 but the resource forecasts in the Cabinet report assume that council tax will increase by 3.5% next year as set out in the July Cabinet budget report. A decision to freeze the council tax in 2012/13 will require an additional £1.2m recurrent savings to be

identified and agreed for next year and an additional £3m recurrent savings in 2013/14 when the new council tax freeze grant ends or require a higher increase in council tax.

## **2.7 Staffing Implications**

The staffing budget for 2012/13 includes funding for a £7.19 per hour living wage and the costs of complying with the new legislation for use of agency workers. A pay freeze is currently in place nationally.

- 2.8 At this stage in the budget process it is difficult to determine exactly how many staff may be affected by the proposals. A broad estimate is that in 2012/13 an estimated 100-120 posts may be removed from the council's staffing structure.

## **2.9 Two Year Budget**

- 2.10 This is the first time that two year budget proposals have been put forward. This longer term horizon is designed to help members take more effective service and financial planning decisions. It also provides time for consultation on some of the reshaping of services that will be required in 2013/14 if the council is to be able to balance its budget whilst still meeting its agreed priority outcomes. The size of cuts required over the next few years has the potential to fundamentally change how the council works and as such longer terms financial planning could be beneficial, as could a more structured dialogue with residents.

## **2.11 Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs)**

- 2.12 EIAs were published with the budget cabinet papers for the first time.

### **3. Recommendations**

- 3.1 The inherently political nature of the budget setting process has meant that recommendations on specific proposals have not been forthcoming; however members have made recommendations both on the process, future process and some fundamental principles upon which to base budget priorities and reductions.

#### **Recommendations**

1. The open manner in which the budget proposals have been brought forward is to be welcomed and should be further developed.
2. The publication of a two year budget is a step forward in providing a greater capacity for services to develop long-term plans for reduced resources and should be continued.
3. Thought should be given as to the best manner in which to expand the reach of the budget consultation building on efforts this year.
4. The publication of the initial Equality Impact Assessments with the budget proposals is to be welcomed. Whilst this is an improvement more work is required to ensure the consistency of all EIAs. Consideration should be given to including a 'poverty' group within the assessment.
5. The impact and outcomes from all areas of council spending should be measured and clearly understood. More work is needed to make this a reality.
6. Budget reductions should be made in relation to impact, quality of service and value for money. In-house services should not be protected at the expense of those provided externally merely because they are council-run; the reverse is also true.
7. The cumulative impact of reductions on service-users should be better evidenced and understood and reported alongside budget proposals.
8. Funding provided to the third sector should be monitored to ensure it is not disproportionately cut.
9. The budget papers present some excellent examples of long-term service reconfiguration, there are however plenty of cases of continued incremental cuts. More work is needed to ensure that a cross-council, pan-public sector and partnership approach to service design is adopted as standard.
10. In order to protect services the council will need to work more closely than ever with partner organisations. It is of concern that the council and partners are looking to reduce funding to support partnership working.

11. The input of the third sector has been a valuable addition to the budget process. This should be expanded in future years.
12. A process of budget development and scrutiny that allows for the wide involvement of partners needs to be developed once the council has moved to a committee system.
13. The publication of carbon budgets is an important development and the approach is to be applauded. The profile and detail provided in this regard to be increased in future years.



## **4. Summary of the Questioning and Comments**

4.1 The section below provides a summary of the issues raised during each of the evidence gathering sessions. It is reproduced to provide an overview for ease of consumption. The detailed minutes of each meeting should be read in **Appendices 2-6** for a more complete view of the process and issues.

### **4.2 Environment and Sustainability (Appendix 2)**

- Public toilets – there was concern regarding how this would impact on families and older people. Questioning focused upon what assessments were made regarding usage and what work could be undertaken to either run toilets differently through ‘friends of’ groups or promote the ‘use our loo’ scheme with local businesses.
- Changes to CityClean – reduction in rounds and street cleaning. What impact would this have to environment of the city along with cuts to other services that impact upon the physical appearance of the city?
- Streetlighting and developing a long-term solution to maintenance and upgrading issues.

### **4.3 Planning, Employment, Economy and Regeneration (Appendix 3)**

- Planning – concern regarding the level of resources and expertise available to produce the new City Plan, whilst continuing other important work.
- Economic Development – agreement that the council needs to support economic development at a difficult economic time but also that there needs to be a way to ensure measurement on what impact council investment in this area actually has.
- Skills and adult education – questioning as to whether resources were sufficient to deliver the city’s Employment and Skills Plan, given the importance of skills and training to the future economy.
- Major Projects – concern over a fairly large percentage cut to the service.

### **4.4 Adult Social Care and Health (Appendix 4)**

- Reductions to residential accommodation provision - concern as to whether the timescales are achievable and what consultation will be undertaken.
- Learning Disabilities Partnership Board – what will the reductions actually mean and how will it affect service provision?
- Day Services – how will the service change and will this impact upon mental health provision? Will the level of service be reduced?

### **4.5 Children and Young People (Appendix 4)**

- Youth Services – security of long term funding and purpose and mechanics of new grant based resources. How does this link to the youth service review?

- Youth Employability Service – concern at the removal of the one-off funding and its impact after previous reductions, especially given current levels of NEETs.
- Changes to support for schools – how prepared are schools to take on this extra work, and what support will the council still be offering?
- Music service – considerable public concern regarding the music service and proposed cuts. Level of local subsidy and comparison nationally.
- Services for Children with Disabilities – cuts fall disproportionately on the third sector. This needs to be looked at again and cuts focused on less effective services overall.

#### **4.6 Finance and Central Services (Appendix 5)**

- Human Resources – continuing overspend, lack of savings going forward and length of time it has taken to implement new systems. How much HR is done centrally and how much by managers.
- Life events – levels of fees and charges for events and how the council compares to other councils.
- Partnerships – support for partnerships and Local Strategic Partnership needed at a time of significant budget cuts across all sectors.

#### **4.7 Transport and Public Realm (Appendix 5)**

- Transport modelling – assurance was sought that the substantial investment in the modelling capability would not be diminished through a small budget saving.
- Shopmobility – substantial concern that the service would struggle with a reduction in resources when it was supporting some of the most vulnerable across the city.
- Road maintenance/line painting – questioning regarding whether a reduction in planned maintenance would be counterproductive in that it would result in more urgent and unplanned work.
- Road safety education – what the cut will actually mean and how will schools fill the gap in provision.

#### **4.8 Housing (Appendix 5)**

- Homelessness/hostel budgets – concern that these services support extremely vulnerable people and that given policy and resourcing changes at a national level the number of people accessing these services will increase.
- Supporting People – that considerable savings were being proposed over a number of years and what would the cumulative impact be?
- Mears contract – clarification sought as to areas of contract renegotiation, use of incentivised payments and operation of contract.

#### **4.9 Culture, Recreation and Tourism (Appendix 6)**

- Library provision – extent of reduction to library services, including the mobile library. Possibility of this being run in different ways.
- Visitor Information Centre – debate regarding the rationale behind moving to a number of satellite sites and whether it will be better than a single centre. There needs to be a main site to direct visitors to.
- Sports Development Fund – questions as to whether different options for funding have been explored and general support for this programme at getting people involved in sports.

#### **4.10 Communities, Equalities and Public Protection (Appendix 6)**

- Equalities savings – clarification sought as to what the pilot has achieved and how the programme is being taken forward?
- Grants/third sector savings – general agreement that the third sector should be supported as should the grants programme.
- Community safety & the police – concern about the community safety programme support and how changes to police funding and governance will affect work in the city.

## **Appendix 1 – Timetable & Witnesses**

### **2<sup>nd</sup> December 2011, Committee Room 3, HTH – 3-5pm**

- Budget Process/Overall Financial Context/General Budget Proposals
  - Cllr J Kitcat, Cabinet Member for Finance & Central Services
  - Director of Finance, Catherine Vaughan
- Draft Budget Proposals Place
  - Cllr West, Cabinet Member for Environment & Sustainability
  - Strategic Director Place, Geoff Raw

### **5<sup>th</sup> December 2011, Committee Room 1, HTH – 2-5pm**

- Draft Budget Proposals Place
  - Cllr Kennedy, Cabinet Member for Planning, Employment, Economy and Regeneration
  - Strategic Director Place, Geoff Raw

### **9<sup>th</sup> December 2011 – Committee Room 1, HTH – 2-5pm**

- Draft Budget Proposals People
  - Cllr Jarrett – Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care
  - Cllr Shanks – Cabinet Member for Children & Young People
  - Strategic Director People, Terry Parkin
  - Director of Adult Social Care, Denise D'Souza
  - Geraldine Hoban, Chief Operating Officer, Clinical Commissioning Group

### **6<sup>th</sup> January 2012 – Committee Room 3, HTH – 2-5pm**

- Draft Budget Proposals Resources
  - Cllr J Kitcat
  - Strategic Director Resources, Charlie Stewart
- Draft Budget Proposals Place
  - Cllr Davey, Cabinet Member for Transport & the Public Realm
  - Cllr Wakefield, Cabinet Member for Housing
  - Strategic Director Place, Geoff Raw

### **9<sup>th</sup> January 2012 – Committee Room 1, HTH – 2-5pm**

- Draft Budget Proposals Communities
  - Cllr Bowden, Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation & Tourism
  - Cllr Duncan, Cabinet Member for Community Safety
  - Strategic Director Communities, David Murray

### **20<sup>th</sup> January 2012, Council Chamber, HTH – 2-5pm**

- Panel meeting to agree final report and recommendations

### **31 January – Overview and Scrutiny Commission**

- Panel reports back to OSC with recommendations

**Appendices 2-6 – Minutes from the evidence gathering sessions.**

**Appendix 2 – Budget Overview and Environment and Sustainability**

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL  
SCRUTINY PANEL ON THE BUDGET PROPOSALS  
3.00pm 2 DECEMBER 2011  
COMMITTEE ROOM 3, HOVE TOWN HALL  
MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillor K Norman (Chair)

**Also in attendance:** Councillor Mears, Mitchell, Pissaridou, Summers and Sykes. Joanna Martindale ( CVSF Co-optee)

**Other Members present:** Councillors J Kitcat, West

**PART ONE**

**1. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**1.1 Election of Chair**

Cllr Ken Norman was unanimously elected Chair of the Panel

**1.2 Declarations of Interest**

There were none

**1.3 Declaration of party whip**

There were none

**1.4 Exclusion of Press and Public**

As per the agenda

**2. CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS**

**3. DRAFT WORK PLAN**

3.1 Members noted the draft work plan. Cabinet Member Councillor Liz Wakefield was due to speak to a future Panel meeting and the date would be confirmed.

## 4. WITNESSES

4.1 Cllr Jason Kitcat, CM for Financial and Central Services (JK), and Catherine Vaughan, Director of Finance (CV) introduced the draft budget and took questions. (as did Mark Ireland, Head of Strategic Finance and Procurement: MI)

4.2 JK told panel members that this was the first time that the council had prepared a two year budget, and the first time that draft budget papers had been ready for early December. The draft budget had been developed via a 'star chamber' process with council departments, and there had been on-going consultation with unions, the local community and voluntary sector, the City Assembly and members of the public. Scrutiny comments were welcomed.

4.3 JK set out the three underlying principles to the budget:

Protecting services for children and young people  
Efficient use of public money  
Promoting partnership working

4.4 In addition, particular care had been taken to protect services to carers, ASC services, youth services, staff terms and conditions (including the introduction of a Living Wage), homelessness grants, the Supporting People programme, the Community Grants programme and the council's commitments to sustainability. Given reduced central Government funding, this necessitated efficiencies and changes being made across all areas of the council's work.

4.5 JK and CV answered members' questions. JM asked how replies from consultation events around the City were being dealt with; would they be reported?

a) MM: equal pay reserves?

CV: reserves for single status will be reviewed – currently the position is the same as was reported to Audit Committee Sep 11

b) MM: redundancy reserves?

CV: 3.5M was set aside for 11/12, of which approx 500K remains. There are still some outstanding issues, as not all staff who indicated a willingness to take voluntary redundancy have yet completed the process. This will therefore need to be reviewed before the final Feb 12 Cabinet decisions. Currently the draft budget proposes allotting an additional 700K to these reserves for 12/13.

c) MM: ongoing savings from previous (11/12) budget from recharges?

CV: any savings would already have been included.

d) MM: Seaside Towns funding?

CV: most has been allocated, but not necessarily spent. The draft budget makes no proposals to re-allocate this funding, so the current spending plan still stands.

e) MM: number of vacant posts?

CV: this is not easy to assess, as it is complicated by the ongoing voluntary severance scheme – in some instances it has been decided to retain a post made vacant by voluntary redundancy, and to make savings by deleting the former post of successful applicants to the vacant post. Until this process has been completed it will therefore not be possible to give a firm figure for vacancies. However we will do some analysis to help scrutiny understand the position.

f) MM: new homes bonus?

CV: provisional announcement now made of 425K is slightly higher than expectations, not currently built into budget assumptions

g) GM: have all planned 11/12 savings been made?

JK: TBM forecasts an overall underspend, but not all departments have reached their targets (e.g. in terms of voluntary redundancies).

CV: it has not been possible to make some 11/12 savings (e.g. carbon reduction and procurement), and these are included as separate costs in the budget papers. There is still ongoing work on some admin and management savings, but all are achievable, bar some savings for the Children's Delivery Unit which have been factored into the budget report.

h) MM: are these risks specifically addressed?

CV: yes, via TBM7 report – and the need to fund these pressures is factored into the budget report.

i) GM: has CYP made required savings?

JK: yes, and has in fact achieved more than required.

CV: Cabinet decided not to implement some 11/12 savings (e.g. closure of Brightstart) and these are included as separate costs in the budget papers.

k) OS: how has public consultation affected budget planning?

JK: a number of respondents were clear that they wanted the council to make decisions re specific planning – too complex an issue for non-experts.

However, responses make it clear that public wants to see front-line people-centric services prioritised, and this has been reflected in the budget plans.

We may see more specific views expressed now that people have a draft budget to interrogate – consultation is still ongoing and the council will respond to public concerns.

l) OS: how are demographic pressures calculated?

MI: this is a best estimate based on past trends, but will be revised in the light of emerging data.

CV: Successful implementation of the council's VfM plans should mitigate against the impact of demographic pressures – the budget pressures to an extent for 2013/2014 assume a scenario where mitigation has not been wholly

successful. The budget does provide more detail of this for 12/13, but this has not yet been factored fully into 13/14 planning.

m) CS: how were savings per department calculated?

JK: each department asked to model 5, 10 and 15% savings across 2 years. Decisions were then taken so as to allocate savings in the least damaging way across organisation.

n) GM: capital investment re schools?

CV: education capital budget sits in People section of budget, but information is not currently available to produce a full capital report. There are significant pressures re capital receipts, and there will need to be re-profiling if some expected receipts are not realised – however this is particularly a timing issue.

o) JM: what is planned % spend on voluntary sector?

CV: can get panel an approximation, although it may be very difficult to get an accurate figure as the financial system does not record information in this way, and BHCC may not be able to collate data using CVSF's preferred definition (i.e. orgs with charitable status). However, does not believe that sector has been disproportionately impacted. Will do some analysis to help inform scrutiny.

p) KN: commitment to protecting services for vulnerable people?

JK: yes, although cannot guarantee to protect all current services given size of financial challenge – i.e. 35M over two years. BHCC has actively looked at increasing income as well as making savings.

q) AP: how many posts to be reduced in 12/13?

JK: 100-120 in 12/13 plus approx 30 outstanding from this year's challenge.

4.6 The panel next heard from Cllr Pete West, CM for Environment and Sustainability (PW), and from Gillian Marston, Head of City Infrastructure (GMa) and Geoff Raw, Strategic Director, Place (GR).

4.7 PW told the panel that this had been a very challenging process. Priorities included:

Minimising impact on workforce

Introducing a food waste pilot

Making parks more sustainable

Investing in infrastructure (e.g. street lighting)

4.8 The need to make savings had resulted in plans to reduce the number of public toilets in the city – city has many and not all are well-used. PW recognises that this is a contentious issue and welcomes public ideas on this (although it has to be recognised that identified savings will have to be made somewhere).



a) GM: have additional costs (vandalism) been factored in re plans to have some unattended toilets?

PW: yes.

b) GM: cityclean savings: how many rounds will be taken out of refuse collection?

GMa: 4 rounds (1 refuse, 3 recycling) – will require re-organisation across city – the number of rounds could change as the work is mapped out. No redundancies planned.

c) GM: commitment to continue weekly collections?

PW: yes, committed to maintaining weekly collections for 12/13. Plans for future years will depend on success of food waste pilot.

d) GM: less reliance on agency staff re cityclean?

GMa: yes, costs can be reduced here, although it is necessary to provide cover for sickness and leave.

e) GM: street cleaning reductions?

GMa: yes, but haven't reduced for several years, and confident that staff levels can be reduced without significant impact upon services.

f) GM: street lighting – is condition of posts still a problem and will maintenance continue to be outsourced?

PW: need to address long term neglect of this infrastructure – will look at capital investment here.

GMa: current maintenance contract still has approximately 2 years to run.

g) CS: how was toilet use assessed (esp. for parks)?

PW: there's no measure of volume of use as such, we rely on managers' experience. Have tried to plan closures to minimise impact – e.g. by signposting availability of toilets in nearby BHCC buildings (i.e. proximity of Hove Town Hall will allow week day closure of Norton Rd toilets).

h) JM: has BHCC explored possibility of encouraging 'friends of' groups etc to get involved in toilet provision in parks?

GMa: this isn't an easy community participation activity to sell. The council already tries to think innovatively about park toilets – e.g. encouraging firms leasing park cafes to take on toilet maintenance.

i) MM: what saving will be achieved here?

GMa: estimate 163K

j) AP: planned cuts to coast protection – how will this impact on costs to BHCC and local residents of flood insurance?

GR: although listed in the budget as coast protection, most savings will be made by reducing maintenance of seaside railings, street furniture etc rather

than actual coastal defences. Will pick up on potential for additional insurance costs to BHCC.

PW: no intention to increase flood risk: savings will be carefully targeted.

l) AP: allotments – will cuts impact upon poorer people?

PW: concessions will remain; increased costs will reflect actual cost of provision rather than being subsidised.

m) AP: City in Bloom?

PW: would like to encourage more business funding here. Unfortunately, hard choices need to be made, and budget does a good job of protecting parks funding.

JK: auctioning mayoral number plate will raise funds for community groups – this could potentially include City in Bloom.

n) OS: reduced waste PFI costs?

PW: less waste being produced has led to lower costs and high energy prices have meant that electricity generated at Newhaven has brought in additional income.

MI: electricity generation income has always been factored into the contract, but BHCC's calculation of this has differed from Viola's. However, recent legal advice supports the council's model for this calculation.

o) AP: possible impact on tourism as a result of cuts in city cleaning?

GMA: we do monitor this closely. There has not been reductions in street cleansing following the introduction of wheelie bins and communal bins and these help and should mean less of an impact..

PW: public have to recognise their responsibility here: if people didn't drop litter there would be less need for street cleaning.

p) Thurstan Crockett, head of Sustainability: welcomes additional funding for sustainability – will be used to replace time-limited grants funding. Focus will be on embedding sustainability in BHCC and the city as a whole.

## **5. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

5.1 The next meeting is on Monday 5<sup>th</sup> December at 2pm in HTH

The meeting concluded at 5.00pm

## **Appendix 3 – Planning, Employment, Economy and Regeneration**

### **BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL SCRUTINY PANEL ON THE BUDGET PROPOSALS 2.00pm 5 DECEMBER 2011 COMMITTEE ROOM 1, HOVE TOWN HALL MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillor K Norman (Chair)

**Also in attendance:** Councillor Mears, Mitchell, Pissaridou, Summers and Sykes. Joanna Martindale (CVSF Co-optee)

**Other Members present:** Councillor Kennedy

#### **PART ONE**

#### **6. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

##### **6.1 Declarations of Interest**

There were none

##### **6.2 Declarations of party whip**

There were none

##### **6.3 Exclusion of Press and Public**

As per the agenda

#### **7. CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS**

7.1 Councillor Ken Norman, Chair, reminded the meeting of the main aims of the Panel. He confirmed that Councillor Wakefield's Housing portfolio was included in the panel's Work Plan for 6 January 2012.

#### **8. WITNESSES**

8.1 Councillor Amy Kennedy CM for Planning Economic Development and Regeneration (AK) reminded the meeting of her remit; it did not include Trading Standards, Environmental Health and Licensing which were the responsibility of Councillor Ben Duncan. She said maintaining Development Control capacity was especially important; effective ways of working and new technology were key.

8.2 AK was concerned about possible changes to the Planning Policy team, not least because of the need to produce a robust and timely City Plan. She said the Council had to be realistic in the current financial climate when there was little funding for development and inward investment opportunities. Regarding rationalisation of Capital Projects team she said capital projects can still be achieved by working 'smarter.'

8.3 AK answered the Panel's questions together with Jeanette Walsh Development Control Manager (JW), Geoff Raw Strategic Director Place (GR) and Cheryl Finella (CF) Economic Development Manager.

a) CS: ICT migration – a big change seemingly with relatively small savings  
JW: this project is due to be delivered in August 2012 and is a forward saving eg on stationery.

GR: it is part of a wider programme of reducing paperwork and improving efficiency.

b) GM: have other options been considered re: savings on major projects team. Potential sources of external income eg regeneration?

AK: there is almost no external funding at present. It is a very tough choice that will likely affect posts. There has to be a balance between front-line and non-frontline posts.

c) GM: is there adequate capacity and knowledge of staff in planning policy, economic development and capital projects?

AK: My portfolio pulls together officers from a number of teams with a wide range of skills which will enable us to review all major projects to identify those that are still viable in this economic climate.

d) MM: How many posts within your remit will be lost?

GR: Restructuring proposals will affect only a small number of posts (that are currently filled) and cannot be shared as they are subject to consultation

e) MM: How many posts in Planning and Public Protection are still vacant?

GR: A written answer can be provided.

f) KN: voluntary severance does not delete a post automatically, does it?

AK: No

g) AP: Is there a list of capital projects that are unlikely to go ahead?

AK: this is subject to review

h) AP: many posts seem to be proposed to be lost in your area.

AK: this is worrying; there are hard choices to be made.

i) KN: what are the risks to the Council of lost posts?

AK: There will still be capacity to produce the City Plan. Frontline services in Development Control (important both for the Council and for residents and developers) remain relatively unscathed under these proposals

j) CS: Do we have the capacity to carry out the Duty for neighbouring authorities to work together?

AK: there is good cross-border co-operation already eg over Shoreham Harbour, Waste and Mineral Plan and National Park Authority. There is capacity to continue this regular work. There would be more pressure if the Council were to support Neighbourhood Forums. Neighbourhood Plans are being looked at, but because they can only be used to promote not prevent development they would not seem to me likely to be popular with many residents and personally at this stage I am sceptical about them for a number of reasons.

k) OS: Will a proposed reduction in technical posts mean this work will go to consultancies instead?

AK: No

l) MM: Will the Planning department still have the capacity and specialist expertise to deal with the volume and complexity of work?

AK: The capacity of the DC team is to be protected; we are looking only to reduce expenditure at senior levels. Expert knowledge exists across all the posts.

m) JM: I welcome close links with the Communities Team on new neighbourhood plans proposals. Joint working with Planning is important. Residents may well be interested in Neighbourhood Councils, eg in involvement in allocation of S106 funding. There are potential sources of European funding that can be accessed via community and voluntary sector.

AK: We are looking at how the Community Infrastructure Levy could be progressed alongside the continuing S106 regime and would welcome wider joint working on this.

n) GM: re redistribution of managerial responsibilities for senior DC and planning posts, what is meant by focussing on core aspects and non-statutory work?

JW: DC has strong management; there will be consultation on this. As the City Plan is following from the Local Development Framework there is a huge change in how plans are drafted and developed. Non-statutory work covers eg communications, graphics, graphic design work. There is no intention to reduce posts in statutory work (such as conservation areas and listed buildings enforcement).

o) CS: in EIAs – page 90 – what will be the effect of reducing the availability of advice on home adaptations?

GR: The Council provides housing adaptation advice to private sector residents. We are exploring the opportunities to safeguard further funding. The Council has policy documents in place 'Lifetimes Homes Policy' and at present an Access consultant works for Planning 1 day per week.

AK The Disability Discrimination Act is law and remains applicable to newbuild.

p) AP: What does the Ordnance Survey budget pay for?

AK: we think a reduction in OS fees (not jobs) can be achieved

q) GM: Economic Development Unit?

AK: we've been able to retain the ED budget which is relatively small but provides initiatives that we think can still make a big difference.

GR ED is central to the Council's being able to address increasing unemployment and increasing deprivation that impacts on the health and well-being of the local community and the pressures on many other local services. An investment prospectus for the City is being drawn up to promote investment and employment in the city.

CF: ED is involved in 3 main areas:

- 1) business support (eg 'Ride the Wave' workshops on networking, supply chains and business clusters; fledgling Environmental Technologies sector which is small but strong and bringing new business into the City; Creative Industries eg digital media and gaming plus performing arts and artists with the Arts Commission; talent scouts in music industry; and business improvement district to support retailers in the town centre)
- 2) skills (City Employment and Skills Programme and working with FE and HE sector to help grow the economy)
- 3) support infrastructure (Brighton & Hove Local Employment Scheme for recruitment and training in construction; an Investment prospectus for the City to develop a strong brand for business {alongside leisure}; showcasing the City and its skills offer including major EcoTec event in June relating to environmental industries)

r) JM: how can we measure the impact of ED, on the wealth of the City?

CF: This is notoriously hard to measure but we do take feedback from the business community and engage with different groups eg re skills. We run questionnaires and an annual business survey. We can't always claim credit for increasing the economy but nor should we be held responsible when the economic situation deteriorates given this relates to the national and international situation.

s) JM: Adult Education doesn't seem to attract much funding. How can we help protect frontline services and support organisations?

AK: We are doing this, and emphasising access to education for all, as part of the City Employment and Skills Plan produced in partnership with City College and with the Universities and Amex.

t) JM: But it's difficult to implement a Strategy without resources

GR: Improving coordination and work by Director of People with schools and FE and HE means that more can be done without necessarily having to increase resources to help support children and young people, as much as we may wish to. CESSG is ably chaired by Phil Frier, Principal and Chief Executive of City College Brighton & Hove.

Chair: Thank you all for attending the meeting and answering questions. Thank you to the Press for being here.

## **9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

9.1 The next meeting would be on Friday 9 December at 2pm in HTH CR1.

The meeting concluded at 3.50pm

## Appendix 4 – Adult Social Care and Health & Children and Young People

### BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL SCRUTINY PANEL ON THE BUDGET PROPOSALS 2.00pm 9 DECEMBER 2011 COMMITTEE ROOM 1, HOVE TOWN HALL MINUTES

**Present:** Councillor K Norman (Chair)

**Also in attendance:** Councillor Mears, Mitchell, Pissaridou, Summers and Sykes

**Other Members present:** Councillors Jarrett and Shanks

#### PART ONE

#### **10. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

10.1 There were no declarations of substitutes, declarations of interest or declarations of party whip.

**10.2 RESOLVED;** that the press and public be not excluded from the meeting.

#### **11. CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS**

11.1 Councillor Ken Norman, Chair of the Budget Scrutiny Panel, welcomed everyone and reminded the meeting of the aims of the Panel:

- To provide cross-party challenge to the budget proposals brought forward by the administration.
- To understand the cumulative affect of budget cuts across the council, city, for service users and providers.
- To begin looking at public service budgets across the piece – fire, police, health
- To make recommendations to Cabinet as to how to improve the budget

#### **12. WITNESSES**

12.1 Councillor Rob Jarrett (RJ) told the meeting that proposed savings were inevitable within Adult Social Care and Health as these service areas represented a large part of the Council's overall budget.

12.2 The underlying principle was that services remain wherever possible and would be delivered more efficiently. Savings would be sought when contracted out services eg in Home Care were due for renegotiation. The Council relied on having the right in-house expertise; internal structures were being looked at to ensure the right numbers and levels of officers. Savings would be made in external contracts wherever possible.

12.3 The Council had a statutory duty to provide care and Brighton & Hove faced some significant demographic pressures; eg there were relatively large numbers of people aged 85+ many of whom had significant health needs and a rise in the numbers of adults with learning difficulties surviving into old age

and a related rise in cases of dementia. So although some significant savings had been identified, this did not mean that the total budget had reduced.

12.4 Raising the service eligibility threshold from 'substantial' to 'critical' had been considered and judged to be a false economy in that service users then would tend to return with more severe problems later on. It is intended to take a preventative approach.

12.5 Compared with other areas Brighton & Hove is known to have significantly higher than average costs per individual, particularly for learning disabilities.

12.6 There are proposals to make savings on accommodation arrangements. Various parts of the City have relatively inefficient buildings, some of which are small and underused so reducing unnecessarily high overheads is key. This would involve rearranging some locations and potentially cause some dislocation to service users. A suitable consultation period was being planned.

12.7 Other efficiencies were planned by using new technologies eg in Home Care, helping people to stay in their own homes. Telecare can be used to reduce the number of home visits needed to ensure a person is OK, resulting in savings without loss of service. Simplifying the range of payment rates in new Home Care contracts would also bring about some savings.

12.8 Community Meals was another area of potential savings, pending the outcome of the current scrutiny process. The option of a new contract would be explored.

12.9 Councillor Sue Shanks (SS) pointed out the wide service areas covered by schools, early years and youth budgets. She said national funding was increasingly being switched from local authorities to individual schools and academies with cuts to spending on eg education welfare, school improvement and early years training subsidies. Councillor Shanks focussed on some of the key areas.

12.10 Some of the Children's Centres did not provide a full range of services and had become expensive to run. For the relatively large numbers of looked after children currently in Brighton & Hove, more learning interventions were being planned to help reduce escalation of service needs. In-house fostering would be used more in future and this was less costly.

12.11 Youth services were shown to be effective, especially at traumatic times in people's lives and the Council would look to protect these; in particular by bringing together commissioning for sports and play services across the City.

A small reduction in employability service was being proposed as schools were increasingly taking responsibility in this area and children staying in school for longer. It was planned to bring together employment services in Housing and Supporting People to cover both young people and older age groups.



12.12 Councillor Shanks said she was keen for schools to stay within the local authority however there were national pressures and a school places commissioning group was established.

12.13 Geraldine Hoban (GH), Chief Operating Officer for Brighton and Hove's Clinical Commissioning Group gave the background to the changes to commissioning for healthcare within the City. She confirmed that the CCG was working closely with the local authority on both the adult and children's Section 75 and on the Commissioning Strategy and Improvement Strategy. She said that joint governance and decision-making process were in place and the budget proposals were aligned with healthcare processes.

12.14 She confirmed that from an NHS perspective she was confident that the commissioning proposals would not adversely affect health or the local health economy. As with the approach in health, benchmarking had enabled 'outliers' to be identified, so that better value for money could be achieved. She noted that within the budget proposal there were also investment areas.

12.15 The level of spending on carers would be maintained; there would be changes to how these services are accessed. Mental health was a priority and more funding was being put into this.

12.16 Re-ablement funding was being re-aligned with £3.2 million being passported to the Council including £500k for work on prevention - enabling access criteria to be maintained. Whilst this year there would be a reduction of £130k in this pot she felt confident it could be managed.

12.17 There would be a specific focus on Children's health within the CCG, and Geraldine Hoban said they would want to work very closely with the Council on proposals around Children's Centres. Among the aims of the clinically led working group on Children that will be established this year is to improve the relationships and connections between primary care and the Children's Centres and to ensure community health services are working to keep children out of secondary care whenever appropriate.

12.18 Cabinet Members answered questions from the Panel together with Denise D'Souza, Lead Commissioner Adult Social Care and Health (DD), Terry Parkin, Strategic Director (People) (TP), James Dougan, Head of Children and Families (JD) and Jo Lyons, Lead Commissioner, Schools, Skills and Learning (JL).

a) MM: No reference to S75 in the ASC Strategic Financial Context (p35)?  
DD: this will be set out more clearly when the proposals go to the Joint Commissioning Board.

b) MM: Savings in the assessment budget (p36)?  
DD: Some of the £200k savings would be found within joint arrangements eg some growth in budget for mental health assessment.

c) MM: Bringing 'in line,' support for the Learning Disability Partnership Board (p36) ?

DD: This budget has been underspent for 2 years. The proposals are adequate to support the LDP Board and consultation.

d) MM: '£50k savings' appears to be a general 'accountancy' number – are these reliable figures (p37, p40 )?

DD: The figures in such a large budget are 'rounded.' There are detailed budget sheets behind each of these.

e) MM: Are these deleted or vacant posts?

DD: A review of support services is in progress; more information can be provided following consultation.

f) MM: How many units would be taken out of Housing Stock for 'extra care' (p38)?

DD: Brighton & Hove is still an 'outlier' regarding numbers of older people in residential care. At current rates the numbers will have increased by 700 people by 2013. The Housing Commissioning Group is looking at a range of options for around 15 units locally at present. No decision on providers of housing has been made and other residential social landlords are also being looked at.

g) MM: Concerned about proposals affecting people with disabilities (p40)

MM: Details in EIA – question 'no' impact eg on transgender, ethnicity groups (p119): 'no' impact on older people (p121) EIA 'to be completed' (p123). Some comments may be misleading.

h) RJ: This budget has been prepared sooner than usual and the EIAs are still developing.

DD: Services would be clear about the potential impact regarding individuals but these EIAs are for budget scrutiny and would be enhanced for budget council.

i) GM: Timescale and achievability for reducing the numbers of people in residential accommodation (p38) ?

DD: Despite developing 200 extra places (eg Patching Lodge, Vernon Gardens) we are still short by around 200 units and the number of people aged 85+ is growing. 15 extra people are in care every week; we are working on how to address this and will consult on proposals.

RJ: At present we have people placed as far away as Devon and this is extremely expensive per person although only a few individuals are involved. We can manage transition better and by remodelling local provision we know we can accommodate people in Brighton & Hove, but this will take time.

j) GM: All current in-house provider services (bottom box p44) is this deliverable?

DD: This is for 2013/14, so there is a year to plan this.

TP: This is 'joining up' children and adult services better. Transitioning here is not as good as in some other local authorities; this is one of our biggest

weaknesses. Significant savings have already been achieved and we're confident further savings can be made.

k) GM: How will savings be achieved?

TP: We know that local provision can bring down costs significantly and improve the offer to the individual.

l) OS: Adults Assessment – meeting VfM target?

DD: Community Care is linked with Personalisation which is included in the summary of VFM gains (p29). This spending on Community Care eg on increasing independence via Telecare and other initiatives has been shown to be effective over the last 2 years and there is no reason to change this, but there is still more to do.

m) JM: We welcome protection of spending on prevention and we recognise budget pressures. How can we ensure that the quality of domiciliary care does not decrease?

DD: These are proposals covering 2 years; it is not intended to increase the eligibility criteria. Our demographics show that numbers of people over 65+ is not a significant issue, however the number of people aged 85+ is growing. The Community Care budget for older people continues to decrease and quality is an issue. We are moving to real time monitoring of care actually delivered and getting feedback from carers. The proposals are for more but different investment, targeting the most vulnerable.

RJ: There are savings planned on Home Care contracts but high quality is still expected. There will be encouragement for training and we are looking at ability to recruit staff at the right pay level. This is a key aim, but not in the budget papers.

n) JM: What is the nature of the cuts to the Learning Disabilities Partnership Board? A consultation is planned for next year – so is this a good time to make cuts of more than a half?

DD: The Board will still be supported but there will be less spend on infrastructure and funding targeted instead at specific initiatives, consultations and transitioning.

RJ: There was a small one-off discretionary grant for a pilot scheme. Individuals will still be supported including moving to employment. No reduction is proposed on advocacy or other support for individuals to participate.

o) JM: The Voluntary Sector has particular expertise in transition. How will integrated Transition be planned; what will be the impact on adult services?

JM: The EIAs need strengthening regarding older people. Referring to the questions for EIAs (p19) - have all the risks been identified in the services?

RJ: We want to make sure the EIAs work as they should but they are not perfect at this early stage. Any concerns that the Panel has on EIAs can be referred to Councillor Ben Duncan, either directly or at a Panel meeting.

p) KN: How are the Day Services proposals (p40) different from previous years? Any changes to mental health provision planned?

DD: There is a continuation in the service for carer relief but there is a relatively low occupancy rate and further reductions are expected in the personalisation budget. More preventive work and a move to more community-based options are expected.

GH: There are no firm proposals as yet. We plan to commission Depression services first and then we will look closely at Day Services this year via the Joint Commission Board with the intention of commissioning in 2013/2014.

RJ: Day Services will still be there for those who need them. But there are low occupancy rates and we want to reduce high overhead costs where possible, for example by reducing the number of buildings but still providing the service.

q) GM: No indicative savings for Youth Services for 2013/2014? Will these continue to be provided in-house?

SS: There are no proposals to reduce funding; the Youth Services Review has been published and we plan to work closely with the voluntary sector. Current staff are anticipated to stay employed by the Council.

r) MM: So Youth Services will continue to be provided in-house and there will be no reduction in funding to the voluntary sector?

SS: There is additional funding of £300k to grant aid more groups so there will be increased provision in this area and no reduction in funding. The Youth Services Review indicates area-based work which will bring services together and avoid duplication. Recommendations are being brought to 20 January CMM

JD: The CMM report will indicate how coordination is to be planned.

s) JM; How long will rollover last?

TP: Officer advice is that holiday schemes should not be put at risk so rollover is needed so that critical schemes can continue. This will take time and we are grateful to all currently involved for their commitment. We plan to stop providing advice on health and safety which most authorities stopped long ago.

t) GM: Does 'Transport' or 'CYP' subsidise school buses?

TP: I can confirm Transport is responsible to subsidise school bus routes and we have looked to ensure there is no double-subsidy. Our home to school policy is inconsistent with neighbouring authorities in that Brighton & Hove children receive funding to travel to schools outside the local authority area but children from elsewhere do not receive funding from their Authority to travel to Brighton & Hove schools.

MM: There is a range of different home-to-school subsidies paid, eg SEN and faith schools.

TP: Yes this could be made clearer in the papers. There are no hidden subsidies. We are taking a fresh look at bus routes. We are not good at supporting SEN independence and we're looking at how to improve this.

MM: Regarding transport to faith schools, some children outside the City Centre could be disadvantaged.

SS: There will be consultation on proposed changes.

u) OS: How will schools be able to take on more responsibility and can that be a seamless transition?

SS: we are working closely with schools and Head teachers

TP: The national picture is that local authorities will not be working so closely with schools in future, other than taking responsibility as a last resort.

JL: We have been working with Head Teachers for a long time, on these changes to support school-school support. There is a national and local push for being self-supporting. The local authority team is refocusing on commissioning and brokering partnerships.

TP: It is important to help schools prepare. The pupil premium will rise and school budgets will increase especially for those with high numbers of pupils receiving free school meals. For the local authority this means a large funding reduction for previously grant-supported services eg around ethnic minorities, school improvement and early intervention so the local authority team may need to reduce further.

v) KN: There has been significant interest in changes to the music service and the reduction in funding – would you like to comment on this?

TP: Funding for music has changed; Brighton & Hove Council provide one of the highest subsidies nationally on top of the ring fenced central government grant. The only reduction proposed is in the additional subsidy made available by the Council. The central government grant remains although now the music service has to bid to the Arts Council for it. The Council remains one of the larger funders nationally however despite this cut.

JL: We will be focussing on music provision for vulnerable groups including looked after children and youth offenders and for 2012-2013 will be looking to schools to do their own commissioning.

w) GM: How will the music service be protected in this budget?

SS: There is free tuition for children receiving free school meals and our Arts Council bid will emphasise vulnerable groups.

x) GM :Youth Employability savings (p52)?; and could external funding be sought?

SS Brighton and Hove Business Enterprise Partnership will be looking at increasing employment across the city; there will be more joined up provision. Joint commissioning will help make savings here. The Foyer is active in this area.

TP: This is an example of where early intervention from age 16 can give better outcomes. At present our performance is low - we need to ensure that more young people achieve 5 or more good GCSE grades.

y) JM: Are these Youth Employability Services figures the latest available and why are 4 CVSF posts proposed to be lost in 2012-2013 not shown as a saving (p52) ? Has the transitional funding of £200k all gone?

JD: The £200k was allocated to the voluntary sector for 2011-2012 as part of the transitional funding from Connexions service.

z) JM: we welcome the £300k new funding – how does this link with other grants programmes?

JD: This is a new pot of money for which the precise details are still being developed.

MM; What is the position regarding S75 funding and Children and Families Delivery Unit (p45)?

JD: The Cabinet report can be made clearer here.

aa) MM: Numbers of vacant and deleted posts in services for children with disabilities?

SS: This could be made clearer in the papers.

JD No cuts are proposed to voluntary sector in Youth services.

bb) MM: Reduction of £10k in adaptations?

JD: this is a small saving for year 2 (not year 1) in a much larger budget that we think will have least impact. Discussions are on-going via the Partnership Forum

TP: New technology will bring down slightly the cost of adaptation; an explanation can be provided.

GH: Most adaptations are from S75 funding; I will check this.

cc) AP: Savings in school Improvement and Inclusion?

SS: Schools will be able to buy local authority services back.

dd) JM: What changes will there be to contracting arrangements for Services for Disabled Children (p57)? The £120k proposed savings does not seem to be in line with the needs assessment. Why is the Voluntary Sector singled out for savings here or is there a proportionate reduction in in-house provision? Proposed savings could have a huge impact on staff levels and organisations' ability to survive. This would disproportionately affect parent carers and disabled children.

SS: the move to 2-year commissioning will help contribute to job security including in the voluntary sector, as well as cost reduction.

TP: Identified savings amount to only a small percentage of the total budget. Efficiencies will result from multiyear commissioning and joint commissioning with adult provision. New ways of commissioning will lead to improved services.

ee) JM: even relatively small cuts can impact disproportionately; not least because without core funding CV sector organisations cannot attract additional funding. The needs assessment has identified priorities and it should be followed. The service should be looked at as a whole, not just the voluntary sector.

JM: Where will the £192k savings on the early intervention fund be made (p49)? Also the £107k cut to CAMHs and TAMHs at a time of a 40% rise in referrals, including children, and the highest suicide rate for under-25s, in the UK

SS; At a national level, CAMHs was an initial pilot that was always due to end in March 2012. We have managed to find the money to support the continuation of the service albeit at a reduced level.

JD: Commissioning for Disability Services is actively being linked in with the needs assessments and the next stage is to look at targets. This could be made clearer in the Cabinet papers.

ff) JM: But the cuts appear to be prescribed to fall entirely on the voluntary sector, where they will have disproportionately greater impact.

JD: The savings are not new and have already been achieved via the EIG review. We can look at how the information is laid out in the table of savings description, impact and risk. (p49)

SS: a small funding reduction will be manageable, providing longer-term commissioning and security is achieved.

gg) MM: How many vacant and deleted posts are proposed in ASC and Childrens' Services?

TP: Across 'People' there are approximately 90 vacant posts and 45 unfilled vacancies. These are subject to consultation and detailed figures will be provided. HR can provide the corporate picture.

hh) OS: How can savings be achieved on asylum seekers without service impact (p56)?

TP: There are fewer asylum seekers and we are working more closely with West Sussex colleagues regarding people arriving at Gatwick airport but then presenting at Brighton.

12.19 Cabinet Members provided a summing up:

12.20 Councillor Shanks said the EIAs did not fully identify all equality issues but could focus on the main matters. She emphasised that it was a challenge to balance targeted work with individuals, with generic services. However she was satisfied with the proposals put forward, including looked after children and play services.

12.21 Councillor Jarrett said even though under difficult financial circumstances, the proposals fulfilled the manifesto commitment, protecting the most vulnerable and carers, and recognising the increasing value of community work. Equalities considerations had been applied across services so that wherever possible there was no disproportionate effect on any particular group. Savings would be applied without impacting on services, though the location or means of delivery might change or the profit line of contractors may be affected.

12.22 Councillor Ken Norman the Panel Chair thanked everyone for attending the meeting and answering questions.

### **13. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

13.1 Members noted that the next Panel meeting will be on 6th January at 2pm in HTH CR1

The meeting concluded at 4.30pm

**Appendix 5 – Finance and Central Services, Transport and Public Realm  
& Housing**

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**

**SCRUTINY PANEL ON THE BUDGET PROPOSALS**

**2.00pm 6 JANUARY 2012**

**COMMITTEE ROOM 1, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillor K Norman (Chair) Councillor Mears, Mitchell, Pissaridou, Summers and Sykes. CVSF Co-optee Joanna Martindale

**Also in attendance:** Councillors J Kitcat, Davey, and Wakefield

**PART ONE**

**14. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

14.1 There were no declarations of substitutes, declarations of interest or declarations of party whip.

**14.2 RESOLVED;** that the press and public be not excluded from the meeting.

**15. DRAFT MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS HELD ON 2  
DECEMBER, 5 DECEMBER AND 9 DECEMBER**

15.1 Subject the addition below at 15.2, the minutes of the three previous meetings were agreed and signed by the Chair.

15.2 It was noted that at the 9 December 2011 Panel meeting the reply to the question on youth contracts 'How long will rollover last?' was 'December 2012.' (Minute 12.18(s) refers)

**16. CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS**

16.1 The Chair Councillor Ken Norman welcomed everyone to the meeting.

**17. WITNESSES**

17.1 Cabinet Members Councillors Jason Kitcat (JK), Ian Davey (ID) and Liz Wakefield (LW) introduced the budget proposals for their portfolios and answered Panel questions together with officers Geoff Raw (GR) Valerie Pearce (VP) Charlie Stewart (CSt) Mark Prior (MP) Gillian Marston (GMa) Jugal Sharma (JS) Nick Hibberd (NH) Sue Chapman (SC) and Catherine Vaughan (CV).



17.2 **Councillor Jason Kitcat** (JK) noted that the cost to the Council of Resources and Finance amounted to some £24million which was comparatively low, representing approximately 5% of gross spend.

17.3 MM: Why 'on-going' development in HR systems (p76)? Improving Council Tax collection rates (p79)? How many posts affected by reducing the costs of the Benefits Service? Withdraw ceremony room facility in HTH? Can £160,000 savings in fact be made on procurement? Reduced ICT Support for Members (p81)? Reduced legal support (p82)?

JK: The HR payroll system was more difficult to implement than expected and there was a backlog of data input. This budget is being resolved. Our benchmarking is good for HR Practitioners. Council Tax collection rates have improved and are expected to continue to improve, but more discounts are being applied for.

VP: Nine Benefits Service posts are likely to be affected and consultation is on-going. This has been planned for and reduction will be through natural staff turnover.

JK: Yes, the procurement savings can be delivered. It is feasible to scale back the current 24/7 ICT support for Councillors. Appropriate legal advice will still be available for decision-making where necessary. There is a separate risk allocation for (legal and democratic) localism issues. There is lower than expected take-up on weddings in Hove Town Hall.

17.4 GM: What potential is there for additional income from life events? Is there any scope to raise fees and charges because they are already generally considered fairly high? How secure are savings re fees from woodland burial site? Is registration service reorganisation linked with the Keep? Will savings from lawyers absent from meetings just be offset by an extra expense of bringing Downland Management in-house?

JK: Life event fees are considered comparatively low, with the exception of a few times of high customer demand eg high summer. A few additional services are being considered and proposals are being draw up. A possible move to the Keep might be considered for the future.

VP: For example, off-peak rehearsal room could be offered for a fee. There are ways to generate more income from wedding ceremonies in Brighton & Hove.

JK: No additional specialist legal services are expected to be needed relating to Downland Management.

17.6 OS: What alternatives have been looked at other than reducing costs in line with Benefits Service grant reduction – eg subsidy or savings from elsewhere? How can business rates collection savings be predicted? Could there be more savings from HR payroll system? Are Records Storage savings realistic? (p89) How would printing quotas work?

JK: We are introducing 'smarter' working but we can't find the proposed 10% reduction in government grant. Improved NNDR collection rates will be similar to improved Council Tax collection rates. A trial to limit printing is to be done. We are paying for the HR system through extra savings to be generated.

17.7 CSt: Additional resources were put to combining 8 payrolls into the new HR system 2 years ago and this has been a success. Savings were made then, with a reduction of 12 posts but 6 remaining post reductions are still outstanding. The data is scheduled to be input so that the planned savings will now be seen for 2013/2014. HR comprises 126 staff. That includes internal pay and pensions, health and safety and organisational development. It's not easy to compare with other authorities.

Record storage, including electronically, is costly. Conversion from manual to electronic records cuts costs New technology can use the computer servers better.

17.8 JM: HR savings for 2013/2014 seem to be small compared with the HR budget and none are planned for this year. CVSF would like to know if more can be done to protect frontline services especially as there is a recruitment freeze. Also, will charities be affected by changes to business rates or will rates relief be maintained?

JK: £230,000 savings in 2013/2014 is not insignificant and income from job adverts can't be assumed to be maintained. 'Back office' costs are low and services are already working 'lean' with small budgets.

JM; I disagree. We think there should be more emphasis on protecting frontline services.

JK: We can get more efficiency. HR TBM has improved considerably during the year. There needs to be a balance between HR and the burden on operational managers.

CV: changes to business rates are planned, government controls the level of business rates and there is an incentive on how much is collected. There is an element of local discretion; this is unlikely to change.

17.9 OS: eliminate SLB consultancy budget? (p91)  
JK; this is only a small amount.

17.10 AP: Closure of operational buildings?

JK: We will try to let buildings where possible. Where buildings are not fit for purpose they may need to be demolished. There is no 'list' of buildings other than the Workstyles rationalisation of offices.

17.11 MM: Savings on Mayors' office?

JK: Small efficiency savings, catering etc that will not impact on the Mayor.

17.12 JM: Support for Partnerships (p83)?

JK: Discussions with Partners on rationalising are on-going.

17.13 Chair KN: which buildings may be demolished?

JK: I would take advice on each case eg redevelopment proposals for Woodingdean Library, Portslade Civic Offices.

17.14 MM: I am concerned about uncertainty over support for strategic partnership, especially in light of the EIA (p219)

17.15 **Councillor Ian Davey** (ID) outlined his portfolio covering transport, accessibility and improving public health through reducing congesting and pollution. Transport and the Public realm were often raised by Partners and he was working to reduce the impact of the budget proposals though still delivering savings. He aimed to protect the well-regarded transport planning and policy work in the City, saying there were better ways to fund traffic data and modelling.

17.16 Significant capital funding had allowed small revenue savings in road safety and accident investigation, the Sussex Safer Roads partnership contribution had been renegotiated in a move towards self-funding. Cllr Davey referred to Brighton Station Gateway and valley Garden proposals funded through LTP capital, and consultation on revisions to parking fees and charges. The Council subsidy to unviable bus services was also planned for reduction.

With Churchill Square and the Federation of Disabled People, different ways were being looked at to support the Shopmobility Service, that was originally fitted out with LTP capital.

The City has 605km of roads and 1,205km of pavements. Average annual capital and revenue spend has been about £7m in recent years and the proposed reduction in preventative maintenance was only a part of the overall spend on highway repairs.

17.17 GM: Having already made a large investment, will savings on transport modelling work restrict the council's ability to use the model effectively now? (p67) Savings on Shopmobility scheme are regrettable– can there be a re-think? Accident Investigation? Highways Maintenance preventative work? Street Lights? School bus routes/ children left standing at bus stops. SE7?

ID: Extra LTP capital funding has been used for data collection.

MP: The transport model is now complete. There is other funding to support it including from developers/ other contributors, in line with the business plan. The proposed savings are a relatively small reduction.

From 2003, Shopmobility was set up within the LTP as 'pump priming' with the intention to move to self-financing. Work is in progress with the Federation

of Disabled People and shopping centre freeholder to help identify extra funding to keep the Shopmobility scheme in operation.

Additional funding for accident investigation is being identified through joint working with the Sussex Safer Roads Partnership, which includes neighbour local authorities and Sussex Police.

The SE7 is a group of 7 local authorities in the Southeast that deals with various workstreams including Highways Maintenance efficiency, to share best practice and reduce costs. The L.A.'s on the group are East Sussex, West Sussex, Hampshire, Surrey, Kent, Medway and Brighton & Hove.

Officers will provide a reply on some operational issues with school bus routes.

A long-term programme is needed for street lighting. BHCC is looking at different forms of funding to deal with outdated lamps and unusual cabling arrangements.

GMA: There are 21,000 street lighting columns in the city and there have been improvements, but much of the stock is not in good condition. Capital investment eg via the carbon programme is needed.

17.18 Chair KN: I would be very concerned about withdrawing funding from Shopmobility that would affect accessibility to the City for many people.

GR: Different options are being looked at to help support Shopmobility, such as alternative premises and sources of funding. On street lighting, there is a backlog of different issues to be addressed.

17.19 MM; I am concerned at potential cuts to the transport model and to highway maintenance when we have received government funding to repair potholes, and when buses are getting bigger and heavier. Also subsidised bus routes and fees and charges for parking and permits. Lighting along Seafront and Marina.

GMA: A reduction is proposed in the £1.1m planned maintenance/re-surfacing programme. The urgent/safety maintenance programme that includes potholes and responsive repairs, amounting to some £1.6m is not proposed to change. There are other ongoing budget lines that also fund highways maintenance.

17.20 GM: Reducing planned maintenance will probably increase urgent work; is the Highways Asset Management Plan being updated? Will there be gains from the Utility companies?

MP: Yes we are looking at long-term investment through the HAMP. Works do reduce the life of a road and we can secure funding from utilities under the Traffic Management Act for specific instances. The Council's Traffic Manager

also coordinates our road works with their Streetworks to minimise disruption and damage.

17.21 OS: Coastal protection and the emerging Seafront Strategy? (p67)  
Faded road lining and signing?

MP; Savings on Coastal protection is coming from budgets intended for painting of the railings. The Seafront Strategy, though not the scheme itself, is funded via Environment Agency grant.

17.22 GM; No lining or planned maintenance of signage outside parking zones?

MM: No double-yellow lines?

GMA; Faded lining and signing will still be renewed where there is a serious safety issue, but not for other, more general requests

17.23 AP: Implications of savings in Road Safety Education (p67)?

MP: Speed awareness and speed courses will continue via the SSRP. We will work better with schools.

17.24 AP: So where will the savings be made? And what will be the effect on schools?

ID: The Council did not pay directly towards the SSRP until central government funding was stopped in 2010. Since then interim funding was agreed between the partner authorities. The SSRP is moving towards a self-sustaining business model in partnership with ESCC, WSCC and the Police. We are committed to better working with schools to encourage safe travel to school.

17.25 JM: Public and community transport is very important to outlying areas, especially for low income families. Is also used by lots of community groups. We welcome the consultation on subsidised bus routes and we would urge a thorough consideration of the EIA. There would be great benefits from a better joined-up approach and we would welcome greater economies of scale.

17.26 MM; working with CYPT on road safety education is unclear.

GR: Teachers, CYPT and transport professionals can deliver more and achieve efficiency savings by reducing duplication.

17.27 AP: So the savings are related to road safety education staff?

GR: A relatively small proportion of Road Safety education revenue funding will stop and be substituted just for this year, by capital spending from the LTP.

17.28 Councillor Liz Wakefield outlined her priorities; delivering well regulated affordable and energy efficient home, well managed Council homes, and targeting supported housing services to people in need. She said Housing was identified by the Director of Public Health as a 'vulnerability' in terms of resilience and a 'priority' in terms of infrastructure. There were significant challenges at a time of rising numbers of homeless people, increasing rough sleeping, rising fuel prices and increasing fuel poverty. She said the longer consultation and 2-year planning timescale gave more time to allow for the best budget for the city. The aim was to protect the most vulnerable and protect frontline services wherever possible

The Housing Revenue Account was a ring-fenced account that must be in balance. The proposals were to increase efficiency of Housing and Social Inclusion, by reducing maintenance unit costs., so that more resources go to frontline tenant services. Resources from the LDV, Brighton & Hove Seaside and Community Homes, would continue to be committed to ensuring all Council tenants can enjoy a decent home. Engagement with council housing tenants would be improved through tenant scrutiny. Multi-agency services were being introduced at the Whitehawk Hub, though there had been some teething problems with access. Financial inclusion was being promoted during a time of economic difficulty.

17.29 MM; the proposals, especially homelessness and supporting people, seem to adversely affect the more vulnerable and this is reflected in the EIA. Concerned about cuts staff reductions in hostel provision. If preventative work isn't done then funding could be withdrawn by CLG and costs will rebound on Adult Social Care.

JS: The Supporting People programme has been protected with an adjustment to bring forward some savings from year 4 to year 3. We are working with the support provider concerned; a risk analysis has been done. There was additional allocation of £1.3m for the anticipated rise in homelessness. There has been a reduction in staff but front line services have been protected.

The hostels budget is a challenge. Most of the savings can be found from non-frontline services eg lower salaries, efficiencies in maintenance.

LW: It is regrettable that cuts have to be made but it is being done in a way which is least harmful to the most vulnerable groups.

JS: There was an in-year reduction in grant. A waiting list built up and in December a decision was made to use New Homes Bonus funding for the capital programme so no-one was worse off and this is being processed. This is expected to dovetail with the Green Deal in about 18 months.

Chair KN: Savings on Supporting People will impact on social care services.

17.30 AP: How many job losses will there be? With cuts to housing benefit how can we provide the extra help that will be needed?

LW: There will be staff changes but no direct job losses. I am concerned at the rise in homelessness and we are looking at how to improve the way we deal with it in Brighton & Hove.

17.31 MM: So how are hostel staffing levels affected?

JS: We currently have 4 posts in the Private Sector team that are being deleted and the four staff have accepted new posts. Savings in Hostel staffing of some £46,000 apply to the whole staff budget, with reduced hours and lower pay scales so there are no redundancies or reductions in numbers of posts.

17.32 MM: It seems shortsighted to take posts from the private sector. The proposals mean there will be reduced Hostel services and this will impact on the vulnerable.

17.33 GM: How can the Supporting People budget be cut by £1m over 2 years 'with minimal risk'?

JS: This budget was known to be reducing by 4% per year or £550k per year over four years and the first 2 years have been implemented. The providers are reasonably confident that the business plan can continue during 2012/13 and 2013/14. It is a challenge to bring forward savings year on year but placements are being identified. This may take 18 months to resolve in two or three individual cases.

17.34 GM: Are there any funding streams to replace the housing-related part of the budget?

JS: A new regime is being looked at with providers for 2 years from now, so there is time to deal with this.

17.35 MM: Organisations are under pressure and can't manage if a year of funding is taken away.

LW: Our Supporting People programme is stronger than in many other local authorities.

17.36 MM: Mears Partnership repairs contract negotiations 'under way' (p63)?

NH: We are moving to open book accounting and achieving this level of savings via reducing overheads and reducing the unit costs of repair and turnaround of empty properties.

17.37 MM: Are the TUPE savings just adjustments after an underestimate?

NH: The final TUPE costs were less than we estimated which has meant that we have been able to fully pay the costs within two rather than three years.

SC: The estimate had been higher than actual as some staff had not transferred.

17.38 OS: A saving of £259k on £8m is not much. Is there scope for incentivising payment so that any future savings are shared with the contractor?

NH: Yes, this approach is built into the open book accounting model.

17.38 GM: Where is the LDV funding reported in the budget papers?  
MM: We should see the budget detail for the separate HRA account.

GR: This can be clarified for scrutiny.

17.39 JM: We are seeing more demand for advice services; so where is the housing element of investment on advice?

GR: Housing officers give advice and work closely with the voluntary sector on this. Also Brighton Housing Trust

17.40 JM: A lot more people need advice on debt, unemployment, changes to benefits that have a direct impact on housing. Where is the housing input on advice, with cross-cutting commissioning?

17.41 NH: We are working closely with the Advice Services Partnership.

GR A more detailed reply can be provided

## **18. RESPONSES VIA CONSULTATION PORTAL**

18.1 Panel members noted the consultation responses and asked for information on the cost of consultation. Any further queries would be sent to the Scrutiny officers.

## **19. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

19.1 Members confirmed that they wished to receive written replies as noted during the Scrutiny review, and were reassured that answers would be provided.

19.2 The Chairman thanked everyone for attending the meeting. The next meeting would be at 2pm on Monday 9 January 2012.

The meeting concluded at 4.30pm



**Appendix 6 – Culture, Recreation and Tourism & Communities,  
Equalities and Public Protection**

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**

**SCRUTINY PANEL ON THE BUDGET PROPOSALS**

**2.00pm 9 JANUARY 2012**

**COMMITTEE ROOM 1, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillor K Norman (Chair), Mears, Mitchell, K Norman, Pissaridou, Summers and Sykes. CVSF Co-optee Joanna Martindale

**Other Members present:** Councillors Ben Duncan Geoffrey Bowden

**PART ONE**

**20. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

20.1 There were no declarations of interest or declarations of party whip.

**20.2 RESOLVED:** that the press and public be not excluded from the meeting.

**21. CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS**

21.1 Councillor Ken Norman, Chair of the Budget Scrutiny Panel, welcomed everyone and reminded the meeting of the aims of the Panel:

**22. WITNESSES**

22.1 The Chair Councillor Ken Norman invited Cabinet Members Councillors Geoffrey Bowden (GB) and Ben Duncan (BD) to introduce the budget proposals for their portfolios. Cabinet Members answered Panel questions together with officers Strategic Director David Murray (DM) and Finance Manager Anne Silley (AS).

22.2 **Councillor Geoffrey Bowden** (GB) said local authorities were in an unprecedented situation, having to do more with less, continuing to provide services for those in most need and minimising job losses. The proposals were to maintain the cultural offer that was critical to the wellbeing of the City's residents and tourists. Some local authorities were closing libraries; in Brighton & Hove no libraries were planned for closure this year.

22.3 **Councillor Ben Duncan** (BD) said key principles included protecting the vulnerable, enhancing environmental sustainability and listening to people's

views. Proper scrutiny was helpful and constructive ideas were especially welcome he said. Though these budget lines were generally relatively small, the scope and reach of the effects was large and the impact high.

22.4 Cabinet Members answered questions accompanied by officers Strategic Director David Murray (DM) and Finance Manager Anne Silley (AS).

22.5 GM: Sports Development Fund – what options have been considered? (p97). Seafront Properties – is there good evidence for this anticipated income in the timeframe? (p98). Restructure Library service; what is the intention re opening hours? Would the hours all be the same? Staff costs could reduce but what about overheads? Is this sustainable? How do DAAT team reductions fit with Intelligent Commissioning pilot work? (p100)

GB: We can keep all 14 libraries open by making some costs savings in equalising branch library opening hours. There will be a new library in Woodingdean. Libraries are used 'outside hours' for other purposes as well. Yes we are confident in getting good incomes from The Wheel and from marketing the Peter Pan site. These will act as extra attractions for this part of the City. Sport England funding is also possible.

22.6 MM: Disappointed in reduction in sports development and mobile library. Shorter library opening hours will affect communities including learning/use of IT. How many vacant or non-vacant posts will be lost?

GB: These are difficult choices. We would like to hear constructive suggestions. The mobile library is near the end of life and costs £77k per year. A replacement would cost £120k. 865 people use it; 70% of whom already use static libraries and only 3 are housebound, who are served by our delivery service. All the remaining users are within 1 ½ miles of a static library. We are looking to develop libraries into access points/community hubs. There is a range of other providers of IT training, including the Third Sector.

Healthy lifestyles are important and we are planning that Take Part Festival of Sport will continue. We are looking at opportunities for other funding streams. I can't say how many posts are at risk; we will be going to consultation with the public and with staff.

DM: There has been much good work within the Sports Development Fund but that model will not be fit for purpose in 3 years' time. We are looking at realigning sports and coaching development, looking at other funding potential.

We are looking at all our buildings and expect libraries to continue to play a key role.

Where income estimates have been quoted in the proposals, these are not just rough figures but they are tested eg against national benchmarks. We have tried to avoid overestimates.

22.7 MM: concerned about reducing library hours and removing visitor information centre from Royal Pavilion (p102)

GB: We would like to extend library hours, but we have to use the budget effectively We have looked at the data including useage rates and plan to contact councillors in affected wards early in the process.

22.8 OS: When will the mobile library be lost?

GB: Woodingdean is having use of the mobile library in 2012/13 to provide temporary provision.

22.9 AP: Removal of Visitor Centre and use of 'satellite' premises? (p102)  
Reduced maintenance of King Alfred Leisure Centre?

GB: Subject to consultation, bring Royal Pavilion café to ground level for better access and to enhance shop business, freeing upstairs space for exhibits. Some partners eg hotels will welcome satellite visitor centres.

A capital sum has been set aside for the wet area of the pool that should reduce maintenance needs.

22.9 OS: How likely is a VAT cultural exemption for Royal Pavilion?

DM: We are optimistic and this should be resolved by end of financial year.

22.10 Chair KN: Will the satellite centres be staffed?

DM: We plan to continue providing visitor information and looking at different methods (such as on the Pier, visitor guides etc) and how best to meet the demand.

The new Seafront Strategy confirms the key importance of the seafront.

GB: New technology is another important way to bring information and services to residents and visitors

22.11 GM: Not convinced about removing VIC from Pavilion eg it is an important focal point for visitor arrivals. What about a kiosk, space in a local store or other fixed focus.

Is there a solution for retaining mobile library which has a substantial number of users. It lends itself eg to a co-operative provider?

DM: Visitor information centre proposals are for 2013-2014 and aimed at improving an already good service.

GB: We are open to ideas. High capital costs of mobile library but would like to explore options eg third sector.

22.12 JM: Concerned about poor adult education for the future in statutory and voluntary sectors. We need to look together at resourcing of training provision, especially in the Community and Voluntary Sector. CVS already provides services in library buildings. We should be looking at a wide range of potential services and the possibility of matched funding. The Communities and Equalities team are key players.

GB: We would like to discuss this.

DM: Volunteering opportunities are being developed too.

### **Communities and Community Safety**

22.13 AP: Equalities savings of £200K (p97) is not clear

GM: In view of the scale of the drug problem, how has the outcome from the IC pilot influenced the DAAT savings proposals (p100)? Are there more community safety synergies with YOT and other services?

BD: The approach taken is 'how to preserve and build on a service that is working well' rather than 'how much can we squeeze any service into a budget?' The Community Safety team programmes eg Family Intervention Project, Communities Against Drugs and DAAT provide measurable outcomes. Reduced funding of Sussex Police will have a large impact in the next few years and responsibility for delivery and funding of some community safety work is moving to local authorities.

There is scope for restructuring and working eg with YOT. Also via Public Health funding, Louise Casey, European and other funds. The majority of FIP funds is spent on just a few families.

There have been, and continue to be, significant changes to these service areas since these proposals were first drafted; eg the papers do not include any external funding.

DM: eg there will also be new opportunities via the Police and Crime Commissioner

22.14 MM: Equalities savings of £200K (p97) is not clear. The EIA refers to the end of the pilot. Has the £200K Communities budget line been spent? How does this link with CYP budget, and what has been achieved?

GM: It is the transfer of this budget that needs clarification.

BD: A written reply will be given.

22.15 OS: The second and third bullet point on p94 re 'reduction in specific grant funding' and 'tackling inequality and neighbourhoods?' Also as Community Safety savings are relatively small on a large budget (p100) - is greater investment needed for 'at risk' families? How can we fill the gaps?

BD: We can mitigate some of the impact of austerity/changes to housing benefits but it is not realistic to increase every budget as we would like. We are looking at how to get the most out of commissioning eg working with PCST and Neighbourhood Policing Team and refocusing community development work.

Our grants programmes are key to supporting many organisations and there are examples of an average 11x social return on investment. We are working closely eg with BHT and through the Advice Partnership re homelessness.

22.16 JM: It is helpful that the effect on resilience of CVS organisations is being acknowledged (p93). Our services often impact on equalities, one of the Council's corporate priorities. What thought has been given to increasing spend in the Third Sector? That does not seem to be reflected in the budget papers. I'm concerned about the effect of reductions in Annual Grants budget and City Communities Fund amounting together to £85k (p101) which seems to take away about a quarter of grants that are available to the very smallest organisations and will have a considerable impact. The priorities for this expenditure need to be more clearly justified.

I think the small savings from staff ( p97) would have a greater impact if spent externally.

This is a continuing theme – does CVS face disproportionate cuts? I'm grateful for the work now being done to draw out the figures for us, because until now expenditure and return on investment have not been recorded in that way. We think there should be continuous monitoring to show the real financial and social value of the Sector. We have evidence to demonstrate the impact and in an earlier session it was interesting to hear that Economic Development do not. We have a large reach on a small spend.

BD: We are carrying out SROI studies to measure outputs and I'm not convinced that Communities and Equalities are being disproportionately cut; these services do need to be protected. We are taking a realistic approach reducing expenditure and taking the impacts into account. There is still a range of grants available amounting to around £1.5m annually but they are not immune from savings although we are restricting the reductions as much as we can. The 2-year budget process still allows for flexibility. For example Community Development commissioning cannot be fixed too far in advance.

The Access Manager post is already vacant and by working differently we've been able to ensure that those services are unaffected. It is difficult to disagree with that approach.

DM: There is still some way to go in working with the CFVS; the Council has to be clear about what it is buying and that commissioned or procured services are as effective as possible. This requires more joining up. We also need to be clear what lies behind various costs. For example, one Authority

(Lambeth), passports significant funding to CFVS to run its services – but that includes services like libraries so figures are always worth delving into.

22.17 JM: Core investment by the Council to the sector allows additional funding to be leveraged in. Various funding opportunities are being lost in this way for training provision for instance. A community organisation, once lost, is unlikely to revive. There should be strategic agreement on the priorities that need support and sustaining.

DM: We recognise the worth of the sector and that's why we continue to be keen to work with agencies like CVSF. We also recognise that the sector itself needs to change because many agree that, for example, consortia ways of working - that streamline how the Council and other partners work with a sector that is currently vibrant and diverse, but complex and fragmented - needs to happen.

22.18 MM: The whole picture needs clarity because the voluntary sector has to make plans.

BD: Cabinet will be considering the grants programmes

22.19 AP: Reducing allocation to FIP would have a disproportionate effect on women as seen in the EIA (p224)

BD: This is a good example of our approach to an area that is an absolute priority; working with families with the greatest problems and leading to the greatest expense; making proposals, assessing the impact and looking at alternative funding or provision. This work is not being reduced but done differently by closer integration with Partners. These budget line proposals give bald figures and it is a rapidly changing picture since the papers were drafted. We're adopting strategic ways to reduce domestic violence at little cost and showing measurable outcomes

22.20 AP: So what has changed?

BD: The figures are presented by budget streams and not individual projects. We are actively looking for external matched funding for work with at risk families. Some of the EIAs will be developed further. Also, some responsibilities will change from November with the advent of the Police and Crime Commissioner.

22.21 MM: But none of these needs are new, so what is the timescale?

DM: Services for some vulnerable families are very costly. Government funding is being discussed at SLB later today. We want to take a fresh look at the families concerned at the same time building on what we already have. We have to be sure of the outcomes needed locally for the City, not only the outcome needed nationally

22.22 JM: What is the effect of the new public health budget? How will it be used? Will scrutiny get information?

BD: The public health budget is not yet known. 2012-2013 will be a 'shadow' allocation and the funding will be ring-fenced. The information will be provided if it's available before this scrutiny panel ends.

22.23 GM: Members will need to be sure exactly what is being proposed.

22.24 Chair Councillor Ken Norman thanked everyone for attending and answering questions, especially members of the public present.

### **23. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

23.1 Members noted that the next meeting on 20 January would be a non-public meeting to consider draft Panel recommendations.

23.2 Additional Papers had been circulated to Members as follows:

Letter re; Music Service  
Letter re: Community Transport and  
CVSF Position Statement.

The meeting concluded at 4.15pm

## **Appendix 7 – CVSF Position Statement on the BHCC Draft Budget 2012/13(14) 11 January 2012**

### **1. Aims of CVSF in BHCC draft budget scrutiny**

CVSF<sup>i</sup> seeks to exert as much influence as possible during the budget scrutiny process to ensure that priority services, delivered by the community and voluntary are protected. We will:

- Maintain clear & transparent communication with all political parties on Brighton & Hove City Council and retain political neutrality
- Aim to protect the sector from disproportionate cuts
- Aim to protect the grants programmes from disproportionate cuts
- Collect & present supporting evidence

### **2. Overview of members' views**

Whilst we are grateful for the ongoing commitment to maintain the grants programmes in 2012/13, our membership believes that small volunteer run services need greater support than ever from the City Council. The loss of national funding in adult learning means that the training provider that many volunteer run organisations relied upon is closing, in addition thresholds for other grant streams are rising. This part of the sector delivers thousands of volunteer hours which benefit the city's economy and quality of life. We urge the City Council to commit to protecting the grants programmes for 2013/14 and, in addition to help find a way to ensure that the training required for volunteers is available on a no-cost basis.

Our membership do not see clear evidence of a desire to invest more in preventative community led services in this budget, we believe that it does not go far enough to shift the emphasis from high cost crisis service provision. We believe that this is only achievable through a partnership approach with the sector and investment should reflect this. In young people, prevention of homelessness and Supporting People in particular the preventative community-led services provided by our members are impacted by this budget. We believe that by working to reduce Council overheads these services provided by non-profit providers could be protected. These voluntary sector cuts impact not only on service provision itself but on the ability of these providers to lever in vital resources to the city.



### 3. Key recommendations of Brighton & Hove's community and voluntary sector:

1. The open manner in which the budget proposals have been brought forward is to be welcomed and built-upon in future years. The sector would welcome early dialogue on how this will happen with the proposed return to a committee system.
2. The impact and outcomes from all council spending (both internal and external) should be measured and clearly understood. More work is needed to make this a reality. We believe that this is an essential component to decision making on resource allocation and that this evidence should be open and transparent.
3. Budget reductions should be made in relation to priorities, impact and value for money. In-house services should not be protected at the expense of those provided externally merely because they are council-run.<sup>ii</sup> A cost-benefit analysis would be useful evidence in understanding these decisions.
4. Funding provided to the third sector should be monitored to ensure it is not disproportionately cut.<sup>iii</sup> The rationale for plans to reduce the grants programme in 2013/14 is not clear especially in view of corporate priorities.
5. 'Salami-slicing' still seems apparent within the budget. The sector does not believe the Star Chamber approach which was undertaken moves the BHCC forward from this process and favours parts of the organisation which have the resource to make a strong case rather than allocating according to need and corporate priorities. Given the scale of the cuts required to 2015/16 this is no longer a viable approach and work needs to speed up a cross council/partner approach.
6. In order to protect services the council will need to work more closely than ever with partner organisations. It is concerning that the council and partners are looking to reduce funding to partnership working.<sup>iv</sup>
7. We believe that reducing resources to the Learning Disabilities partnership, especially in supporting users and providers to participate in consultations is unfair when a major service redesign exercise is planned for 2012/13.

8. Work should be done to understand the impact on job losses in the community and voluntary sector throughout the budget reduction process. National research<sup>1</sup> suggests that the sector is losing 9% of posts, which is further and faster than reductions in the public sector. Our membership believes that this information, together with information on volunteer hours should be gathered locally as part of understanding the impact of decision making on our sector.
  
  9. The Equalities Impact Assessment once completed, should highlight any cumulative impacts on groups and, should identify older people and poverty as themes.
- 

<sup>1</sup> CVSF (Community & Voluntary Sector Forum) is the umbrella body for the city's community and voluntary sector. We have over 500 groups within our membership. [www.cvsectorforum.org.uk](http://www.cvsectorforum.org.uk) Twitter @cvsfbrighton Email [emma@cvsectorforum.org.uk](mailto:emma@cvsectorforum.org.uk) or telephone 01273 810230

<sup>1</sup> In particular the sector would point to the budget lines Children's Services on p 57 where £120,000 will be removed from the voluntary sector providers of services to children with disabilities. No clear rationale for this decision was provided during the scrutiny process. In addition the cuts planned for Supporting People and preventing Homelessness are concerns for the sector. A lot of this provision is carried out by the community and voluntary sector.

<sup>1</sup> The funding provided to the sector whether via grants or through service contracts should be properly flagged when entered onto the payments system.

<sup>1</sup> In particular the sector expresses concern about the proposed cut of £25,000 to the Policy Team of LSP/PSB support on p83

<sup>1</sup> NCVO Labour Force Survey <http://www.ncvo-vol.org.uk/news/people-hr-employment/charity-workforce-shrinks-nearly-9>

## Appendix 8 – Responses to outstanding queries from the Budget Scrutiny Panel

Meeting Date and Minute Item	Extract from Minutes (Responses required in bold)	Response
2 December 4.5 e)	<p>MM: number of vacant posts?            CV: this is not easy to assess, as it is complicated by the ongoing voluntary severance scheme – in some instances it has been decided to retain a post made vacant by voluntary redundancy, and to make savings by deleting the former post of successful applicants to the vacant post. Until this process has been completed it will therefore not be possible to give a firm figure for vacancies. <b>However we will do some analysis to help scrutiny understand the position.</b></p>	<p>Vacancy information can only be reviewed periodically because although vacancies are identified within the corporate HR system, the action planned in relation to each vacancy is not recorded. Therefore, to gather information for the panel, we have reviewed all vacancies as at December 2011 (excluding Schools) and asked services to identify whether the vacancy will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Filled, if not already filled since December;</li> <li>- Deleted in respect of meeting Management &amp; Administration Value for Money savings requirements; or</li> <li>- Deleted in respect of meeting 2012/13 Budget Savings proposals.</li> </ul> <p>Only those posts that it is intended to fill will be available to the council's Redeployment Pool.</p> <p>In summary, the total number of vacancies at December 2011 was 285.03 FTE (Full Time Equivalent) posts. Of these vacant posts:</p>

Meeting Date and Minute Item	Extract from Minutes (Responses required in bold)	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 63.85 FTE posts have been/will be deleted to meet 2011/12 Management &amp; Administration VFM targets;</li> <li>- 64.27 FTE posts will be deleted in respect of 2012/13 Budget Savings proposals;</li> <li>- 156.91 FTE vacancies are intended to be recruited to. Some will be filled by 'bumped' redundancies in other service areas resulting in savings elsewhere i.e. there will be limited external recruitment.</li> </ul> <p>The vacancies for each service unit are summarised at Appendix A.</p>
4.5 o)	<p>JM: what is planned % spend on voluntary sector?  CV: can get panel an approximation, although it may be very difficult to get an accurate figure as the financial system does not record information in this way, and BHCC may not be able to collate data using CVSF's preferred definition (i.e. orgs with charitable status). However, does not believe that sector has been disproportionately impacted. <b>Will do some analysis to help inform scrutiny.</b></p>	<p>Identifying expenditure on Community &amp; Voluntary Sector organisations is difficult as this information is not formally held in the council's financial systems. However, officers have worked with colleagues from CVSF to attempt to identify relevant organisations using the CVSF's on-line web directory. This data has been matched to our database of payments to all suppliers. The detailed payment information has been passed to CVSF colleagues and indicates that expenditure on CVSF associated organisations in Brighton &amp; Hove was approximately £25.8m in 2009/10 and 25.3m in 2010/11. Payments up to Christmas 2011</p>

Meeting Date and Minute Item	Extract from Minutes (Responses required in bold)	Response
		<p>(£17.3m) indicate that expenditure in 2011/12 will be at broadly the same level. Excluding Schools and Benefit payments, expenditure on CVSF organisations represents approximately 12% of net service expenditure and 6% of gross service expenditure.</p> <p>The level of payments may change between years for various reasons including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- availability of one-off government grant funding each year for specific services or projects;</li> <li>- changes to specific government grants year-on-year (e.g. Supporting People Grant has been reducing year-on-year) as well as grants coming to an end;</li> <li>- decisions on the allocation of government grants and the council's Global Grants Programme funding;</li> <li>- changes in contractual arrangements with CVSF providers (e.g. changes in contractual arrangements for care services);</li> </ul> <p>Taking these factors into account it would appear that investment in Community &amp; Voluntary organisations has remained relatively stable over recent years despite some loss/reduction of grants such as Supporting People. The proposals for 2012/13 and</p>

Meeting Date and Minute Item	Extract from Minutes (Responses required in bold)	Response
		<p>2013/14 indicate that there are savings proposals totalling over £2m of which some part may impact on CVS providers. For example, reductions in Supporting People Grant total £1.3m over the two years but this will affect a mixed economy of providers, including in-house services, and the precise impact on CVS and other providers will be dependent on final commissioning plans and performance assessment. Many other proposals will be subject to consultation and service redesign before the full impact on CVS organisations will be known. A list of the savings proposals where there may be a potential impact, whether service, contractual or financial, is provided. CVSF colleagues will be interested in the Equality Impact Assessments and consultation processes for these proposals.</p> <p>The savings proposals where there may be a potential impact on CVS organisations are identified at Appendix B.</p>
5 December		
8.3 e)	<p>MM: How many posts in Planning and Public Protection are still vacant?  GR: <b>A written answer can be provided.</b></p>	<p>There are 12.49 FTE (Full Time Equivalent) vacant posts in the Planning &amp; Public Protection delivery unit. Of these vacant posts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 8.26 FTE posts will be deleted to meet 2011/12</li> </ul>

Meeting Date and Minute Item	Extract from Minutes (Responses required in bold)	Response
		Management & Administration VFM targets; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1.60 FTE posts will be deleted in respect of 2012/13 Budget Savings proposals;</li> <li>- 2.63 FTE vacancies are intended to be recruited to.</li> </ul>
9 December		
12.18 r)	MM: So Youth Services will continue to be provided in-house and there will be no reduction in funding to the voluntary sector? SS: There is additional funding of £300k to grant aid more groups so there will be increased provision in this area and no reduction in funding. The Youth Services Review indicates area-based work which will bring services together and avoid duplication. Recommendations are being brought to <b>20 January CMM</b> <b>JD: The CMM report will indicate how coordination is to be planned.</b>	Copy 20 Jan CMM report to Panel
12.18 t)	MM: There is a range of different home-to-school subsidies paid, eg SEN and faith schools. TP: <b>Yes this could be made clearer in the papers.</b> There are no hidden subsidies. We are taking a fresh look at bus routes. We are not good at supporting SEN independence and we're looking at how to improve this.	Report wording to be reviewed for 9 <sup>th</sup> February Cabinet.
12.18 z)	JM: we welcome the £300k new funding – how does this	Report wording to be reviewed for 9 <sup>th</sup> February

Meeting Date and Minute Item	Extract from Minutes (Responses required in bold)	Response
	<p>link with other grants programmes?            JD: This is a new pot of money for which the precise details are still being developed.            MM; What is the position regarding S75 funding and Children and Families Delivery Unit (p45)?            JD: <b>The Cabinet report can be made clearer here.</b></p>	Cabinet.
12.18 bb)	<p>MM: Reduction of £10k in adaptations?            JD: this is a small saving for year 2 (not year 1) in a much larger budget that we think will have least impact. Discussions are on-going via the Partnership Forum            TP: New technology will bring down slightly the cost of adaptations; <b>an explanation can be provided.</b></p>	Ongoing advances in the manufacture and design of adaptations continue to improve not only their effectiveness as products but mean they can also be procured at lower prices from the manufacturers.
12.18 dd) & ee)	<p>JM: What changes will there be to contracting arrangements for Services for Disabled Children (p57)?            The £120k proposed savings does not seem to be in line with the needs assessment. Why is the Voluntary Sector singled out for savings here or is there a proportionate reduction in in-house provision? Proposed savings could have a huge impact on staff levels and organisations' ability to survive. This would disproportionately affect parent carers and disabled children.            SS: the move to 2-year commissioning will help contribute to job security including in the voluntary sector, as well as cost reduction.            TP: Identified savings amount to only a small percentage of the total budget. Efficiencies will result from multiyear</p>	Report wording will be reviewed for 9 <sup>th</sup> February Cabinet.



Meeting Date and Minute Item	Extract from Minutes (Responses required in bold)	Response
	<p>commissioning and joint commissioning with adult provision. New ways of commissioning will lead to improved services.</p> <p>JD: Commissioning for Disability Services is actively being linked in with the needs assessments and the next stage is to look at targets. <b>This could be made clearer in the Cabinet papers.</b></p>	
12.18 ee) & ff)	<p>JM: Where will the £192k savings on the early intervention fund be made (p49)? Also the £107k cut to CAMHs and TAMHs at a time of a 40% rise in referrals, including children, and the highest suicide rate for under-25s, in the UK</p> <p>SS; At a national level, CAMHs was an initial pilot that was always due to end in March 2012. We have managed to find the money to support the continuation of the service albeit at a reduced level.</p> <p>JM: But the cuts appear to be prescribed to fall entirely on the voluntary sector, where they will have disproportionately greater impact.</p> <p>JD: The savings are not new and have already been achieved via the EIG review. <b>We can look at how the information is laid out in the table of savings description, impact and risk. (p49)</b></p>	<p>Brighton &amp; Hove were participants in the Targeted Mental Health in Schools (TAMHS) 3-year national project to build whole school awareness of mental health issues, research effective interventions, and develop the emotional curriculum in schools.</p> <p>The national project and funding was scheduled to end March 2011. We therefore managed the local project to that timescale and in the second half of 2010/11 tapered resources down to one worker providing training and supervision in schools and liaising with the independent evaluators.</p> <p>Unexpectedly TAMHS funding of £157k was included in the Early Intervention Grant allocation for 2011/12. Children's services reviewed EIG funding (approx £10m) to ensure VFM and we were able to sustain the new approach to supporting children in schools, protect existing posts and make a low impact saving (schools aware) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- £50k to support 2 posts: a project co-ordinator</li> </ul>

Meeting Date and Minute Item	Extract from Minutes (Responses required in bold)	Response
		<p>and one additional Primary Mental Health Worker to deliver training, supervision and direct work in schools;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- £107k recurrent saving from 2012/13.</li> </ul>
12.18 gg)	<p>MM: How many vacant and deleted posts are proposed in ASC and Children's Services?  TP: Across 'People' there are approximately 90 vacant posts and 45 unfilled vacancies. These are subject to consultation and detailed figures will be provided. <b>HR can provide the corporate picture.</b></p>	<p>Provided within the response to the vacancy information request above.</p>
6 January		
17.17	<p>GM: School bus routes/ children left standing at bus stops.  ID: <b>Officers will provide a reply on some operational issues with school bus routes.</b></p>	<p>This discussion was in relation to recent pressure to increase the number of school buses serving Longhill School from Whitehawk as some pupils were being left behind in the mornings. Up until now, there have been two service 72 buses on this route in the mornings and afternoons. One is provided commercially by B&amp;H Buses and the other is contracted to B&amp;H Buses by the Public Transport Team and paid for by the Home to School Transport Team, Children's Services.</p> <p>From 23 January 2012, Home to School Transport will be paying for a contract with B&amp;H Buses to provide an extra service 72 bus in the mornings to serve Whitehawk to Longhill. This was arranged in the first</p>

Meeting Date and Minute Item	Extract from Minutes (Responses required in bold)	Response
		week of the New Year.
17.38	<p>GM: Where is the LDV funding reported in the budget papers?  MM: We should see the budget detail for the separate HRA account.</p> <p>GR: <b>This can be clarified for scrutiny.</b></p>	<p>With regard to the LDV, the repayment of one off resources to the council's General Fund is included in paragraph 3.31 of the 8 December Cabinet report.</p> <p>In respect of the lease premium income and related expenditure plans, this will be included in the HRA Capital Programme to be reported to Housing Management Consultative Committee on 6 February 2012.</p> <p>There are no additional costs in the General Fund revenue budget arising from the various commitments and guarantees given to the LDV. This is because on the basis of the information currently available at this time it is not considered that any risks will crystallise in the immediate future.</p> <p>Detailed information on the HRA Budget will be provided in the HRA Budget Report to Housing Management Consultative Committee on 6 February 2012.</p>
17.40/17.41	JM: A lot more people need advice on debt, unemployment, changes to benefits that have a direct impact on housing. Where is the housing input on	The Housing & Social Inclusion delivery unit works with the Advice Services Partnership to promote access to services which tackle financial exclusion for families

Meeting Date and Minute Item	Extract from Minutes (Responses required in bold)	Response
	<p>advice, with cross-cutting commissioning?</p> <p>NH: We are working closely with the Advice Services Partnership.</p> <p><b>GR A more detailed reply can be provided</b></p>	<p>and adults on low incomes, especially those subject to multiple disadvantage. Housing &amp; Social Inclusion have recently worked with the Advice Services Partnership on the development of the financial inclusion Pathfinder projects which focus upon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the promotion of financial inclusion through the provision of advice and information to residents;</li> <li>- helping the Advice Partnership to test new ways of working in response to the changing external climate (welfare reform, legal aid cuts etc.);</li> <li>- informing, through thorough evaluation, the Council's subsequent commissioning of advice services in the city.</li> </ul> <p>Housing &amp; Social Inclusion are engaged with the Families in Multiple Disadvantage commission; the Tackling Inequality commission; the Financial Inclusion Advice commission; and the current scoping of the impact of welfare reform.</p> <p>The HRA 2012/13 budget proposals include a contingency amount for investment in these commissioning priorities as they emerge through the current commissioning process, as part of a commitment to tackle inequality, and improve support for vulnerable families and adults on low incomes.</p>

Meeting Date and Minute Item	Extract from Minutes (Responses required in bold)	Response
18.1	<p>RESPONSES VIA CONSULTATION PORTAL</p> <p>Panel members noted the consultation responses and <b>asked for information on the cost of consultation.</b> Any further queries would be sent to the Scrutiny officers.</p>	<p>Extract from Minutes of Council 15 December 2011. Item 42, Written Questions from Councillors.</p> <p>d) Councillor A Norman: "Can the Cabinet Member for Finance and Central Services please tell me the value of the contract that the Council has with the Democratic Society of Brighton &amp; Hove to run Budget consultation and other events across the City, when this contract was awarded and by whom?"</p> <p>Reply from Councillor J Kitcat, Cabinet Member for Finance and Central Services: "Brighton &amp; Hove City Council commissioned the Democratic Society to deliver 3 budget participation events, to take place over 3 days in November 2011 as part of our budget consultation work. The events ran alongside an online consultation using a budget simulation website provided by Delib. The offline exercise was structured in broadly the same way, and used the same spending data and division of services. The findings from this work will be included in the budget consultation information provided to support the authority's budget setting processes. The value of the contract with the Democratic Society for this work was £8000 plus VAT. The contract was agreed by the Chief Executive and</p>

Meeting Date and Minute Item	Extract from Minutes (Responses required in bold)	Response
		<p>arrangements were finalised in the week commencing 6th October.”</p> <p>In addition to the costs referred to above, the cost of providing the Budget Simulator software (provided by DELIB) via the council’s web site together with the report and analysis of results by YouGov was £9,345.</p>
9 January		
22.14	<p>MM: Equalities savings of £200K (p97) is not clear. The EIA refers to the end of the pilot. Has the £200K Communities budget line been spent? How does this link with CYP budget, and what has been achieved?</p> <p>GM: It is the transfer of this budget that needs clarification.</p> <p><b>BD: A written reply will be given.</b></p>	<p>This response is currently being drawn up by David Murray, Strategic Director - Communities.</p>
22.16	<p>JM: It is helpful that the effect on resilience of CVS organisations is being acknowledged (p93). Our services often impact on equalities, one of the Council’s corporate priorities. What thought has been given to increasing spend in the Third Sector? That does not seem to be reflected in the budget papers. I’m concerned about the effect of reductions in Annual Grants budget and City Communities Fund amounting together to £85k (p101) which seems to take away about a quarter of grants that</p>	<p>Covered in CVS response above.</p>

Meeting Date and Minute Item	Extract from Minutes (Responses required in bold)	Response
	<p>are available to the very smallest organisations and will have a considerable impact. The priorities for this expenditure need to be more clearly justified.</p> <p>I think the small savings from staff (p97) would have a greater impact if spent externally.</p> <p>This is a continuing theme – does CVS face disproportionate cuts? I'm grateful for the work now being done to draw out the figures for us, because until now expenditure and return on investment have not been recorded in that way. We think there should be continuous monitoring to show the real financial and social value of the Sector. We have evidence to demonstrate the impact and in an earlier session it was interesting to hear that Economic Development do not. We have a large reach on a small spend.</p> <p>BD: We are carrying out SROI studies to measure outputs and I'm not convinced that Communities and Equalities are being disproportionately cut; these services do need to be protected. We are taking a realistic approach reducing expenditure and taking the impacts into account. There is still a range of grants available amounting to around £1.5m annually but they are not immune from savings although we are restricting the reductions as much as we can. The 2-year budget</p>	

Meeting Date and Minute Item	Extract from Minutes (Responses required in bold)	Response
	process still allows for flexibility. For example Community Development commissioning cannot be fixed too far in advance.	
22.22	<p>JM: What is the effect of the new public health budget? How will it be used? Will scrutiny get information?</p> <p>BD: The public health budget is not yet known. 2012-2013 will be a 'shadow' allocation and the funding will be ring-fenced. <b>The information will be provided if it's available before this scrutiny panel ends.</b></p>	Shadow Public Health allocations are anticipated in the near future. More information will be added to the Revenue Budget Report if available in time for the 9 <sup>th</sup> February Cabinet meeting.

### Budget Scrutiny Panel 6<sup>th</sup> January 2012

Minutes 17.20

In relation to Utilities contributing to maintenance costs, there are certain specific incidents that are laid down in law/Code of Practice about where the council may charge utilities for resurfacing or ask them to make a greater contribution.

These are few and far between and usually refer to when the local authority is itself spending money on maintenance, for example, where both the utility and the highway authority contribute funds because the road was going to be resurfaced by the Highway Authority anyway and we simply combine costs of utility re-instatement with costs of resurfacing or where we have proven beyond doubt that the utility company caused the problem – which is difficult.

*Gillian Marston 11 January 2012*



## Appendix 8A

### Brighton & Hove City Council

#### Vacant Posts as at January 2012

(FTE = Full Time Equivalent)

Service	FTE Posts Vacant at January 2012	FTE Posts to be deleted (VFM savings)	FTE Posts to be deleted (Budget Savings)	FTE Posts to be filled *
<b>Commissioning Units</b>				
Children, Youth & Families	4.89			4.89
City Regulation & Infrastructure	3.81	3.81		
Communities & Equalities	0.41		0.41	
Housing	22.31	3.91	2.29	16.11
Learning & Partnerships	8.91	6.05		2.86
People	3.80	3.40		0.40
<b>Delivery Units</b>				
Adults Assessment	23.51	5.04	7.36	11.11
Adults Provider	27.52	4.41	0.50	22.57
Children & Families	39.66	4.60	3.80	31.25
City Infrastructure	30.28	3.00	12.28	15.00
City Services	32.01	7.60	16.22	8.22
Community Safety	3.00		3.00	
Housing & Social Inclusion	13.66		5.85	7.81
Planning & Public Protection	12.49	8.26	1.60	2.63
Tourism & Leisure	14.94	1.00		13.94
<b>Resources &amp; Finance Units</b>				
Finance Unit	12.59	1.00	4.00	7.59
Communications	0.57			0.57
HR & Organisational Development	7.08	3.65	0.83	2.60
ICT	7.68	4.00	1.00	2.68
Legal & Democratic Services	7.32	3.12	2.53	1.68
Policy & Performance Analysis	4.00	1.00	1.00	2.00
Property & Design	4.60		1.60	3.00
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>285.03</b>	<b>63.85</b>	<b>64.27</b>	<b>156.91</b>

\* i.e. available to be filled by 'bumped' redundancies



## PEOPLE - Adult Social Care

## 2012/13 Savings proposals

Service (including brief description)	Total Net budget £'000	Description of saving	Service impact and risks	Savings identified 2012/13 £'000	Could saving impact on funding of CVS providers (Yes/No)	If Yes, what is potential impact
<b>Commissioner - People</b>						
Commissioned advice and support services to meet statutory obligations	590	Review of all contracts for services as part of commissioning plans and where appropriate re-specify contracts to meet changing needs.	Contracts are being reviewed and discussions with providers taking place, including tapering and re-specifying contracts/contract sums.	50	Yes	Discussion taking place with providers – also links to wider corporate work. Potential to affect all contracts including CVS providers.
Commissioned Community Meals service providing 85,000 meals pa	243	Review and Re-specify Community Meals. To consider impact of personalisation and the range of options that are currently now available.	Awaiting further feedback from Scrutiny (November 2011). Current contract extended to September 2012 due to capacity to tender	50	Yes (as current provider is WRVS)	Contract up for renewal so potential for significant change
Service specific Partnership Boards	232	Prioritise use of partnership funding to achieve 50% efficiencies.	Formalise arrangements to engage people with learning disabilities and family carers in commissioning and attendance at meetings, including review costs of	110	Yes	This is not related to the main Board but a small grant that supports specific pieces of work. It has been

			project support to the Learning Disability Partnership Board. Would limit scope of partnership boards to consultations, 3rd sector providers could feel disengaged			underspent for the last couple of years and therefore impact should be limited.
<b>Delivery Unit - Adults Assessment</b>						
The service has a duty to meet assessed needs of people with Learning Disabilities within the Fair Access to Care (FACS) criteria	Incl. below	Develop proposals to implement the Learning Disabilities accommodation and support strategy and consult on the options. Look to utilise the capacity in the city and operate a robust and appropriate service Key areas:- - Supporting move on to greater independence by increasing low level supported living options and modernising shared lives. - Remodel services to provide short term crisis support and for those with the most complex needs to reduce out of area respite and emergency placements. -Ensure provision is fit for purpose going forward	Detailed proposals to be taken to the Cabinet Member Meeting and Joint Commissioning Board for permission to consult and report back. Detailed implementation plans will need to be in place based on assessed needs of individuals.	75	Yes	There is potential for positive growth in CVS and independent providers here
				38		

The service has a duty to meet assessed needs of people with Learning Disabilities within the Fair Access to Care (FACS) criteria	Incl. below	Recommissioning of Independent Sector contract re Learning Disabilities Supported Accommodation at Sackville Gardens when current 3 year contract expires (December 2012).	Detailed proposals to be taken to the Cabinet Member Meeting and Joint Commissioning Board for permission to consult with tenants and service users and report back. Detailed implementation plans will need to be in place based on assessed needs of individuals.	15	Yes	Potential new provider
These services provide the statutory duty under the NHS and Community Care Act (1990) to assess needs and to provide services to meet those assessed needs.	52,601	Community Care. Scope potential to increase move on by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- further focus on reablement activities</li> <li>- short term interventions</li> <li>- prevention activities</li> <li>- better use of Telecare</li> <li>- better use of in-house residential services</li> </ul>	Value for Money target/ Benefits Realisation  Enhanced reablement and better use of assisted technology to reduce numbers into residential/ nursing homes. Dependent on reviews and provider services	1,172	Possible	However, these are generally independent sector providers rather than CVS providers
Meeting assessed needs through Home Care	Incl. within Community care	Recommission Home Care to a new specification and let contract from 1 June 2012. .	New contract gives the opportunity to revise rates structure and to eliminate incentive payments.	280	Possible	However, these are generally independent sector providers rather than CVS providers
			Monitor impact of Electronic Care Monitoring System and impact of new contracts on savings. Risk that ECMS doesn't deliver or causes instability in the home care market	100		

# PEOPLE - Adult Social Care

# 2013/14 Savings proposals

Commissioner - People						
Service (including brief description)	Total Net budget £'000	Description of saving	Service impact and risks	Savings identified 2013/14 £'000	Could saving impact on funding of CVS providers (Yes/No)	If Yes, what is potential impact
Commissioned advice and support services to meet statutory obligations	590	Review of all contracts for services as part of commissioning plans and where appropriate re-specify contracts to meet changing needs.	Contracts are being reviewed and discussions with providers taking place, including tapering and re-specifying contracts/contract sums.	150	Yes	Potential to affect all contracts including CVS providers
Commissioned Community Meals service providing 85,000 meals pa	243	Review and Re-specify Community Meals. To consider impact of personalisation and the range of options that are currently now available.	Awaiting further feedback from Scrutiny.	100	Yes (as current provider is WRVS)	Contract up for renewal so potential for significant change
Delivery Unit - Adults Assessment						
The service has a duty to meet assessed needs of people with Learning Disabilities within the Fair Access to Care (FACS) criteria	incl. below	Develop proposals to implement the Learning Disabilities accommodation and support strategy and consult on the options. Look to utilise the capacity in the city and operate a robust and appropriate service Key areas:-	Detailed proposals to be taken to the Cabinet Member Meeting and Joint Commissioning Board for permission to consult and report back. Detailed implementation plans will need to be in place based on assessed needs of	100	Yes	There is potential for positive growth in CVS and independent providers here

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supporting move on to greater independence by increasing low level supported living options and modernising shared lives.</li> <li>- Remodel services to provide short term crisis support and for those with the most complex needs to reduce out of area respite and emergency placements.</li> <li>- Ensure provision is fit for purpose going forward</li> </ul>	individuals.	50		
Meeting assessed needs through Home Care	Incl. within Community care	Recommission Home Care to a new specification and let contract from 1 June 2012.	New contract gives the opportunity to revise rates structure and to eliminate incentive payments.	120	Possible	However, these are generally independent sector providers rather than CVS providers
Meeting assessed needs		Short Term Services Review across integrated arrangements with health. This covers a range of both community and bed based services provided by a range of providers including the local authority. These services support hospital discharge, prevention of admission and reablement.	Review of Short Term Care services and support-development of proposals for consultation	100	Yes	2 small contracts are held with a CVS provider (£100k)

# PEOPLE - Children's Services

# 2012/13 Savings proposals

Commissioner - Children, Youth & Families						
Service (including brief description)	Total Net budget £'000	Description of saving	Service impact and risks	Savings identified 2012/13 £'000	Could saving impact on funding of CVS providers (Yes/No)	If Yes, what is potential impact
Early Intervention and Prevention	1,117	Recommissioning/service redesign of early intervention & prevention services as part of the review of spend from the Early Intervention Grant (EIG).	Reduced opportunities to strengthen early intervention services. No impact on posts.	192	Yes	Approx £20 to £30k impact. Specialist provision of parenting interventions are currently delivered by Amaze, Mosaic, Oasis & RISE
Delivery Unit - Children & Families						
<b>Childcare Workforce Development</b> - Commission and deliver training e.g. non-accredited short courses on Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) welfare requirements and for children under 3 inc safeguarding, 1st aid, Presens and Ethnic Minority	425	Reduce funding for training and bursaries by 50%. Restructure Childcare Workforce Development Team to reflect changes. Charge for some short courses.	Charging for some training courses will increase costs for childcare providers and may reduce take up. Reduced funding for bursaries for childcare qualifications will also increase costs for	212	Yes	Impact on CVS providers is estimated to be circa £35k

202



Achievement Service (EMAS) training, and bursaries for L2,3 and 5 childcare qualifications			providers and may reduce number of qualified staff. The Early Years Single Funding Formula within the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) should be reviewed to take account of these changes.			
<b>Graduate Leader Fund (GLF)</b> - provides incentives for childcare providers to support staff to become Early Years Professionals (EYPs) and to subsidise the costs of employing EYPs. Funds whole costs of 2 EYPs in very disadvantaged settings, £10k for an EYP.	464	Reduce funding by 60% and no longer fund the Early Years Professional network.	No funding for settings with staff on an Early Years Professional (EYP) pathway. Reduce level of funding for settings with EYPs with levels of funding graduated according to the number of disadvantaged children. Increased costs for childcare settings with EYPs. Research shows that children benefit particularly from a place at an early education setting with highly qualified staff, and that high quality early education is a key factor in closing gaps in attainment and improving school readiness of the neediest children. The Early Years Single	278	Yes	Potential impact on CVS estimated at £70k

			Funding Formula in the DSG should be reviewed to take account of these changes.			
<b>Youth Employability Service</b>	841	It is proposed in 2012/13 that a commissioning review takes place of the Youth Employability Service and the other employment/ apprenticeship/ economic regeneration activities within the council, with implementation in 2013/14. The reduction in Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET) figures for young people in the city is heavily dependent on 3 factors; secondary schools, employment and training opportunities. Improvements in secondary schools are being led by the secondary schools commission to improve advice and guidance and positive destinations for young people. Improvement in training opportunities is being led by the 11-19 year old partnership. Therefore it is hoped to improve employment and support by recommissioning the Youth Employability Service and the other council activities around	The proposed savings of £30k in 2012/13 for the Youth Employability Service will have some impact on support for front-line services in terms of a reduction in training, publicity for engaging young people with the service and some ICT support. However the main front-line delivery of the service will not be greatly affected, with the same number of workers in post and working directly with young people aged 16-18 who are Not in Education Employment or Training (NEET) and young people with Learning Difficulties / Disabilities (LDD).	30	No – all CVS commissioned adviser posts for 2011-12 were funded by a one-off budget of £200K agreed by Council in March 2011. This was additional to the main Y.E.S. budget and was clearly identified as funding for one year only. The CVS contracts were let on that basis to end on 31/3/12. Funding will continue for the use of CVS premises	Nil

		employment and economic regeneration together. Synergies and cost savings will be realised alongside improving employment and apprenticeships opportunities.			at YAC (YMCA) and YPC (Impact).	
<b>Extended Schools - Start Up</b>	103	10% reduction in grants.	Small reduction in grant funding - only fund voluntary groups with most disadvantaged children.	9	Yes	Estimated impact of £5k

## PEOPLE - Children's Services

## 2013/14 Savings proposals

Service (including brief description)	Total Net budget † £'000	Description of saving	Service impact and risks	Savings identified 2013/14 £'000	Could saving impact on funding of CVS providers (Yes/No)	If Yes, what is potential impact
<b>Delivery Unit - Children &amp; Families</b>						
Asylum Seekers	115	Reduction in service provision to children traumatised by events in war affected countries.	No service impact.	35	Yes (indirectly)	Impact on overall capacity to provide input to young people traumatised by events in war torn countries seeking asylum
<b>Childcare sufficiency and quality</b> - Support new and existing childcare providers, including childminders, to provide good quality and safe childcare, advice and sustainability funding to voluntary childcare providers, ensure sufficient places for all 3 and 4 year olds.	568	Further reduce quality support for childcare providers. Further reduce funding for sustainability. (Increases two year savings to 32%).	Reduced support for childminders and out of school providers could lead to reduction in quality of Ofsted inspections for childcare providers. Less support for voluntary settings may lead to closures and less choice for parents in disadvantaged areas.	80	Yes	Estimated impact of up to £30k

<p><b>Children's Centres</b> - 5 full offer CCs in disadvantaged areas, 9 smaller gateway CCs in other areas and 5 linked sites which are not designated. Offer a universal and targeted early years services. Buildings also host other Children and Families Service</p>	2,986	<p>Implement the outcomes of the consultation on the citywide strategy for children's centres. Increases the saving to 23% over 2 years.</p>	<p>Statutory guidance includes a presumption against the closure of children's centres. The revised strategy would need to demonstrate that the Council is still meeting its duty to provide sufficient children's centres. There is a requirement for local authorities to notify and consult with the Department for Education about any plan to transfer, dispose of, or change the use of buildings or any other tangible fixed assets which has a current market value of more than £2,500. The consultation will need to consider the delivery of universal health services delivered from children's centres. Reductions in funding will lead to less universal services for children under 5 and</p>	642	Possible	<p>Impact not known – will depend on outcome of the consultation process</p>
--	-------	--	--	-----	----------	--

			<p>their families. Reductions in the number of children's centres may make it more difficult for vulnerable families to access children's centres and lead to worse outcomes for young children.</p>			
<b>Services for Children with Disabilities</b>	5,695	Implementation of Disability Commissioning Strategy	<p>Implementation of the Disability Commissioning Strategy will: introduce personal budgets; drive further integration across health, social care and education provision; and promote resilience of parent carers. Efficiency savings achieved by remodelling across all providers will: prioritise support to families to keep their children at home, ensure all commissioned services are value for money and develop the market to provide flexible, cost</p>	120	Yes	Impact is not known and is subject to outcome of service redesign

			effective short break and respite care.			
<b>Youth Employability Service</b>	841	<p>The Youth Employability Service fulfils several statutory functions for the local authority. The previous Youth Employability Service budget was significantly reduced in 2010/11 resulting in the deletion of many front-line and management posts. The budget for 2012/13 does not include the one-off amount of £200k transition funding or £93k for full-year effect funding given for 2011/12 which has allowed us to keep some Community and Voluntary Sector advisors for this year only. The one-off nature of the £200k transition funding for 2011/12, means that there will be no funding in 2012/13 for front-line workers from Sussex Central</p>	<p>This will require significant service redesign and may mean a significant reduction in the Youth Employability Service's ability to deliver the LA's statutory requirements in terms of NEET and LDD support, which concentrate on some of the most vulnerable young people in the city - young people who are Not in Education Employment or Training (NEET) and young people who have a statement of Special Educational Need (SEN). The Youth Employability Service is still evolving and coming to terms with the cumulative effect of major budget savings in 2009/10 and 2010/11 on work with NEET young people. The</p>	120	<p>This is uncertain. The proposal is that in 2012/13 a commissioning review takes place of the Youth Employability Service and the other employment/apprenticeship/economic regeneration activities within the council, with implementation in 2013/14. Synergies and cost savings will be realised alongside improving employment and apprenticeships opportunities.</p>	<p>This could mean a potential reduction in funding to the CVS in terms of whether we continue to lease space in YAC and YPC. However, this is entirely dependent on the outcome of the proposed commissioning review.</p>

		<p>YMCA and Impact Initiatives. Further savings on the remaining 2012/13 budget of £841k cannot be achieved without cutting front-line posts. - 2 FTE level 4 advisor posts (from a total of 10 FTEs) - £68k, - 0.5 admin posts - £10k.</p>	<p>number of drop-in locations would reduce and there would be no services delivered from CVS partner premises. Advisers would continue to deliver drop-ins and other services in some of the most deprived areas of the City: Whitehawk (46.9% children and young people in poverty), Moulsecoomb (44.5%), Hollingdean (28.7%) but with a much reduced frontline team. Taken together, and without significant further service redesign, there is a risk that NEET figures may increase.</p>			
--	--	---	---	--	--	--



		<p>These proposed reductions also mean there will be no funding to continue to offer drop-in and other support services from 2 voluntary sector premises - YAC (YMCA) in Blatchington Road Hove, and YPC (Impact Initiatives) in Central Brighton. This will mean that there will be no access point or drop-in in the West of the City or City Centre. - saving £26k. Savings will also be made by reducing the support budgets to front-line workers, including ICT and publications. - £16k.</p>	<p>There would be no drop-in at YPC (Central Brighton) and YAC (Hove) which would limit our coverage of the city. These are voluntary sector premises which are accessed by many of these vulnerable groups from the central and west areas of the city including Queens Park (26.2%) and North Portslade (23.7%). Reductions to electronic media and other publications would make it harder to contact and engage NEET young people and offer them appropriate support. This would have an adverse effect on government requirements for tracking NEET young people and providing management information.</p>			
<b>Extended Schools - Start Up</b>	103	Restrict sustainability grants to the	Less affordable out of school childcare	10	Yes	Estimated impact of £6k

		schemes supporting the most disadvantaged children.	places for low income families.			
--	--	---	---------------------------------	--	--	--

# PLACE - Housing

# 2012/13 Savings proposals

Commissioner - Housing						
Service (including brief description)	Total Net budget £'000	Description of saving	Service impact and risks	Savings identified 2012/13 £'000	Could saving impact on funding of CVS providers (Yes/No)	If Yes, what is potential impact
Supporting People	11,213	Efficiency savings.	<p>*These have already been built into business plans with providers at minimal risk. Efficiency savings are being delivered through working effectively with providers to mitigate impacts/risk and protect preventative services for the most vulnerable. A cost-benefit analysis of housing-related support indicates that Investment in preventative services delivers savings for other budgets, such as ASC and CYPT.</p> <p>Investment in housing-related support services supports local community &amp; voluntary third sector organisations that provide specialist support services to vulnerable clients.</p>	551	Yes (but already planned)	Impact of delivering savings is being managed in close liaison with providers.

# PLACE - Housing

# 2013/14 Savings proposals

Commissioner - Housing						
Service (including brief description)	Total Net budget £'000	Description of saving	Service impact and risks	Savings identified 2013/14 £'000	Could saving impact on funding of CVS providers (Yes/No)	If Yes, what is potential impact
Supporting People	11,213	Efficiency savings.	These have already been built into business plans with providers at minimal risk. <i>(*see above)</i>	494	Yes (but already planned)	Impact of delivering savings is being managed in close liaison with providers
		Year 4 savings from Supporting People Commissioning Plan brought forward (i.e. efficiency savings in 2014/15 to be delivered in 2013/14).	Service contracts will need to be renegotiated with providers to achieve savings. This will require a supported consolidation of local provision to enable savings to be achieved.  All providers had confirmation of 4-year allocation of funding and have developed financial and business plans on this basis. Proposal to bring forward savings from 2014/15 to 2013/14 will have a significant impact and potentially lead to service closures as providers will no longer be in a position to sustain services.	308	Yes (brings forward known savings)	Full saving will impact significantly on CVS providers and some providers may no longer be able to sustain services and this may potentially lead to service closures.

214

## PLACE - City Regulation and Infrastructure 2012/13 Savings proposals

Service (including brief description)	Total Net budget £'000	Description of saving	Service impact and risks	Savings identified 2012/13 £'000	Could saving impact on funding of CVS providers (Yes/No)	If Yes, what is Potential Impact
<b>Delivery Unit - City Infrastructure</b>						
CityParks	5,673	Withdraw resources provided to support Brighton In Bloom	Appropriate communications with groups and advice and support where able	30.0	Yes	Potential impact on CVS Orgs

# COMMUNITIES

## 2012/13 Savings proposals

Commissioner - Sports						
Service (including brief description)	Total Net budget £'000	Description of saving	Service impact and risks	Savings identified 2012/13 £'000	Could saving impact on funding of CVS providers (Yes/No)	If Yes, what is Potential Impact
Sports Development Fund	100	Reduce expenditure on sports development initiatives which assist with creating opportunities for people to participate in sport and physical activity.	A reduction in funding will mean the number and level of funding for such initiatives has been prioritised, with support continuing for such important events as the Takepart Festival of Sport. External funding will be sought to mitigate the impact but access to such funding is limited with the consequent risk it may not be achieved.	50	Yes (indirectly)	Impact is dependent on ability to find alternative external funding. Options are currently being reviewed including emerging information on Sport England's recently announced strategy.

# COMMUNITIES

# 2013/14 Savings proposals

Service (including brief description)	Total Net budget £'000	Description of saving	Service impact and risks	Savings identified 2013/14 £'000	Could saving impact on funding of CVS providers (Yes/No)	If Yes, what is Potential Impact
<b>Commissioner - Communities and Equalities</b>						
Equalities	372	Reduction to Annual Grants Budget	A reduction in small groups funded for their activities will impact on community and voluntary sector activity.	55	Yes	However, budget has been underspending while still managing to meet all eligible funding requests.
City Communities Fund	30	Cut annual budget completely; this fund was established in 11/12 to support community based activity that did not fit within the cycle of existing grant rounds, e.g. Brighton Voices in Exile supporting refugees seeking citizenship.	There will be no flexibility to support additional community activities which do not fit into the criteria of the annual grant programme. This will affect activity.	30	Yes	Budget has been substantially under-utilised despite meeting most if not all demands but may remove some flexibility.

217

