

**BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL  
CABINET  
26 January 2012**

**REPORT TITLE: REVENUE BUDGET 2012/13**

**Ward(s) affected by this report: Citywide**

**Strategic Director: Will Godfrey / Strategic Director, Corporate Services**

**Report author: Peter Robinson / Service Director, Finance**

**Contact telephone no. 0117 9222419  
& e-mail address: peter.robinson@bristol.gov.uk**

**Report signed off by  
executive member: Cllr Barbara Janke**

**Purpose of the report: To finalise the Cabinet's revenue budget recommendations  
to be considered by the Full Council on 28 February 2012**

**RECOMMENDATION for Cabinet approval:**

1. That the Cabinet determines its recommendation to Council in respect of the revenue budget for 2012/13;
2. That the Cabinet determines that the council tax for City Council services be held at the same level as 2011/12, including the use of the council tax freeze grant for 2012/13.

**Summary**

2. The report summarises the budget process and provides information in relation to the final draft budget proposals. Original proposals for budget reductions were published on 24 November 2011. The significant issues in the report are:
  - the budget proposals - substantial council-wide efficiencies and reductions totalling £27m have been identified. This is on top of £28m reductions to the 2011/12 budget, meaning £55m of the £70m savings required by the end of 2014/15 will have been identified;
  - associated one-off costs will be met partly from the savings and partly from reserves;
  - £1m has been included in the proposals for the cost of financing

additional prudential borrowing for the Investing in Bristol's Future Package and for new capital investment in parks, regeneration of Lockleaze and the upgrade of Jubilee pool;

- freeze in the level of council tax for 2012/13 for council services;
  - change programmes, delivery plans and, crucially, budgets will need to be closely monitored during the year to ensure that reductions are being delivered;
  - other areas of risk;
  - the equalities impact assessments (EQIA's).
3. The Council's constitution requires that the Cabinet publishes its budget recommendations to Council at least 15 working days before the Council budget meeting on 28 February 2012.
  4. The report to the Council budget fixing meeting on 22 February 2011 identified a total savings requirement of £70m over the period 2011/12 to 2014/15. This reflected the reductions in central government grant funding announced in the Comprehensive Spending Review last year.
  5. The approved budget for 2011/12 was reduced by £28m as the first phase of meeting the overall savings requirement. The latest indications are that the Council is on target to deliver spending within budget by the year end (see paragraph 12 below).
  6. Proposed reductions of £27m have been identified for 2012/13. Including additional council tax income (see paragraph 14 below). Cumulative savings are as follows:

Directorate	Budgeted Savings 2011/12 £'000	Savings Proposal 2012/13 £'000
Corporate Services		8,004
Neighbourhoods & City Dev		6,527
Health & Social Care		5,144
Children & Young People's Services		5,188
Additional council tax income		2,200
Savings total	28,000	27,063
Accumulated savings		55,063
Less additional expenditure:		
Revenue cost of prudential borrowing		(1,000)
One-off costs		<u>(9,523)</u>
Savings after one-off costs		44,540

6. One-off costs required to implement the various change programmes together with other initiatives which will deliver the reductions have been assessed and amount to £9.5m in 2012/13. As well as severance costs (estimated at £5.3m), this includes the cost of change programme teams and new systems. In 2012/13, some of these costs can be met from excess savings, with the remainder being funded from reserves.
7. Provision has been made within the recommended budget to finance additional prudential borrowing of £55m, at a cost of £1m to the general fund in 2012/13. The proposals for new capital investment are set out in the report on the Capital Programme 2012-15, also on the agenda, and comprise:

	£m
Bristol's Future Package - investment in priority areas	50.0
New/improvements to parks	3.8
Regeneration of Lockleaze	1.0
Upgrade of Jubilee Pool	0.4
	<u>55.2</u>

8. The overall budget position now recommended is as follows:

	£'000	£'000
Base budget		
- Directorates	352,511	
- Unallocated pensions	3,910	
- Capital financing	19,079	
- Levies	1,098	
- Contingency and provisions	5,500	382,098
Less reductions		<u>(24,863)</u>
Net budget before additions		357,758
Add		
- Revenue cost of prudential borrowing		1,000
- One-off costs		9,523
Net revenue requirement		<u>367,758</u>

Funding for the budget will be:

	£'000	
Formula grant	171,283	
Council tax	183,555	
Council tax freeze grant	9,087	
One-off resources:		
Share of collection fund surplus	1,861	
Use of general fund balances	1,972	3,833
		<u>367,758</u>

9. A summary of the draft budget proposals is attached at Appendix 1, together with details for each directorate. Further details of the proposals for reductions, by directorate, are included at Appendix 2.
10. Since the original budget proposals were published for consultation in November there has been one change which is now reflected in the draft budget set out in paragraph 8 above. Following representations, the proposed saving of £25k in respect of the Lord Mayor's Chapel (Corporate Services directorate) has been deleted.
11. The draft budget proposals will mean a freeze in the council tax for 2012/13 (ie the band D tax would remain at £1,338.95 for the city council's own services). As for 2011/12, the government is providing an additional grant to those authorities which would otherwise be increasing council tax by 2.5%. The grant that will be received on this basis will be £4.59m, but will only be payable for one year. This is different from the grant for the 2011/12 freeze, which will be paid for each year of the CSR, ie up to and including 2014/15.
12. Spending in 2011/12 has been reviewed. Based on expenditure to the end of November, total spending for the year is now projected to be within budget by the year end, largely as a result of the improved position in HSC and the inclusion of additional, unbudgeted income from the PCT. The main risk relates to exempt accommodation and this will be regularly monitored through the remainder of the year. Strong service and financial management arrangements will continue to be applied to ensure that this position is maintained. A summary of the overall position is set out in Appendix 3. More details for each directorate, showing the projected outturn against budget for the main service activities, are available from the Corporate Finance Team.
13. The council tax collection fund is estimated to show a surplus of £1.67m at 31 March 2012, of which Bristol's share is £1.43m. This is broadly in line with the position forecast earlier in the year and reflects expected reductions in exemptions allowed (primarily for empty property), new property added, in excess of that expected, with no significant additions to the bad debt provision. In terms of collection performance, the actual collection rate is on target for the year at 95.1%. To the end of December, collection was 83.3% against a target of 83.9%.

In addition, a further sum of £0.43m also needs to be taken into account in 2012/13, being the council's share of the refund due in respect of 2010/11, where the actual deficit on the fund at 31 March 2011 was less than the amount estimated when the 2011/12 budget was approved.

14. The tax base for 2012/13 has been set at 137,089, an increase of 2% over the figure for 2011/12. This increase is primarily due to the review of single person and student discounts and will generate additional income of £2.2m in 2012/13, above that anticipated in the Medium Term Financial Plan.
15. The provisional grant settlement for 2012/13 was announced on 8 December 2011. Bristol's Formula Grant for 2012/13 is £171.283m, and this is in line with the indicative figure provided in November 2010. This is a reduction of £13.9m or 7.5%, on a like-for-like basis, over 2011/12. This compares with a national reduction of 7.7%.
16. The damping mechanism within the grant system results in a grant loss for Bristol of £10.8m (2011/12 - £12.9m). The overall reduction in grant before the damping adjustment would have been limited to 1.7%. The loss through damping has eliminated any gain that would have come through in the formula from increased population. Representations were made to the government last year, both directly to ministers and through Core Cities for an improved settlement, centred particularly on the way the damping mechanism works and its impact on Bristol and the case for increasing the amount of business rates that is distributed nationally - given Bristol's position as a net contributor to the national pool. This approach failed to achieve a positive outcome.
17. Some use of unallocated reserves and balances is necessary to support the one-off costs needed to generate the significant savings not only in 2012/13, but also in the remainder of the period covered by the current Medium Term Financial Plan. Savings identified in excess of the targeted sum will offset some of the costs in 2012/13, with the balance of £1.97m being drawn from unallocated general fund balances, resulting from the underspend in 2010/11.
18. Proposals for the use of the Dedicated Schools Grant are being discussed with the Schools Forum.

## **Reserves and balances**

19. The draft budget includes a working balance of £6m, to cover the eventuality that overall spending exceeds the budget. As well as this balance, the Council's balance sheet carries numerous specific reserves. These have been earmarked for specific purposes, eg the capital programme, schools PFI and Standards Fund. A review of all reserves has been undertaken during the current year which has resulted in some resources being re-badged towards meeting future restructuring costs.

## **Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP)**

20. As indicated previously, the Council faces further reductions in spending in 2013/14 and 2014/15 to achieve the MTFP reductions of £70m by 31 March 2015. The change programmes that are being implemented should contribute towards the remainder of the projected budget gap over the MTFP period. Further use of reserves will be required to meet one-off costs over the Plan period.

### **Consultation and scrutiny input:**

#### **a. Internal consultation:**

The budget proposals are considered deliverable by the Strategic Leadership Team.

The original proposals were also submitted to the Trade Union Executive Forum and directorate Joint Consultative Committees.

The Resources Scrutiny Commission has examined the budget in-depth over a series of public meetings. At the time of publication of this report, the results are not available. The Commission is due to meet on 24 January to finalise its submission to the Cabinet.

#### **b. External consultation:**

Initial proposals to save £27m from the revenue budget were published on 24 November. Comments on these were invited via the council's website and the Budget Conversation site. A summary of the comments made up to 11 January 2012 is attached as Appendix 4. An update of additional comments received after this date will be available to members at the budget fixing meeting on 28 February.

The draft budget proposals have also been sent to GWE Business West, as coordinators of non-domestic ratepayers in the city.

### **Risk assessment / assessment:**

The most substantial risks have been assessed in the budget process and reasonable provision/mitigation has been made.

**Substantial reductions to all directorate budgets** totalling £25m have been identified within the draft budget proposals. These are in addition to the £28m savings in the current year. Over the two years, the council's total net spending will have reduced by over 13%. Change programmes, delivery plans and, crucially, budgets will continue to be closely monitored during the year to ensure that reductions are being delivered.

**Economic conditions** continue to have a direct impact on a number of income (local land charges and the commercial property estate) and expenditure (benefits, homelessness) budgets. The budget reflects prudent assumptions around the continuing impact of the economic situation, although it should be noted that significant reliance has been placed on large increases in income from new and increased parking charges as well as a review of parking strategy.

**Housing benefits** - the draft budget proposals include funding to meet the current level of de-regulated tenancies, but not further increases in the level of these claims. As indicated in the current year monitor, the risk relates to cases not yet in payment and subject to appeals, and rejected claims not yet appealed.

**Health and Social Care** - the directorate has a major transformation programme to modernise services and deliver significant service improvements that proposes to deliver savings of £5.1m in 2012/13. The main areas of change are set out in the November Cabinet report 'Delivering an Effective Social Care System'. The plans for the HSC budget will require particularly careful management in terms of both delivering the proposed savings and the issues around the demand for care packages driven by local demographic changes. This has been an important focus in this financial year and HSC is close to delivering on budget in 2011/12,

**Children's care placements** (numbers and unit costs) for both adult and childrens services. The current trend in childrens care placements has resulted in a major budget pressure in 2011/12. Plans to reduce the number of external placements by increasing in-house fostering are being closely monitored during the year as well as numbers in children's placements.

However, whilst additional in-house foster carers are being recruited to meet the recurrent overspend from 2010/11, the population of Bristol continues to grow, in particular the age groups 0-4 and 5-10, as evidenced by the demand for primary school places. This has placed further demands on the care placements budgets and the 'mother and baby' assessment budget.

**Inflationary pressures on contract and energy costs** - the draft budget includes provision for inflation on the more significant contracts, eg the waste collection and public transport contracts. Additional provision has also been included for increases in energy contracts. although significant savings in the energy costs of street lighting and signage have been built into the budget.

**Corporate budgets** - prudent assumptions have been made about interest rates, cash flow, price increases on major contracts, council tax (and other

income) collection rates and the council tax base.

Financial and performance monitoring will prioritise the identified risk areas.

### **Public sector equality duties:**

The Council's approach to understanding the impact of the budget proposals on people in Bristol with a range of protected characteristics, as defined in the Equality Act 2010, and in line with the Council's Public Sector Equality Duty is set out in the paper attached at Appendix 5(i).

The impact of the main budget proposals in terms of equalities issues has been assessed by each Strategic Director. Details of the EQIA's for each of the budget proposals can be viewed on the Council's website at [www.bristol.gov.uk/page/budget-conversation](http://www.bristol.gov.uk/page/budget-conversation).

As a result of the public consultation on the budget proposals and the equalities stakeholder consultation on 8 December 2011 a number of EQIA's attached to the budget proposals have been amended and enhanced. The majority of EQIA's have not changed. The revised versions of specific EQIA's, along with the original assessments, can also be viewed at the above link. A summary of equalities related comments from the stakeholder conference and the public consultation exercise is attached at Appendix 5(ii).

The possible cumulative impacts on equalities communities of budget reductions have been assessed and factored into the final proposals. The assessment of cumulative impact can be found in Appendix 5(i).

### **Environmental checklist / eco impact assessment:**

Not applicable.

### **Resource and legal implications:**

a. Finance

As set out in the report.

b. Legal implications:

None sought.

c. Land / property implications:

Not applicable.

d. Human resources implications:

Not applicable.

## **Appendices:**

<b>Appendix</b>	1	Draft revenue budget 2012/13
	2	Detailed directorate budget savings proposals
	3	Latest budget monitor 2011/12
	4	Consultation responses
	5(i)	Cumulative Impact on equalities issues
	5(ii)	Summary of equalities related comments from the stakeholder conference and the public consultation exercise.

## **Access to information (background papers):**

Relevant working paper files in Finance Division.

## Draft Revenue Budget 2012/13

## APPENDIX 1

Directorate	Page Nos	Base Budget 2012/13 £'000	Net Reductions £'000	Draft Budget 2012/13 £'000
Children, Young People and Skills	1	72,232	(5,188)	67,044
Corporate Services	2-4	25,218	(7,004)	18,214
Health and Social Care	5-6	131,605	(5,144)	126,461
Neighbourhoods and City Development	7-8	123,456	(6,527)	116,929
		<b>352,511</b>	<b>(23,863)</b>	<b>328,648</b>
Other budgets:				
Unallocated pensions				3,910
Net capital financing costs				18,079
Levies				1,098
Contingency and provisions				5,500
One-off costs				9,523
Revenue cost of prudential borrowing				1,000
<b>Sub-total</b>				<b>367,758</b>
Less transfer from reserves				(1,973)
<b>Total net spend</b>				<b>365,785</b>
<b>Financed from:</b>				
Formula grant				(171,283)
Council tax freeze grant				(9,087)
Share of collection fund surplus				(1,860)
Council tax				(183,555)
				<b>0</b>

# DRAFT REVENUE BUDGET 2012/13

# CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES

Activity	Base Budget 2011/12 (Outturn Prices)	Inflation	Virement	Other Variations	Budget 2012/13 excl. capital charges	Savings Proposals 2012/13	Proposed Budget 2012/13
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
<b>Individual Schools Budget</b> (see note)	213,334				213,334		213,334
<b>Director's Office</b>	1,306				1,306		1,306
<b>TOTAL - Director's Office</b>	<b>1,306</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,306</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,306</b>
<b>Safeguarding &amp; Specialist Support</b>							
Children in Care	1,883	3			1,886		1,886
Corporate Parenting	8,302	2			8,304		8,304
Locality Teams	7,300	2			7,302		7,302
Welfare	604				604		604
Peripatetic / Child & Family Support	1,287				1,287		1,287
Safeguarding Commissioning	17,506	406			17,912	(350)	17,562
Secure	240				240		240
Parent and Baby	185	5			190		190
Management & Support	4,033				4,033	(350)	3,683
Complex Needs, SEN & Statements	10,738				10,738	(150)	10,588
Training	203				203	(50)	153
<b>TOTAL - Safeguarding &amp; Specialist Support</b>	<b>52,281</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>52,699</b>	<b>(900)</b>	<b>51,799</b>
<b>Learning, Achievement &amp; Schools</b>							
Programme Director	740				740		740
Inclusion in Learning	5,141				5,141		5,141
Early Years	23,384				23,384	(1,047)	22,337
School Leadership & Governance	208				208		208
Primary	2,714				2,714		2,714
Secondary	373				373		373
Division-wide Savings						(75)	(75)
<b>TOTAL - Learning, Achievement &amp; Schools</b>	<b>32,560</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>32,560</b>	<b>(1,122)</b>	<b>31,438</b>
<b>Education Strategy &amp; Targeted Support</b>							
Programme Director	930				930		930
Learning Partnerships	7,424	97			7,521	(10)	7,511
Communities & Adult Skills	59				59		59
Capital Assets & Access	1,702				1,702	(50)	1,652
Youth, Play Services	4,272	5			4,277		3,277
Connexions	3,352				3,352	(1,000)	3,352
<b>TOTAL - Education Strategy &amp; Targeted Support</b>	<b>17,739</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17,841</b>	<b>(1,060)</b>	<b>16,781</b>
<b>Finance &amp; Central Budgets</b>							
Early Intervention Grant	(19,159)			(200)	(19,359)		(19,359)
Pensions, Severance and other central budgets	8,120				8,120		8,120
Finance Team	801				801		801
Central Support Service Charges	5,296			9	5,305		5,305
<b>TOTAL - Finance &amp; Central Budgets</b>	<b>(4,942)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-191</b>	<b>(5,133)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(5,133)</b>
<b>Performance, Policy &amp; Partnerships</b>							
Children's Trust & Commissioning/Health Partnership	3,123			200	3,323	(600)	2,723
Performance	679				679		679
<b>TOTAL - Performance, Policy &amp; Partnerships</b>	<b>3,802</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>4,002</b>	<b>(600)</b>	<b>3,402</b>
<b>Funding</b>							
<b>Dedicated Schools Grant/ LSC</b>	<b>(244,377)</b>				<b>(244,377)</b>		<b>(244,377)</b>
<b>Directorate-wide savings</b>						<b>(1,506)</b>	<b>(1,506)</b>
<b>Directorate Total</b>	<b>71,703</b>	<b>520</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>72,232</b>	<b>(5,188)</b>	<b>67,044</b>

Note: budget for 2012/13 is dependant on the level of Dedicated Schools Grant, which is not announced until June (based on January pupil count). Hence draft budget repeats 2011/12 figure at this stage. The Council allocates funding to schools in March by using a draft pupil count at the end of February, with an in-year adjustment in consultation with the Schools Forum, if necessary.

## DRAFT REVENUE BUDGET 2012/13

## CORPORATE SERVICES

Activity	Base Budget 2011/12 (Outturn Prices)	Inflation	Virement	Other Variations	Budget 2012/13 excl. capital charges	Savings Proposals 2012/13	Proposed Budget 2012/13
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
<b>Chief Executive</b>							
Chief Executive's Office	1,095			(50)	1,045	(167)	878
Bristol Partnership	160				160	0	160
Graduate Trainees	122				122	0	122
	1,377	0	0	(50)	1,327	(167)	1,160
Less recharged to other Services and Departments	(1,274)			50	(1,224)	167	(1,057)
Other Income	(105)	0	0	0	(105)	0	(105)
<b>Budget net of recharges</b>	(2)	0	0	0	(2)	0	(2)
<b>One Council Communications</b>							
Arts, Events and Festivals	2,120			(30)	2,090	(85)	2,005
Lord Mayor's Office/Chapel	509		(10)		499	(40)	459
Place Making Director	300				300	0	300
Communications	4,071			(26)	4,045	(406)	3,639
	7,000	0	(10)	(56)	6,934	(531)	6,403
Less recharged to other Services and Departments	(4,142)		10	24	(4,108)	443	(3,665)
Other Income	(884)				(884)	(47)	(931)
<b>Budget net of recharges</b>	1,974	0	0	(32)	1,942	(135)	1,807
<b>Bristol Futures</b>							
Service Director: Bristol Futures	0		121		121	0	121
Digital 20:20	856		8		864	(80)	784
CX Projects	242			145	387	(233)	154
International	155		1		156	0	156
Regeneration	1,987		96	(31)	2,052	(83)	1,969
Sustainable City Group	670		77		747	(65)	682
	3,910	0	303	114	4,327	(461)	3,866
Less recharged to other Services and Departments	(110)				(110)	0	(110)
Other Income	0				0	0	0
<b>Budget net of recharges</b>	3,800	0	303	114	4,217	(461)	3,756
<b>Chief Executive sub-total</b>	<b>5,772</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>6,157</b>	<b>(596)</b>	<b>5,561</b>
<b>Corporate Services</b>							
<b>Strategic Director: Corporate Services</b>							
Strategic Director: Corporate Services	226	0		1	227	0	227
Procurement	1,732		(29)	(12)	1,691	(150)	1,541
	1,958	0	(29)	(11)	1,918	(150)	1,768
Less recharged to other Services and Departments	(1,487)		29		(1,458)	150	(1,308)
Other Income	(302)	0		0	(302)	(200)	(502)
<b>Budget net of recharges</b>	169	0	0	(11)	158	(200)	(42)
<b>Strategic HR and Shared Transactional Services</b>							
Service Director: Strategic HR & STS	121			4	125	0	125
Strategic and STS HR	7,762		300	(14)	8,048	(374)	7,674
Organisation & Learning Development	2,838			13	2,851	(189)	2,662
Shared Transactional Service- Finance	3,050			3	3,053	(115)	2,938
Facilities	8,299			(312)	7,987	(484)	7,503
Fleet	6,803				6,803	(416)	6,387
Cleaning	2,998				2,998	(13)	2,985
Buildings	12,287	0		(1,140)	11,147	0	11,147
	44,158	0	300	(1,446)	43,012	(1,591)	41,421
Less recharged to other Services and Departments	(41,605)		0	1,300	(40,305)	1,540	(38,765)
Other Income	(2,306)				(2,306)	0	(2,306)
<b>Budget net of recharges</b>	247	0	300	(146)	401	(51)	350

## DRAFT REVENUE BUDGET 2012/13

## CORPORATE SERVICES

Activity	Base Budget 2011/12 (Outturn Prices)	Inflation	Virement	Other Variations	Budget 2012/13 excl. capital charges	Savings Proposals 2012/13	Proposed Budget 2012/13
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
<b>Information &amp; Communication Technology</b>							
Information & Communication Technology	17,293	101		(68)	17,326	(609)	16,717
Changing Bristol	1,049	0		(10)	1,039	(240)	799
	18,342	101	0	(78)	18,365	(849)	17,516
Less recharged to other Services and Departments	(17,581)	(101)		68	(17,614)	849	(16,765)
<b>Budget net of recharges</b>	761	0	0	(10)	751	0	751
<b>Finance</b>							
Service Director - Finance	147	0		(2)	145	0	145
Directorate Finance Teams	5,721	0	(71)	(39)	5,611	(695)	4,916
Corporate Property	2,301	0		(24)	2,277	(173)	2,104
Internal Audit	1,703	0		(7)	1,696	(106)	1,590
Performance and Improvement Team	269	0		(13)	256	(34)	222
	10,141	0	(71)	(85)	9,985	(1,008)	8,977
Less recharged to other Services and Departments	(9,763)		71	85	(9,607)	1,008	(8,599)
Other Income	(251)	0	0		(251)	0	(251)
<b>Budget net of recharges</b>	127	0	0	0	127	0	127
<b>Property</b>							
Commercial Property Services	1,675			3	1,678	0	1,678
Miscellaneous Properties	695				695	0	695
Non-operational Property	1,078				1,078	0	1,078
	3,448	0	0	3	3,451	0	3,451
<b>Income</b>	(11,742)				(11,742)	0	(11,742)
<b>Net Property</b>	(8,294)	0	0	3	(8,291)	0	(8,291)
<b>Legal Services</b>							
Service Director: Legal	117			(7)	110	0	110
Democratic Services	1,293			(18)	1,275	0	1,275
Members Support	548			(7)	541	0	541
Legal Teams	4,309			(147)	4,162	(586)	3,576
	6,267	0	0	(179)	6,088	(586)	5,502
Less recharged to other Services and Departments	(6,795)			32	(6,763)	586	(6,177)
Other Income	(10)				(10)	0	(10)
<b>Budget net of recharges</b>	(538)	0	0	(147)	(685)	0	(685)
<b>Statutory Services</b>							
Local Land Charges	538			(8)	530	0	530
Electoral Services	1,053		4	3	1,060	(120)	940
Registrar - Births, Deaths & Marriages	1,309		6	4	1,319	0	1,319
	2,900	0	10	(1)	2,909	(120)	2,789
Income	(1,399)	0			(1,399)	(20)	(1,419)
<b>Total Statutory Services</b>	1,501	0	10	(1)	1,510	(140)	1,370
<b>Coroner</b>	739	0	0	0	739	(55)	684
<b>Integrated Customer Services</b>							
ICS Service Directors Office	193			(1)	192	(17)	175
ICS Customer Service	7,565			(41)	7,524	(797)	6,727
Welfare Benefits - Payments	1,525			1,600	3,125	0	3,125
Welfare Benefits - Administration	3,546			130	3,676	0	3,676
Local Tax	6,153	2		63	6,218	(225)	5,993
	18,982	2	0	1,751	20,735	(1,039)	19,696
Less recharged to other Services and Departments	(7,866)			49	(7,817)	797	(7,020)
Other Income	(2,293)				(2,293)	0	(2,293)
<b>Budget net of recharges</b>	8,823	2	0	1,800	10,625	(242)	10,383
<b>Changing Bristol Programmes</b>							
ICT Infrastructure Programme	2,040				2,040	0	2,040
New Ways of Working	770			655	1,425	0	1,425
	2,810	0	0	655	3,465	0	3,465

# DRAFT REVENUE BUDGET 2012/13

# CORPORATE SERVICES

Activity	Base Budget 2011/12 (Outhurn Prices)	Inflation	Virement	Other Variations	Budget 2012/13 excl. capital charges	Savings Proposals 2012/13	Proposed Budget 2012/13
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
<b>Corporate Expenses</b>							
Corporate Management and Strategy	9,584	101	(10)	63	9,738	(4,725)	5,013
Members Allowances	1,508			6	1,514	0	1,514
Financing Transactions and General Expenses	368			1	369	0	369
Discretionary Rate Relief	216				216	0	216
Asbestos removal	505				505	0	505
<b>Corporate Services sub-total</b>	<b>18,526</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>2,213</b>	<b>21,142</b>	<b>(5,413)</b>	<b>15,729</b>
<b>Public Health</b>							
Strategic Director	390			1	391	0	391
Other Income	(48)				(48)	0	(48)
	342	0	0	1	343	0	343
<b>Corporate Services total before use of reserves</b>	<b>24,640</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>603</b>	<b>2,296</b>	<b>27,642</b>	<b>(6,009)</b>	<b>21,633</b>
Less transfers from reserves:							
NWOW - to fund ParkView	(315)			315	0	0	0
To fund Transforming Bristol portfolio	(362)				(362)	0	(362)
To fund Strategic Directors/Comms & Marketing	(22)				(22)	0	(22)
To fund ICT Infrastructure Programme	(2,040)				(2,040)	0	(2,040)
<b>Total transfers from reserves</b>	<b>(2,739)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>(2,424)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(2,424)</b>
<b>Council-wide Savings</b>							
Revenue Income Project					0	(495)	(495)
Terms & Conditions					0	(500)	(500)
<b>Directorate Total</b>	<b>21,901</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>603</b>	<b>2,611</b>	<b>25,218</b>	<b>(7,004)</b>	<b>18,214</b>

Note: £1m saving included in Corporate Services budget proposals relates to the capital financing budget, so is not included here

# DRAFT REVENUE BUDGET 2012/13

# HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE

Activity	Base Budget 2011/12 (Outturn Prices)	Inflation	Virement	Other Variations	Budget 2012/13 excl. capital charges	Savings Proposals 2012/13	Proposed Budget 2012/13
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
<b>Care Management</b>							
<b>Localities and Care Direct</b>							
Locality Assessment Teams	18,981	155		(6)	19,130	(10)	19,120
Care Direct	533				533	63	596
Extra Care Housing	2,848				2,848	(315)	2,533
Other	1,568	16	(150)	35	1,469	(12)	1,457
	23,930	171	(150)	29	23,980	(274)	23,706
<b>Hospitals, Safeguarding and Deprivation of Liberty</b>							
Hospitals	8,857	156	(100)	(114)	8,799	115	8,914
Other	439	3		(10)	432	(2)	430
	9,296	159	(100)	(124)	9,231	113	9,344
<b>PSI, Asylum, Transitions, Carers, Care Brokerage</b>							
Physical & Sensory Impairment	8,464	36	(3)	104	8,601	(77)	8,524
Transitions	2,335	17		26	2,378	(21)	2,357
Asylum Seekers	761	13		(1)	773	(1)	772
Carers	1,508	4	(59)	(1)	1,452	(22)	1,430
Other	709		(110)	67	666	(2)	664
	13,777	70	(172)	195	13,870	(123)	13,747
<b>Property Income</b>	(1,308)		(85)		(1,393)		(1,393)
	<b>45,695</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>(507)</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>45,688</b>	<b>(284)</b>	<b>45,404</b>
<b>Learning Difficulties</b>							
Locality Teams	33,621	446	2		34,069	(934)	33,135
Other	(15,924)	4			(15,920)	(11)	(15,931)
	<b>17,697</b>	<b>450</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18,149</b>	<b>(945)</b>	<b>17,204</b>
<b>Mental Health</b>							
Adults of Working Age	8,348	92	(50)		8,390	(173)	8,217
Older People	5,033	73	50	2	5,158	69	5,227
	<b>13,381</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>13,548</b>	<b>(104)</b>	<b>13,444</b>
	<b>31,078</b>	<b>615</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>31,697</b>	<b>(1,049)</b>	<b>30,648</b>
<b>Divisional Total Care Management</b>	<b>76,773</b>	<b>1,015</b>	<b>(505)</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>77,385</b>	<b>(1,333)</b>	<b>76,052</b>
<b>Care Services</b>							
<b>Continuing to Care</b>	3,254		(62)		3,192		3,192
<b>Residential/Longer Term Services</b>							
Residential Unit - School Road	471			(1)	470		470
Community Meals Service	850		10	9	869	25	894
Learning Difficulties Day Centres	3,405	3	(10)	(5)	3,393		3,393
Supporting People	158	4		24	186	(85)	101
Other	153		(23)	2	132	30	162
In-House Elderly Persons Homes	10,182	26	269	(18)	10,459	(2,097)	8,362
Residential and Older People Day Services	244		86	2	332	(24)	308
	15,463	33	332	13	15,841	(2,151)	13,690
<b>Sickness &amp; Absence Reablement Team (SART), Westleigh, Older Peoples Day Services</b>							
Older People Day Centres	1,907	(2)	48	6	1,959	(176)	1,783
SART	164		(164)		0		0
	2,071	(2)	(116)	6	1,959	(176)	1,783

Activity	Base Budget 2011/12 (Outturn Prices)	Inflation	Virement	Other Variations	Budget 2012/13 excl. capital charges	Savings Proposals 2012/13	Proposed Budget 2012/13
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
<b>Reablement</b>							
Residential Unit - Concord	924	1		(2)	923		923
Short Term Assessment & Reablement (STAR)	2,503				2,503		2,503
Intermediate Care	3,311		(14)	(2)	3,295		3,295
Independent Living Service	2,746		(145)	(29)	2,572	6	2,578
Other	63			2	65		65
	9,547	1	(159)	(31)	9,358	6	9,364
<b>Choice and Control</b>							
Programme Manager	(2)		105		103	(19)	84
<b>Divisional Total - Care Services</b>	<b>30,333</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>(12)</b>	<b>30,453</b>	<b>(2,340)</b>	<b>28,113</b>
<b>Strategic Planning and Commissioning</b>							
<b>Commissioning</b>							
Commissioning Manager Longer Term Services	151		2		153		153
Strategic Commissioning Manager Reablement	392		(21)		371		371
Strategic Commissioning Manager Prevention							
- Supporting People	26,017		0	(13,054)	12,963	(1,360)	11,603
- Other	150		2		152		152
Strategic Commissioning Manager Mental Health, Learning Difficulties	1,806	10	2	(2)	1,816	(30)	1,786
Strategic Planning Manager	150		(8)		142	(9)	133
Performance and Standards Manager	557		(4)	(1)	552	(55)	497
Programme Manager Commissioning	205		(80)		125	(2)	123
<b>Divisional Total Strategic Planning and Commissioning</b>	<b>29,428</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>(107)</b>	<b>(13,057)</b>	<b>16,274</b>	<b>(1,456)</b>	<b>14,818</b>
<b>Other Services</b>							
The Director	588			15	603		603
Finance	2,426		(106)	16	2,336		2,336
Professional Development	4,980		4	(80)	4,904	(15)	4,889
ICT	2,004	1		18	2,023		2,023
Legal Services	163				163		163
Other Services	(3,115)		614	(35)	(2,536)		(2,536)
<b>Total Other Services</b>	<b>7,046</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>512</b>	<b>(66)</b>	<b>7,493</b>	<b>(15)</b>	<b>7,478</b>
<b>Directorate Total</b>	<b>143,580</b>	<b>1,058</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(13,033)</b>	<b>131,605</b>	<b>(5,144)</b>	<b>126,461</b>

Note: savings of £2.1m shown against In-House Elderly Persons Homes do not take account of reprovision costs. These are included against other activities where adult purchasing budgets are held.

# DRAFT REVENUE BUDGET

# NEIGHBOURHOODS & CITY DEVELOPMENT

Activity	Base Budget 2011/12 (Outturn Prices)	Inflation	Virement	Other Variations	Budget 2012/13 excl. capital charges	Savings Proposals 2012/13	Proposed Budget 2012/13
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
<b>Strategic Housing</b>							
Housing Solutions	2,634		845		3,479	(50)	3,429
Private Housing & Adaptations	2,072		349		2,421	(191)	2,230
Rehousing	(419)		729		310		310
Housing Strategy & Commissioning	562		98	10,648	11,308	(1,200)	10,108
Tenant Support Services	3		13		16		16
HMO Licensing	(1)				(1)		(1)
Travellers	141		(5)		136		136
<b>TOTAL Strategic Housing</b>	<b>4,992</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,029</b>	<b>10,648</b>	<b>17,669</b>	<b>(1,441)</b>	<b>16,228</b>
<b>Safer Bristol</b>							
Community Confidence	281		80	450	811		811
Community Safety	427		45		472		472
Substance Misuse Strategy	778		322	1,596	2,696		2,696
Emergency Control Centre	330		164		494		494
Neighbourhood Enforcement	2,135		254		2,389	(115)	2,274
Regulatory Compliance	133		118		251	(132)	119
Crime and Substance Misuse General	2,144	3	48	815	3,010		3,010
Youth Offending Team	1,246		470		1,716		1,716
Policy Co-ordination Unit	10		62		72		72
Civil Protection Unit	305		20		325		325
<b>TOTAL Safer Bristol</b>	<b>7,789</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1,583</b>	<b>2,861</b>	<b>12,236</b>	<b>(247)</b>	<b>11,989</b>
<b>Environment &amp; Leisure</b>							
Parks Grounds Maintenance	4,474	64	325		4,863	(100)	4,763
Parks Horticulture	900	20	470		1,390		1,390
Parks Estates and Cems & Cems	521	15	351		887	(210)	677
Public Protection	1,325	1	331		1,657	(276)	1,381
Sports	3,504	71	319	413	4,307	21	4,328
Environment & Leisure Projects	193	1	20		214		214
Neighbourhood Engagement	626		31		657		657
Strategy, Performance and Planning	923	(1)	79		1,001		1,001
Waste Services	29,036	935	1,039		31,010	(2,020)	28,990
<b>TOTAL Environment &amp; Leisure</b>	<b>41,502</b>	<b>1,106</b>	<b>2,965</b>	<b>413</b>	<b>45,986</b>	<b>(2,585)</b>	<b>43,401</b>
<b>Neighbourhoods &amp; Communities</b>							
Community Development	1,139		179		1,318		1,318
Equalities & Social Inclusion	432		173		605		605
Equalities Recharge	(270)				(270)		(270)
Investment Grants	2,932		27		2,959	(149)	2,810
Legacy Commission	139				139	(139)	0
Neighbourhood Partnerships	521		57		578		578
Libraries	6,115	19	1,328		7,462		7,462
<b>TOTAL Neighbourhoods &amp; Communities</b>	<b>11,008</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>1,764</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12,791</b>	<b>(288)</b>	<b>12,503</b>
<b>Major Projects</b>							
Sustainable Projects	89		16		105		105
Building Practice / EMU	(64)		240		176	(25)	151
Engineering Consultancy	(146)	(1)	(198)		(345)	(25)	(370)
Technical Services	684		(684)		0		0
Docks	1,113	14	186		1,313	(25)	1,288
Major Projects Team - Transport	(51)		34		(17)		(17)
<b>Total Major Projects</b>	<b>1,625</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>(406)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,232</b>	<b>(75)</b>	<b>1,157</b>

# DRAFT REVENUE BUDGET

# NEIGHBOURHOODS & CITY DEVELOPMENT

Activity	Base Budget 2011/12 (Outturn Prices)	Inflation	Virement	Other Variations	Budget 2012/13 excl. capital charges	Savings Proposals 2012/13	Proposed Budget 2012/13
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
<b>Planning &amp; Sustainable Development</b>							
Development Management	538		1,001		1,539		1,539
Strategic Planning	634		324		958		958
City Design Group	850	1	174		1,025		1,025
<b>Total Planning &amp; Sustainable Development</b>	<b>2,022</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1,499</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,522</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,522</b>
<b>Transport</b>							
Highways and Traffic	10,725	525	456		11,706	(460)	11,246
City Transport	2,805		406		3,211	(41)	3,170
Passenger Services	(107)	94	13		0		0
Parking	(4,274)	12	515		(3,747)	(865)	(4,612)
Passenger Transport	12,836	300	865		14,001	(400)	13,601
<b>Total Transport</b>	<b>21,985</b>	<b>931</b>	<b>2,255</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>25,171</b>	<b>(1,766)</b>	<b>23,405</b>
<b>Support Services &amp; Other Accounts</b>							
Directors Account / Support Services	13,973	(252)	(13,219)	(152)	350	(100)	250
Museums, Galleries & Archives	2,807	(22)	1,038		3,823	(25)	3,798
Bristol Music Trust grant	938	(1)	189		1,126		1,126
<b>Total Support Services &amp; Other Accounts</b>	<b>17,718</b>	<b>(275)</b>	<b>(11,992)</b>	<b>(152)</b>	<b>5,299</b>	<b>(125)</b>	<b>5,174</b>
<b>Neighbourhoods &amp; City Development total before use of reserves</b>	<b>108,641</b>	<b>1,798</b>	<b>(303)</b>	<b>13,770</b>	<b>123,906</b>	<b>(6,527)</b>	<b>117,379</b>
Less transfers from reserves			0	(450)	(450)		(450)
<b>Directorate Total</b>	<b>108,641</b>	<b>1,798</b>	<b>(303)</b>	<b>13,320</b>	<b>123,456</b>	<b>(6,527)</b>	<b>116,929</b>

## APPENDIX 2

## Budget Proposals 2012/13

## Children &amp; Young People's Services

	Proposed Change	Impact	Equalities impact assessment reference	Net Budget 2012/13 £000	Savings Proposals 2012/13 £000
1	Redesigned model for screening and assessment as part of Pathways Project leading to a simplified and more efficient way for families to get the services they need.	Budget reduction secured without implications for current service delivery; savings achieved by reviewing planned in-year allocation and continuing with expenditure at current budgetary levels (rather than at an increased level, as previously considered). Forms part of Pathways project to maintain commitment to early intervention/ help with improvements in multi-agency working and removal of duplication.	No Equalities Impact	3,131	600
2	Your Life, Your Future - Reviewing assessment & service delivery for disabled children and those with special educational needs (SEN) to deliver integrated assessments and increased personalisation in line with Government Green Paper and Complex Needs Strategy.	Increased effectiveness in early intervention (School Action Plus Enhanced system within schools) and integrated assessments reduces need for, and increase effectiveness of, statutory SEN assessment process. Does not affect level of funding delegated to schools for SEN.	CYPS4	4,018	150
3	Strategic Safeguarding Capacity - Review with partners of business model supporting the Bristol Safeguarding Children Board.	Efficiency in organisational arrangements of strategic body - no reduction in operational safeguarding capacity.	CYPS6	370	50
4	Reduced legal and expert costs associated with child care proceedings.	Transfer of some responsibilities back to central government, in line with policy. Increased internal capacity to provide expert assessment in court proceedings, reducing requirements for external purchasing.	CYPS7	1,660	300
5	Increase elements of trading with schools, e.g. offer services to academies and new services in light of national policy: Recover costs of Risk, Resilience & Wellbeing Team	Continue to provide statutory core service, improve cost recovery in relation to bespoke additional services.	CYPS8	146	50
6	Increase elements of trading with schools, e.g. offer services to academies and new services in light of national policy: education support services	Offer of enhanced services to schools and academies additional to core and statutory offer.	CYPS9	1,461	75
7	Bristol Youth Links - radical approach to commissioning integrated teams to deliver Bristol Youth Links services for 8-19 year olds and provide opportunities for local providers.	Shift of service delivery to targeted offer on vulnerable young people and delivery by external service providers.	CYPS11	7,434	1,000
8	Reconfiguration of central early years team to reflect changes to local authority roles in delivery of national policy statutory responsibilities	No direct impact on frontline provision.	CYPS12	1,863	297
9	Changes to early years provision to reflect government policy	Statutory, universal offer will be maintained in early years provision. Eligibility criteria for allocation of targeted resources for enhanced and subsidised provision to be reviewed to target most vulnerable families. Provision to be reconfigured in line with University of Bristol recommendations on providing effective family support.	CYPS13	8,698	250

**Budget Proposals 2012/13**
**Children & Young People's Services**

	<b>Proposed Change</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Equalities impact assessment reference</b>	<b>Net Budget 2012/13 £000</b>	<b>Savings Proposals 2012/13 £000</b>
10	Streamlining strategic and planning services for CYPS and H&SC	No direct impact on front-line service delivery; Enabling Hub (i.e. combined, smaller internal team) will improve consistency and use of resources in strategic planning, commissioning and other 'enabling' functions.	CYPS14	2,500	450
11	Efficiencies in workforce development spend through improved targeting and increased integration of learning and development resources: social care workforce	Improved commissioning of training and development for social care workforce.	CYPS15	247	50
12	Efficiencies in workforce development spend through improved targeting and increased integration of learning and development resources: early years and play workforce.	High levels of early years qualifications achieved in recent years, proposals will embed further development within early years settings and the new early years teaching centre with resources targeting specific areas of need e.g. diversity of workforce.	CYPS16	851	230
13	Reduction in overall supplies budget, e.g. printing, computing costs, equipment to reflect leaner organisation and improved procurement practices.	Limited direct impact on frontline service delivery.	CYPS17	3,824	956
14	Reduced costs through improved Early Years and Childcare commissioning arrangements and reconfiguration of service delivery	No significant reduction in quality of outcomes achieved for children and young people through efficiency measures.	CYPS18	1,115	270
15	Development & implementation of revised specialist placement commissioning strategy for children in care - improvements to Edge of Care services.	Improvements to Edge of Care services delivers a reduction of estimated 5/6 placements for children in care annually.	CYPS19	13,430	200
16	Development & implementation of revised specialist placement commissioning strategy for children in care - improvements to adoption services	Speedier adoption process reduces placement costs for children in care and increases stability for children.	CYPS20		150
17	Denominational transport policy	Savings accrued from previous policy change in relation to denominational transport; no further change to policy or any further tightening of transport support criteria.	CYPS24	408	10
18	Reduced costs arising from identifying efficiencies and premises changes as a result of other projects	Limited direct impact on front-line service delivery.	CYPS25	1,400	100
	Services not included in budget proposals			19,676	
	<b>DIRECTORATE TOTAL</b>			<b>72,232</b>	<b>5,188</b>

# Budget Proposals 2012/13

# Corporate Services

	Proposed Change	Impact	Equalities impact reference	Net Budget 2012/13 £000	Savings Proposals 2012/13 £000
	<b>Finance, Audit and Property</b>				
1	<b>Finance</b> - Review of Finance function linked to the introduction of a new Financial Management System (FMS) - new ways of working, manager self service and a modern system.	Efficiency savings	CS1a CS1b	8,558	591
2	<b>Property</b> - Staffing reductions - delivered from a more cohesive Corporate Property function	Efficiencies only.	CS1a CS1b	2,203	150
3	<b>Audit</b> - Staffing reductions in audit and HB fraud teams - Prioritisation of resources to key risk areas.	Only minimal additional risk, through effectively setting priorities	CS1a CS1b	1,646	100
4	<b>Performance Team</b> - Staffing reductions	No impact on the service as admin functions will be absorbed within the team.	CS1a CS1b	256	34
	<b>Strategic Commissioning &amp; Procurement</b>				
5	<b>Commissioning and Procurement</b> - Complete restructuring of service. More strategic focus on high-spend opportunities. Some operational support no longer available. Increasing collaborative work.	New, more efficient ways of working no reduction in quality of commissioning and procurement outcomes.	CS1a CS1b	1,389	140
6	<b>Commissioning and Procurement</b> - More favourable rates negotiated with suppliers of agency staff.	None	No Equalities Impact		200
	<b>ICT and Centre of Excellence</b>				
7	<b>ICT</b> - Additional benefits from the ICT change programme (Fit for the Future) completed in October 2011. (Note - the ICT change programme has already delivered savings of £1.9m including £1m to the 2010/11 MTFP)	No service implications - these are the cost savings flowing from efficiency improvements taken in previous years.	CS7	17,326	225
8	<b>ICT</b> - Phase 2 of ICT reductions, including further post reductions, exploit the benefits of our investment in new technology to reduce the cost of replacing PC's/ IT equipment, and adjust some internal service support levels	Potential reduction in service desk opening hours. No other impacts anticipated	CS1a CS1b		290
9	Centre of Excellence (CoE) - Reductions in staffing levels in the Centre of Excellence for programme and project management as capability to manage programme and projects increases in business teams (note - elements of CoE are funded from reserves, not general fund)	Will require services to grow stronger project management and business change capability, as there will be less support available from the CoE	CS1a CS1b	677	160
10	Centre of Excellence - Integration of the CoE for Programme and Project Management (PPM) and the ICT services, economies of scale	Improved change support to internal services as resources will be better aligned, planned and coordinated with business change plans.	CS1a CS1b		80
	<b>Integrated Customer Services (ICS)</b>				
11	<b>ICS</b> - Modernisation of Customer Services programme (via increase in channel shift - so access to services via self serve 24/7 for suitable transactions / customers. Involves reconfiguration of Customer Service Points, business process re-engineering.)	Improved customer service	CS11	7,524	485

**Budget Proposals 2012/13**
**Corporate Services**

	<b>Proposed Change</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Equalities impact reference</b>	<b>Net Budget 2012/13 £000</b>	<b>Savings Proposals 2012/13 £000</b>
12	<b>ICS</b> - Business process reengineering in Revenues and Benefits - Speed up processing times, improve accuracy, reduce risk of reduced subsidy from government.	Improved customer satisfaction. Potential dip in service levels whilst work is done.	CS1a CS1b	7,601	50
13	<b>ICS</b> - Combine back office functions across ICS. Benefits and Local tax already merged, and can now review their back offices together with Customer Service; IT, business support and Training.	Likely no impact on customers.	CS1a CS1b		50
14	<b>ICS</b> - Service manager post deleted.	No impact on customers.	CS1a CS1b		55
15	<b>ICS</b> -Merge Court and debt management.	No impact likely to be noticed by customers. Reduces capacity and therefore potential collection / cash flow issues - especially with introduction of localised Council tax Benefit, and other Welfare Reforms.	CS1a CS1b		80
16	<b>ICS</b> - Merge business rates and valuation teams.	No impact on customers.	CS1a CS1b		40
17	<b>ICS</b> - Service director budget - remove budget for temporary project staff	No noticeable customer impact. No scope for agency / fixed term project and ad hoc support.	CS1a CS1b	192	17
	<b>Legal Services</b>				
18	<b>Legal Services</b> - Comprehensive service review - increased efficiency enabling increased income and decreased spend on external legal support	No likely impact on outcomes through less costly new ways of working.	CS1a CS1b	6,078	536
	<b>Shared Transactional Services (STS)</b>				
19	STS - Full year effect of the establishment of STS phase 1	None	No Equalities Impact	7,902	464
20	STS - Improving electronic invoicing take up from 20% to 50%	Payments will be made more promptly	No Equalities Impact		91
21	Learning and Development - Reduction in commissioned training spend	Minimal risk to the skills needed across the organisation to focus on priority challenges through tighter focusing of available funding onto priorities.	CS24	2,851	170
	<b>STS: Facilities Management:</b>		CS1a CS1b	15,752	
22	<b>STS FM</b> - Cleaning - reduce number of vans and increase external income	None	CS1a CS1b		13
23	<b>STS FM</b> -Centralise pool cars, reduce external hire	None	CS1a CS1b		222
24	<b>STS FM</b> - reduce mail volumes, reduce one co ordinator, lower cost large mail runs	channel shift dependant on behavioural change	CS1a CS1b		121
25	<b>STS FM</b> - Security reductions, restructure day security, increase external income	Change in service delivery mechanism	CS1a CS1b		139
26	<b>STS FM</b> - Increase external lettings, reduce one FTE, centralise management of venues	None	CS1a CS1b		105
	<b>Statutory Services</b>				
27	<b>Elections</b> -Change in scanning centre arrangements for postal vote returns	Efficiency through new, smarter working arrangements.	No Equalities Impact	1,050	70

# Budget Proposals 2012/13

# Corporate Services

	Proposed Change	Impact	Equalities impact reference	Net Budget 2012/13 £000	Savings Proposals 2012/13 £000
28	<b>Elections</b> -Use BCC staff for key posts as part of their total employment requirements	none	CS27		25
29	<b>Elections</b> -Reduction in usage of temporary staff to support elections and canvass	Service delivery - internal. A core team of 7.5 FTE will assist in reduction of use of temporary staff by 1.5 FTE.	CS1a CS1b		25
30	<b>Lord Mayor Support</b> –Implement a lean support package for Lord Mayor's diary, functions and transport. Reduce hospitality budget.	Modernised support arrangements, but some reduction in hospitality and religious services provided	CS1a CS1b	301	40
31	<b>Coroner</b> – Reduction in Assistant Deputy Support. NB 40% savings in Coroner and Mortuary to BCC -this is an Avon wide service (60% to other 3 local authorities).	none - efficiency only	CS1a CS1b	536	10
32	<b>Mortuary</b> – Reduction in employee costs in specialist mortuary team (40% to BCC a further 60% to three other partner authorities)	none - efficiency only	CS1a CS1b	203	20
33	<b>Mortuary</b> - income optimisation (40% to BCC a further 60% to three other partner authorities) by seeing more specialist/out of area work within existing capacity	None	CS35		10
34	<b>Coroner</b> –All Post Mortem examinations at Flax Bourton (40% to BCC a further 60% to other local authorities) - Bath hospital deaths transferred	Some bereaved families may have further to travel (as consistent arrangements are introduced across the greater Bristol area)	CS36		15
35	<b>Registrars</b> –NCS (Nationality Checking Service) implementation - Additional net income. Bristol will fill a current vacant post to deliver this service on behalf of the city	More efficient service, charged at standard national rate	CS38	580	20
	<b>Communication, Marketing, Festivals and Events</b>			5,649	
36	<b>Comms, Marketing, Festivals and Events</b> - Stop producing Our City magazine as a paper publication, distributed door to door (i.e. move to online only).	Reduction in capacity to promote services/council campaigns in support of business/20:20 objectives	CS41		86
37	<b>Comms, Marketing, Festivals and Events</b> - Reduced contribution to Destination Bristol	Efficiency only	CS48		17
38	<b>Comms, Marketing, Festivals and Events</b> - Increased income from outside space licensing	Better sweating of our assets	No Equalities Impact		50
39	<b>Comms, Marketing, Festivals and Events</b> - Centralisation of Design and Print budgets	Structural change to get to grips with reducing avoidable spend on design and print	CS50		300
40	<b>Comms, Marketing, Festivals and Events</b> - Arts, festivals and events - full year effect of 2011/12 changes	No further change - just realising full year effect of changes mid-year	No Equalities Impact		85
	<b>Bristol Futures</b>				
41	<b>Bristol Futures</b> - Restructure of teams within the Bristol Futures Division and refocusing of external commissioning. Refocus of the deliverables of the Bristol Futures Division to help meet the Council's objectives	reduction in capacity only in lower priority and lower impact work areas (to be identified)	CS1a CS1b	3,940	228

# Budget Proposals 2012/13

# Corporate Services

	Proposed Change	Impact	Equalities impact reference	Net Budget 2012/13 £000	Savings Proposals 2012/13 £000
	<b>Miscellaneous</b>				
42	<b>Corporate</b> - Senior Management Restructuring	None, changes already occurred	No Equalities Impact	1,432	400
43	<b>Corporate</b> - Revenue Income project	None - all through increasing income for using spare capacity and assets	CS54		495
44	<b>Corporate</b> - Treasury Management - changes in debt management between the General Fund and the Housing Revenue Account	none	No Equalities Impact		1,000
45	<b>Corporate</b> - Terms and Conditions. A comprehensive review of terms and conditions of employment will take place over two years with the objective of modernising our employee reward package and increasing productivity. The proposals will focus on delivering savings through streamlining and discontinuing non contractual allowances, reducing expenditure on voluntary overtime and introducing a holiday purchase salary sacrifice scheme	Although some staff may lose income, this would be through consistently paying a fair, agreed rate for the job. Other staff would benefit from the flexibility for trading off holidays against pay	CS56(1) CS56(2) CS56(3)		500
	Services not included in budget proposals			20,533	
	Recharges to other Departments			(89,006)	
	<b>DIRECTORATE TOTAL</b>			25,173	<b>8,004</b>

**Budget Proposals 2012/13**
**Health and Social Care**

	<b>Proposed Change</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Equalities impact reference</b>	<b>Base Budget 2012/13 £000</b>	<b>Savings Proposals 2012/13 £000</b>
	<b>Savings Proposals</b>				
1	To streamline care management processes to deliver an improved and high performing care management function.	Realignment of the workforce to deliver a simplified and standardised customer pathway to make it easier for people to access self directed support.	HSC1	12,113	590
2	To review the shape and delivery of day opportunities for all service user groups which supports the delivery of self directed support.	An increased use of personal budgets across user groups leading to a more creative and flexible model of delivery.	HSC2	7,223	233
3	To revisit the Residential Futures programme and finalise a 3-year plan for the delivery of residential care in March 2012 .	Potential impact on current residents, subject to the contents of the plan.	HSC3	10,545	1,448
4	To work with care providers to review high cost packages, to ensure value for money.	Service users to continue to receive good quality packages but at a reduced cost.	HSC4	6,317	245
5	Improved commissioning of independent sector homecare through the introduction of a framework contract, exploring working with neighbouring local authorities.	Good quality packages for service users with greater coverage and better value for money.	HSC5	8,044	75
6	Review of community equipment service through joint commissioning with Health to ensure value for money. Reduction in care costs through increased use of Assistive Technology.	Improved choice to support independence.	HSC6	2,572	32
7	Ensure usage of standardised commissioning processes across all Health & Social Care commissioning activity.	Improved value for money across all commissioning activity.	HSC7	12,285	500
8	Creating alternatives to residential/nursing care by expanding community supported living and shared lives.	Increased community based living opportunities.	HSC8	15,852	586
9	Re-commissioning of Supporting People services	Commission only cost effective interventions and retender to ensure best value.	HSC10	12,963	1,360
10	Streamlining and sharing of business support functions with Children and Young Peoples Services (Enabling Hub).	Reduction in staffing numbers as functions are brought together.	CYPS14	1,949	100
11	Developing the service delivery model for community meals	Delivering improved choice at lower costs	No Equalities Impact	376	(25)
	Services not included in budget proposals			41,366	
	<b>DIRECTORATE TOTAL</b>			<b>131,605</b>	<b>5,144</b>

**Budget Proposals 2012/13**
**Neighbourhoods and City Development**

	Proposed Change	Impact	Equalities impact reference	Net Budget 2012/13 £000	Savings Proposals 2012/13 £000
1	Market tested efficiency savings to Building Practice and Docks	Improvement Plan - year 2 actions	No Equalities Impact	1,489	50
2	Increase land income generated by increasing charges for Landlords Expo, furnished tenancies (service charges covered by), increased rents in council hostels (covered by Housing Benefit) and charges for training.	A sliding scale of charges for training will be used that reflect organisational circumstances	NHDS03a NHDS03c	NA	62
3	Process reviews and efficiencies within Strategic Housing	Savings from process redesign and commissioning	NHDS04	1,342	84
4	Licensing fees increases e.g. houses in multiple occupation (HMO)	Improvement in housing conditions in this sector. This change was agreed last year and represents the last stage of making HMO licensing self-financing. It has been agreed up-front with landlords and is not expected to have much impact on the availability of HMO's.	NHDS06	NA	75
5	Reduce discretionary housing activity. Divert staff from discretionary activity like low-level complaints into additional licensing (non-statutory) of HMO's, funded through fees. The project is subject to specific consultation.	Improvement in housing conditions in this sector as it shifts resources to worst condition/worst managed stock.	NHDS09	NA	20
6	Legacy Commission (LC) - withdraw funding - end of transitional year funding; agreed with Commission.	Potential reputational impact of ending support for this work within Black and Minority Ethnic communities. However, significant piece of consultation currently underway to identify a suitable route forward for the core work from the LC and joining it up with wider black voice and influence work	NHDS11	139	139
7	Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) Invest option 1 - reduction in investment. 2nd phase of agreed reduction (previous MTFP) to VCS investment fund. Delivered through new agreed strategy from 1st April 2012. Already consulted with sector.	There will be some groups currently funded which will not be via the new strategy, which may have a wider impact. This will not be known until after the funding allocations in December 2011.	NHDS12	1,280	75
8	Grounds maintenance: Reduce spending on Parks fleet.	None	No Equalities Impact	4,863	100
9	New Waste Contract procurement, delivering savings	New contract has service improvements	NHDS18	16,165	1,900
10	Parking charges: introduce £1 charge per visit at Ashton Court	None	NHDS19	0	210
11	Reduce commercial consumer advice	Reduce commercial consumer advice where it duplicates an alternative free service from another provider. One post to be funded through the Recovered Assets Fund to provide a level of Tier 2 intervention.	NHDS21	689	80
12	Licensing to become cost neutral	None	NHDS22	121	132
13	Regulatory compliance unit	Cost reduction	No Equalities Impact	110	35
14	Reduce scope of food safety business advice service to focus on statutory functions	Food Safety: training could be provided by the private sector who would charge for the service.	NHDS25	1,346	116
15	Pest service - reduce/outsource/introduce cost recovery for some non-statutory services	Service will now focus on treatments for Rats, Gulls, Operation Stream clean and Sewer baiting. Customers will be charged £25 per treatment for rats, and a free service for those on benefits.	NHDS26	411	160

**Budget Proposals 2012/13**
**Neighbourhoods and City Development**

	Proposed Change	Impact	Equalities impact reference	Net Budget 2012/13 £000	Savings Proposals 2012/13 £000
16	Reduce cost of toilets	No public toilets will close	NHDS27	822	120
17	Reduce staff in Museums and Archives	Increased pressure on what is already a lean staff structure	No Equalities Impact	2,513	25
18	Market testing Parking enforcement/ Engineering consultancy. Year 2 of implementing a Service Improvement Plan as a result of a Soft Market Testing Exercise	None	No Equalities Impact	NA	50
19	Blue badges - introduce charge as permitted by national legislation towards cost of badge issue.	Better enforcement of the scheme and improved security which should in time create a better situation for Blue Badge holders to park.	NHDS34	NA	40
20	Drainage works - reduced budget	No implications for drainage works due to equivalent increase in capital funding. Reduction in capital available for other highway maintenance works but this will be more closely guided by the Transport Asset Management Plan.	NHDS39	141	41
21	Street lighting energy savings through improvements and investment	None	NHDS42	2,979	285
22	Lighting maintenance - savings to be found through reduced maintenance requirements of new technologies such as Light-emitting diode (LED) and reduced need to change lamps due to white light.	None	NHDS50	859	50
23	On street parking - additional income from pay & display spaces in new schemes and conversion of limited waiting bays to pay & display and further enforcement of bus lanes	None	NHDS44	(11,537)	500
24	Rationalise non-statutory public transport contracts & negotiate improved deals	Reduced level of supported bus services - agreed at Cabinet on 9 June 2011	NHDS45	14,001	400
25	Traffic and Highways - rationalised staffing structure - Savings incorporated into service review and restructure.	None	No Equalities Impact	7,383	75
26	Review of parking strategy, introduction of new charges using new technology	None	NHDS44	NA	300
27	Signals maintenance - budget reduction	Chargeable maintenance to be reduced which will reduce improvement of ageing infrastructure but only by a small amount.	NHDS49	485	50
28	Performance and Programme Management - Establishment reduced by 2 posts.	Work will be covered by realigning this team onto core duties	No Equalities Impact	816	100
29	Jubilee Pool - additional budget		No Equalities Impact	155	(21)
30	Re-commissioning a range of housing support services.	Impact of reductions mitigated through larger contracts with lower overheads, faster throughput, and reduced numbers of repeat users	NHDS55a NHDS55b NHDS55c NHDS55d NHDS55e NHDS55f NHDS 55g	16,327	1,200
31	Further reduction of temporary funding in former Neighbourhood Renewal areas	This is a tailing off of transitional funding, whilst still developing the Neighbourhood Partnership work	NHDS56	500	74
	Services not included in budget proposals			60,057	
	<b>DIRECTORATE TOTAL</b>			<b>123,456</b>	<b>6,527</b>

## APPENDIX 3

The latest projection for 2011/12, based on expenditure to the end of November, indicates that, overall, expenditure is now expected to be contained within available resources by the year end. A small net underspend is now forecast, compared to a projected overspend of £2.7m at the half year stage, as previously reported to Cabinet. This is largely due to a significant improvement in the HSC position and additional, unbudgeted income from the PCT now being included. Details, by directorate, are as follows:

Directorate	Spending pressures	Budget £m	Net Projection	
			Previous £m	Latest £m
CYPS	<p>The latest projected overspend remains as reported previously.</p> <p>The key risk area continues to be care placements, where the number of children in care has fallen each month since July 2011, but still above the level anticipated in the MTFP. The strategy for reducing expenditure in this area is based on the recruitment of in-house foster carers, whose cost is less than independent agencies.</p> <p>All planned expenditure for the remainder of the year is being reviewed and maximum use of grant funding is being applied in order to minimise the overspend.</p>	71.7	2.2	2.2
Corporate Services	<p>A net underspend of £300k is now forecast, after the agreed use of reserves.</p> <p>The main pressure is still Benefits payments, where the projected overspend is £1.3m, mainly in respect of de-regulated tenancies currently in payment. Significant risks remain for cases not yet in payment and subject to appeals (estimated £3.1m) and also rejected claims not yet appealed (estimated £1m). This will continue to be closely monitored and potential provision considered at year end when the outturn position is known.</p>	17.4	-	(0.3)

Directorate	Spending pressures	Budget £m	Net Projection	
			Last report £m	Current report £m
Health and Social Care	<p>The latest forecast indicates further improvements since the last projected overspends (£0.8m based on October, £1.6m based on August).</p> <p>The Care Management Division is forecast to overspend by £3.4m, but this is offset by underspends in Care Services (£1.1m) and Strategic Planning and Commissioning (£2.1m). The underspends are largely due to staff vacancies and reductions in Supporting People spend, where payments to providers have been reduced in line with performance. Continuing action is being taken within the directorate to bring the budget back into balance by the year end.</p>	143.6	1.6	0.3
City Development/ Neighbourhoods	<p>City Development - the forecast overspend is unchanged from the previous report at £0.2m.</p> <p>Neighbourhoods - A small underspend now projected.</p> <p>Savings targets in both areas have been achieved, however there have been pressures as a result of the economic climate, eg in parking, parks grounds maintenance and Development Management. These have been funded from reserves and one-off savings.</p>	41.0	0.2	0.2
		72.2	-	-
		113.2	0.2	0.2
Capital financing	No change. Variation previously reported reflects reduced borrowing costs as a result of the level of slippage on the capital programme in 2010/11, plus increased return on investments above that budgeted.	18.1	(1.0)	(1.0)

Directorate	Spending pressures	Budget £m	Net Projection	
			Last report £m	Current report £m
Contingency & Provisions	Forecast now includes provision of £2m for potential costs of De-regulated tenancies decisions and settlement of legal costs in respect of Waste Management appeal outcome. Offset by allocation of funding from PCT (£2.2m).	2.0	0.5	(0.8)
Unallocated pensions, water levies, etc		3.8	-	-
<b>Sub-total</b>		<b>369.8</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>0.6</b>
Less corporate contingency not required			(0.8)	(0.8)
<b>Total projected underspend</b>			<b>2.7</b>	<b>(0.2)</b>

## Budget Consultation - Summary

### 1. Overview

The council published its proposals for £27 million worth of savings for the 2012/13 budget on 24 November 2011. The public consultation also began on this date.

### 2. Methodology

Following the strong response from the 2011/12 (financial year) consultation, a budget conversation website was once again created ([askbristolonbudget.wordpress.com](http://askbristolonbudget.wordpress.com)) to explain the proposals and background and begin a public conversation. A deadline of Wednesday 11 January 2012 was set for comments to be included in the Cabinet report. A further deadline of the Wednesday 15 February was set for additional comments for an updated report to Full Council.

In this consultation, we asked people to consider specific budget proposals and respond to them. This differed in methodology to last year's consultation which was easier for the public to engage with as we were asking for broader suggestions on doing more-for-less and saving money, before specific proposals were published.

- The public could participate in the public conversation - where their comments are visible to all, or in a private capacity using an online and offline form
- In the private response form in this year's consultation, we did include an invite for the public to make any new suggestions for saving money, but asked them to review the multitude of suggestions received last year and our response prior to check if their idea was a duplicate.
- Posters were distributed to all public libraries in the city promoting the consultation and offline resources were made available in the Central Library and on request by telephone
- An article was included in the last edition of Our City (delivered to all homes in early 2012) to ensure the main elements of the proposals were communicated and people had an opportunity to respond
- Extensive work was done with the local media to ensure the message about the proposals and the consultation was effectively communicated
- Short videos featuring The Leader were made to help promote the consultation

### 3. Response

The ASK Bristol on budget website received a good response with 5,114 visits. The private response form attracted 22 fully completed responses (36 partially completed responses). A total of 47 public comments were left on the website with some respondents making multiple comments. The website received a good number of visits, however, it should be noted that the number of respondents leaving a comment was very small. Two respondents cited the difficulty in understanding the budget proposals. The methodology of asking respondents to study the specific proposals and address their comments to them makes for a more demanding process which probably explains the low response.

Members are invited to look at the verbatim responses at: [www.bristol.gov.uk/budgetproposals](http://www.bristol.gov.uk/budgetproposals)

### 4. Analysis of response

Any analysis of comments needs to consider the low number of people taking part. A varied

range of concerns and suggestions were raised on the ASK Bristol on budget website and the private response forms, including:

- Ashton Court parking charges
- Adult social care changes
- GBBN – concerns about spending, effectiveness and suggestions to divert money
- Street lights – ideas about turning them off at night
- Road maintenance and schemes
- Salaries and Councillor's allowance

Members are recommended to look at the verbatim responses at:

[www.bristol.gov.uk/budgetproposals](http://www.bristol.gov.uk/budgetproposals)

#### **5. Suggestions for saving money**

The survey attracted 11 ideas for other suggestions for saving money, including street light changes, transport savings and a proposal for more street markets to help with employment and regeneration. These can be viewed at [www.bristol.gov.uk/budgetproposals](http://www.bristol.gov.uk/budgetproposals)

#### **6. EQIA comments**

The budget proposals were published alongside equalities impact assessments (EQIA) for the proposals. The private response form gave respondents the opportunity to make comments on the EQIA's. Appendix 5 (ii) summarises the equalities related consultation responses, together with the Council's response.

#### **7. Summary**

The council's budget proposals attracted interest from the public, borne out by the 5,067 visits to the ASK Bristol website, however, the number of people choosing to leave a comment was low despite the promotional effort. Consideration of the comments and suggestions here needs to bear in mind the low levels participating. Future budget proposal consultations could benefit from greater efforts to explain the proposals in plain English to make it easier for the public to understand what is being proposed.

### **Budget Proposals 2012/13 – Cumulative Impact on Equalities Issues**

This paper summarises Bristol City Council's approach to understanding the impact of budget proposals for 2012 - 2013 on people in Bristol with a range of protected characteristics, as defined in the Equality Act 2010, and in line with the Council's new Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED).

There is a general reality that with less public spending, some individuals may be negatively affected by the spending reductions that have to be put in place. This process is first about ensuring that wherever possible those savings are made without such negative impacts (such as by making efficiency savings in the way things are run). It is also about making sure that where there is a risk of unavoidable negative impacts, that the extent of those impacts are where possible predicted, with any mitigating measures put in place to help reduce that impact so that it is neither unexpected, nor ultimately disproportionate.

This paper does not purport to tell the whole story of the budget - merely to look in more detail at a modest number of issues where there is potentially a risk of cumulative impact on a particular group or set of individuals. This paper demonstrates that we are mindful of the risk of cumulative impact and have taken account of the risk in our budget proposals.

As detailed at length elsewhere in the papers, there have been a range of principles that are repeatedly reflected in these budget proposals including:

- \* deliberately and proactively seeking to protect the levels of service or positive outcomes enjoyed by our service users
- \* a general approach, in tough economic times, to target services at those most in need rather than to maintain universality, keeping some services unchanged and cutting some others altogether
- \* successful efforts to meet savings targets through efficiencies, better use of technology, and through organisational change - prioritising services and outcomes for the users of those services over maintaining a particular way of doing business (or necessarily continuing with an existing provider where another could perhaps do the job better or more economically).

Elsewhere in the budget papers are details of proposals which will substantially improve the lives of different people in Bristol, including older people, young people and people with disabilities - whether that is building a new swimming pool or investing more in elderly extra care housing, providing new school places or making extra funding available for aids and adaptations which allow people to stay living more independently in their own homes, or for new bus routes with accessible buses.

What this paper does show is how hard we are working to think about, and where possible minimise, the risk of negative impacts from so large an overall net reduction in public spending.

Details of the process we went through to reach these conclusions are set out in appendix A.

## **1. Cumulative Impact - Vulnerable Young People**

A range of budget proposals potentially affect young people generally.

The Bristol Youthlinks (BYL) proposal does represent a budget saving, but also contains with it a greater focus on vulnerable young people. The savings proposed here come from the way in which services are organised, rather from cutting the level and quality of services provided. Under the proposal, funding will be weighted to areas of deprivation in the City.

Voluntary and Community Services (VCS) organisations, including those that are equalities led, have raised concerns about how they might be affected by the commissioning process. As it is not possible to predict which groups will feel what level of impact before detailed commissioning processes are actually carried out, we accept that we will need to return to this issue at a later stage during that commissioning process, so as to ensure that these potential impacts are identified and mitigated as appropriate.

More positively, housing support to young people is an explicit part of one of the BYL proposals, and should therefore see an enhancement of services to vulnerable young people. City wide and targeted provision for Deaf young people and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) young people is also explicit within the specification for the services.

Elsewhere, the proposal in relation to high support services to young people (previously provided through 'Supporting People' funding) will see no reduction in quality of service.

Government reorganisation has placed added responsibilities on local authorities relating to disabled young people and young people with Special Educational Needs (SEN) having access to further education – up to the age of 24 years. This means aligning statutory processes that are currently delivered separately in different Council departments, making sure that we work as one council (and also with the National Health Service) to deliver the savings whilst ensuring that young people aren't at risk of losing support during the transition.

In relation to the Pathways Project – it is too early to say who will be affected, as we have not designed the operating model yet. Some of the current providers are VCS organisations, but we do not know yet what, if any, decommissioning will occur and what issues for the users of those VCS services we might need to identify and mitigate. We accept therefore the need to return to this issue at a later stage during that commissioning process, so as to ensure that these potential impacts are identified and mitigated as appropriate. There has not been an impact of saving from Pathways to date but it is part of a broader project which will need to be monitored carefully as we go forward.

In relation to Youth Inclusion Projects (led by the Safer Bristol partnership) – contracts are ending and our aim is that the Common Assessment Framework

(CAF) process will pick up the young people who need this service in future. We accept that we will need to monitor this as CAF processes change and are streamlined within the Pathways project. Again, we shall therefore need to return to this issue at a later stage during that process, so as to ensure that these potential impacts are identified and mitigated as appropriate.

In relation to changes proposed around disabled children – maintaining and putting in place good support and services to young people who have a relatively low level of need, for example those children and people who are visually impaired or hearing impaired, is a concern and will be monitored. Ultimately the council has a responsibility to meet the needs of children with Special Educational Needs.

The budget proposals also reflect the pressure that by 2015 we need to create 3,000 more primary places, in light of the growing numbers of children in Bristol. Very positively, there is a capital commitment of £58M to invest in the primary sector to develop such new places.

When considering the impact of welfare reform on children, we found for instance that 37 families in 4+ bedroom properties will each lose about £80 per week because of national changes to housing benefit (cap on income). A high proportion of these families are Black and minority ethnic (BME), many Somali. This will happen in the course of 2012/13. On the positive side we know who the families are and will be offering a level of intervention to ensure families are enabled to access all other benefits they may be entitled to and to negotiate with the private landlords about rent levels (where possible). We also note that the tax threshold will increase by 8% from April 2012 and may increase again, meaning that low income families will pay less income tax.

There will be no reduction in support to care leavers to access and take up further and higher education opportunities. Bristol provides relatively high levels of support to children in care but we have to bear in mind that there are currently 700 children in care which is at a peak level. The council has therefore protected budgets for children in care/at risk.

The proposals around early years services are to reshape rather than reduce services. Positively, more 2 years olds will be eligible for free early education places (based on free school meals type criteria) and funding will come from Government for this. Although all 3 and 4 year olds will continue to access free government-funded early years provision, our priority is to ensure that children in need and their families receive additional health, family support and early education services. Families on relatively good income levels currently accessing wrap-around childcare places in Children's Centres may experience higher costs as subsidies are reduced. A strength in Bristol is the established partnership working with health services. This is evident in our 3 specialist children's centres where there are joined up support services that yield efficiencies e.g. fewer missed health appointments because of co-location of services. We are working to increase advice and guidance provided by Jobcentre Plus at children's centres - to help families with parents and carers out of work/on benefits.

Any changes in day centre provision could impact on disabled parents and this needs to be looked at by the Council services that also support disabled parents.

The changes to housing adaptation service will be modest and should result in a better service for less money.

There are concerns about reductions in transport funding because many young people are dependent on public transport. As this transport is high cost, the withdrawal nationally of Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA) means many young people are less able to pay for transport to get to college etc. Also, reductions in concessionary transport home to school (for those young people attending faith schools) will impact on young people being able to go to their school of choice.

Positively, the Government has recently announced that the pupil premium will increase from April 2012. This is additional funding from Central Government to schools and is based on numbers of children who receive free school meals. The current amount is £488 per child and this will increase to £600 per child. The funding will enable schools to support better those children who are from disadvantaged backgrounds.

Overall, therefore, we have recognised that some young people will be impacted by more than one budget proposal (either directly, or by changes affecting their parents/carers). As well as the general mitigating factors suggested alongside each individual proposal, where practicable, we are identifying the specific individuals/families concerned, so that we can seek to mitigate disproportionate cumulative impacts.

## **2. Cumulative Impact – Older People and Disabled People**

The move to Personalisation in social care is driven by a commitment to ensuring that older and disabled people are in the driving seat about the activities they wish to undertake and how they want those to be delivered in order to meet their social care needs. We recognise the need to offer support to people to enable them to exercise more choice and control over the services they receive. There will be opportunities for those who prefer a traditional approach to services to have this although people will know the value of the support provided and how this may be spent. We believe personalisation will bring huge benefits to older and disabled people that will impact on all aspects of their lives.

Access to transport is key to people being able to access other services e.g. as traditional day service provision changes people need transport to other services/locations. The transport proposals, in relation to the Greater Bristol Bus Network (GBBN) will improve the transport offer, particularly to older and disabled people. There will be £70M of investment in 10 corridors into Bristol with improved access and infrastructure and real time information. Hackney carriage taxis are now also required to be accessible, which provides another transport choice.

The Council will need to further consider transport links and accessibility as part of future service changes.

We are about to embark on recommissioning of community transport, mainly to improve the efficiency of the service (rather than to reduce service levels). In this process, the Council will seek to ensure that we commission to meet the needs of older and disabled people who find it most difficult to access other forms of transport and who may need more flexible transport to get to community based social care opportunities. We are currently undertaking in-depth research to ensure a thorough assessment of community transport needs.

In relation to Community Care individual assessments – through this process we are able to identify the impact of changes on the individual service user and carer. This is the safety net that will identify individual service needs and meet those needs.

Any changes in day centre provision could impact on disabled people, older people and carers and impact will be considered as part of the proposals that are developed. We are currently in consultation on this issue.

With regards to the blue badge charging proposals, from January 2012 councils are able to charge for blue badges in order to cover some of the costs of administration. Disabled people in Bristol will be charged £10 for a 3 year badge, with £5 going to Government and £5 towards the Council's administration costs. Although this is a small charge, we have noted that disabled people are affected by many cuts and changes e.g. welfare reform, so there is a cumulative impact. This charge may be considered 'disability related expenditure' by the Council which is a positive as it means it will be taken in to account when means-testing people for services (that is, that some people will be charged a little less for other services as a result of from now on paying for their blue badge).

Although the proposals around public toilets represent a big concern for older and disabled people, we can confirm that these savings are to be found by efficiencies in toilet cleaning costs, rather than by reducing the number or opening times of those toilets.

When it comes to proposals around street lighting – there may be a disproportionate fear of crime amongst disabled people and older people. However, the switch from yellow sodium light to white light is about energy efficiency and does not diminish light levels. Any dimming during the night will happen on main roads in 2012/13 and if implemented in local neighbourhoods in future there will be consultation with residents using the Council's neighbourhood partnership/neighbourhood forum structures. This consultation will need to consider the impact on older people disabled people e.g. visually impaired people in particular.

9,000 households receive a range of services and cuts to the former 'Supporting People' budgets could affect older and disabled people. Also some providers may be affected by these same reductions, so we will need to track impact on some multiply funded VCS organisations as we proceed with the implementation of this proposal.

Benefits checks and advice services, including the Council's welfare rights and money advice service (WRAMAS), are key to ensuring that we maximise the income of older and disabled people. We have protected VCS advice service funding and WRAMAS. Care Direct staff are being trained up to offer benefits help as are other practitioners to further enhance this provision.

We acknowledge that it will be important that any changes to residential care look closely at current and future users' needs. Full consultation is currently underway on a 3 year plan for residential care with proposals going to Cabinet in March 2012. Once proposals are agreed full EQIAs will be done to support them. Managing any moves will be key to any service change as will the individual assessments which will be undertaken for each person potentially affected.

When we review high cost packages, we will be negotiating with providers to understand the costs of care and renegotiate lower costs where appropriate without loss of support to the service user.

Pest control – we will be charging for this service but for people on benefits or pension credit the service will continue to be free.

### **3. Cumulative Impact – Women**

Women are more than half of the Bristol population, make up 63% of council staff, and are highly represented among our service users in most areas, because of the make up of the population and their associated needs (e.g. 56% of people over 70 years are women, as women generally live longer than men). This means that budget cuts across the board will affect women but there are some areas that we have identified where we need to be particularly vigilant :

Women as carers - in the move to personalisation of social care budgets, many disabled and older people will make the transition to managing their own budgets and this has implications for carers, the majority of whom are women. We recognise the need to ensure that support for carers is maintained and that we fulfil our responsibilities to carers. Changes to benefits also mean that carers may lose income. Childcare will become less affordable as child tax credits reduce. See the section on vulnerable young people for information about early years services and our priority groups.

In relation to women affected by domestic and other forms of gender violence – funding for organisations that support women affected by violence has been protected year on year over recent years and will continue to be protected within 2012/13 commissioning budgets, even though these budgets are under considerable pressure generally. We still need to consider changes to Legal Aid and welfare benefits cuts that impact on women affected by or fleeing violence and this has informed our commitment to preserving investment in this area.

Women on low income – the pay gap between women and men is particularly wide for older women. As in the section on older and disabled people we recognise the need to offer people support to identify benefits that they are entitled to and to increase uptake to maximise women's income levels. Also,

as the majority of user of public transport, the Greater Bristol Bus Network is delivering improvements in bus services but we recognise that as income decreases, transport becomes less affordable for many people.

We have noted that single parents (90% of whom are women) will also be affected by welfare reform, particularly changes to child tax credit, income support and Jobseekers Allowance which could result in reduced household income. We are tracking this with a view to identifying how these changes will cumulatively affect our service users as we implement budget savings.

In all staff reductions and managing change processes an EQIA of the impact on employees must be carried out and the redeployment scheme applied. Our success rate in redeploying people is high. Employees transferring to external providers are protected to a level by TUPE (Transfer of Undertakings, Protection of Employment regulations).

The Bristol Fawcett report in to the impact of public sector cuts on women in Bristol is also being used as a resource when considering impact on women.

#### **4. Cumulative Impact – Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) Communities**

We have identified that 25% of service users of services funded by the former 'Supporting People' funding are BME – therefore it is important that decommissioning and reductions in these services are further assessed, as there is the risk of a disproportionate impact. Each individual service user will be individually assessed as necessary to ensure that the ongoing level of support after these changes meets appropriate levels.

We need to continue to identify and track any decommissioning and closure of BME-led Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) organisations because it could result in the loss of dedicated services. The challenge is to ensure that mainstream services and the wider VCS/provider market are delivering culturally appropriate and accessible services. Otherwise services might close without a suitable and effective replacement.

BME older people may also find it difficult to find appropriate services to purchase with their personalisation budgets – that meet specific language and cultural needs. We recognise our role in market development and in signalling our commissioning intentions so that the market can prepare to meet need.

This is not unique to personalisation but is an ongoing challenge, and both of these issues are already being addressed through encouraging the market in these areas.

BME communities are increasing as the city population increases through inward migration and as the birth rate increases. This is particularly true for younger age groups and means that service changes in early years will need to take account of the needs of diverse groups of children.

As service budgets reduce across the board (not just provided by the Council but also health and other public services) service providers may reduce their spend on translating and interpreting which will have a knock-on effect to

service users who face language barriers. WE have not seen this trend in our own services but we need to be vigilant.

A number of smaller potential impacts were also identified:

Reduction in food safety business advice service – could impact on BME businesses where the first language is not English. Although training can be bought from the private sector this may be more difficult for some businesses to access.

Reduction in consumer advice – again, customers who are newer to Bristol/the UK or whose first language is not English could find it more difficult to exercise their consumer rights if this service is removed. We are negotiating with existing VCS advice services who will be able to help meet this needs.

## **5. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender People**

We are conscious that specific issues around lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender communities/ people have not been strongly raised within the Equality Impact Assessments for the current set of proposals. It is important to note however that even if these may not always be highly apparent due to the particular proposal (i.e. a focus on older people services/ young people's services) we are clear that any service user may be LGBT and therefore services need to be appropriate for and sensitive to the needs of these groups.

This chimes with existing and ongoing initiatives – for example, in encouraging the market to understand the importance of offering LGBT-sensitive services for older LGBT people exercising their spending control with their personalised care budgets.

## **Appendix A**

### **1. Our Process**

In 2010 we worked to ensure that all budget savings proposals for 2011/12 were assessed for equalities impacts including consultation with equalities communities about the implications for them as service users. This resulted in equalities impact assessments (EQIAs) related to 2011/12 savings being made publicly available on the council website.

We learned from last year's budget process, and have developed this to ensure that we give due regard to the public sector equality duty (PSED). Our methodology for achieving this is to support all 2012/13 budget savings proposals with an EQIA. Equalities implications have been identified and considered from the very start of the budget planning process so that we are clear about the impact on equalities communities and actions that we can plan to mitigate impact. Equalities considerations have also informed which proposals have gone forward as budget savings.

On 24<sup>th</sup> November 2011 we published the administration's savings proposals and began the public consultation phase before proceeding to a Cabinet decision on 26<sup>th</sup> January 2012. All EQIAs were published on 24<sup>th</sup> November, giving the public an opportunity to look at our analyses of equalities issues, data used and any consultation to date that has been taken in to account in formulating our proposals. The public can comment and add intelligence to our EQIAs. Views and information submitted will be considered and will be used to further develop the EQIAs which will then be re-published in January to support the Cabinet's decision-making on the 26<sup>th</sup>. The closing date for the public consultation is 11th January 2012.

Part of our public consultation was to hold a conference for equalities stakeholders on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2011 (similar to our 2010 conference) to present the budget proposals, gain the views of equalities stakeholders and answer questions. Points raised have been fed in to EQIAs.

We have however gone further than that, including also a detailed consideration of the cumulative impact of different budget proposals. That is, we have sought to think through the overall impact on people with particular characteristics to see how all the proposals, when considered together, are likely to affect them. This is because we recognise that the impact of the whole set of proposals might be greater than the sum of the individual proposals when considered in isolation.

### **2. EQIAs Supporting the Budget Proposals**

Some proposals did not require an EQIA (because we assessed that there will be no direct impact on communities), some required a stage 1 basic EQIA, and many required a full EQIA because of the potentially more significant impact on service users and communities.

All proposals that will have an impact on staff groups will be supported by a combined staff EQIA, but this will not be made public in cases where staff

could be identified (although details will be shared with staff affected and with trade unions where appropriate).

EQIAs are set out in a standard template that demonstrates how 'due regard' has been given to the public sector equality duty. The council's EQIA template was revised in May 2011 to reflect the requirements of the Equality Act 2010 and ensure that officers demonstrate due regard to the public sector equality duty.

All EQIAs must be approved and signed off by a Service Director or Strategic Director. This ensures clear accountability and ownership of each EQIA.

EQIAs are attached to the budget proposal spreadsheet, enabling people to click in to an EQIA attached to a particular proposal of interest.

### **3. Legal Precedents**

A summary of legal challenges mounted against councils in relation to failure to meet their public sector equality duty is attached at appendix B.

The cases provide useful learning points about the process for producing EQIAs and the content and quality of EQIAs needed to support decisions about budget cuts. Some of the key points are :

- Having due regard to the need to promote disability equality includes the need to take account of persons' disabilities, even where that involves treating them more favourably.
- The key findings of EQIAs should be included in the Cabinet (or other decision-making) reports
- Some service proposals are extremely relevant to people with a particular protected characteristic and decision-makers must give full consideration as to how the proposal would affect people from that group
- Effective consultation is key to discharging our PSED and we must be willing to revisit our proposals in the light of consultation responses
- Where decisions may involve large numbers of vulnerable people, many of whom fall within one or more of the protected groups, the due regard necessary is very high.
- EQIAs should include evidence-based information about the specific impact on people from protected groups and an explanation of how people would be affected and what the detriment would be.

### **4. Cumulative Impact**

Identifying cumulative impact on specific protected groups is key to fulfilling our PSED and is a major challenge because it requires us to look across the whole council and to take in to account other factors affected people's lives.

In Bristol we have identified 3 major factors that could impact on equality outcomes for communities :

- 1) council budget proposals
- 2) welfare reform – changes and reductions to benefits that the most vulnerable people in our communities receive e.g. housing benefit

- 3) reductions in voluntary and community sector (VCS) activity and service delivery – not all external providers are VCS but VCS organisations are often at the forefront of local delivery to vulnerable groups, including equalities and deprived communities.

We have held several internal sessions with leading officers across the Council to tease out cumulative impacts on specific protected groups and have attempted to show which protected groups we believe could be particularly affected (cumulatively) and by which proposals across the council. The public consultation phase will also help us pick up where there might be cumulative impact.

## Consultation on the Equalities Implications of Budget Proposals 2012-13

This paper collates the equalities related comments from our stakeholder conference in December 2011 and our public consultation exercise. We have noted the points made, taken them in to account in our equalities impact assessments (EQIA's) and have prepared responses below to the main points that came out of consultation. All comments have been fully considered in arriving at our final proposals.

### 1. Equalities Stakeholder Consultation 8<sup>th</sup> December 2011

We held a full day consultation on the budget proposals which was attended by 80 equalities stakeholders, both individuals and voluntary and community sector representatives. Strategic Directors presented their budget proposals and stakeholders commented and asked questions face to face and through written submissions on the day.

The substantive issues raised that have been taken in to EQIAs are:

Issue raised by stakeholders	Response from BCC
Charging for Blue Badges was raised by a number of attendees - especially in the light of the cumulative impact of welfare reform and other factors that are impacting on the income of disabled people. The issue of non-disabled people parking in allocated blue badge spaces was also raised.	This has been considered within the EQIA of blue badge charging but the proposal remains. The cost to a disabled person will be £3.33 in effect (£10 for a badge for 3 years). We will be taking action to address abuse of blue badges by non-disabled people.
Concerns were expressed, about not having senior youth workers working with young people from specific equalities groups. The question was asked about whose responsibility it will then be to sustain and progress this work. It was felt that, despite the cuts, youth services need to ensure that the needs of groups such as Deaf young people and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender young people continue to be met specifically and centrally. Concern was also expressed about the proposed lack of specific provision for Disabled young people. There was a specific request that a centralised group for LGBT young people is continued.	This has been considered within the Bristol Youthlinks commissioning process. Specialist city wide youth work with LGBT young people and specialist city wide work with Deaf young people will be retained as part of youth work commissioned city wide.

<p>1) How will we ensure that people who have been institutionalised over many years are enabled to take up the opportunities offered by personalised budgets. What support will there be for them to do this?</p> <p>2) How joined up is the thinking across HSC in moving to spot purchasing - what will the transitional arrangements be?</p> <p>3) Closing of day centres. With the introduction of personalised budgets how will we ensure that people such as those with learning difficulties will be enabled to meet with their peers, as they are able to do now. How will we address possible issues of isolation?</p> <p>4) Generally what will we do to continue to meet the needs of people who used to attend day centres?</p> <p>5) Specific concerns were raised about the quality of the contracts being awarded through commissioning - there were queries about the pay and conditions of staff - how bad pay impacts on women in the city (as they hold the majority of the jobs) and how it also impacts on the quality of the care being offered to older and disabled people. It was felt that it is possible to specify some issues about staff's Terms and Conditions (T and C) through commissioning and that this should be done and closely monitored.</p> <p>6) The above is also a concern in the review of High Cost Packages.</p> <p>7) Also re: T and C of staff working through commissioned providers and the training they could expect - BCC should specify expectations around training of staff and monitor this. Example given was about how staff talk to people in their care, tone of voice etc.</p> <p>8) Also re: T and C. Concerns were raised that there already providers working in the city who do not pay the minimum wage. The Advice Network can be contacted for specific information about this. generally there was concern that outsourcing of services will mean paid carers having to take a cut in wages.</p>	<p>1. We will need our care management staff to be working in a way that supports people to take up these opportunities. We are also looking, as part of our care management change process, and what other sources of support we need now and going forward. There will be opportunities for those who prefer a traditional approach to services to have this although people will know the value of the support provided and how this may be spent.</p> <p>2. We have been working with individual organisations, where we are moving from block to spot contracting, to ensure an individual plan for the transition eg for day services all the individual users of the service will be assessed /reviewed for personal budgets in the same time period and the block contract will run through this transition period.</p> <p>3. We are currently looking at day opportunities and are in the middle of a consultation process. No decisions have therefore been made to close any day centres. We will be coming back to Cabinet in March with proposals and any new model of delivery will need to consider how people meet with their peers. Social inclusion and community engagement is a key aspect of successfully delivering Personalisation and therefore any new service model will need to reflect this.</p> <p>4. This will be based on individual need, allocation of a personal budget and person centred planning so that the individual is in the driving seat about the activities they wish to undertake and how they want that to be delivered.</p> <p>5. We do not commission home care services from providers who do not pay the minimum wage. The specifications, which set out the services we wish to commission, include quality standards that we expect the provider to deliver. The difference in unit costs for home care between the independent sector and what was the in house service is not about pay rates.</p> <p>6. As above</p> <p>7. We expect all the providers we commission to have well trained staff in order to deliver quality care services. This forms part of our specification.</p>
---	--

<p>9) General concerns about the cumulative impact on disabled people re: cuts to services and benefits. This included the fact that organisations such as BCC are cutting staff, thereby putting more pressure on the staff that are left which will impact on their ability to provide adequate service for disabled people.</p> <p>10) Concerns about the cumulative impact on Deaf people caused by various cuts across the city.</p> <p>11) Also cumulative impact on women - for instance outcome of overall cuts to provision in HSC will mean increase in number of women having to cut their hours or leave their jobs to undertake caring.</p> <p>12) Also need to consider multiple disadvantages when making changes to services, eg. being a disabled person from a BME background or a LGBT carer etc.</p> <p>13) General unspecified concerns were raised about the implications of the flexible carers strategy. There were general concerns that all the changes that are happening will make things worse for carers - and that BCC needs to listen to carers with the accusation that we do not do so.</p> <p>14) Specific concern raised by contracted provider (Brigstowe project) about being told they spend too much time with clients who they consider to be very vulnerable and to need the time spent with them.</p>	<p>8. We do not commission home care services from providers who do not pay the minimum wage. The difference in unit costs for home care between the independent sector and what was the in house service is not about pay rates.</p> <p>9. We are currently looking at our whole care management process to look more efficient service delivery by streamlining processes, reducing duplication, looking at our skill mix etc and will be actively involving stakeholders to test out new models. Therefore we are not looking to deliver in the same way with a reduced number of staff, but to deliver services and support differently. As we complete this work over the coming months we will be revising the EQIA when we are clear about the model of delivery.</p> <p>10. We understand these concerns and are working with the deaf community through community development and VOSCOUR to look at how we address them.</p> <p>11. We are very aware that the work force in H&amp;SC is predominately women and as we bring forward proposals and before decisions are made, we will need to assess the impact on women both as users/carers and as staff.</p> <p>We will be looking to the work that is being lead by Corporate Services on the cumulative impact of Welfare Reform, to inform our work when we review the EQIAs.</p> <p>12. Agreed and this will be reflected in further iterations of the EQIA's as proposals are brought forward.</p> <p>13. In Bristol there has been a lot of innovative work with carers including very strong carer input and voice into the joint development of the strategy. Carers are key in any changes we make to the social care system and we very much need to listen to their voice in the development of services. Following the Equalities Impact meeting we have arranged with the Carers Centre an open meeting between carers and the senior management team. As we move through the consultation process re residential care and day opportunities and proposals are developed, the impact on carers will be assessed as part of the developing EQIA.</p>
--	---

	14. There was agreement at the meeting that there would be further discussion between the organisation and Supporting People Team which has been undertaken.
<p>I understand that there is no proposal to shut more council run public toilets, but some specific concerns were raised, which would come into the scope of the EQIA on the Budget:</p> <p>1) Please can BCC ensure that people in the public toilet scheme display their stickers.</p> <p>2) Complaint that there are not enough accessible public toilets across the city.</p> <p>3) Problems with public toilets not being open when they are meant to be because of staff shortages.</p>	<p>We will not be reducing the number of public toilets as a result of these budget proposals. We have in the past closed a number of public toilets which were inaccessible and we have reduced opening hours previously. We provide a map (hard copy at the moment and we will ensure it is web-based as well in future) of toilets that the public can use – both council and other provision. The new Access Guide to Bristol includes information about toilets in the city centre and their accessibility. We recognise we need to develop information about toilets that includes information about access and that is more easily available to the public.</p>
<p>At the meeting concerns were raised about the impact on women (who are the majority of staff working in Early Years services), loss of jobs and the terms and conditions that a review of Value for Money in these services might produce. This was raised in the light of the cumulative effect on women of the current budget cuts, especially on those who are already low paid. Issues of commissioned services and BCC specifying in contracts re: it being essential to pay at least the minimum wage, provide training etc were also raised.</p>	<p>All contracts between BCC and providers include conditions that require contractors to comply with employment and equalities legislation. Paying staff below the minimum wage would be a breach of contract. Commissioning processes also require providers to demonstrate that their staff have the relevant qualifications and skills to be able to deliver specific services.</p>
<p>1) Specific concerns were raised about the quality of the contracts being awarded through commissioning - there were queries about the pay and conditions of staff - how bad pay impacts on women in the city (as they hold the majority of the jobs) and how it also impacts on the quality of the care being offered to older and disabled people. It was felt that it is possible to specify some issues about terms and conditions (T and C) through commissioning and that this should be done and closely monitored.</p> <p>2) In relation to the above it was asked what terms and conditions BCC will be putting into contracts to ensure quality of service, to include specific criteria about the terms and conditions of staff.</p>	<p>The council's Enabling Commissioning programme is driving improvements and a consistent approach to commissioning across the council. Commissioning processes are based on commissioning for outcomes. In terms of social care services providers need to demonstrate that their staff have the necessary qualifications/skills to deliver the services required.</p> <p>We are not aware that any of our providers are paying below the minimum wage. Advice providers who support people with employment/income advice do on occasion hear about unscrupulous employers paying below the minimum wage and will raise this with BCC if it is one of our providers.</p>

<p>3) The above is a concern generally in the many reviews of Value for Money going on across the council in its contracts.</p> <p>4) Also re: T and C of staff working through commissioned providers and the training they could expect - BCC should specify expectations around training of staff and monitor this.</p> <p>5) Also re: T and C of staff. Concerns were raised that there are already providers working in the city who do not pay the minimum wage. The Advice Network can be contacted for specific information about this. There were specific issues about the cumulative impact on women as they are the majority of employees in many of our commissioned services.</p> <p>6) It was stated a number of times that contracts need to be regularly monitored and, if necessary, providers need to be held to account.</p> <p>7) Contracts should be made public and all processes need to be transparent.</p> <p>8) It was raised that the move towards commissioning can exclude smaller and voluntary and community sector (VCS) providers - this means that there is the potential for money spent in the city does not stay in the city - and what we can do to prevent this?</p> <p>9) A specific concern was raised about where and how LGB and T people can ensure that their concerns are heard?</p> <p>10) Assurance was sought that LGB and T and Religion and Belief would be monitored, including using 6% as the baseline for LGB people.</p>	<p>Knowledge of local communities and experience of delivering local services will often mean small local providers are well-placed to bid for and win contracts but ultimately we must secure services that deliver the best outcomes, particularly for our most vulnerable citizens.</p> <p>LGBT people can raise concerns through the Equalities Team and through Bristol's LGBT Forum which works in partnership with BCC but is an independent LGBT led organisation.</p> <p>The Equalities Team and Voscur will be offering training to the VCS on developing equalities policies and how to undertake equalities monitoring, which includes monitoring service users by religion/belief and sexual orientation. This is an area we have identified for improvement.</p>
<p>The point was made at the meeting that the consultation on high level and low level Housing Support services should not be run separately because the services impact on each other.</p>	<p>There is currently a consultation on-going on Homelessness Prevention High-Support Services (i.e. includes 24h hostels for homeless people and other similar schemes - these are explicitly accommodation-based services that support vulnerable homeless people for short periods of time.</p> <p>This will lead to a competitive tender for high-support services, and existing services will be extended to September 2012 to allow this procurement to take place. Some schemes would close at that point, if</p>

	<p>the need can be met with a smaller estate.</p> <p>A second project is beginning to review low-support accommodation services and floating support services in the area of Homelessness Prevention. It makes sense to review this separately, as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) the risk to vulnerable people and the risk of market disruption would be too great of doing this at the same time;</li> <li>(ii) we have the opportunity to learn any lessons;</li> <li>(iii) high-support services are clearly accommodation based, whereas there may be opportunity to alter the relationship between low-support and floating (e.g. less accommodation and more floating?) if this meets strategic need.</li> </ul>
<p>The point was raised at the meeting that we need to look at the cumulative impact of cuts in provision on children and young people. Annie Hudson mentioned that the January meeting of the Children's Trust will be looking at a systematic way of tracking this.</p>	<p>This is ongoing. The implementation of the CYPS transformation programme will take account of changes that have already affected services delivered to children and young people.</p>
<p>1) The point was made that some of the mitigations in the Central Services EQIAs were not mitigations but cost reductions - The Communications plan and changes to staff allowances were specifically mentioned.</p> <p>2) It was asked if there was any plan for senior staff to undertake pay freezes or reductions.</p> <p>3) An assurance was asked for that, in the cuts to training, Equality and Diversity training would not be cut.</p> <p>4) There is an over dependence on IT solutions - websites and emails etc - for council communications. This has the potential to exclude older and poorer people from consultations and information.</p>	<p>1) To be clear – our proposals are about cost reductions. The EQIAs show where mitigating actions have been identified e.g. we confirm that we will be saving money by reducing printed material except where this is required by people who cannot access web-based information.</p> <p>2) No but we have significantly reduced posts at management level to reduce management costs. All employees have been subject to a pay freeze over 3 years.</p> <p>3) We cannot guarantee that training budgets will not be cut. However we are already in the process of rolling out e-training on equality and diversity and 1 day face to face training to all middle managers January-December 2012. There is significant investment in this programme.</p> <p>4) We will always offer alternative formats for people who cannot access IT/the web.</p>

Concerns were raised at the meeting about any cuts to services to support children as carers. The meeting was assured that no such cuts were proposed, but the issue of meeting the needs of children who might have multiple disadvantage was raised, children mentioned were BME children, children caring for LGB and T family members or who are LGB or T themselves.	Noted.
---	--------

## 2. Public Consultation – Submissions Raising Equalities Issues

The following substantive comments were received through the council website about equalities related issues. Again, these have been taken into account by decision-makers.

Issue raised	Response
<p>97 (CYPS13) changes to early years provision</p> <p>There is a very clear gender equality impact arising from any changes to early years provision.</p> <p>Women tend to be the primary carers for children so any cuts to services in these areas will therefore disproportionately affect women. Such cuts may also have wider equality impacts (e.g. in terms of women's ability to remain in employment if they lose vital childcare support; an increase in the numbers of families living in poverty).</p>	<p>We acknowledge women still hold the majority of caring responsibilities. Our budget reductions are focussed on maintaining childcare provision to children and families most in need and on low income.</p>
<p>There IS no equality for those with severe disabilities so making a start, whatever the budget, would herald a new era.</p>	<p>Noted – disabled people and those with high level needs are a priority group for the city council in terms of service provision and tackling inequality.</p>
<p>76 (NHDS55) - re-commissioning housing support services.</p> <p>We have consulted with Bristol University's School for Policy Studies who wrote a report last year on women and homelessness. Our main concerns are:</p>	<p>We funded this University of Bristol study, as part of the Supporting People Innovation Fund, which was completed by the University and People Can. This was one source of information on need for vulnerable homeless people.</p>

<p>A) whilst there is reference to women only services, there is a failure to consider gender in the generic service provision and other specialist areas.</p> <p>B) there is a criticism of larger hostels but no breakdown of whether men and women had different views of safety. There is only a gendered analysis of the data related to the women only services so no comparison with women in generic services is possible. In the University's work major concerns have been uncovered with women NOT using generic hostels for fear of safety.</p> <p>C) the mental health specialist provision does not address some of the specific gendered issues found in the study. Most notably issues of childhood sexual abuse and sexual exploitation which women say have led them to be substance dependent and as a result homeless.</p> <p>D) there is no acknowledgement that women with high support needs might need a safe place to stay yet feel unable, initially, to sign up to more targeted interventions. We have real fears that the closure of the women's night service, in a central location, will put individual women in danger. We do not support the argument that a crash pad in a specialist women service is an adequate replacement for the women's night service.</p> <p>The WNS was regularly full (12 women) with only 3 crash beds being offered.</p> <p>We feel the crash pads, whilst having more privacy, are more isolating than the WNS provision.</p> <p>E) In the proposal for offenders there is no recognition that the needs of female offenders (as outlined in Baroness Corston's report) are specific and need to be addressed as specialist need.</p>	<p>A - Women's homelessness has been considered in the study, and views are welcome in the consultation.</p> <p>B - Demographic information is captured and analysed for all clients, in generic or specific services. Overall 79% of single homeless clients are male and 21% female (from Client Record details), whereas homeless family clients are predominantly female (79% female, to 21% male).</p> <p>C - The proposals for addressing the support needs of clients with mental health needs has specifically emphasises the importance of addressing 'complex trauma', which include the lasting impacts of previous experiences. This is a significant need for many homeless people, and the High Support Review will lead to an increase in the use of psychologically-informed environments in support planning.</p> <p>D - There are, and need to be, a range of means of accessing emergency/supported accommodation, and a women's night shelter is not the most effective means of providing this.</p> <p>E - The City Council has responded to the Corston Report by working with the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) to jointly commission a specialist day opportunities service for women offenders (Eden House) - one of very few authorities in the UK to have made this specific commitment. We will continue to commission this service (as will NOMS), and it is not part of the high support review.</p> <p>F - High support homelessness services are by definition short-term support service that seeks to equip vulnerable people to move-on to more independent living when they ready. This possible in less than 90 days in many cases, but not all.</p>
---	---

<p>F) The reduction in move-on times is also worrying for women with complex needs. Most of the homeless women the research team has spoken to are battling complex and entrenched issues which require long term support in order to avoid the revolving door process. It is unclear to us how these issues can be addressed in 90 days.</p> <p>G) The review looks at the needs service users identify but only the initial need. The University's report looked at what needs women needed addressing now and those they needed to address in the future. We feel that the review only takes into account the initial need which masks the challenges which service users face when moving on.</p> <p>H) As a final point we are concerned that there is no recognition that homeless women are vulnerable per se. They are vulnerable to (sexual) exploitation from other homeless men, and men in wider society. In an effort to avoid being on the street sleeping rough women have told us they end up in dangerous places with men who take advantage. A cut in safe and accessible services is likely to increase the risk faced by homeless women.</p>	<p>G - As mentioned above, the review of women's homelessness was one, useful source of information on need for homeless services in Bristol.</p> <p>H - We agree that safe and effective supported accommodation places are required to meet the needs of vulnerable homeless women. The proposals include a smaller reduction than for other types of services (from 42 units to 37) based on evidence that this could continue to meet the current level of demand, but this proposal for the volume and location and high-level supported accommodation will be reassessed following the views expressed in the consultation, which closes on 18 January.</p>
<p>The report, Cutting Women Out in Bristol, which is available at <a href="http://www.bristolfawcett.org.uk/Documents/Economy/BristolCuttingWomenOut.pdf">http://www.bristolfawcett.org.uk/Documents/Economy/BristolCuttingWomenOut.pdf</a> sets out how the national picture of cuts disproportionately affecting women will interact with the cuts being proposed in Bristol and result in a further widening of the inequality gap between men and women in the city, with the most vulnerable or already disadvantaged groups (e.g. single parents) at most risk of further disadvantage. Women face a triple jeopardy from the public sector cuts:</p>	<p>Noted. We confirm that funding for services to support women and girls affected by domestic abuse and sexual violence has been protected and will not be decreased in 2012/13.</p>

<p>1) Disproportionate impact on women's jobs and earnings</p> <p>2) Cuts to benefits and tax credits which women rely on more than men</p> <p>3) Cuts to support and care will increase the burden on women of unpaid caring and support work. These cuts take place in the context of existing inequality between women and men in our city, as outlined in our report.</p> <p>We welcome the fact that services in Bristol for women who have experienced domestic and sexual violence and abuse have, to a large extent, been protected from the worst of the cuts. For the coming year, at least, the council will protect refuge and other services and housing support services for women who have suffered domestic abuse (with a few exceptions, e.g. NextLink's specialist mental health service); and will continue paying for specialist sexual violence advisors at the Sexual Assault Referral Centre (which provides statutory services for women who experience sexual violence) for another year. This is far better than in many other parts of the country and is a testament to the awareness in Bristol of the importance of maintaining support for victims of abuse.</p>	
<p>Women are half of the population and are over-represented in a number of the most vulnerable groups. Women are the majority of those providing care to adults (both paid and unpaid). As such they will be disproportionately impacted upon by a range of different cuts and including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction in funding for organisations supporting carers in Bristol (HSC2 Day Opportunities)</li> <li>• Cuts to welfare benefits that may affect those receiving care as well as those providing it.</li> </ul>	<p>We are very aware that the work force in H&amp;SC is predominately women and as we bring forward proposals and before decisions are made, we will need to assess the impact on women both as users/carers and as staff.</p> <p>We will be looking to the work that is being lead by Corporate Services on the cumulative impact of Welfare Reform, to inform our work when we review the EQIAs.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cuts to legal advice on welfare benefits that is heavily utilised by sick and disabled people.</li> </ul> <p>The cumulative impacts of all these changes may also lead to human rights issues for those receiving care. Human rights that could be engaged include the right to life, the right not to be subjected to torture or to inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, the right to liberty and security of person, and the right for respect for private and family life.</p> <p>The following areas should be closely monitored and reported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any changes in actual levels of care provided to adults in Bristol</li> <li>• The impact of any reduced care on those receiving care and carers</li> <li>• The level of support provided to carers and the impact of any reductions in support</li> </ul>	
<p>NHDS03: The proposal to add £4 a week to furniture rental costs in furnished tenancies will not only be discriminatory but also counter-productive. Cumulative cuts to welfare and benefits including LHA are already reducing weekly income of vulnerable tenants already living in poverty. Anxiety about welfare availability as well as inability to afford the increase may well result in tenants not taking up furnished tenancies, as well as potentially affecting tenants' ability to plan for the future.</p>	<p>This proposal has been given further consideration and analysis, as reflected in the updated EQIA. We will not be implementing the proposal to add £4 per week to furniture rental costs in furnished tenancies.</p>