

Full Council Supplementary Information



Date: Tuesday, 25 February 2020

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: The Council Chamber - City Hall, College Green, Bristol, BS1 5TR

8. Budget Report 2020-2021

(Pages 2 - 20)

Issued by: Sam Wilcock, Democratic Services

City Hall, Bristol, BS1 5TR

Tel: 0117 92 23846

E-mail: democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk

Date: Wednesday, 19 February 2020



Full Council

25th February 2020



Report of: Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (OSMB)

Report Title: Budget Scrutiny Report – Comments on the ‘Budget Report 2020 -2021’

Recommendation:

For Members to note the report.

Context:

For the 2019/2020 municipal year OSMB delegated the responsibility of scrutinising the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) and budget proposals to the Resources Scrutiny Commission. The Resources Scrutiny Commission referred this to the Scrutiny – Finance Task and Finish Group.

Appendices:

Appendix 1 - Officer Responses to Questions from the Task and Finish Group



Report from the Resources Scrutiny Commission - Budget Scrutiny Meeting on 06.02.2020

The purpose of this document is to distil the information that has been obtained from six meetings of the Finance Task and Finish Group and a number of Resources Scrutiny Commission sessions. It is not intended to replace the detailed papers that have been attached elsewhere for this meeting. It has been prepared as an aide for Members to consider what they feel are the most important and potentially difficult issues with the budget.

As part of this process, the Scrutiny Finance Task and Finish Group posed a number of questions concerning the Mayor's budget and the answers were helpfully provided by officers. The full written answers can be found in Appendix 1 at the end of this report.

Mayor Rees and Deputy Mayor Councillor Cheney attended the most recent Resources Scrutiny Commission meeting and provided some verbal context to their budget. They reaffirmed the scale of the challenge, highlighting that Councils had experienced significant funding cuts in recent years, equating to around 60 pence in every pound. Mayor Rees referred to the 8 years of austerity that had been imposed on this Council by central Government.

The Commission was assured by the Mayor, however, that despite these pressures a balanced budget had been prepared and no further savings were anticipated in the coming year.

The Chair of the Finance Task and Finish Group, Councillor Clive Stevens, introduced his report advising that they had undertaken a three-stage process that began in September 19 and aimed to add value at each stage. The Resources Scrutiny Commission meeting held on 6th February 20 was the final step of the budget scrutiny process for 2019/20.

Councillor Steven's summary of the conclusions from the Finance Task and Finish Group was as follows:

- One of the key changes this year was to look at the budget differently i.e. splitting one-off funding from ongoing payments (partially prompted by the large 'one-off' funding announcements provided last year by central Government). £18m of one-off payments were promised to Bristol City Council (BCC) this year but it could not be assumed that the Council would receive that much in future years. In the proposed budget before you, the £18m is used to top-up the Council's reserves and pay for this year's £6m overspend. Once the overspend (discussed below) was accounted for, that would leave £13m of the one-off payment. £10m of this would go into reserves for future years and the remaining £3m would be allocated for projects such as City Leap and Education Health and Care Plans (EHCP) for special educational needs. [The numbers, which don't appear to add up to £18m, are reconciled by the £1m coming from a different part of reserves.]
- Ongoing funding (referred to in the papers as 'base-line') included: £11m from the proposed Council Tax increase; £3m from business rates; £8m from the adult social care grant from central Government which partially funded the increased cost pressures on services; and £9m of savings (which were already agreed two years ago).
- Education funding appeared to be on a slightly better footing with a three year Government funding stream, but there were still pressures on the High Needs Budget which need to be explored in detail.

Members of the Commission noted the introduction from Councillor Stevens and agreed that the next part of the session would be framed around the questions put forward by the Task and Finish Group.

Review of Officers' Answers to Members' Questions (the full questions and answers are provided in Appendix 1)

The comments below are a summary of the Commission's deliberations around the questions and answers.

Growth and Regeneration Directorate:

Q1: Residents Parking (PL03): Members were advised that this question related to the costs of running the scheme which were showing at just over £1m and a £1.6m income stream. Members asked whether the £684k was effectively the net profit from parking and were advised that the total income from all the schemes was £4m which was reinvested into transport initiatives. The income was ring-fenced. *(Note – following the meeting officers confirmed that the difference between the stated income of £1.6 and the later figure of £4m was the full revenue and the £684k saving is because the capital cost has now been fully paid off and so that money is used for other transport schemes).*

Q2: Chocolate Path (PL09a)

The Commission noted that the Capital Fund specified that £7.4M of funding was required to make the necessary repairs, which was a significant investment. Members expressed some concern about the costs and asked if an initial assessment of the problems on the areas surrounding the path had been surveyed yet. Officers confirmed that the original assessments had been conducted to make the area safe. The exact costs of longer term repairs would be available once the tendering process had completed, thought to be end of February 2020.

Q3: Highways and Traffic Infrastructure (PL10)

Members asked for additional information about how the funding remaining in the budget would be invested, for example on walking or cycling, and expressed some concern that this information was not readily available. Officers confirmed that a full reply would be provided in due course. Members requested that if the funding was to be used for maintenance needs, clarification should be provided about how projects were prioritised.

Q4: Affordable Housing Grants PL30

Members suggested that the number of affordable homes being built by developers seemed to be reducing with affordable homes now appearing to be delivered primarily through grant agreements. Members considered that there were two issues to consider. The first related to the number of affordable homes being built by developers and whether the number funded in the normal way by S106 planning agreements was reducing. Officers advised that wasn't the case but did advise they would check the numbers to provide assurances. The second issue was the funding of grants that BCC gave to developers to enable affordable homes to be built. The 5 year funding plan of the £72m of affordable housing grants (PL30) shows £51m of it coming from borrowing.

Q5 Council Housing Investment HRA02:

Members stated they were satisfied with the written response that had been provided. They also appreciated that the Medium Term Financial Plan had not yet been recalculated.

Members understood that the Capital Strategy for the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) wasn't yet set but asked about the potential consequences of the decision not to increase rent rises this year. Officers confirmed that the Council's business plan had been prepared on the current figures with no rent increases.

People Directorate Questions:

Adult Social Care (ASC): the spreadsheet shows the detailed breakdown of ASC costs and the budget challenges (see bottom line of spread sheet in the appendix below):

The Commission were advised that the gap between the current spend (i.e. for 19/20) and the 20/21 budget was a negative figure of £3.7m (the 'Gap'). The Task and Finish Group and the Commission were somewhat sceptical that the quoted £3.7m represented the true extent of the Gap. In order to limit the Gap to that figure, Better Lives must somewhat improbably deliver £6.3m of savings. £4.3m of this figure needs to come from Adult Social Care savings not delivered this year (19/20) and therefore 'rolled-over.' The additional £2m of savings was also part of Better Lives and is budgeted to come from additional Adult Social Care savings.

In addition, Members were concerned about contract inflation, in part as a result of the 6.2% increase in the Living Wage. This would mean that the Gap (which perhaps should be renamed as the 'Challenge' at this

point) could well be over £10m. The Commission imagined that other Members would share their concerns around the issue, particularly as there had obviously been problems with the Adult Social Care budget in previous years, especially in 19/20.

Officers emphasised that the ASC service was facing very challenging circumstances; the health system had experienced unprecedented levels of activity which had in turn resulted in high demands in home care and residential care. Services had tried to manage demand but had been buffeted by wider pressures. It was highlighted that this represented a nationwide trend, partly due to funding reductions from central government but also alongside the huge demands currently being put on NHS and adult social care. It was said that the Local Government Association (LGA) has estimated a £3.6b hole in ASC funding across the country.

One of the underlying issues was recruiting sufficient numbers of home-care workers, partly due to outdated perceptions about working conditions, pay and career progression. There needed to be a broader pool of carers to draw from and therefore increase capacity so more people could continue to be cared for at-home. This could lead to improvements in service user experience as well as cost savings. Officers said they were reaching out to attract new providers and encouraging them to diversify. More 'Extra Care' housing was also needed.

Officers went on to advise that Bristol was a high cost provider. However, a number of measures were in place to move service users over to more efficient models of service delivery. Officers were keen to point out that lower costs did not necessarily lead to lower standards of care.

Members raised concerns about the potential for continued increases in service demand impacting on the budget but were assured that early signs indicated that they were managing to keep it on track and they were confident about the future.

Members flagged ASC as a potential area for further in-depth scrutiny in the next municipal year and this was welcomed by officers.

Q2. Children and Families Service

Members acknowledged the difficulties in setting a budget under the current funding arrangements. They did however want to understand why the costs were so high. Officers confirmed that placement costs were significant, especially for children, and that nationally this was a 'dysfunctional market'.

Q3. Educational Improvement

Members were satisfied with the reply to the part of the question dealing with Educational Health and Care plans (EHCP). With regards to Home-to-School Transport there were some concerns about the savings being deliverable, however, officers confirmed that they were on track following a staff restructure and the introduction of new software.

Q4: Education

Members commented that they were encouraged by the replies provided by officers i.e. that the Council was investing in capital to help save revenue costs to deliver a better service. They went on to query the plans in relation to 'mothballing' schools (rather than closing or moving them) so they could potentially provide additional places for children with special needs. Officers confirmed that at the recent Scrutiny SEND Inquiry Day, the idea of resource centres working well had been confirmed by head teachers. Officers were looking at specialisms that would enable more children to stay in mainstream schools.

There had previously been a bulge in numbers of children in primary schools that was now moving though to secondary schools so there could be more capacity in the primary school system going forward.

Q5: Care Services

Members said they were happy with the written response provided.

Q6: Mobile Working for Social Care RE05

Members noted this was something the Resources Scrutiny Commission had recently looked at due to the delays in the project and subsequent risk to savings. In particular, there were concerns about the number of additional applications needing to move over to Windows 10. Officers advised they would come back with a full reply in due course.

Q7 Dedicated Schools Grant & High Needs Block

Members were concerned with the answer provided, especially the part that said 'the detail on the High Needs Block spend and wider Education Transformation Programme would be presented at the Schools Forum on 31 March 2020' since this would be after the budget setting Full Council meeting on 25th February 19.

They went on to note that 400 Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCP) were going through currently which could cost around £5m. Officers confirmed that the cost of top-ups could be as high as £20k per child. The rules had however changed and the Council were now permitted to go into deficit that could be carried forward until the funding situation had been resolved. Central Government have accepted that current funding is not sufficient. The Council will carry forward the deficits and lobby strongly for additional funding.

Resources Directorate:**Q4: Commercialisation**

Members advised that they were happy with the written answer that had been provided but commented that the '£210k of the savings relating to commercialisation projects' appeared to be low. It was confirmed this figure did not include the income generated by the Council's Legal Service.

Officers commented that the target had been £0.5m (and that £290k had already been delivered) and that some projects would start small but could still make significant savings in the longer term. This figure was a particular savings target but it was not the whole picture in terms of commercialisation. It was still expected that the projected savings for 2019/2020 would be realised.

Members confirmed that they were very supportive of the Commercialisation and Income Generation Programme.

General Comments:

Members asked for more details about the funding set aside to address the Climate Emergency and were advised that £3m had been set aside for that purpose.

The Chair concluded by thanking officers for their expertise in preparing a viable budget, following a prolonged period of austerity.

The Chair of OSMB and the Deputy Mayor both thanked the Finance Task and Finish Group for their work.

Process:

It was agreed that the report of Scrutiny Members' comments would be approved by the Resources Scrutiny Commission and Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (via email) and submitted to Full Council on the 25th February.

Councillor Stephen Clarke, Chair of the Resources Scrutiny Commission

Resources Scrutiny Commission Supplementary Information



Date: Thursday, 6 February 2020

Time: 4.00 pm

Venue: City Hall

Distribution:

Councillors: Stephen Clarke (Chair), Mark Brain (Vice-Chair), Donald Alexander, Afzal Shah, Mhairi Threlfall, Hibaq Jama, Margaret Hickman, Graham Morris, John Goulandris, Sultan Khan, Clive Stevens and Geoff Gollop

Issued by: Johanna Holmes, Democratic Services

City Hall, Bristol, BS1 5TR

Tel: 0117 90 36898

E-mail: democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk

Date: 5th February 2020

Supplementary Agenda

8. Finance Task and Finish Group Report

Responses to questions from the Finance Task and Finish Group.

(Pages 3 - 14)



Resources Scrutiny Commission

06/02/2020



Report of: Michael Pilcher, Chief Accountant

Title: 2020/21 Budget Scrutiny

Ward: All

Officer Presenting Report: n/a

Contact Telephone Number: 0117 9036287

Recommendation

To note the responses to questions submitted by Resources scrutiny.

The significant issues in the report are:

The following appendices are responses to questions submitted by Resources Scrutiny in preparation for the meeting to scrutinise the 2020/21 budget proposals.

Appendix 1 - Growth and Regeneration

Appendix 2 - People

Appendix 2a - Adult Social Care Budget

Appendix 3 - Resources



Resources Scrutiny Commission – 2020/21 Budget Scrutiny Questions

Growth and Regen Directorate		
No	Question	Answer
1	<p>Residents Parking PL03</p> <p>a) This shows zero spend for all 5 years. Or is all spend associated with existing schemes now revenue? If so how much and in which line?</p>	<p>Yes the spend associated with existing schemes is now all revenue. Ongoing works relating to the existing RPS are now covered through revenue budgets, which all fall within Division 47, Management of Place in the report. The 2020-21 budgeted revenue expenditure figure for RPS is £1,086,180.</p> <p>The capital programme covered the creation of the RPS and at least one subsequent formal review. The reviews were completed during 2018-19 & 2019-20 and the capital works are now complete</p>
2	<p>PL09a Chocolate Path</p> <p>a) Currently down for £7.4m of capital. What is the likely cost looking like now?</p>	<p>Note commercial sensitivity.</p> <p>We intend to proceed with the intended Capital stabilisation works as per PLO9a for £7.4m forecast. However there has been a recent failure of the wall which supports the chocolate path which may incur an additional cost. Works to support the existing structure are in motion with the immediate additional costs being covered by existing budgets. The long term options of addressing the wall structure itself is currently being evaluated along with the various options of reinstatement but we are unable to provide an estimate of the potential additional costs of these works at this point in time. This will be evaluated once the Contract Works are substantially completed.</p>
3	<p>Highways and traffic infrastructure PL10</p> <p>a) This is £38m over the 5 years. How is this broken down by transport mode (walking, cycling, bus etc) please?</p>	<p>The allocation for each year of £7.5m is based on an estimate of future funding from WECA as part of the capital Highways Maintenance Grant (£3.132m), Highways Incentive Grant (£0.652m) and Integrated Transport Block Grant (£2.743m), and Prudential Borrowing for structures and carriageway maintenance to reduce future revenue costs (£1m).</p> <p>Historically the Highways Maintenance Grant, Highways Incentive Grant and Prudential Borrowing would be utilised for maintenance of structures, carriageway and footways – this work would affect multiple transport modes (bus, car, cycling, walking). The remaining funding is allocated yearly, based on the current transport priorities and other available funding streams. As such it is not possible to break this</p>

		budget down by transport mode.																																																																								
4	<p>Affordable Housing grants PL30</p> <p>a) What is the breakdown of the categories of the £72m five year investment please?</p> <p>b) For the affordable housing grants (non S106 i.e. after permission has been granted) what are the sources of those funds?</p>	<p>a) The £72m investment supports the Affordable Housing Grant Funding Programme (c£50m), capitalised salaries for the Housing Delivery Team, Housing Enabling and external grant funding.</p> <p>b) BCC Affordable Housing Grants (to RPs etc.) is funded from the Council's Prudential Borrowing. To date this fund has enabled 380 'additional' (over and above s106 agreements) social rent/affordable rent homes (below local housing allowance limits) to receive grant funds.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2019/20 £000s</th> <th>Ref</th> <th>Scheme</th> <th>2020/21 £000s</th> <th>2021/22 £000s</th> <th>2022/23 £000s</th> <th>2023/24 £000s</th> <th>2024/25 £000s</th> <th>Total £000s</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>8,708</td> <td>PL30</td> <td>Housing Strategy and Commissioning</td> <td>31,478</td> <td>17,967</td> <td>11,458</td> <td>11,160</td> <td>0</td> <td>72,063</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="9">Funding</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4,712)</td> <td></td> <td>Prudential Borrowing</td> <td>(16,474)</td> <td>(13,062)</td> <td>(10,958)</td> <td>(11,160)</td> <td>0</td> <td>(51,654)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(1,459)</td> <td></td> <td>Capital Receipts</td> <td>(705)</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>(705)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(2,540)</td> <td></td> <td>Grant</td> <td>(13,799)</td> <td>(4,405)</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>(18,204)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td>s106</td> <td>(500)</td> <td>(500)</td> <td>(500)</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>(1,500)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(8,711)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>(31,478)</td> <td>(17,967)</td> <td>(11,458)</td> <td>(11,160)</td> <td>0</td> <td>(72,063)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2019/20 £000s	Ref	Scheme	2020/21 £000s	2021/22 £000s	2022/23 £000s	2023/24 £000s	2024/25 £000s	Total £000s	8,708	PL30	Housing Strategy and Commissioning	31,478	17,967	11,458	11,160	0	72,063	Funding									(4,712)		Prudential Borrowing	(16,474)	(13,062)	(10,958)	(11,160)	0	(51,654)	(1,459)		Capital Receipts	(705)	0	0	0	0	(705)	(2,540)		Grant	(13,799)	(4,405)	0	0	0	(18,204)	0		s106	(500)	(500)	(500)	0	0	(1,500)	(8,711)			(31,478)	(17,967)	(11,458)	(11,160)	0	(72,063)
2019/20 £000s	Ref	Scheme	2020/21 £000s	2021/22 £000s	2022/23 £000s	2023/24 £000s	2024/25 £000s	Total £000s																																																																		
8,708	PL30	Housing Strategy and Commissioning	31,478	17,967	11,458	11,160	0	72,063																																																																		
Funding																																																																										
(4,712)		Prudential Borrowing	(16,474)	(13,062)	(10,958)	(11,160)	0	(51,654)																																																																		
(1,459)		Capital Receipts	(705)	0	0	0	0	(705)																																																																		
(2,540)		Grant	(13,799)	(4,405)	0	0	0	(18,204)																																																																		
0		s106	(500)	(500)	(500)	0	0	(1,500)																																																																		
(8,711)			(31,478)	(17,967)	(11,458)	(11,160)	0	(72,063)																																																																		
5	<p>Council Housing investment HRA02</p> <p>a) £148m to deliver new council housing stock over the next five years (p88) and yet it seems to decline slightly from 20/21 peak of £40.8m - why?</p>	<p>The 2020/21 development plan budget accurately reflects the expected costs of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Completing the existing phase of work on sites where building has commenced, such as Alderman Moores (now known as Ashton Rise); and - Commencing a new phase of development; seeking planning permission on new sites and commencing building on 5 of these. <p>As indicated in the January 2020 HRA Budget report, whilst the annual budget has been updated the 5 year medium term financial plan has not, as future years income and expenditure will be reviewed in depth as part of the review of 30 year business plan in the coming months.</p> <p>Through this work we will be identifying what new development the 30 year business plan can support, though this needs to be considered alongside other ambitions as outlined in the budget report (service improvement, estate regeneration, carbon retrofitting and responding to building regulations relating to building safety).</p> <p>We remain committed to our ambition to maximise opportunities for new council</p>																																																																								

	housing development over the course of the 30 year plan.
--	--

Resources Scrutiny Commission – 2020/21 Budget Scrutiny Questions

People Directorate		
No	Question	Answer
1	<p>Adult Social Care</p> <p>The P8 report forecasts a £154.4m outturn. (P9 is £154.35m). This needs to be reconciled with the 20/21 Budget of £145.55m to fully understand the challenges facing the ASC team in achieving this budget. On 27/1 We discussed and agreed the need for a reconciliation please in the form as follows:</p> <p>P8 outturn £154.4m add back the £2.028m one off winter pressures income in 19/20 = £156.4m</p> <p>Then reduce savings and add extra pressures from the £156.4m like:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - add in the £0.787m expected pay award, - reduce £0.920m of costs transferring to housing dept, - reduce £2.86m of iBCF funding and more.... <p>This will come to a figure £Xm that is ASC costs before savings.</p> <p>That figure £Xm compared with the new budget of £145.55m shows the true challenge (or gap) that needs to be made up from savings from approved programs like Better Lives, ASC Innovation and some capital spend as well as programs not yet finalised.</p>	<p>See Appendix A for reconciliation.</p>
2	<p>Children and Families Service</p> <p>Cost control depends heavily on the effectiveness of the Strengthening Families and Edge of Care programs (FP31). This has been working well and bucking the national trend. But I have heard of some recently expensive placements due</p>	<p>a) The most significant uncontrollable expense is the requirement on the local authority to meet the remand costs of young people in custody. We do receive a grant based on previous trends of £180k. Each young person costs approximately £200k if on remand for one full year. In this financial year we have had significant periods of time when 6 young people have been</p>

	<p>to Court/Police decisions (out of our control).</p> <p>a) P9 outturn is £62.75m, similar to P8 so have these recent costs been incorporated into the outturn? If not are they significant?</p> <p>b) If they are significant how are they being mitigated this year and does that leave us in a more difficult situation next year? How much?</p>	<p>remanded and so we are forecasting approximately £700k spend. The difference between the budget and spend is being mitigated elsewhere within existing budgets.</p> <p>b) The budget is based on a formula determined by the Ministry of Justice which looks at the numbers of remands over previous years. We receive the grant annually in April each year. We are using a mixture of troubled families, children centre and early help cost centres to meet the gap as I am expected to consume the overspend in my budget.</p> <p>Next year we might get an enhanced grant depending on government decisions, and based on our higher use of remand this year. It is uncontrollable in that we cannot dictate the number of young people who will be remanded in custody and so we have to meet the expenditure.</p>
3	<p>Educational Improvement This is budgeted at £11.831m.</p> <p>a) Does this include the costs of processing EHCPs? (If not where is it please).</p> <p>b) We note that P9 shows an expected outturn of £12.495m. This implies a saving of £0.65m to be made next year, what are the chances of containing this? (Note - this question was written before the SEND Scrutiny Day so it might need to be reworded at Resource Scrutiny in the light of further information).</p>	<p>a) Within the budget of £11.8m, £0.91m is the budget for Special Needs Team staffing – which includes the staff supporting EHCP. (Total High Needs General Fund is £6.778m, includes further £5.423m on HTST and £0.445m for Ed Psyc and Sensory Support).</p> <p>b) This relates to the Home-to-School Transport saving, which is currently undergoing a service review seeking to introduce new software to make the service more efficient. This will look to reduce the overspend back in line with budget for 2020/21.</p>
4	<p>Education</p> <p>a) Is any of this Capital program on p81 allocated for expanding in house SEND provision?</p> <p>b) We note that PE02 on page 86 describes additional SEN provision capital investment and this totals £42m. What projects might this include?</p>	<p>a) Yes approx. £11m of the capital is for expanding existing in house SEND provision</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. KnowleDGE b. Kingsweston Special School c. Feasibility work to identify future key SEND expansion and improvement projects

		<p>b) This is the project pending business case development and securing external funding. It is recognised that further SEND capital investment is required in the city, to which external SEND grant would need to be directed on receipt. Invest to save opportunities are being explored, lobbying DFE for to enable the PWLB borrowing to be charged to DSG.</p>
5	<p>Care Services</p> <p>a) This shows zero capital spend. Does this mean we have no social care infrastructure or that we don't need to maintain it? Or something else?</p>	<p>a) Capital expenditure of maintenance of general fund Council owned property is included within Resources under Building Practice Service.</p> <p>b) The project relates to Day Opportunities and reports as completed in 2019/20 which had a remaining Budget of £0.228m which the Forecast is confirming will be spent in full</p>
6	<p>Mobile Working for Social Care RE05</p> <p>a) This shows zero capital spend. This was an important project two years ago to help control Care spend. What is its status now?</p> <p>b) Has it been absorbed into the larger IT projects above that line. If so which one?</p>	<p>a) In March 2018 a Social Care proposal was approved by Cabinet to invest in tablets for the Children's and Adult Care Services to enable agile/mobile working and bring in efficiencies and meet some Ofsted recommendations amongst other things. The project was commenced to deliver service improvements quickly (to ASC within 1 year and to Children's Services by 2020). It was run as a separate project due to expected delays in the FSA Programme (Future State Assessment, approved by Cabinet in July 2018) which could also deliver the technology.</p> <p>The project experienced a series of delays, both technical and operational. A small number of pilot devices were deployed with the mobile application (a cut-down version of the case management system which holds just the records needed and synchronises changes with the main system), and this has generated some valuable feedback. One of the key findings is that the Council has been unable to obtain supplier assertions that the mobile software meets the security standards expected by Information Assurance officers. In addition, it has been identified that a variety of different devices is required to meet the different workstyles across the services (one type does not fit all).</p> <p>b) The technical aspects for the Agile Working pilot were essentially a short-term</p>

		<p>tactical solution which was developed prior to the FSA Programme being established with its long-term solution not ready to deploy. However, now that the IT Transformation Programme (the successor to the FSA Programme) is developing its roll-out schedule, it would seem sensible for the Care Services to now get the properly developed long-term solution (which is fully supported and robust) when the timelines for deployment of either solution appear to be almost identical (end 2020)</p> <p>In Nov 2019 all the money attributed for the laptops/tablets, and small amount of equipment used for trials, has been transferred back to the IT department. This money will be utilised to procure the equipment which will be delivered as part of the IT Transformation Programme, and the equipment is being used elsewhere for other trials.</p> <p>It seems that the business case in March 2018 didn't quantify the benefits nor how they would be achieved or monitored and as the project delivery has not been met, the anticipated service improvements haven't been realised thus not reducing cost pressures on ASC.</p> <p><u>ICT's offer...</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) The new IT approach is to supply PC's, laptops etc with Windows10 (W10) and to configure them for Cloud Computing so that the applications run on the Cloud and not on the PC. This also means that all hardware will be required to have more robust security protocols (and 4G). Non W10 hardware like iPads/Android will have their Council software operate in a contained part of the software. This "contained area" will be invisible to the user but provide protection if there are other non-Council apps running.2) Therefore all Council applications (nearly 800 of them) need to be able to run on W10; some of our existing apps can do this, some need upgrades and some legacy software needs replacement software as it cannot be upgraded.3) In addition to considering whether software is compatible with W10, Information Assurance Officers are establishing whether our software meets
--	--	--

		<p>current security standards and is compatible with GDPR legislation. The mobile application to be used by Social Care needs to meet these standards, and at present, we do not have confirmation whether it can. It is thought any development or assurance work to achieve/assure these standards, could take 6 months or more.</p> <p>4) When the new devices and the new mobile application are released, it will enable social workers to update information wherever they are sited without returning to the office. Referrals will be able to be made quicker and bring more confidence to users of the care services. In addition, they will be able to meet the ofsted requirements about children’s photo albums (life histories). These benefits directly brought about by the scope of the Agile Working Project will be augmented by the wider collaboration and productivity improvements which will be made available through the IT Transformation Programme.</p> <p><u>The wider costs to BCC...</u></p> <p>1) It seems there still isn’t a clearly defined and available benefits document for the Agile Working Project. But, since improved efficiency of operation is expected and hasn’t occurred, it could be costly. We are entering a phase of carer shortages (especially for homecare) then every 5% improvement in efficiency will make a huge saving on costs to the service, £millions or more.</p> <p>2) The delivery of the Agile Working benefits are now part of the IT Transformation Programme and requires better coordination with Children’s and Adult Care Services.</p>
7	<p>Dedicated Schools Grant & High Needs Block</p> <p>P227 shows the high needs block funding at £62.38m for 20/21. The spend is set at the same amount. We query this; the P9 forecast for 2019/20 is £60.269m. But there are major pressures on that.</p> <p>- A lot of work is going in to catch up on the EHCPs (and the</p>	<p>The actual funding earmarked for general high-needs spend in 2020/21 is £61.0m as £1.3m allocated from the schools block will be held in abeyance for the education improvement programme. In addition there is a further £1.5m from the general fund and £1.2m carried forward from £2019/20 giving the total £4m for the education transformation programme.</p> <p>The detail on the High Needs Block spend and wider Education Transformation</p>

<p>reviews). Whilst some reviews might reduce the need it is assumed that most new ones will trigger new needs at £20k to £25k per head. So potentially the catch up and then providing resources for 400 extra SEND children could add £ multi millions of costs.</p> <p>- Pay rises (if 2.7%) could be £1.5m on top. Some of the skills are in tight demand so inflation could be higher.</p> <p>Therefore please we would like to see a more rigorous presentation of the predicted SEND needs.</p>	<p>Programme will be presented at Schools Forum on 31 March 2020. The detailed financial impact of the unprocessed EHCPs will form part of this.</p> <p>It needs to be noted that the grant conditions for the DSG have changed for 2020/21 reinforcing the ring-fenced nature of the grant and will prohibit any contributions from general funds.</p> <p>Current forecast outturn is £60.3m in comparison to a £61.0m budget in 2020/21.</p>
--	--

Adult Social Care Budget Reconciliation

Outturn 2018/19 £'000s	Financial Year 2019/20	19/20 Forecast £'000s	Directly allocated to Social Care						Budget Held Corporately				Variance to Outturn	No of Service Users	Average cost per week £		
			Revised Budget £'000s	Removal of One-off Income	Fees and Charges Inflation	Service Transfer	Growth	Savings Assumptions	2020/21 Budget £'000s	Innovation Fund	Pay Inflation	Contract Inflation				Total	
	Gross Expenditure																
30,351	Staffing & Overheads - Referral & Assessment	31,558	34,981	2,028	-24	-3,707	0	0	0	33,279	2,100	787	2,228	38,394	6,836		
	Working Age Adults 18-64																
28,050	Residential	27,905	26,400							26,400				26,400	-1,505	365.36	1,464.83
3,726	Nursing	3,637	3,400							3,400				3,400	-237	69.33	1,006.07
2,649	Home Care	3,122	2,624							2,624				2,624	-498	254.72	235.07
412	Extra Care Housing	595	515							515				515	-80	53.83	211.98
5,221	Outreach	6,195	5,374							5,374				5,374	-821	429.76	276.47
1,028	Day Care	1,257	1,025							1,025				1,025	-232	165.62	145.57
14,173	Accommodation based support	16,446	13,751							13,751				13,751	-2,695	475.27	663.67
452	Adult Placement	430	402							402				402	-28	38.50	214.20
10,343	Direct Payment	9,886	10,042							10,042				10,042	156	540.25	350.96
66,054	Subtotal	69,473	63,533	0	0	0	0	0	0	63,533	0	0	0	63,533	-5,940	2,392.64	
	Older People 65+																
22,449	Residential	23,371	19,854							19,854				19,854	-3,517	534.92	837.95
27,901	Nursing	27,278	22,829							22,829				22,829	-4,449	626.17	835.51
10,487	Home Care	10,489	11,468							11,468				11,468	979	866.49	232.17
4,082	Extra Care Housing	4,383	4,052							4,052				4,052	-331	361.17	232.75
501	Outreach	638	495							495				495	-143	79.92	153.11
401	Day Care	474	418							418				418	-56	83.75	108.55
1,578	Accommodation based support	1,722	1,516							1,516				1,516	-206	57.67	572.71
91	Adult Placement	85	84							84				84	-1	4.67	349.33
5,215	Direct Payment	5,562	4,965							4,965				4,965	-597	296.33	359.98
72,705	Subtotal	74,002	65,681	0	0	0	0	0	0	65,681	0	0	0	65,681	-8,321	2,911.07	
	Preparing for Adulthood - 0 to 25																
3,794	Residential	4,059	3,410							3,410				3,410	-649	31.35	2,483.00
0	Nursing	0	0							0				0	0		
6	Homecare	15	5							5				5	-10	1.31	220.00
134	Daycare	223	150							150				150	-73	23.97	178.41
2,797	ABS	2,681	2,209							2,209				2,209	-472	47.74	1,077.06
1,454	Outreach	1,619	1,462							1,462				1,462	-157	62.65	495.59
76	Adult Place	143	83							83				83	-60	8.54	321.22
693	DP Long	960	909							909				909	-51	67.30	273.58
8,954	Subtotal	9,700	8,228	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,228	0	0	0	8,228	-1,472	242.87	
	Social Support																
697	Social Support: Substance Misuse Support	660	719							719				719	59		
736	Social Support: Support for Isolation/Other	864	792							792				792	-72		
	Other																
613	Block Placement Voids	499	0							0				0	-499		
405	Rehab Block Beds	70	366							366				366	296		
36	Savings holding accounts	0	0						343	-2,000				-1,657	-1,657		
150,200	Gross Expenditure TOTAL	155,268	139,319	0				343	-2,000	137,662	0	0	0	137,662	-17,606		
	Income																
	Service User Contribution																
-263	PFA	-238	-233							-233				-233	5		
-4,178	Working Age Adults 18-64	-4,259	-4,046							-4,046				-4,046	213		
-18,353	Older People 65+	-20,060	-16,793							-16,793				-16,793	3,267		
-246	Social Support	-189	-217							-217				-217	-28		
-23,040	Subtotal	-24,746	-21,289	0				0		-21,289	0	0	0	-21,289	3,457		
	IBCF Inflation Provision																
-640	IBCF Inflation Provision	-640	0							0				0	640		
-6,502	Section 117 income	-7,065	-4,100							-4,100				-4,100	2,965		
-29,542	Income TOTAL	-32,451	-25,389	0		0		0		-25,389	0	0	0	-25,389	7,062		
151,009	Net Expenditure TOTAL	154,375	148,911	2,028	-24	-3,707	343	-2,000		145,552	2,100	787	2,228	150,667	-3,708		

Resources Scrutiny Commission – 2020/21 Budget Scrutiny Questions

Resource Directorate		
No	Question	Answer
4	<p>Commercialisation</p> <p>a) How much of the £1.4m of forecast savings next year are from income expected from commercialisation projects?</p> <p>b) What are the top 2 or 3 commercialisation projects in terms of forecast net income for 20/21 and what are the expected net incomes for those same projects this year? (If these are related to the Capital Program lines PL35 (Harbour Operational Infrastructure) PL36 (Markets) and/or NH03 (Cemeteries and Crematoria) what are the projected net incomes for 20/21 from the business plans for those projects please?)</p>	<p>a) £0.210m of the savings relates to commercialisation projects.</p> <p>b) Commercialisation projects included in the current strategy will be categorised as micro, medium term and major projects: The 20/21 forecast incorporates projections that include the Harbour Review, market and dock estate improvement plan, fleet services, in addition to any short term opportunities for savings, income generation, and securing alternative funding streams from known and/or in year emerging opportunities.</p> <p>Business plan development is at an early stage, and project level projections are subject to change and not yet finalised:</p> <p>i. PL35 Harbour – zero in the Business Case for 20/21 (although previously planned in savings tracker as £25k p.a. for Harbour in 20/21 and £250k for Docks in 20/21)</p> <p>ii. PL36 Markets – indicative £69k for year 2 (20/21) (and previously planned in savings as £35k p.a. for 20/21)</p> <p>iii. NHO3 Cemeteries and Crematoria – no additional income planned for 20/21. Income is budgeted unchanged at £3.962m (before any annual inflationary increase is applied). (Please note any savings related to Cemeteries and Crematoria will sit with Management of Place under G&R.)</p>