

Full Council Supplementary Information



Date: Tuesday, 23 February 2021

Time: 2.00 pm

7. 2021-2022 Budget Report

Please find following the report of Resources Scrutiny Commission in response to the Budget Report. **(Pages 2 - 21)**

Issued by: Sam Wilcock, Democratic Services
City Hall, Bristol, BS1 9NE
Tel: 0117 92 23846
E-mail: democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk
Date: Monday, 22 February 2021



Resources Scrutiny Commission – 2021/2022 Budget Report

1. Introduction and context
2. Capital Programme Overview
3. Housing Revenue Account
4. Transport Capital Programme
5. Business Rate Retention
6. Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG)
7. Adult Social Care (ASC)
8. Company Business Plans
9. Public Health Grant

Appendix A: Member Questions and Officer Responses

1. Introduction and context

For the 2020/2021 municipal year, the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (OSMB) delegated the responsibility of scrutinising the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) and Cabinet budget proposals to the Resources Scrutiny Commission and the Commission created a Finance Task and Finish Group to achieve this aim. Between June 18th and December 18th 2020 the Finance Task and Finish Group met with Finance Officers on nine occasions to consider and provide feedback on the Covid-19 financial situation and preparations for 2021/2022 budget, and reported the findings to OSMB.

Areas of focus included:

- Covid-19 impacts and pressures
- General Fund
- Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP)
- Collection Fund medium term impact
- Council Tax Reduction Scheme (CTRS)
- Council Reserves
- Capital Strategy
- Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG)
- Facilities management
- Housing Revenue Account (HRA)
- Capital Programme
- Revenue

Members offer their sincere thanks to finance officers for their continued commitment and their time spent making this a highly constructive process. They presented the information to us in a cogent and understandable way and answered all our questions patiently.

On 4th February 2021 the Resources Scrutiny Commission considered the Budget Proposals to Full Council that were published for the Cabinet meeting on the 26th January. The topics highlighted in this report refer to concerns or queries raised by commission members regarding the budget proposals that were discussed at the Resources Scrutiny Commission meeting. References are made to the papers published for the Cabinet meeting (available [here](#)), and to questions submitted by Members prior to the meeting for which written responses were received from finance officers and relevant cabinet members (Appendix A).

2. Capital Programme Overview

In the Cabinet meeting of 26th January 2021, the Capital Programme budget for the years 2021/22 to 2025/26, totalling £907.6 million, was discussed. This included the Housing Revenue Account and Transport Capital Programme, both of which were discussed within the Resources Scrutiny Commission (see below). It was confirmed that the Capital Programme was set within the longer-term parameters of the Medium-Term Financial Plan.

Prior to the meeting, one of the issues that was raised by members was the budgeting within the Capital Programme for the Bristol Beacon. Officers responded that the current budget for the Bristol Beacon is £48.8 million, and the Capital Programme (£907m) contains a corporate general fund contingency of £60m, intended to accommodate the potential for overruns and new cost associated with existing projects. During the meeting concerns were raised around the transparency of this project where exact figures are not yet known. Councillor Cheney, the Deputy Mayor with responsibility for Finance, Governance and Performance stated that as decisions had not yet been formally made the current planning involved provisions only. It was noted that a Scrutiny Briefing on Bristol Beacon was anticipated in the near future.

3. Housing Revenue Account

Members noted the forecast underspend of £3.3m on the Housing Revenue Account (HRA). Officers explained that an underspend of £6.3m had arisen due to delays in the maintenance programme caused by COVID. Combined with the forecast £3.0m spend on Covid-19 related pressures for which no government funding had been provided, this resulted in the total net underspend of £3.3m. This will be transferred to the HRA reserve at year-end to address the backlog of repairs.

In response to member's queries, it was noted that applying a 1% uplift to current rents would increase annual revenue to the HRA by £1.1 million each year. In light of this, Members queried the decision not to increase rents. Members were concerned that there would be serious pressures on the HRA reserve in three to four years time and suggested that in other scenarios the decision not to increase rents would have been made after consideration of efficiencies and other options first, and it was unclear how these pressures could be resolved.

This was noted by Councillor Cheney who confirmed that rent increases in future years had not been ruled out, and long-term predictions would remain speculative. However, the decision was taken as 'an ethical decision' in the context of expected wholesale redundancies and other economic vulnerabilities following the pandemic.

4. Transport Capital Programme

Members submitted a number of written questions regarding transport elements of the Capital Programme, particularly around allocation of maintenance funds. The responses received stated that the Capital Programme had allocated £13m to essential maintenance works. There was a significant backlog of maintenance needs and the final allocations had not yet been decided, but an indicative list was provided. The next phase of the maintenance will detail the full risk profile of each project.

Members raised a concern that the position taken around maintenance appeared to be reactive rather than proactive, noting that an Enhanced Asset Register had previously been raised as a potential way to address this, and it was asked if there were any plans in place to develop such a register. It was understood that this had not been possible for the current budget due to the necessity of prioritising need, while looking to prevention work where possible.

Members noted in submitted questions that no budget had been allocated in the Capital Programme for drainage enhancements which seemed surprising given recent increases in local flooding. They received

the response that the lifecycle modelling and asset assessment for drainage was not available and in any event this was not currently considered an immediate health & safety priority. Members queried that the lifecycle work had been previously budgeted for but not completed. Councillor Dudd, the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Transport, Energy & New Green Deal agreed to check drainage maintenance against the priority matrix.

5. Business Rates Retention

The papers provided outlined the recent Government announcement that Local Authorities could remain in the 100% business rates retention pilot for a further year but that a future reduction to 75% had not been ruled out as the review of Business Rates is still underway. It is unknown when these reviews will conclude, and a subsequent risk to future funding was noted. This could have a material impact on both the Bristol City Council income and the revenue funding of the West of England Combined Authority.

It is proposed in the 2021/22 budget that this fund will be used to contribute to a range of one-off schemes and income shortfalls within Adult and Children Social Care and other initiatives, and 5% would be transferred to WECA for core operational activity. These streams of funding would be at risk should the Business Rates Retention Scheme not continue into 2022/23.

It was clarified that the commitment to the 100% Business Rates retention (and associated 5% funding for WECA) was part of the devolution deal, and central Government would need to consider not only the impact for the three unitary councils, but how WECA would be funded if a change to arrangements was made. Within Bristol City Council itself, the choice was made last year to de-risk the budget by using the funds gained from this sources for discrete or one-off projects to ensure that the core business as usual could continue in the event that this fund was lost.

6. Dedicated Schools Grant

The combined in-year forecast deficit together with a carried-forward deficit for the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) gives a total deficit to carry forward at the end of the year of £11.4million. Members expressed concern about this. Officers explained that this largely came from the High Needs Block and related to the cost of Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) provision and improvements made in completing Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCP), but there were also challenges in Early Years with a lack of Covid-19 support in this sector.

Members noted there was now an increasing deficit carried forward without a clear picture of how it would be resolved. SEND cost pressure is not just a local issue but a national issue. Officers stated that they hoped the ongoing and legacy cost issues driving these deficits would be addressed in future years by government. However, a deficit management plan (aligned with the Education Improvement Programme to improve outcomes and services and to reduce pressures in the High Needs block) was in development. There was continuous lobbying of the central government for appropriate funding. This plan will be brought to the Schools Forum and scrutinised by the People Scrutiny Commission and through other processes.

It was noted that as with many Local Authorities, we are seeing increasing deficits that exceed the overall School Reserves. A statutory override is in place to allow this to be carried forward as a liability with the view that a later deficit management plan would be implemented. Members expressed concern about this and stated strongly that there needed to be a national strategic review of funding to provide some clarity around ongoing management, particularly once the statutory override is lifted.

7. Adult Social Care

The papers published for the Cabinet meeting of 26th January demonstrated that Adult Social Care (ASC) shows a 2020-2021 overspend of £35.1m (including the impact of Covid) and an underlying non-Covid overspend of £7.2M.

Members queried whether the ASC overspend had been predictable (given that overspends had happened on numerous previous occasions). They queried whether this could be related to a problem with the budgeting process itself as well as the cost pressures. It was noted that the Scrutiny Budget Task Group had previously raised similar concerns over the ASC budget, which were also raised at Full Council. Officers stated that savings and efficiency targets were taken into account in budget setting, as well as provisions made in case of 'slippage' or 'optimism bias', however the pandemic had caused significant delays in implementing many of the changes that were necessary to achieve these savings. The Council was carrying out a Transformation Plan which included the continued challenge of reducing the costs of services, but the impact of COVID had affected its implementation.

Councillor Helen Holland, Cabinet Member with responsibility for Adult Social Care, was confident that the amount budgeted for this year which included some one-off funding, was a more realistic figure, but there were savings to be made every year. She agreed that the funding situation was not sustainable, and that Bristol and many other Local Authorities required input from Central Government to help resolve the situation. The option to charge more via the council tax precept was welcomed but members noted that the precept puts the burden on local taxpayers and that in any event may not cover the total funds required. Officers said that this issue was frequently raised with the Local Government Association (LGA) and Central Government.

Members acknowledged the positive work taking place and the pressures experienced from different quarters. It was asked if a follow-up piece of 'constructive challenge' scrutiny with Resources Scrutiny or OSMB at the appropriate time would be helpful. This was welcomed by the Cabinet Member.

8. Company Business Plans

Members submitted a number of written questions regarding Goram Homes and other Company Business Plans. The responses received stated that the funding earmarked for Goram Homes is from the capital investment reserve and the company is required to operate within an approved funding envelope for each pipeline of activity. Goram Homes was initially approved with up to £10m potential loan facility for working capital and development investment from this reserve.

It was noted that the consideration of the Company Business Plans had been deferred, and it was confirmed that these would be considered by Scrutiny prior to consideration.

It was clarified that all funds to Goram Homes are repayable loans with interest payable (and not subsidies or grants). As the pipeline of activities to be undertaken by Goram Homes is currently in development, this fund had not yet been allocated.

It was understood from a recent OSMB meeting that a potential significant delay in an existing pipeline for a planned project had been identified, with a corresponding financial impact due to the delay. Officers stated that the potential delay in an element of the scheme would be built into the financial model, with consideration given to accelerating other pipelines as appropriate. A £3.3m loan facility for the working capital is available that has not yet been fully drawn down, and alternative pipeline activities are being discussed.

It was confirmed that the details of further projects are currently being developed, with the expectation that they would shortly be brought to Cabinet for approval. Once approved, Goram Homes will finalise and submit the company business plan.

9. Public Health Grant

Members queried how COVID and non-COVID related funding was separated within the Public Health budget. It was clarified that the Public Health grant related solely to non-COVID related funds. The current grant for 2020/21 was £32m but confirmation from central Government of the value of the grant for 2021/22 was awaited. The assumption had been made for budgeting purposes that this would remain the same as previous years.

Councillor Stephen Clarke

Chair Budget Task and Finish Group and Resources Scrutiny Commission

Member Questions for Budget Resources Scrutiny Commission

Councillor Cheney

No.	From	Question	Portfolio Holder/ Executive Director/ CFO	Response
1	Councillor Stephen Clarke	Why is there a forecast underspend of £3.3m on the HRA?	Councillor Craig Cheney /Stephen Peacock	HRA is a ring-fenced budget and is currently forecasting £3.0m COVID related pressures, due to increase in rent related debt provision and additional costs in making shared buildings COVID-secure, for which no government COVID funding has been provided. Simultaneously an underspend of £6.3m has arisen from slower than expected recruitment and temporary delays in the repair and maintenance programme due to the pandemic and socially restrictive measures. The overall forecast for the HRA is therefore a net underspend of £3.3m which, if it materialises, will be transferred to the HRA reserve at year end to address the backlog repairs.
2	Councillor Stephen Clarke	I'm not clear why the last monitoring report we will get will be for Dec?	Councillor Craig Cheney /Denise Murray	The temporary change in reporting arrangements will mean that the monitoring report to be submitted to February Cabinet for Period 9 will reflect the December close adjusted to reflect any relevant information or material movement that comes to light between P9 and P10. The last report for the year will be the outturn report (P12).
3	Councillor Stephen Clarke	What would be the extra revenue from a 1% rise in council rents?	Councillor Craig Cheney /Stephen Peacock	Applying a 1% uplift to current rents would increase annual revenue to the HRA by £1.1 million each year.
4	Councillor Stephen Clarke	What will be the impact if the Business Rates Retention Scheme is not extended beyond next year?	Councillor Craig Cheney /Denise Murray	A number of one-off funding streams / decisions have been applied in the Spending Round 20 and subsequent 21/22 provisional settlement of which the continuation of the 100% Business Rates Retention scheme is one, contributing to a

No.	From	Question	Portfolio Holder/ Executive Director/ CFO	Response																																				
				range of projects within Adults and Childrens Social Care and income shortfalls. Should the scheme not continue into 22/23 it will impact on the Council's ability to continue these schemes and the 5% currently transferred to WECA to support core highways and transport activity.																																				
General Revenue – 5	Councillor Geoff Gollop	Can I have a breakdown of the costs of running the Mayor's office broken down between staffing travel and other cost headings, along with details of staff numbers and comparatives for the last 2 years?	Mayor/ Councillor Craig Cheney	<p>The 2021/22 budget for this divisional service area is £0.871m. The additional information sought in relation to more detailed analysis and historic budget breakdown is outlined below and reflects increase in pay award in 20/21.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>19/20</th> <th>20/21</th> <th>21/22</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>£k</th> <th>£k</th> <th>£k</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Employees</td> <td>652</td> <td>666</td> <td>666</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Premises-Related</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Transport-Related</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Supplies & Services</td> <td>123</td> <td>123</td> <td>123</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Third Party Payments</td> <td>68</td> <td>68</td> <td>68</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Support Services</td> <td>9</td> <td>9</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>856</td> <td>871</td> <td>871</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		19/20	20/21	21/22		£k	£k	£k	Employees	652	666	666	Premises-Related	3	3	3	Transport-Related	2	2	2	Supplies & Services	123	123	123	Third Party Payments	68	68	68	Support Services	9	9	9	Total	856	871	871
	19/20	20/21	21/22																																					
	£k	£k	£k																																					
Employees	652	666	666																																					
Premises-Related	3	3	3																																					
Transport-Related	2	2	2																																					
Supplies & Services	123	123	123																																					
Third Party Payments	68	68	68																																					
Support Services	9	9	9																																					
Total	856	871	871																																					
General Revenue – 6	Councillor Geoff Gollop	Can I have a breakdown of the costs of running the Executive Office broken down between staffing and other cost headings?	Mayor/ Councillor Craig Cheney /Mike Jackson	<p>The table below includes the detail of the Executive Office 2021/22 budget and reflects no increase on the 2020/21 budget.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>21/22 Budget</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>£</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Employees</td> <td>1,517</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Premises-Related</td> <td>6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		21/22 Budget		£	Employees	1,517	Premises-Related	6																												
	21/22 Budget																																							
	£																																							
Employees	1,517																																							
Premises-Related	6																																							

No.	From	Question	Portfolio Holder/ Executive Director/ CFO	Response																																				
				<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Transport-Related</td> <td>8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Supplies & Services</td> <td>44</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Support Services</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>1,576</td> </tr> </table>	Transport-Related	8	Supplies & Services	44	Support Services	1	Total	1,576																												
Transport-Related	8																																							
Supplies & Services	44																																							
Support Services	1																																							
Total	1,576																																							
General Revenue – 7	Councillor Geoff Gollop	Please provide detail of the Communications budget by account heading, and in particular the staff numbers and comparatives for the last 2 years.	Councillor Craig Cheney /Mike Jackson	<p>The Council does not budget specifically for Communication. The 2021/22 budget for the public relations, engagement and consultation is £0.751m. The additional information sought in relation to more detailed analysis and historic budget breakdown is outlined below and reflects a decrease of £50k from savings in publication and design costs.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>19/20</th> <th>20/21</th> <th>21/22</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>£k</th> <th>£k</th> <th>£k</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Employees</td> <td>1,158</td> <td>1,136</td> <td>1,136</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Premises-Related</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Transport-Related</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Supplies & Services</td> <td>67</td> <td>45</td> <td>45</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Support Services</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Income/Recharges</td> <td>(428)</td> <td>(433)</td> <td>(433)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>800</td> <td>751</td> <td>751</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		19/20	20/21	21/22		£k	£k	£k	Employees	1,158	1,136	1,136	Premises-Related	1	1	1	Transport-Related	1	1	1	Supplies & Services	67	45	45	Support Services	1	1	1	Income/Recharges	(428)	(433)	(433)	Total	800	751	751
	19/20	20/21	21/22																																					
	£k	£k	£k																																					
Employees	1,158	1,136	1,136																																					
Premises-Related	1	1	1																																					
Transport-Related	1	1	1																																					
Supplies & Services	67	45	45																																					
Support Services	1	1	1																																					
Income/Recharges	(428)	(433)	(433)																																					
Total	800	751	751																																					
General Revenue – 8	Councillor Geoff Gollop	How much is budgeted for social media monitoring?	Councillor Craig Cheney /Mike Jackson	<p>The budget does not specifically allocate an amount for social media monitoring. The costs of any spend related to social media are within individual service budgets.</p> <p>We do however have a contract with Impact Social which expires at the end of March with an annual contract value of £21k.</p>																																				
General	Councillor	How much is budgeted for social	Councillor	The budget does not specifically allocate an amount for																																				

No.	From	Question	Portfolio Holder/ Executive Director/ CFO	Response
Revenue – 9	Geoff Gollop	media?	Craig Cheney /Mike Jackson	social media. The costs of any spend related to social media are within individual service budgets.
Bristol Beacon - 10	Councillor Geoff Gollop	How much is included in the capital budget in respect of the Bristol Beacon.	Mayor/ Councillor Craig Cheney /Stephen Peacock	The current budget for the Bristol Beacon is £48.8 million. Internal and external option reviews have been completed for the Bristol Beacon and detailed forecast for the completion of the works and external funding secured are being finalised and will be subject to a separate report.
Bristol Beacon – 11	Councillor Geoff Gollop	Does this cover all anticipated costs?	Mayor/ Councillor Craig Cheney /Stephen Peacock	The Capital Programme (£907m) contains a corporate general fund contingency of £60m, which is intended to accommodate the potential for cost overruns and new cost associated to existing projects and in addition new urgent projects / risks during the reporting period. This capital contingency is expected to be sufficient to manage the risks associated to the programme and give Council confidence in the affordability of the programme.
Bristol Beacon – 12	Councillor Geoff Gollop	If yes, please explain where they are shown.	Mayor/ Councillor Craig Cheney /Stephen Peacock	
Bristol Beacon - 13	Councillor Geoff Gollop	If no, please explain how a capital budget can go to Full Council without	Mayor/ Councillor Craig Cheney /Stephen Peacock	The Capital Programme will continue to be closely managed and until the position is finalised in the spring any additional programme costs or new schemes identified for incorporation at this stage in the process would need to be offset by reductions to or deferrals of other approved schemes which are not externally funded.

No.	From	Question	Portfolio Holder/ Executive Director/ CFO	Response
Companies Goram – 14	Councillor Geoff Gollop	Are there any revenues costs in the budget in respect of Goram Homes, if so how much and what do they relate to?	Councillor Craig Cheney /Stephen Peacock	<p>No revenue costs are in the 2021/22 Revenue Budgets for Goram Homes.</p> <p>The Council approved the establishment of Goram Homes (a housing company) in 2018, with an initial pipeline 1 development, namely: Romney House and Baltic Wharf, land transfer (with a deferred receipt) and up to £10m (earmarked reserve) potential loan facility for working capital and development investment (terms to be agreed).</p> <p>Pipeline 1 schemes are expected to deliver 432 units of housing, 173: 40% of which will be 'affordable' housing.</p>
Companies Goram – 15	Councillor Geoff Gollop	Please confirm the capital append /reserve available for Goram homes.	Councillor Craig Cheney /Stephen Peacock	<p>To date a loan facility of £3.3m for working capital has been established, against the approved £10m, reserve drawdowns to date are being repaid and scheduled to be fully repaid (principal plus interest) by March 2024 and currently payback of the deferred capital receipt (valued at £13m) is estimated to be complete by March 2023.</p>
Companies Goram – 16	Councillor Geoff Gollop	Is there any other spend on Goram?	Councillor Craig Cheney /Stephen Peacock	

No.	From	Question	Portfolio Holder/ Executive Director/ CFO	Response
Companies Goram – 17	Councillor Geoff Gollop	Are these sums intended to be a loan or a subsidy and where does it specify this in the budget?	Councillor Craig Cheney /Stephen Peacock	<p>The Council budget is proposing that the Capital Investment reserve will be increased in 2021/22 by £6m to add to the £4m from the existing pipeline no longer required and create a new £10m fund to enable Goram Homes to work with private / public sector partners in the optimum manner to build a 2nd pipeline of sustainable, affordable homes that create communities, respect the environment and contribute to the local economy.</p> <p>The terms for pipeline 2 are anticipated to reflect those outlined for pipeline 1.</p> <p>The net position above will result in £3.3m loan and £13m capital receipt (in the process of being repaid to the Council) delivering 267 homes of which 107 affordable (agreed to date) and £12.7m earmarked reserve, to enable future housing developments.</p> <p>The full budgets attributed to Goram are outlined above.</p> <p>Full details will be outlined in the Companies report to Cabinet and the budget report to Council will be revised to ensure the details above are clearly summarised.</p>
Companies Bristol Energy - 18	Councillor Geoff Gollop	<p>Is there any further cost budgeted to be spent on Bristol Energy in 21/22?</p> <p>If yes how much and where is it shown</p> <p>If no can I have an assurance that there are no further costs</p>	Councillor Craig Cheney /Denise Murray	<p>As we finalise the transfer and process towards the orderly winding up of the company and any potential company liabilities that could arise to end March 2023 the risk reserve of £7.3m earmarked for risk associated to the collateral / guarantees has been translated into an indemnity agreement not to exceed this value and accounted for as a liability on the Council's balance sheet to be unwound as the potential liabilities fall away.</p>

No.	From	Question	Portfolio Holder/ Executive Director/ CFO	Response
Budget General – 19	Councillor Geoff Gollop	Can you confirm how the Council budget can be approved at Full Council before the business plans have been approved?	Councillor Craig Cheney /Denise Murray	Yes, the Council budget can be approved at Full Council before the companies' business plans have been approved. The Council budget will reflect the Council's financial commitment associated reserves and establish the capital and revenue cash limits that we consider sufficient to meet the business needs. The companies will operate within for 2021/22. Business plans for 2021/22 will be developed within these thresholds and utilisation where appropriate of our companies own reserves and contingencies. Any risks associated will need to be clearly outlined and closely monitored.
Fees General - 20	Councillor Geoff Gollop	Can you give an indication of the total fees payable to professional firms (business service, all disciplines) budgeted for in the revenue budget?	Councillor Craig Cheney /Denise Murray	Spend on professional services is on a case-by-case basis as need arises in delivery of services across the Council and a specific budget is not set in the revenue budget.
Fees General - 21	Councillor Geoff Gollop	Can you also give an indication of the fees payable included in the capital budget?	Councillor Craig Cheney /Denise Murray	Spend on professional services is on a case-by-case basis as need arises in delivery of services across the Council and a specific budget is not set in the capital budget.
Resources budget – 22	Councillor Mhairi Threlfall	What are the common activities that are being reviewed to improve efficiencies?	Councillor Craig Cheney /Mike Jackson	A full scoping is currently being completed, but the following areas are being considered, others may be added: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Admin & Cusiness Support • Internal Contact Handling • Customer Contact Handling • IT • MI/BI Activity • Debt • Contract Management • Modern Records

No.	From	Question	Portfolio Holder/ Executive Director/ CFO	Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further centralisation of FOI/Complaints/SARs • Project Management • Policy • Property
Resources budget – 23	Councillor Mhairi Threlfall	How might this impact an already very busy workforce?	Councillor Craig Cheney /Mike Jackson	The redesign and centralisation of common functions into smaller, more efficient and effective professional services should enable us to provide the best support we can to colleagues - through the removal of non-value added activity and clearer, priority driven service offers to best meet the needs of users of those services within available resources.
Resources budget – 24	Councillor Mhairi Threlfall	What are the risks in not meeting these savings?	Councillor Craig Cheney /Mike Jackson	Several benefit realisation approaches are being considered to allow flexibility in applying the right model to each situation and to increase the likelihood of safe benefit delivery to the levels stated within the MTFP. Initial savings estimates will be further refined as the work commences in each area, but this was felt to be an achievable figure, based on activity analysis undertaken across the organisation last year.

Councillor Asher Craig

25	Councillor Stephen Clarke	What are the strategic plans going forward for the Public Health Budget? There seems no logic in effectively cutting it by having no increase.	Councillor Asher Craig /Jacqui Jensen	The public health grant is set by the Department of Health and Social Care. At the point of writing the allocation for the 2021/22 financial year has yet to be confirmed. Early indication is that the grant will remain at the same level as 2020/21 with no uplift (which means a real term cut). Once the grant allocation is confirmed, the spending plans will be developed and a report will be taken to Cabinet to approve the specific budget plans for 2021/22.
----	---------------------------	--	---------------------------------------	---

Councillor Helen Holland

26	Councillor Stephen Clarke	ASC is budgeted for £183m next year. How would you like to see this funded in future years as clearly it is becoming unsustainable?	Councillor Helen Holland/Jacqui Jensen	<p>Funding of pressures in adult social care is a huge issue which needs a national solution. The current situation of council tax rises and one-off grant funding doesn't enable local authorities to effectively plan in the medium and long term.</p> <p>The additional one-off funding for social care for 2021/22 is welcome, however this is a continuation of the sticking plaster approach to funding adult social care. The adult social care precept provides limited means to raise additional funding but it is not sustainable. It raises different amounts of money in different parts of the country dependent on the regions tax base and bands. It is unrelated to need and adds an extra financial burden on households.</p> <p>Reform of adult social care funding is overdue and urgently required.</p>
27	Councillor Stephen Clarke	ASC is showing a £6m overspend this year. Why is this always under budgeted? Virtually every year there is an overspend.	Councillor Helen Holland/Jacqui Jensen	<p>2020/21 Adult Social Care non-Covid variance is £7.2m (P8) which mainly relates to undelivered savings plus market pressures</p> <p>Additional budget has been allocated to Adult Social Care in each year from the Council Tax social care precept as well as new grants including reducing savings plans in this service. When benchmarking our spend on Adult Social Care we have higher costs than other comparative authorities and we continue to look for ways of improving our efficiency and driving value for money from the services we deliver and commission.</p>

Councillor Kye Dudd

Companies City Leap – 28	Councillor Geoff Gollop	Can you confirm the amount of money allocated to spend on City Leap during 2021/22, split between Revenue and Capital budget?	Councillor Kye Dudd / Stephen Peacock	The City Leap programme funding is from earmarked reserves.
Companies City Leap – 29	Councillor Geoff Gollop	Is there any other spend on City Leap that does not fall into these categories such as straight from reserves?	Councillor Kye Dudd / Stephen Peacock	All City Leap spend is funded from reserves, budget spend for 2021/22 is £0.786m. Note that some of the remaining spend forecast for 2020/21 could fall into 2021/22 but the overall budget envelope has not been increased from approved levels.
Companies City Leap – 30	Councillor Geoff Gollop	How much is expected to be spent on EY, and other financial advice.	Councillor Kye Dudd / Stephen Peacock	As per the December 2020 Cabinet report, the forecast fund outlined for financial advice to City Leap is up to £0.962m. Prior to EY's appointment of this total, £0.134m was spent on financial advice from Deloitte. The only other spend related to finance advice is from internal financial advice / support from BCC Finance.
Companies City Leap – 31	Councillor Geoff Gollop	How much is expected to be spent on Burges Salmon and other legal advice.	Councillor Kye Dudd / Stephen Peacock	The forecast fund outlined for legal advice to City Leap is up to £0.856m Under the Council's first contract with Burges Salmon through to April 2019 Cabinet Report, £0.137m was incurred. As per the December 2020 Cabinet report, up to a maximum of a further £0.856m spend can be incurred.

				The only other legal advice has been from internal BCC Legal which is not included in the above.
Companies City Leap – 32	Councillor Geoff Gollop	How many Council employees are expected to be working on City Leap during the year?	Councillor Kye Dudd / Stephen Peacock	<p>There are three permanent employees who are working full time on City Leap. In addition to this, 2.0FTE of BCC Legal resource and 0.8FTE of BCC Finance resource and Procurement also work on the project. With the exception of procurement, all of the costs associated with internal employees is anticipated to be £2.2 million across the project which aren't included in the figures above.</p> <p>In addition to this, the City Leap Project Board meets for c2 hours/month and there are regular catch up meetings with the City Leap SRO and Director, Management of Place (c2 hours/month).</p> <p>On an ad hoc basis, other officers contribute to City Leap by providing information in response to clarifications and also occasionally attending meetings with Bidders as subject matter experts. This is variable but would estimate c1-2 FTE in total, spread across a large number of individuals.</p>
Transport capital programme - 33	Councillor Mhairi Threlfall	Of the £75m or so earmarked for transport improvements, what is the external (e.g. WECA) / internal split of the funding?	Councillor Kye Dudd / Stephen Peacock	<p>A breakdown of £75m referred to as transport improvements:</p> <p>£24.9 million BCC funds £35.7 million WECA grant £14.4 million other grant e.g. JAQU</p>
Transport capital programme - 34	Councillor Mhairi Threlfall	An additional 15m or so has been earmarked for maintenance. I couldn't find a list of these schemes, firstly what are they?	Councillor Kye Dudd / Stephen Peacock	The capital programme allocated £13m to essential maintenance works. The backlog maintenance needs of the city's infrastructure is significant and the final allocations of how this will be specifically spent have not been finalised, however an indicative list of essential works is

				<p>outlined below.</p> <p>Transport and Harbour</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Park Street footways • St Peters Rise • Transport signage (Variable Message Sign Replacement) • Replace life expired signals • West End and Temple St repairs • Harbour pressures • New cut pedestrian bridges <p>Parks Maintenance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard surfaces rebuild and restoration • Grounds maintenance operational equipment replacement • Wall, footpath and riverbank urgent work • Cemeteries and crematoria urgent works
Transport capital programme – 35	Councillor Mhairi Threlfall	Given we still have outstanding maintenance liabilities (e.g. chocolate path, Redcliffe bridge) from 4, 5 years ago, many of which are now costing the council more, what are the risks that the cost of the maintenance of the assets will go up?	Councillor Kye Dudd / Stephen Peacock	Individual projects have risk factored into overall allocation however sometimes this may not be sufficient and therefore a capital contingency across the whole programme is allocated at a level deemed appropriate for the current level of risk in the overall programme.
Transport capital programme – 36	Councillor Mhairi Threlfall	What is the risk profile for each project?	Councillor Kye Dudd / Stephen Peacock	The next phase of some of the maintenance work above will detail the full risk profile of each project. As part of the assessments a risk assessment will be undertaken with recommendations of implementation and the risk of not delivering the outcomes. Projects such as Cumberland Rd and Redcliffe have QRA completed whilst projects for

				partial delivery will have risk registers done as part of the detailed design.
Transport capital programme - 37	Councillor Mhairi Threlfall	Are there any existing concerns that the cost of already allocated maintenance projects will also continue to go up?	Councillor Kye Dudd / Stephen Peacock	Existing schemes are at varying stages of delivery, some with early feasibility work and some in construction. Those at early stages of development have more significant unknowns and therefore have higher risk of increased cost as works progress.
Transport capital programme – 37	Councillor Mhairi Threlfall	Does the bridge investment also include the reinstatement of Kingsweston bridge?	Councillor Kye Dudd / Stephen Peacock	No, PL09 bridge investment relates to works on Plimsoll Bridge and Redcliffe Bascule Bridge.
Transport capital programme - 39	Councillor Mhairi Threlfall	What percentage of maintenance funds are going towards maintenance of footpaths/pavements versus roads?	Councillor Kye Dudd / Stephen Peacock	From the annual funding from Department for Transport circa £4 million via WECA and the additional £1million Council borrowing the authority general spends £2.2 million on roads and £0.930 million on footways with the remaining spread between structures, lighting, drainage and other assets. However, a direct correlation between road and footway funding is not a true reflection of repair amount. Repairing footway is considerably cheaper to repair than a road. In terms of length of footway with the current allocation, we treat more footway length than roads every year.
Transport capital programme – 40	Councillor Mhairi Threlfall	How much of the new allocation of maintenance funds is going towards enabling walking and cycling - for instance repairing the poor surfaces on the new emergency cycle lanes?	Councillor Kye Dudd / Stephen Peacock	The new allocation is being targeted to urgent health and safety issues. The recent Challenge Fund and Pothole Fund grants from government have been targeted to fully resurfacing roads, repairing structural defects, footway surfacing and drainage defects which support sustainable modes. The emergency cycle lane projects are currently temporary and will potentially change to permanent measures where poor surfaces will be considered as part of the works.

Transport capital programme – 41	Councillor Mhairi Threlfall	Why is there no budget allocated in the capital programme for drainage enhancements given recent increases in local flooding (e.g. junction 3 roundabout, Lawrence Hill roundabout)?	Councillor Kye Dudd / Stephen Peacock	As above the funding is being targeted to health and safety issues. At present, the life cycle modelling and asset assessment for drainage is not available. We have a number of potential flooding projects currently being assessed and data gathered, but not considered an immediate H&S concern.
----------------------------------	-----------------------------	--	---------------------------------------	---