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# PURPOSE OF REPORT AND POLICY CONTEXT

## This report includes the proposed General Fund Revenue and Capital Budget 2024/25 including the latest estimated resource position for the Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) covering 2024/25 to 2027/28, including changes in assumptions arising from the key impacts of the Autumn Statement 2023 and the subsequent provisional Local Government Financial Settlement. It also includes revised estimates of demographic and cost trends based on the latest information and forecasts. This includes updated Council Tax and Business Rate tax base forecasts as received by Strategy, Finance & City Regeneration Committee at its January 2024 meeting.

## The Autumn Statement 2023 and recent additional funding announcement purport to increase Local Government Spending Power by 7.5% for 2024/25. However, this includes assumed maximum Council Tax increases of up to 4.99%, including an Adult Social Care precept of 2%, and a Business Rates increase of 6.7% in line with September 2023 CPI. Therefore, a substantial element of the increase will fall on local businesses and council tax-payers.

## Real Terms inflation being experienced by the council is closer to 8% due to increases in the costs of social care provision, most of which is externally provided, together with energy cost uplifts, increased interest rates driving up capital financing costs, and increased external contract costs. However, this is before significant increases in demands are added including, for example, significant growth in adult and children’s social care, home to school transport, and homelessness. A further impact that is compounding funding pressures is the impact of the cost of living crisis on council incomes including everything from reduced planning fees to lower commercial rent incomes to lower than expected parking and permit income.

## As the Local Government Association (LGA) has noted, the Autumn Statement 2023 falls far short of the funding needed to meet demand and cost pressures across local government. The LGA estimates a £4 billion funding gap over the next two years, likely to require large cuts to local services and the use of at least £2.3 billion council reserves to avoid sector-wide Section 114 ‘bankruptcy’ notices. A highly unsustainable position. The additional funding announcement on 24 January 2024 is welcomed by the sector but does not address the scale of the overall situation.

## In this council, the conservative estimate of the growth in costs and demands in 2024/25 is approximately £48 million, an unprecedented increase of over 20% of the council’s net budget. This includes the combined impact of inflation, increased demands and reduced incomes as referred to above. It also includes an assumption of 3% for the nationally set Local Government pay award, yet to be negotiated.

## The combination of unprecedented cost pressures and an Autumn Statement that offered nothing above the 2-year announcement made in 2022, despite inflation continuing to be much higher than forecast by the Office of Budget Responsibility together with increased interest rates and an ongoing cost of living crisis, has, unsurprisingly, resulted in the biggest financial challenge this council has ever faced. A budget shortfall (gap) of over £30 million is estimated for 2024/25 and this inevitably results in some very difficult choices given that the council has no unallocated provisions or risk reserves to help the position in the short term. This is due to cumulative savings and cuts of over £240 million having been required since 2010 in the context of a loss of government grant of over £120 million in real terms, the capping of Council Tax increases, and very significant increases in demands and needs for statutory services such as social care over the same period.

## As before, the government continues to issue very late, short term (one year) funding settlements; 2024/25 being the sixth one-year settlement in succession. It has also failed to review or resolve any of the long-term funding issues that it set out to address including Adult Social Care, the Fair Funding review, and the review of Business Rates. This adds to the challenge of councils being able to develop viable, sustainable medium term financial plans and it remains to be seen how many councils will continue to be financially viable over the next 2 years without resorting to unsustainable, short-term measures including using up emergency reserves (Working Balances) or selling off public assets.

# RECOMMENDATIONS:

## That Strategy, Finance & City Regeneration Committee recommends to Council:

## The Administration’s proposed budget and Council Tax increase on the Brighton and Hove element of the council tax, comprising:

## A general Council Tax increase of 2.99%;

## An Adult Social Care Precept increase of 2.00%;

## The council’s net General Fund budget requirement for 2024/25 of £246.353m;

## The 2024/25 budget allocations to services as set out in Appendix 1;

## The Budget Strategies and proposed savings as set out in Appendix 1;

## The one-off resource allocations as set out in the table at paragraph 5.8.

## A recommended working balance of £9.000m (approximately 3.7% of the net budget) to be maintained or replenished over the period of the Medium Term Financial Strategy.

## That Council notes the updated 4-Year Medium Term Financial Strategy included at paragraph 10.3 including predicted budget shortfalls of £73m over the 4-year period.

## That Council approves the Capital Strategy for 2024/25 at Appendix 2 comprising:

## The strategy for funding the investment in change, including the flexible use of capital receipts as set out in section 8;

## The capital resources and proposed borrowing included at Annex A of the Capital Strategy;

## The Capital Investment Programme for 2024/25 of £211.470m included at Appendix 1 and incorporating allocations to strategic funds.

## That Council notes the Equalities Impact Assessments to cover all relevant budget options as set out in Appendix 6.

## That Council further notes that approval of the budget is an indicative resourcing decision to be taken in the context of the explanation given in the Legal Implications at paragraph 18.2.

## That Council approves the Treasury Management Strategy Statement as set out in Appendix 3 comprising:

## The Annual Investment Strategy;

## The Prudential and Treasury Indicators;

## The Minimum Revenue Provision policy;

1. The authorised borrowing limit for the year commencing 1 April 2024.

## That Council notes that supplementary information needed to set the overall council tax, including a detailed Budget Book, will be provided for the Budget Council meeting as listed in paragraph 12.3.

## That Strategy, Finance & City Regeneration Committee:

## Agrees that the council’s Chief Finance Officer be authorised to make any necessary technical, presentational or consequential amendments to this report before submission to Budget Council.

# Context and background information

## Whilst inflation appears to have peaked, it has been slower to level out than the Office of Budget Responsibility (OBR) had predicted which has led to ongoing cost pressures across all areas of spend including higher than anticipated pay award settlements. The high uplift of the National Living Wage this year and next (around 10%) is also driving up costs across a number of sectors, most notably for councils across private and independent sector adult and children’s social care providers from whom the council purchases the great majority of its statutory care services.

## The continuing impact of inflation and subsequently high interest rates on the economy is also a key factor, resulting in increased demands due to the cost of living crisis and the continued suppression of income from fees, charges and commercial rents, key sources of funding for most councils. Latest OBR forecasts indicate inflation falling to 2% by quarter four of 2024 but it remains to be seen if this is realistic given the backdrop of ongoing global and domestic events.

## As noted above, the corollary of this is a very large projected budget shortfall of over £30 million in 2024/25, the largest in the authority's history. This comprises increased costs, demands and income pressures of approximately £48 million offset by additional funding from Council Tax increases and growth, Business Rates increases, and Adult Social Care grant of £18 million. This clearly demonstrates the failings of the Local Government system of funding, both nationally and locally, and is being replicated across every council in the country. The ability of councils to manage this will come down to the strength of their Council Tax and Business Rate tax bases, their ability to raise other incomes, and the level of their reserves. However, many councils are already struggling and at least 16 councils of all political colours are known to have formally approached the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities (DLUHC) for exceptional financial support including the ability to sell public assets or borrow to fund annual revenue costs.

## This authority has navigated through substantial budget shortfalls over a long period of years, particularly since 2010, including managing its finances through the pandemic, albeit with the help of substantial government Covid grant funding. This report presents a balanced budget for the Authority for 2024/25 but, given the scale and cumulative impact of the projected budget gap next financial year, this inevitably comes with consequences including:

## The need to prioritise resources to ensure that core statutory services such as social care and child protection can be maintained to adequate and safe standards;

## As a result, there are unavoidable cuts to some local services, council staffing, and support to other organisations including the Community & Voluntary Sector;

## Significantly increased risks of delivering all budget savings measures successfully;

## An inability to address the entirety of the forecast medium-term pressures;

## Impacts on the council’s ability to invest for the future due to challenges to the affordability of future capital investment programmes;

## Impacts on the council’s strategic partnerships due to funding constraints on both the council and its partners, including the NHS.

## However, producing a set of balanced budget proposals in the extreme context set out earlier in the report demonstrates that the council continues to do everything possible to manage the position through effective financial management and planning, and without resorting to a further depletion of emergency reserves or applying to government for exceptional financial support. As set out in the budget planning reporting to the July 2023 meeting of the Strategy, Finance & City Regeneration Committee, this has been achieved through a wide range of planned measures including:

## Working with the Administration on a regular basis throughout the budget setting process to test out proposals and ensure alignment with Council Plan priorities as far as possible, including a Star Chamber process with each Directorate to test out final proposals and options;

## Identifying and investing in longer term MTFS workstreams that will continue or start in 2024/25 but will aim for medium term savings and efficiencies. There are many workstreams and examples include:

## a strategic review of parking across the city;

## developing the Foster Care Plus incentive scheme to grow the number of foster carers locally;

## developing a new Housing Strategy to optimise the use of the wide range of temporary accommodation and affordable and social housing investments to prevent homelessness and reduce longer term costs;

## developing the new Family Hub model to improve prevention and support for vulnerable families and children;

## undertaking a review of organisational design and staffing structures to ensure that management and administrative costs are optimal, particularly in light of technological investments, and that functionally similar areas are organised as efficiently as possible, eliminating any duplication of effort;

## continuing to optimise (reduce) the use of administrative offices through adopting new ways of working, making the best use of new technologies and computing devices, and maximising the layout and use of floor space;

## continuing to identify opportunities (business cases) to modernise services to ensure they are cost effective, deliver services to appropriate standards, and minimise waste;

## Ongoing scrutiny of the value for money of services including reviewing the balance of provision between in-house and externally commissioned and procured services to ensure the most appropriate option is utilised, as evidenced by a number of the budget savings proposals;

## Reviewing the affordability and financing of the 5-year Capital Investment Programme;

## Ensuring that fees & charges keep pace with corporate inflation assumptions as a minimum. However, this has proved to be one of the most challenging areas to address due to ongoing unfavourable economic conditions.

## Delivering the budget proposals for 2024/25 will undoubtedly present a major challenge to the organisation and a key risk remains any worsening of the cost of living crisis or any deepening of local or national economic challenges. The projections for later years of the MTFS, while very difficult to predict with great accuracy given the short term funding settlement and a forthcoming General Election, suggest that there will almost certainly be ongoing financial challenges for the council in future. Therefore, proposals and initiatives that can contribute to longer term financial sustainability through economies, efficiencies or improved prevention and demand management should be a key priority for focusing resources and/or investment.

## This report covers the full scope of the General Fund budget for 2024/25 and sets out in the main report and appendices the projections, strategies and proposals for the following:

## Resources (funding) and financial planning assumptions;

## The prioritisation of resources (‘Service Pressure Funding’) to protect core statutory services, meet unavoidable commitments and support key priorities;

## Savings proposals (in Appendix 1) to contribute to addressing the projected budget gap;

## Estimates of one-off resourcing requirements and funding;

## A Capital Strategy including a proposed 5-Year Capital Investment Programme and the proposed use of capital receipt flexibilities (Modernisation Funding);

## Projections for the MTFS 2024/25 to 2027/28, and;

## Implications of the budget proposals for council staffing.

## The following section details the outcome of the Autumn Statement and subsequent provisional Local Government Financial Settlement alongside updated estimates of other costs and resources.

# RESOURCES AND PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS 2024/25

***Provisional Local Government Financial Settlement (LGFS)***

## The provisional LGFS for 2024/25 was announced on 18 December 2023 and reflected the headline funding announcements for the second year of the 2-year Autumn Statement originally announced on 17 November 2022 which included:

* Confirmation of an allowable 2% Adult Social Care precept which would provide an additional £3.524m if agreed;
* Confirmation that the threshold at which an increase in Council Tax requires a local referendum will be 5% including a 2% Adult Social Care (ASC) precept. Any proposal to increase core Council Tax by 3% or more would therefore need to be accompanied by an agreed substitute budget, which would need to be implemented if the increase were voted down by the electorate;
* Additional Social Care funding as part of the 2-year Autumn Statement which is reflected in table 1 below;
* A reduction in Services Grant of £2.015m to £0.376m. The scale of reduction was much higher than expected as this grant was used to provide minimum funding guarantees to non-Social Care authorities;
* The council’s income from Business Rates and section 31 grants increased by September 2023 CPI of 6.7%;
* An increase in the Revenue Support Grant (RSG) of £0.526m reflecting the application of a CPI inflationary increase of 6.7%;
* A further one year extension of the New Homes Bonus grant of £2.627m which is once again provided on a one-off basis as the government has said over a number of years it intends to replace the mechanism for distributing this funding in the future.
* No funding announcement for the Household Support Fund beyond the current allocation which ends on 31 March 2024. During 2023/24 the council received £4.281m.

## On 24 January 2024, the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities announced additional measures to support local authorities worth £600m nationally. This includes £500m to be distributed through the Social Care Grant. It is estimated this council will receive additional resources of £2.250m from this change which is included in the overall Budget for 2024/25 however the actual amount will not be confirmed until the final LGFS which is expected to be announced in early February 2024.

***Social Care and Better Care Funding (BCF)***

## In November 2022 the government announced it would delay the introduction of the care reforms from October 2023 to October 2025 and re-purpose this funding to support councils with the increasing costs of social care although there has been no further information on how the care reforms will be funded from October 2025.

## The government confirmed a further 2% Adult Social Care precept for 2024/25.

## In addition, the government made a further announcement of additional Social Care grant funding as described in paragraph 4.2.

## All additional funding for Social Care has been directed towards supporting the demand and cost pressures within Social Care services. The table below summarises the resources available to support Social Care pressures in 2024/25.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 1: Social Care Resources** | **2022/23** | **2023/24** | **2024/25** |
| ASC Precepting \* | 1%  £1.588m | 2%  £3.295m | 2%  £3.524m |
| Improved BCF | £9.459m | £9.459m | £9.459m |
| Social Care Grant | £10.815m | £17.856m | £20.976m |
| ASC Discharge Grant |  | £1.326m | £2.210m |
| ASC Market Sustainability and Improvement Fund and Workforce Fund |  | £4.746m | £5.375m |
| Social Care Grant announced 24/1/24 (Estimated share of £500m) |  |  | £2.250m |

## \* Subject to full Council approval for 2024/25

***Business Rate Retention and Council Tax Income***

## Details of the expected business rate retention income forecasts were set out in the report to the January 2024 Strategy, Finance & City Regeneration Committee. The council is forecast to receive £84.911m from its locally retained share of business rates and Section 31 compensation grants in 2024/25, which is an increase of £5.045m compared to 2023/24. This increase includes 6.7% inflation, anticipated growth in business space in the city and an estimate of the expected impact of successful appeals against business rates rateable values. Note, the council has no control over business rate multipliers which are set by government.

## The Council Tax taxbase report was also agreed by Strategy, Finance & City Regeneration Committee in January 2024. Assuming a Council Tax increase of 4.99% and taking into account changes to the tax base, the total projected Council Tax income in 2024/25 is £185.090m. This is an increase of £11.792m compared with 2023/24.

***Other Government Grants***

## The grant allocations for 2024/25 have been included within the summary budget at Appendix 1. Some grant allocations for next year have not yet been announced, in particular, homelessness, rough sleeping funding and Public Health Grant. However, where these are critical to the setting of the 2024/25 budget, as in the case of those named, a rolled-forward estimate has been included.

***Fees and Charges***

## The council’s Corporate Fees & Charges Policy requires that all fees and charges are reviewed at least annually and should normally be increased by a minimum of either the corporate standard inflation rate, statutory increases, or actual increases in the costs of providing a service to reflect cost inflation.

## Over recent years, fees & charges have become an increasingly important element of the council’s financial sustainability following real terms government grant reductions of over £100 million since 2010. Services therefore benchmark non-statutory fees and charges with other providers and councils to ensure that charges are comparable and competitive within the local context and can maximise discretionary income to protect essential services wherever feasible. However, fees & charges must normally be set to recover costs. Costs have increased substantially during the last two years but the ability to successfully increase fees & charges in-line with costs depends on the impact on demand (price elasticity) and, where commercial, market conditions.

## As always, increases to discretionary fees & charges above the standard rate of inflation and changes to concessions or subsidies are normally considered by the relevant service committee in advance of budget proposals. Increases in fees and charges above the standard inflation rate (assumed at 3.5% for 2024/25) may generate budget savings and, where this is the case, are reflected in savings proposals set out in Appendix 1.

# COUNCIL PLAN INVESTMENTS & PRIORITY SERVICE PRESSURE FUNDING

## The Council Plan 2023 to 2027 sets out a vision for Brighton & Hove to be a city to be proud of, a healthy, fair and inclusive city where everyone thrives. To deliver the vision the council aims to be a responsive council with well-run services and will focus on four outcomes over the next four years. For each of these, the Council Plan describes what the council will do and how it will measure progress.

## The four outcomes are as follows:

1. **A city to be proud of:**

* Investing in the city and supporting a flourishing and inclusive local economy that attracts and nurtures businesses and talent.
* Creating an accessible, clean, and sustainable city that we can all be proud of.

1. **An inclusive and fairer city:**

* A city where people feel safe and welcome.
* Homes for everyone through delivery of accessible, affordable, and high-quality homes for all residents of Brighton & Hove.

1. **A healthy city where people thrive:**

* Supporting a better future for children and young people by keeping children safe, for no child, young person or family to be left behind, and by providing high quality, inclusive, and accessible services.
* Supporting living and ageing well by promoting and improving health and wellbeing to reduce health inequalities and supporting people to live independent and fulfilling lives.

1. **A responsive council with well-run services:**

* Our goal is to be a responsive council that listens to and engages with its communities and delivers positive results for the city.

## The investments to support these outcomes are continually developing as many are informed by local demographic and economic trends, ongoing research and policy development, and consultation and engagement with residents, communities, partners and other stakeholders. As the investment requirements become more certain they are built into both the annual budget setting process and, for longer term objectives, into the MTFS, so far as they can be estimated and afforded.

## A major investment area for the Council Plan continues to be housing and homelessness including further capital investment plans of over £78 million to deliver new build or purchased, affordable housing and temporary and emergency accommodation through the self-financing Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and other innovative schemes including the Housing Joint Venture. These plans are set out in detail in the HRA Revenue and Capital Budget also reported to the February Strategy, Finance & City Regeneration Committee and Budget Council.

## Another important area requiring substantial investment concerns services that can help to support a healthy city. Demands on Social Care services continue to increase, reflecting the continuing trend for people to live longer but increasingly with limiting illnesses, disabilities, mental health illnesses or dementia that require increasing social care support to help them remain in their homes and communities. The government has recognised some of the increased costs of Adult Social Care through the Autumn Statement in terms of additional grant, an allowable Adult Social Care precept and, belatedly, additional funding through the LGFS. However, these fall significantly short of the actual costs and demands being experienced by councils.

## Significantly more investment is required in 2024/25 than in previous years to simply maintain effective and well-run services for the city. This is due to a range of factors including the continuing impacts of inflation, the impact of market conditions on suppliers and providers, and the impact of a weakened economy on many income streams such as planning fees, parking revenues and commercial rent incomes which are an important source of funding to protect service delivery.

## In total, there are proposed ongoing investments of £27.229m and provisional one-off investments of £0.956m to support services that contribute to Council Plan outcomes. These revenue investments are enabled by proposed local taxation increases (4.99%), including the 2% Adult Social Care precept, increased government grant support, additional retained business rates income, and the substantial package of savings proposals focused on delivering services at a lower cost through redesign and/or technological changes, or reprioritising investment to other service areas. However, as for 2023/24, inevitably a significant element of the required investment is to meet ongoing inflationary impacts and significant increases in demands for statutory services.

## The full list of proposed investments to support Council Plan priorities and associated outcomes is set out below:

## Table 2: Council Plan Investments and Service Pressure Funding 2024/25

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority Supported** | **Table 2: Proposed Council Plan Investments** | **Recurrent**  **Investment 2024/25 £m** | **One-off Revenue Support £m** |
|  |
|  |
|  |
| **A City to be Proud of:**  **An Accessible, Clean and**  **Sustainable City** |  |  |  |  |
| Re-opening Public Conveniences at Royal Pavilion Gardens | 0.120 |  |  |
| Improvement in maintenance of pavements through investment in new weed management | 0.266 |  |  |
| Investment in Arboricultural Services including diseased tree (Ash and Elm) management | 0.250 | 0.200 |  |
| Investment in improved Air Quality monitoring and management | 0.050 |  |  |
| Investment for development of a Business Prospectus for the city to attract inward investment |  | 0.040 |  |
| Feasibility for an additional Business Improvement District (BID) in the city |  | 0.030 |  |
| Investment to maintain Cycle Hangers across the city | 0.125 |  |  |
| Investment in the A27 'clean up' initiative | 0.090 |  |  |
| **Total Investments - A City to be Proud of** | **0.901** | **0.270** |  |
| **A Fair and Inclusive City** |  |  |  |  |
| Investment in homelessness to increase Temporary Accommodation and meet increased leasing costs | 2.626 |  |  |
| Investment to maintain the quality of repairs for Seaside Homes Temporary Accommodation properties | 0.150 |  |  |
| Provision to safeguard Lifeguard support for the city’s beaches | 0.050 |  |  |
| Support for the planned transfer of 120 CCTV cameras to council control from Sussex Police | 0.250 |  |  |
| Provision to meet statutory Playground Inspection costs | 0.040 |  |  |
| Transfer of full Coroner's Service to the local authority | 0.255 |  |  |
| **Total Investments - A Fair & Inclusive City** | **3.371** | **0.000** |  |
| **A Healthy City where People Thrive** | Investment to meet increased unit costs for Adult Social Care – Physical Disability Age 18 - 64 | 1.385 |  |  |
| Investment to meet increased demand and costs for Adult Social Care – Physical Disability Age 65+ | 3.358 |  |  |
| Investment to meet increased costs for Adult Social Care – Mental Health | 0.161 |  |  |
| Investment to meet increased demand and costs for Adult Social Care – Memory & Cognition Services | 1.742 |  |  |
| Investment to meet increased demand and costs for Adult Learning Disability including Transitions from Children’s to Adults services | 4.266 |  |  |
| Adult Social Care Pressures above will be reduced by estimated Market Sustainability funding | -1.050 |  |  |
| Investment to meet increased cost and complexity of need across Children’s Disability and SEND services | 0.796 |  |  |
| Investment to meet increased cost and complexity of need across Children’s Social Care | 1.768 |  |  |
| Increased funding to meet demands on the Home to School Transport Service | 1.069 |  |  |
| Investment in a School Counselling Service pilot | 0.200 |  |  |
| Provision for increased legal support for Adult Social Care safeguarding cases | 0.120 |  |  |
| Provision for increased recruitment costs across Adult Social Care | 0.065 |  |  |
| Additional provision to facilitate planned School Organisation changes |  | 0.256 |  |
| **Total Investments - A Healthy City** | **13.880** | **0.256** |  |
| **A Responsive Council with Well-run Services** | Provision for increased corporate energy contract costs | 0.160 |  |  |
| Provision for increased Housing Benefit subsidy loss | 0.700 |  |  |
| Contractual uplifts to maintain security, cleaning and other contracted services | 0.397 |  |  |
| Contractual uplifts to achieve Living Wage commitments | 0.380 |  |  |
| Increased costs of maintaining Transport and Parking Infrastructure | 0.350 |  |  |
| Major income pressure due to economic conditions - Planning Fees | 0.600 |  |  |
| Major income pressure due to economic conditions - Architecture & Design fees | 1.701 |  |  |
| Major income pressure due to economic conditions - Commercial Rents | 1.267 |  |  |
| Major income pressure due to economic conditions - Parking Revenues | 1.200 |  |  |
| Major income pressure due to economic conditions - Local Land Charges | 0.360 |  |  |
| Income pressure on booking fees due to transfer out of sports facilities to other organisations | 0.083 |  |  |
| Provision for increased staff take up of Local Government Pension Scheme enrolment | 0.400 |  |  |
| Investment in technology to improve City Clean service and round management | 0.108 |  |  |
| Provision for increased cost of the Schools PFI contract | 0.643 |  |  |
| Provision for increased IT licensing costs including Office 365 | 0.139 |  |  |
| Investment to improve Council Tax customer service and address backlogs | 0.150 |  |  |
| Other minor service contractual uplift and income pressures | 0.090 |  |  |
| All other corporate income and contractual pressures | 0.349 |  |  |
| One-off Contingency for diseased tree management, school organisation and other potential year-end liabilities (subject to final outturn) |  | 0.430 |  |
| **Total Investments to maintain Well-Run Services** | **9.077** | **0.430** |  |
|  | **TOTAL COUNCIL PLAN INVESTMENTS 2024/25** | **27.229** | **0.956** |  |

# RESERVES POSITION AND ONE-OFF FUNDING

***Latest Financial Performance in 2023/24***

## Targeted Budget Management (TBM) is the council’s system of budget monitoring and the TBM Month 9 (December) report included on this committee agenda indicates a near break-even position with a small projected overspend of £0.021m on the General Fund, which includes a projected underspend of £0.159m on the council’s share of NHS controlled Section 75 partnership services. The overall overspend is a substantial improvement of £2.849m since Month 7 (October).

## The improved position has resulted from a combination of continuing recruitment and spending controls since July, alongside normal financial management actions and a number of one-off measures, including using the one-off Public Health reserve to support eligible General Fund services, particularly the development of Family Hubs.

## Conversely, the net Collection Fund deficit across Council Tax and Business Rates has increased to £2.695m due to a range of factors including pressures on collection performance, a sustained Council Tax Reduction caseload and increased Business Rate appeals against 2017 rateable values. The one-off resources table below indicates that New Homes Bonus funding will need to be utilised to mitigate the net Collection Fund deficit.

***One-off Resource Liabilities and Proposed Allocations***

## The working balance will be recommended to continue at a minimum of £9.000m to meet general risks applicable to a unitary authority. The overspend in 2022/23 resulted in the working balance being reduced by £3.374m to £5.626m. This is planned to be replenished over the next 3 financial years to support the council’s overall financial resilience and the first repayment of £1.125m is included in the budget proposals for 2024/25.

## Table 3 identifies the potential one-off resources and liabilities that will need to be taken into account in setting the 2024/25 budget. At this stage, this assumes that spending in 2023/24 will reduce by a further £0.500m from the TBM Month 9 (December) projection. Any change to the TBM position by the end of the financial year will be reflected in the 2023/24 outturn report to this committee, usually in July.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3: One-off Resources, Liabilities and Proposed Allocations** | **£m** | **£m** |
| ***Revenue Budget position 2023/24 (TBM):*** |  |  |
| Forecast outturn overspend (as at TBM Month 9 / December) | -0.021 |  |
| Assumed further improvement between Month 9 and Outturn | +0.500 |  |
| Sub-total Estimated Year-end TBM Outturn |  | +0.479 |
|  |  |  |
| ***Collection Fund Position:*** |  |  |
| * Estimated 2023/24 Council Tax collection fund net deficit | -1.174 |  |
| * Estimated 2023/24 Business Rates Retention collection fund deficit | -1.816 |  |
| * Contribution from Section 31 grant towards 3 year smoothing | +0.295 |  |
| Sub-total Collection funds net position |  | **-2.695** |
|  |  |  |
| New homes bonus one off allocation |  | +2.627 |
| Outcome of the review of reserves |  | +0.545 |
| **Projected One-off Resources from 2024/25** |  | **+0.956** |
|  |  |  |
| **One-off Allocations in 2024/25:** |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Minimum requirement for Diseased Tree removals | -0.200 |  |
| Minimum additional resource requirement to support additional costs of school reorganisation closures | -0.256 |  |
| Development of a Business Prospectus and a potential additional BID district for the city from assumed TBM improvement \* | -0.070 |  |
| Contingency for diseased trees and/or school organisation changes from assumed TBM improvement | -0.430 |  |
| **Total One-off allocations** |  | **-0.956** |
|  |  |  |
| **Balance** |  | **0.000** |

## \* Subject to the liabilities arising from diseased trees and/or school organisation changes which would be a first call on available resources.

## The proposed one-off allocations for 2024/25 are explained in more detail below:

* **Ongoing management of Ash & Elm dieback (health & safety works) (£0.200m):** This allocation is in relation to the recommendations emanating from the Tree Diseases report, which were approved by the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee at its meeting on 24 November 2020 (Item 43). Investment of £0.600m has been provided for the last 3 years. The allocation above is a minimum level of investment with overall resources for this financial liability being reviewed at outturn. This will help to manage the ongoing spread of the diseases as well as safely removing dying and unsafe trees from public spaces.
* **School Reorganisation:** The council has set aside a provision for costs relating to school reorganisation but some costs are not fully known at this stage. Provision of £0.500m for school closures and £0.315m for Homewood College have been provided but a minimum additional allocation of £0.256m will be required to meet growing school deficits and severance costs of the relevant schools. As the costs become clearer, the level of additional funding required will be reviewed at 2023/24 outturn and reflected in TBM reports in 2024/25.
* **Business Development:** Subject to available resources it is proposed to set aside £0.040m funding to develop a Business Prospectus for the city to attract investment into the city and potentially increase both employment and Business Rates. Similarly, one-off funding of £0.030m is proposed to research the feasibility of an additional Business Improvement District (BID) for the city. Both are subject to availability of funding after meeting unavoidable liabilities as noted above.
* **Contingency:** Improvement in the TBM forecast between month 9 and outturn is anticipated given the continuation of recruitment and spending controls and further expected improvements in Waste PFI energy incomes. A prudent assumption of a £0.500m improvement by year-end is included in the resource assumptions above. The first call on this resource will be the two pressures above, diseased trees and school reorganisation. Subject to availability up to £0.070m will be utilised to support the Business Development initiatives as described above.

# SAVINGS PROPOSALS 2024/25

## Council Tax, Business Rate Retention and Adult Social Care precept increases, together with additional resources provided by the Autumn Statement, are not sufficient to balance the budget due to the need to provide cover for substantial excess pay award costs and provide for ongoing inflationary increases and growing demands across critical statutory services such as Adult and Children’s social care, homelessness and home-to-school transport. To balance the budget therefore requires a substantial savings programme as has been the case for the previous 13 years since 2010.

## However, the level of budget shortfall next year is the highest the authority has ever seen at over £30 million. Whilst some of this can be mitigated by changes to the tax base, including introducing the long-term empty premium after one year instead of two, significantly reducing capital financing charges through the review of the Capital Investment Programme, and reviewing planned contributions to earmarked reserves, a very substantial package of cuts and savings is inevitably required to achieve a legally balanced budget. The savings package proposed totals some £23.730m for 2024/25, almost £10m greater than in the current year, and therefore clearly presents a higher level of risk. Savings proposals are provided at Appendix 1 and are accompanied by Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) at Appendix 6 where appropriate.

# CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAMME AND CAPITAL STRATEGY 2024/25

***Capital Strategy 2024/25***

## The Prudential Framework requires local authorities to produce a Capital Strategy which is to be presented and approved by full Council each year. The purpose of the Capital Strategy is to provide a single place for transparency and accountability of local authority non-financial investments and its Capital Investment Programme, including any commercial investments in property or loans to third parties.

## The aim of the Capital Strategy is to ensure members are fully conversant with the risks of capital investments and are aware of how the risks are proportional to the council’s core service activity. The document will include:

* The proposed Capital Investment Programme
* The Governance & Risk Framework
* Potential and pending non-financial[[1]](#footnote-1) investments
* An overview of the council’s risk exposure

## The new Prudential Code for Capital Finance issued in 2021 prohibits Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) lending to local authorities that plan to borrow to buy commercial assets primarily for yield. The PWLB will still be available to all local authorities for refinancing. In order to borrow from the PWLB, local authorities are now required to submit a summary of their planned capital spending and PWLB borrowing for the following three years. The Capital Strategy and Treasury Management Strategy are compliant with the new code and do not include capital investment activity for commercial yield only.

## The Capital Strategy forms part of the General Fund budget report to ensure that the link between capital and revenue decisions is maintained and to ensure that budget resourcing decisions are taken in the context of the full range of proposed revenue and capital budgets, resources, investments and savings.

***Capital Investment Programme***

## As previously, a 5-year capital programme has been developed and the associated capital financing implications will be included in the MTFS.

## During 2023/24, the council established an officer Capital Programme Board to provide governance and monitoring of the Capital Investment Programme and undertake a detailed review of the programme within the context of the severe financial challenge facing the authority. A large element of the capital programme is funded through borrowing and the Board’s initial focus was to review schemes that had not progressed to potentially decommit them as well as update the expenditure profile of continuing schemes. These actions have helped reduce financing costs and increase investment interest in 2023/24 and for future years. The schemes decommitted are included in the TBM month 9 report elsewhere on the agenda which will ensure that the council’s capital budget is amended accordingly.

## The capital expenditure estimates incorporate planned rolling investment programmes alongside major infrastructure projects. The creation of a Commercial Asset Investment Fund (CAIF) was approved by this committee in December 2023 and this has been incorporated into the capital programme, funded from net capital receipts generated from the commercial property portfolio.

## The key rolling programmes, including those re-focused to support Council Plan priorities, are as follows:

* Investment in Housing Stock and acquisition through the Housing Revenue Account;
* The Education Capital programme, which provides investment from central government for Education Capital Maintenance, High Needs provision and Devolved Formula Capital for schools;
* Disabled Facilities Grants to help maintain people in their homes;
* The Carbon Neutral Investment Programme;
* The Local Transport Plan (LTP) to support sustainable transport and transport infrastructure;
* The Information Technology & Digital Investment Fund and Modernisation Fund delivering the Digital, Data and Technology Strategy (DDaT) approved in March 2023;
* The Asset Management Fund (AMF) to ensure the strategic elements of the Asset Management Plan can be supported;
* The CAIF to protect and enhance the income generated from the existing commercial and farmland property portfolios;
* Corporate Planned Maintenance (PMB) to ensure the operational elements of the Asset Management Plan are supported and that backlog maintenance does not build up unduly;
* The Strategic Investment Fund (SIF) to support the advancement of major regeneration schemes and initiatives, and;
* The Vehicle Fleet and plant replacement annual programme.

## The current strategy identifies longer term capital investment plans as well as a funding strategy and the potential outcomes for each investment plan. This strategy includes major investment requirements such as investment in food waste collection, coast protection works, A27 junction works and investment in New England House.

## Capital receipts from the sale of surplus land and buildings support the capital programme and the projections are regularly reviewed. The capital strategy allows for an assessment of the potential social value of surplus or underperforming assets against the potential disposal value and where possible will aim to maximise the use of assets to enhance social value across a 4-year Asset Management Plan.

## The detailed capital programme is set out in Appendix 1 (and will be included in the Budget Book) and shows the approved and proposed capital investments for each directorate.

## The overall Capital Investment Programme for 2024/25 is £211.470m. The proposed investments are summarised as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table 4: Capital Investment Programme 2024/25** | **£m** |
| **Housing** including New Homes for Neighbourhoods, the Home Purchase scheme, the Hidden Homes programme, the Housing Joint Venture, Temporary Accommodation purchases and conversions | 78.846 |
| **Sustainability & Carbon Reduction** including Carbon Neutral and Net Zero investment, Street Lighting and carbon reduction measures to operational buildings | 16.180 |
| **Parks & Open Spaces** including Kingsway to the Sea LUF and parks infrastructure including tree replacement | 8.784 |
| **Sport & Recreation** including Playground refurbishment and maintaining and improving the city’s swimming facilities | 2.514 |
| **Transport & Highways** reflecting the Local Transport Plan (LTP) allocation for 2024/25, Pothole Action funding and the major Bus Service Improvement Scheme | 13.194 |
| **Schools Investment** to provide educational places for pupils based on demographic changes in the city | 4.534 |
| **Regeneration** including Madeira Terraces, Black Rock, Valley Gardens, The Royal Pavilion Estate and New England House | 37.109 |
| **Tackling Inequality** including Disabled Facilities Grant (DFG) projects and the Knoll House redevelopment | 10.679 |
| **Building Maintenance** including the Workstyles programme, Planned Maintenance, Education and Social Care Buildings Maintenance, the Asset Management Fund and various security, fire and safety works | 26.828 |
| **IT&D / Modernisation** including the Modernisation Fund as well as re-procurement of the Local Area Network, investment in digital services for customers, and ongoing investment in the IT&D infrastructure and Digital Data & Technology (DDaT) strategy | 10.302 |
| **Vehicles & Equipment** for the council’s vehicle fleet replacement programme | 2.500 |
| **TOTAL CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAMME 2024/25** | **211.470** |

## The Capital Strategy at Appendix 2 sets out how the programme will be funded from a combination of government grants, capital receipts, capital reserves, HRA direct revenue funding, external contributions and prudential borrowing.

***Future Potential Investments***

## Whilst the 5-year capital programme highlights known or quantifiable investment plans, there are a number of schemes that are high priority but require further development before inclusion in the capital programme. These currently include:

* Research and design for a Park and Ride scheme in the city.
* A feasibility study to consider improvements to the Brighton Station to the Sea thoroughfare to add to the quality of the city as a visitor destination.
* Potential redevelopment of Brighton Town Hall including community, civic and/or commercial spaces.

## The above potential schemes will require resources to undertake feasibility studies which are likely to require expert advice and consultancy at a cost. This could be enabled through further decommitment of lower priority capital investments or through identifying alternative one-off capital or revenue resources during 2024/25.

***Modernisation Programme Funding (‘Modernisation Fund’)***

## As noted earlier the council has focused on identifying and supporting the delivery of savings through its Modernisation Programme supported by significant capital investment. This is enabled by generating capital receipts from the sale of surplus assets to create an invest-to-save budget using the government’s capital receipt flexibilities, which allowed capital receipts to be applied to revenue saving projects and programmes.

## The government has extended the ability to use capital receipts to support modernisation of services and deliver savings until March 2030. The table below sets out the use of capital receipts for this purpose in 2024/25. For future years, a review of ongoing investment requirements will be undertaken, including associated funding arrangements, to ensure they continue to achieve the modernisation and savings ambitions of the council.

## The Modernisation Fund is kept under review as budget plans develop and spend-to-save opportunities and investment requirements emerge in more detail over the planning period. The indicative profile of the Modernisation Fund for 2024/25 is shown in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table 5: Indicative Modernisation Fund** | |
| **Programme Area** | **2024/25** |
| £m |
| Invest to Save business cases | 0.571 |
| Customer Digital | 1.550 |
| Modernisation enablers | 1.040 |
| Managing staffing changes | 1.000 |
| **Total** | **4.161** |

## The Modernisation Fund is expected to be deployed as follows:

* **Invest-to-Save Business Cases:** Investment of £0.571m is estimated to be required to support implementation of specific savings and efficiency programmes including service redesigns, recommissioning and process improvements. For 2024/25 these include school reorganisation, the review of operational buildings, and the transformation of homelessness services. Further investments can be added during the year subject to viable business cases, however, due to the many competing demands for capital receipts the preference will be for business cases to be self-financing through future revenue savings.
* **Customer Digital:** A further £1.550m is anticipated to be required next year to maintain ongoing investment in digital infrastructure and applications and to support continued development of the council’s digital services and integration of data across systems and services to improve the accessibility, efficiency and ease-of-use of on-line services. This resource forms part of the Digital, Data and Technology (DDaT) Strategy approved by the former Policy & Resources Committee in March 2023,
* **Modernisation Enablers:** £1.040m is estimated to be required to support ongoing change and modernisation programmes next year. This includes everything from an effective project management support team, business improvement analysts, investment in ‘Our People Promise’ for staff development and skills programmes, resources to implement changes and reductions to office accommodation, together with additional specialist support where required. Although eligible for funding from capital receipt flexibilities, it is noted that some of these resources have now been resourced through the Modernisation Fund since 2016/17 and there is therefore an argument for mainstreaming funding within the General Fund revenue budget in future years if this becomes viable.
* **Managing staffing changes**: Efficiency programmes and a continual drive for improved value for money, alongside the significant budget savings proposals for 2024/25 will result in changes in the level and/or mix of staffing and skills required across the council. Changing staffing levels or skills will often need financial consideration in order to effect severance for roles or posts no longer required or needing to be replaced or re-trained with different roles or skills. Minimum estimated resources of £1.000m are required to meet severance costs to manage change next year.

# STAFFING IMPLICATIONS (GENERAL FUND SERVICES)

## An estimate of the posts to be deleted in relation to the budget proposals has been made and indicates that approximately 186 full time equivalent (fte) posts are expected to be deleted from the council’s staffing structure, approximately 5% of total staffing. Many of these posts will already be held vacant in lieu of savings proposals but some may initially result in staff being potentially placed at risk of redundancy. This is difficult to estimate with certainty but approximately 75 fte staff (not headcount) have been identified as potentially at risk at this stage of the process. The proposals also include the potential TUPE of up to 12 fte staff. This information has been shared with the council’s recognised trades unions and the staff affected in advance of the release of this report.

## However, the savings proposals for 2024/25 also include a set of ‘Organisational Design’ savings recognising the necessity of reducing overall staffing costs to contribute to achieving a balanced and sustainable budget. This work will focus on management spans and layers, improving administrative and business support efficiency, and exploring opportunities for rationalisation or economies across functionally similar areas, for example, commissioning and contract management, customer service, project management and so on. Eleven potential areas for review have been identified but others may emerge as this work progresses.

## As in previous years, actual numbers of staff affected will be highly dependent on the detailed options proposed and on the outcome of formal consultation with staff and unions. As previously experienced, it is likely that some of these will be resolved through normal turnover, or through redeployment to other vacancies across the council, thereby further minimising the risk of redundancies.

## As always, if the forthcoming proposals do potentially place any staff at risk of redundancy the council will support them by:

* Providing appropriate support to staff throughout the change process to enable them to maximise any opportunities available;
* Controlling recruitment and ensuring there is a clear business case for any recruitment activity;
* Managing redeployment at a corporate level and maximising the opportunities for movement across the organisation;
* Managing the use of temporary or agency resources via regular reports to Directorate Management Teams (DMT’s);
* Inviting applications for voluntary severance where appropriate to staff affected by budget proposals, subject to viability and approval on a case by case basis.

These measures will remain in place as consultation with trade unions, staff and other stakeholders is undertaken. Where necessary, a targeted voluntary approach to releasing staff in areas undergoing change will be managed to support service redesigns whilst ensuring that the organisation retains the skills that will be needed for the future.

# BUDGET BOOK AND MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2024/25 to 2027/28

## The council produces an annual Budget Book which aims to support understanding and transparency of the council’s budget by providing:

* Information at sub-divisional levels to aid understanding of the wide range of services and teams in each service directorate;
* Analysis of spending and income by category (subjective analysis);
* Staffing information for each service;
* Analysis of budget movements between years;
* Analysis of savings, investments and service pressure funding by category;
* Information on capital investments.

## The MTFS planning assumptions, resource and expenditure estimates are also included within the Budget Book. The MTFS has been revised to reflect the latest cost, income and demand pressures and the proposed 4.99% council tax increase, including a 2% Adult Social Care precept.

## This year, the very late announcement of the LGFS and the severe financial challenge facing the authority mean that the development of savings and the review of service pressure funding has continued throughout late December and January and has delayed production of the Budget Book. This will therefore be provided to Budget Council as part of the Supplementary Budget report. However, all of the information contained in the Budget Book is separately provided in appendices to this report including budget strategies, savings proposals, capital investment proposals and summary Budget and MTFS information. The MTFS summary is also presented in the table below:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 6:**  **Medium Term Financial Strategy 2024 to 2028** | **2024/25** | **2025/26** | **2026/27** | **2027/28** |
| **£m** | **£m** | **£m** | **£m** |
| **Net Budget Requirement B/Fwd** | **232.385** | **246.353** | **267.463** | **273.246** |
| Remove net one-off short term funding and expenditure | 2.631 | 0.200 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| **Net Budget Requirement B/Fwd** | **235.016** | **246.553** | **267.463** | **273.246** |
| Standard Pay and Inflation – Expenditure | 14.046 | 12.892 | 12.036 | 12.228 |
| Standard Inflation – Income | (3.614) | (3.539) | (3.642) | (3.747) |
| Demographic and inflationary pressures across Adult Social Care and Adult Learning Disabilities | 10.302 | 7.000 | 5.500 | 5.500 |
| Demographic and inflationary pressures for Children’s Disability, Children in Care, and Care Leavers | 3.407 | 2.000 | 1.750 | 1.750 |
| Temporary Accommodation and Rough Sleepers - cost and demand pressures | 2.776 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Home to School Transport - cost and demand pressures | 1.069 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Housing Benefit Subsidy shortfall | 0.700 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Income and Commercial Rent pressures (due to falling demand) | 5.346 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| All other pressures across council services | 4.129 | 4.000 | 3.800 | 3.800 |
| Commitment - Increase in Social Care Grant and Better Care Fund | (5.390) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Commitment - New Homes Bonus - One-off allocation | (2.627) | 2.627 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Commitment - Reduction/loss of Services Grant | 2.016 | 0.079 | 0.214 | 0.000 |
| Commitment - Change in S31 grants | (3.035) | 10.176 | (0.108) | (0.108) |
| Commitment - Pay award 2023/24 above 3.75% | 3.809 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Commitment - Change in contributions to/from reserves | (0.090) | 1.020 | 0.000 | (1.125) |
| Commitment - Change in capital financing costs | 1.371 | 4.223 | 1.033 | (0.195) |
| Commitment - Impacts of previously approved decisions | 0.852 | 1.632 | 0.900 | 0.350 |
| Savings Package 2024/25 | (23.730) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Budget Gap (Future Savings Requirements) | 0.000 | (21.200) | (15.700) | (12.600) |
| **Budget Requirement C/Fwd** | **246.353** | **267.463** | **273.246** | **279.099** |
| **Funded by:** |  |  |  |  |
| Revenue Support Grant (RSG) | 8.453 | 8.538 | 8.538 | 8.538 |
| Locally retained Business Rates | 55.800 | 67.371 | 67.864 | 68.360 |
| Net Collection Fund position | (2.990) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Council Tax including Adult Social Care Precepts | 185.090 | 191.554 | 196.844 | 202.201 |
| **Total Funding** | **246.353** | **267.463** | **273.246** | **279.099** |

## 

## The MTFS above includes estimates for pay awards, price inflation, and pension changes taking into account OBR forecasts for deflators alongside actuarial pension forecasts. Detailed assumptions are set out in the MTFS at Appendix 1. The MTFS also includes assumptions regarding future resources including predicted taxbase growth and assumed taxation increases.

## Many other elements of the MTFS reflect previous decisions made by the council including the outcome of local pay negotiations, the award of market supplements, and other approved commitments. The MTFS also reflects the demographic and other cost pressures set out in Table 2 of this report. For 2025/26 and beyond, the demographic and other cost pressures are estimates based on the midpoint of high and low estimates.

## The Budget Gaps indicate the estimated additional savings required in future years of the MTFS period to balance the budget and, importantly, to repay any reserves used to balance (smooth) the budget in earlier years. The predicted budget gaps remain very significant assuming a return to 1.99% Council Tax increases from 2025/26 onwards. Total shortfalls of £73m are projected over the 4-year period, meaning further savings of £49m will potentially need to be identified over the period.

# TREASURY MANAGEMENT AND ANNUAL INVESTMENT STRATEGY

## The Treasury Management Strategy Statement (TMSS) and Annual Investment Strategy (AIS) are now incorporated in the budget report to ensure that inter-related financial decisions and strategies can be considered together. The council is required to operate a balanced budget, which broadly means that cash raised during the year will meet cash expenditure. Part of the Treasury Management operation is to ensure that this cash flow is adequately planned, with cash being available when it is needed (liquidity) and that surplus monies are only invested into counterparties and instruments commensurate with the council’s risk appetite.

## Another important function of the Treasury Management service is the funding of the council’s capital plans. The capital plans provide a guide to the council’s borrowing need, which is essentially the longer term cash flow plan, to ensure the council can meet its approved capital spending obligations.

## The strategy reflects best practice as set out in the CIPFA Prudential code and the CIPFA Treasury management Code of Practice. The Treasury Management Practices and schedules identify the practices and procedures that will be followed to achieve the aims of the TMSS and that underpin the council’s Treasury Management function.

## The AIS for 2024/25 is also incorporated within Appendix 3 to this report. The AIS gives priority to security and liquidity.

## Security is achieved by:

* selecting only those institutions that meet stringent credit rating criteria or, in the case of non-rated UK building societies, have a substantial asset base; and
* limiting exposure risk by limiting the amount invested with any one institution.

## Liquidity is achieved by limiting the maximum period for investment and matching investment periods to cash flow requirements.

## There are no changes proposed to the council’s AIS or risk appetite for 2024/25.

# COUNCIL TAX SETTING

## The Administration is proposing a council tax increase of 4.99% which includes a 2% Adult Social Care precept allowed by government within the local government finance settlement. A council tax increase of 4.99% results in a Band D council tax of £1,977.66 for the council’s element, an increase of £94.03 from 2023/24; of this increase £37.66 relates to the Adult Social Care precept.

## In order to propose an overall Council Tax for the city, the Council Tax set by the precepting authorities needs to be known and this information will be included in the Supplementary Budget Report to Budget Council.

## ***Supplementary Budget Report to Budget Council***

## Not all of the budget and council tax information needed to set the budget and council tax is available at present. Therefore, additional information will need to be provided for Budget Council; this will include:

## Confirmation of the final LGFS 2024/25.

## Any other grants that are announced before Budget Council.

## The agreed Council Tax set by East Sussex Fire Authority and Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner.

## The statutory Council Tax calculations required under the 1992 Local Government Finance Act.

## The full budget and Council Tax resolution for Budget Council.

## Other information as necessary including a detailed Budget Book.

# REPORT OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER (SECTION 151) UNDER SECTION 25 OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2003

## Section 25 of the Local Government Act 2003 requires the Chief Financial Officer (Section 151 Officer) of a local authority to report on the robustness of the estimates included in the budget and the adequacy of the reserves for which the budget provides. This report has to be considered by the Strategy, Finance & City Regeneration Committee and the full Council as part of the budget approval and council tax setting process.

***Robustness of Estimates***

## There is inevitably an element of judgement in drawing up budget estimates of expenditure and income which are made at a point in time and may change as circumstances change. This has never been more evident than in recent times where national and global events have had significant and unexpected impacts on nearly every aspect of the council’s budget. This statement on the robustness of estimates cannot therefore give complete assurance about the proposed budget for 2024/25 but aims to provide the council with reasonable assurance that the budget has been based on the best information and assumptions available at the time, particularly in relation to economic forecasts and indicators, demand-led budget estimates, and pay award and inflation assumptions. It also aims to demonstrate that sensitivity and risks have been considered. However, no local authority’s reserves and balances are limitless and severe financial shocks can and do destabilise local authorities and can require government intervention (or application for emergency government support) if this means it can no longer balance its budget and meet statutory duties.

## For 2024/25, further funding of over £48 million has had to be identified to support estimated inflationary and demand pressures including for core statutory demand-led services across Adults Social Care, Children’s Safeguarding & Care services, and Homelessness services. Provision for this level of investment substantially supports the predicted demand-led service pressures at the time of setting the budget. Assuming no other changes, this considerably lessens potential overspending risks in 2024/25 but cannot completely remove all risks, particularly concerning locally fragile provider markets and sufficiency, and therefore services will need to continue to contribute to the mitigation of residual risk through management of non-statutory budget areas as normal.

## As seen in the current year, the continuing cost of living situation and inflation continuing at higher levels than government forecasts have placed significant pressures on finances, requiring early implementation of recruitment and spending controls alongside other financial management actions. However, this has successfully mitigated risks in the current year. In addition:

* The authority continues to demonstrate its proactive approach to managing its budget. The current year followed on from the severe inflationary challenges of 2022/23 which led to an overspend of over £3 million met from the Working Balance – the authority’s first overspend. 2023/24 also started with substantial early overspend forecasts of around £14 million and therefore spending and recruitment controls were brought in earlier, in July, to tackle the position. A steady and sustained reduction in forecast risk has seen the position reach near break-even at month 9. Unlike many authorities, this council places very limited reliance on the use of reserves to balance its budget as it has a very low level of unallocated reserves. While not enviable, this does mean that the authority has developed a robust approach to in-year financial management as it is aware that living beyond its means for a sustained period would quickly result in government intervention.
* Despite the ongoing challenges from inflation and the cost of living, the authority continues to achieve substantial savings, including nearly £10 million this year, supported by its Modernisation Programmes and the use of capital receipt flexibilities. However, over recent years, including the two pandemic years, the achievement of savings in full has been problematic and has been hampered partly by the impact of events on capacity to manage and deliver savings, and partly by a range of economic conditions that have impacted on original assumptions. The External Auditor has commented on this in recent Annual Reports and has recommended aiming for the over-programming of savings to mitigate against the risk of under-achievement.
* While ‘over-programming’ of savings is accepted as a sensible objective, with such a large gap to close in 2023/24 and a significantly larger gap in 2024/25, the largest in the authority’s history, the External Auditor accepts that this is not a realistic aim in the immediate future but should be considered and modelled for future MTFS projections which continue to indicate significant budget gaps over the next 3 years. Aiming to restore the minimum recommended Working Balance is a pre-requisite which is supported within the 2024/25 budget proposals and begins the process of de-risking the budget and restoring financial sustainability.
* The authority continues to work closely with NHS Sussex to jointly manage and mitigate risks as far as practicable. This has been evidenced in the current year where the NHS has continued to provide funding to assist in managing hospital discharges and provide joint funding for Section 117 Mental Health provision. Proposals for joint funding arrangements under the Integrated Care System (ICS) continue to be developed for the medium term.
* The authority has been able to maintain adequate reserves and provisions against known and identified risks and, in the current proposals, has made provision to restore its minimum recommended Working Balance to £9 million over 3 years.

## Taking into account identified risks as set out in Appendix 5, the council is recommended to maintain and, where utilised in an emergency, replenish its minimum working balance of £9.000m. This is approximately 3.7% of the net General Fund and represents around 2.5 weeks’ council tax income. The council should also continue to maintain other earmarked reserves to meet long term commitments and provide additional flexibility to manage any short term pressures. The Working Balance and other usable reserves are held to mitigate exceptional legal and financial risks including appeals and challenges, as well as potential billing failures, civil contingencies and other emergencies.

***Adequacy of Reserves***

## The recommendation on the prudent level of the General Fund working balance has been based on the robustness of estimates information and a risk assessment of the budget provided at Appendix 5.

## As indicated above, current analysis of authority-level risks and past experience indicates that a working balance at a level of £9.000m remains prudent and appropriate having taken into account all known and foreseeable risks in relation to the 2024/25 budget. This is supported by the experience of the current year which has seen the mitigation of significant financial pressures and is not expected to require emergency use of the Working Balance.

## All specific reserves have been reviewed in detail to ensure they are set at an appropriate level as set out in Appendix 4. The council’s earmarked reserves fulfil specific contractual, legal or financial risk requirements and are not therefore available to support the annual revenue budget. However, they can be borrowed from internally provided that provision for their replenishment is built into the budget and MTFS ahead of when they are required.

***Assurance Statement of the Council’s Section 151 Officer***

## In relation to the 2024/25 General Fund revenue budget, the Section 151 Chief Finance Officer has examined the budget proposals and considers that, with the very substantial investments and service pressure funding provided, reasonable assumptions regarding pay and prices informed by a prudential view of OBR estimates, realistic profiling of capital investments, prudential treasury management estimates, and a reasonable balance of low, medium and higher risk savings proposals, the budget plan for 2024/25 is potentially deliverable with effective governance and accountability at all levels. However, learning from the previous two years, there will need to be a continued focus on spending and recruitment controls from day one of the new financial year to ensure that forecast risks, including the risks inherent in a very large savings package, are managed proactively.

## In terms of the adequacy of reserves, the Section 151 Chief Finance Officer considers a minimum working balance of £9.000m (or replenishment thereof) to be appropriate to manage risks, taking into account other available reserves.

# ANALYSIS & CONSIDERATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

## The budget process allows all parties to engage in the examination of budget proposals and to put forward viable alternative budget and council tax proposals to Budget Council on 22 February 2024. Budget Council has the opportunity to debate the proposals put forward by this committee at the same time as any viable alternative proposals. Budget Council will normally be recommended to adopt special procedures at the start of the Budget Council meeting, which set out the procedure applicable to any alternative budget proposals put forward.

## In this respect, a ‘Budget Protocol’ for managing alternative proposals (Budget Amendments) will be presented to full Council on 1 February 2024 and will determine both the number of allowable Budget Amendments and the process and timeline for their prior assessment and sign off by the council’s Section 151 Chief Finance Officer, Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer.

# SCHOOLS FUNDING AND BALANCES

***Dedicated Schools Grant Funding 2024/25 - Overview***

## The Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) is divided into four blocks – the schools block, the high needs block (HNB), the central school services block (which allocates funding to local authorities for their ongoing responsibilities towards both maintained schools and academies), and the early years block. Each of the four blocks of the DSG are determined by separate national funding formulae (NFF).

## In December 2023, the Department for Education (DfE) announced the updated DSG funding settlement for the 2024/25 financial year. This is set out in the table below, together with a comparison to 2023/24.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Financial Year** | **Schools Block\***  **£’000** | **Central**  **School**  **Services**  **Block**  **£’000** | **High Needs Block**  **£’000** | **Early Years Block**  **£’000** | **Total DSG**  **£’000** |
| Provisional 2024/25 | 165,039 | 2,074 | 38,883 | 26,554 | 232,550 |
| 2023/24 | 159,378 | 2,136 | 37,364 | 15,433 | 214,311 |
| Increase / (Decrease) | 5,661 | (62) | 1,519 | 11,121 | 18,239 |

***Schools Block***

## For 2023/24, schools have received a separate mainstream additional grant outside of the main DSG. This equates to £5.364m. For 2024/25, this funding is being rolled into the Schools Block of the DSG meaning the overall Schools Block funding is virtually unchanged between the two financial years. In overall terms, after other adjustments are considered, it is estimated that total funding available to mainstream schools through core formula budget allocations between 2023/24 and 2024/25 will increase by c. £0.500m. This equates to a percentage increase in cash terms of just 0.3%, and an increase in per pupil funding of 2.0%. For presentational purposes the Schools Block figures above are inclusive of funding for non-domestic business rates.

## It should be noted that the Schools Block pupil numbers have decreased from 29,451 in October 2022 to 28,972 in October 2023. This is a reduction of 479 pupils and equates to an overall loss of DSG Schools Block funding to the local authority of c. £2.450m.

***High Needs Block***

## The headline allocation of high needs block funding is shown in the table above. The high needs block position for the 2024/25 financial year looks very challenging. The government increase in funding of c. £1.5m (4%) is significantly below the demand and cost pressures the council is expecting, and forecasts show a potential deficit in the 2024/25 high needs block of approximately £2.5m

## The council continues to seek to provide additional local specialist provision linked to the SEN Sufficiency Strategy however costs associated with the establishment of this are high.

## Under current national legislation a statutory override mechanism is place which allows local authorities to keep DSG deficits separate from General Fund budget, however this statutory override arrangement is due to finish in March 2026.

## The latest published data shows that approximately 100 out of 150 local authorities are operating with deficits against the high needs block of their DSG allocations.

***Early Years Block***

## There are significant extensions to free entitlement in 2024/25 resulting in a large increase to Early Years Block funding. For 2024/25 the main early years entitlements are:

## the 15 hours entitlement for eligible working parents of children from nine months to two years old (new entitlement from 1 September 2024);

## the 15 hours entitlement for eligible working parents of two-year-old children (new entitlement from 1 April 2024);

## the 15 hours entitlement for disadvantaged two-year-olds;

## the universal 15 hours entitlement for all three and four-year-olds;

## the additional 15 hours entitlement for eligible working parents of three and four-year-olds.

## Government funding rates are increasing for 2024/25 and there is a requirement for the local authority to pass on a minimum of 95% Early Years Block funding to providers.

***Mainstream Schools***

## Core funding allocations for each mainstream school and academy will be determined through calculation using the local authority’s funding formula. During autumn 2023 it was agreed that limited changes would be made to the operation of the local school funding formula for 2024/25. These proposals were subject to consideration by the Schools Forum in October 2023. The key changes to the 2024/25 local formula are summarised below and follow the principle of moving towards the proposed National Funding Formula (NFF) on an incremental basis as follows:

## the mainstream school additional grant funding provided by government in 2023/24 has been rolled into the Schools Block and core formula budgets in 2024/25;

## in line with government requirements, all local formula factor values outside of permitted tolerance levels will be moved 10% closer to those in the NFF;

## apply the mandatory factor to ensure that minimum funding per pupil levels (excluding premises factors) are set at £4,610 for primary schools and £5,995 for secondary schools;

## apply uplifts to formula factors to reflect increases in national funding allocations;

## split site funding will be allocated using a DfE set formulaic approach, replacing the previous locally determined split sites factor;

## apply a minimum funding guarantee of +0.50% per pupil.

## As in previous years, academies and free schools are included in the DSG allocation to ensure all schools, academies and free schools are funded on the same basis using the LA’s funding formula. DfE then recoups the funding attributable to academies and free schools and pays this directly to these establishments.

## Funding proposals for 2024/25 were presented to, and agreed with, the Schools Forum on 15 January 2024 and are subject to final sign off by the government.

## The net school carry forwards at the end of 2023/24 are expected to be around the breakeven mark, a reduction of around £4.500m from £4.540m carried forward into 2023/24. School budgets for 2024/25 are likely to be issued in early February 2024, once DfE have completed compliance checks to funding regulations. Overall funding for mainstream schools is increasing in the 2024/25 financial year by an average of approximately 2% per pupil. However, a large number of schools are continuing to see reductions in pupil numbers, and this will have an adverse impact on the financial position of these schools with approximately half of all mainstream schools seeing a reduction in actual funding in 2024/25 compared to 2023/24. There is considerable uncertainty about unavoidable cost pressures, such as the level of pay awards in 2024/25. The impact on future levels of school balances will become clearer in early March once draft school budget plans for 2024/25 are received.

# COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & CONSULTATION

## General information and advice about the council’s budget will continue to be provided through the council’s web site which provides information and graphics on how money is spent on services, where the money comes from and a summary of the financial challenges ahead. These materials will continue to be promoted to residents across the budget setting period.

## The council will also publicise on-line its key proposals from the budget along with information about council services, and questions and comments invited from residents over the period leading to the February Budget Council meeting.

## Frequently asked questions and common themes have previously emerged through the development of the annual budget and have been responded to in our ‘Behind the Budget’ web page: [Behind the budget (brighton-hove.gov.uk)](https://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/council-and-democracy-draft/council-finance/council-budget/behind-budget)

## The frequently asked questions and themes include:

* Doesn’t Council Tax [alone] pay for all council services?
* How about using [i.e. raising or changing] parking charges further?
* [Why not] Cut pay instead of services?
* [Why not] Make students pay Council Tax?
* [Why not] Just cut councillors and/or their allowances?
* [Why not] Charge wealthier people more Council Tax?
* Extra Business Rates will solve the problem [won’t they]?

## Other consultation and engagement processes are as follows:

## Information will be shared with Strategic Partners and community groups as normal. Local Strategic Partners remain acutely aware of the potential cumulative impact of funding pressures across public sector agencies on the city. All Local Strategic Partnership representatives will therefore ensure that information is shared across the sector to assess and mitigate adverse cumulative impacts wherever possible and develop joint actions where appropriate. Engagement with statutory partners will continue on an ongoing basis to further share and understand the potential cumulative impact of budget proposals across the city as they take shape.

## In particular, the council continues to engage fully with the NHS Sussex Integrated Care System to ensure that the budget processes of the two organisations are aligned and communicated as far as practicably possible. As with the council, the local NHS is likely to remain under severe financial pressure due to continually increasing demands on the local health economy. Unfortunately, NHS funding announcements (Operating Plans) are normally announced much later than Local Government, often close to or after the start of the next financial year.

## There is ongoing liaison and discussion with the Economic Partnership that covers potential funding sources and bids, city regeneration, economic growth, employment and apprenticeship strategies. Officers of the council and members of the administration meet periodically with representatives of the Chamber of Commerce and B&H Economic Partnership to discuss the council’s high level plans and over-arching budget situation.

## The Schools Forum, a consultative body attended by representatives of all school phases, received a report on the overall budget position and potential scale of General Fund budget savings at its meeting on 15 January 2024, providing an opportunity to feedback views. Unfortunately, the lateness of the Local Government Financial Settlement precluded detailed proposals being shared as in previous years, due to proposals still being developed throughout January. The forum is a public, minuted meeting and agendas and minutes are available on the council’s website.

## Similarly, officers of the council and members of the Administration met with representatives of the Community & Voluntary Sector on 22 January 2024 to discuss the budget proposals, including reductions in third sector funding, and to provide them with an opportunity to feedback their views to the council and members.

## For staffing proposals, there have been a number of confidential meetings with the council's recognised unions, including appropriate officers and members of the Administration, to keep unions abreast of developing proposals to ensure they have early sight of where support to their memberships may be required. See also Section 9 Staffing Implications for further information. Proposals will be shared with staff ahead of formal publication of budget proposals through Departmental Consultative Groups (DCGs) and through line management. Further updates and communications are provided via the council’s intranet, corporate email broadcasts and Chief Executive blog. Formal consultation and engagement with directly affected staff will be undertaken as normal, including relevant union representatives, under the council’s Organisation Change Management Framework.

## Similarly, where appropriate or required by statute, specific consultation will be undertaken with residents and other people directly affected by proposed changes to service delivery.

# CONCLUSION

## The council is under a statutory duty to set its budget and council tax before 11 March each year and must agree a lawfully balanced budget. This report sets out the budget assumptions to be used as the basis for Council Tax calculations in order to meet the statutory duty and the proposals to achieve a balanced budget. The full details of 2024/25 revenue and capital budgets are appended to this report and will be brought together in an annual Budget Book which will provided to Budget Council as a supplementary item.

# FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS

**Financial Implications**

## These are contained within the main body of the report.

*Finance Officer Consulted: James Hengeveld Date: 29/1/24*

**Legal Implications**

## Whilst the Strategy, Finance & City Regeneration Committee is being asked to recommend, and subsequently the Council asked to agree, the revenue budget and capital strategy, the budget decision is a resourcing decision and does not necessarily constitute final approval of what policies will be implemented or what sums of money will be saved under the service proposals.

## Any decisions taken as part of the budget setting process are subject to compliance with relevant legal requirements, where appropriate, before implementation. The revenue budget and capital strategy recommendations in the report do not commit the council to implement any specific savings proposal. When specific decisions on budget reductions are necessary, focussed consultations and the full equality implications of doing one thing rather than another will be considered in appropriate detail. If it is considered necessary, in light of equality or other considerations, it will be open to those taking the decisions to spend more on one activity and less on another within the overall resources available to the council.

## For these purposes, the “budget” includes the allocation of financial resources to different services and projects, and setting the council tax.

## Section 52ZB of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 requires a billing authority to determine whether its relevant basic amount of council tax is “excessive”. If the amount is excessive, the billing authority is required to hold a referendum, with a view to applying an alternative amount if the excessive amount is rejected in a referendum.

## The determination of whether a relevant basic amount of council tax is excessive must be made in accordance with principles determined by the Secretary of State.

## Strategy, Finance & City Regeneration Committee has delegated power to formulate the council’s revenue budget proposals, Capital Strategy, including the capital investment programme, and the Treasury Management Strategy Statement, including the Annual Investment Strategy, and to recommend their adoption by full Council as part of the overall budget setting process.

*Lawyer Consulted: Elizabeth Culbert Date: 30/01/2024*

**Equalities Implications**

## In Brighton & Hove City Council a budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) process has been used to identify the potential disproportionate impacts of proposals on groups/individuals covered by legislation (the ‘protected characteristics’ in the Equality Act 2010) and actions to mitigate these negative impacts or promote positive impacts. This is a key part of meeting the requirements of the Act and demonstrating that the council is doing so.

## In law, the potential impacts identified, and how far proposed actions mitigate them, must be given due regard by decision-makers when making budget and resource decisions. However, as noted under legal implications above, in setting the budget members are making resourcing decisions which remain subject to compliance with all necessary legal and statutory consultation requirements.

## All proposals with a potential equalities impact in 2024/25 will have an EIA completed and provided to all Members for the Budget Council. EIAs are cross-referenced with savings proposals in Appendix 1. Detailed EIAs are available at Appendix 6.

## Note that, as in previous years, EIAs relating to staffing impacts are not published with the budget report as these may contain sensitive information. Instead, EIAs relating to staffing changes are provided as part of the relevant consultation paper issued to affected staff and recognised trade unions.

**Sustainability Implications**

## One of the criteria considered for developing budget proposals, aligned with the Council Plan, is whether or not budget proposals contribute to carbon net zero. This plays out through everything from reviewing the council’s use of office buildings and facilitating remote working for staff which can reduce office space, to increasing the number of electric vehicles in its fleet, through to embedding sustainability within its procurement requirements.

## The capital and revenue budget proposals for 2024/25 cannot address all of the Council Plan objectives but do aim to balance support to these and other priorities within the resources available. In addition, the council has been successful in attracting external funding to support this objective including Active Travel funding, Bus Services Improvement Plan funding and funding for Electric Vehicle charging infrastructure.

**Crime & disorder implications:**

## The budget includes provision for many services that support the prevention of crime and disorder, in particular, through the Community Safety budget which includes budgets for supporting Women’s Safety including those affected by Domestic Abuse, as well as budgets to promote the council’s Anti-Racism Strategy, support efforts to reduce anti-social behaviour and reduce drug related crime. There are also budgets for commissioned or contracted support from third sector organisations also working across these and other areas.

**Public health implications:**

## The budget includes the ring-fenced Public Health Grant which is spent on providing priority public health services, including advice and support, in accordance with the Joint Health & Well-Being Strategy (with the NHS) and Annual Public Health Reports both of which link to national research and guidelines and involve considerable engagement and consultation.

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

**Appendices:**

1. Budget Strategies and proposed savings
2. Capital Strategy including the Capital Investment Programme 2024/25
3. Treasury Management Strategy Statement 2024/25
4. Review of Reserves
5. Assessment of Risks
6. Equalities Impact Assessments (EIAs) – Individual Assessments

**Documents in Members’ Rooms**

1. None

**Background Documents**

1. Budget files held within Finance

**2024/25 BUDGET - Budget changes from 2023/24 to 2024/25 Appendix 1**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ***2023/24 Adjusted Base £'000*** | ***Inflation £'000*** | ***Service Pressures £'000*** | ***Commitments and Reinvestment £'000*** | ***VFM & Other Savings £'000*** | ***2024/25 Original Budget £'000*** | ***Change over adjusted base £'000*** | ***Change over adjusted base %*** |
| Families, Children & Learning | **63,001** | 2,506 | 4,476 | - | (4,991) | **64,992** | 1,991 | 3.16 |
| Health & Adult Social Care | **98,943** | 5,160 | 10,302 | (62) | (4,712) | **109,631** | 10,688 | 10.80 |
| Economy, Environment & Culture | **40,005** | 1,078 | 7,817 | 264 | (6,801) | **42,363** | 2,358 | 5.89 |
| Housing, Neighbourhoods & Communities | **21,493** | 924 | 2,776 | - | (2,993) | **22,200** | 707 | 3.29 |
| Governance, People & Resources | **31,006** | 904 | 998 | 10 | (1,758) | **31,160** | 154 | 0.50 |
| **Total Directorate Spending** | **254,448** | **10,572** | **26,369** | **212** | **(21,255)** | **270,346** | **15,898** | **6.25** |
| Housing Benefit Subsidy | **(301)** | - | 700 | - | - | **399** | 700 | (232.56) |
| Bulk Insurance Premia | **3,548** | 66 | - | 150 | - | **3,764** | 216 | 6.09 |
| Capital Financing Costs | **6,466** | - | - | 1,371 | - | **7,837** | 1,371 | 21.20 |
| Corporate VFM Savings | **(147)** | (13) | - | - | (2,475) | **(2,635)** | (2,488) | 1,692.52 |
| Contingency and Risk Provisions | **(3,343)** | (96) | 660 | 3,958 | - | **1,179** | 4,522 | (135.27) |
| Unringfenced Grants | **(23,318)** | - | - | (8,795) | - | **(32,113)** | (8,795) | 37.72 |
| Levies to External Bodies | **229** | 8 | - | - | - | **237** | 8 | 3.49 |
| Other Corporate Budgets | **(3,027)** | (105) | - | 100 | - | **(3,032)** | (5) | 0.17 |
| **NET REVENUE EXPENDITURE** | **234,555** | **10,432** | **27,729** | **(3,004)** | **(23,730)** | **245,982** | **11,427** | **4.87** |
| Contributions to/ from(-) reserves | **461** | - | **-** | (90) | - | **371** | (90) | (19.52) |
| **BUDGET REQUIREMENT** | **235,016** | **10,432** | **27,729** | **(3,094)** | **(23,730)** | **246,353** | **11,337** | **4.82** |
| **Funded By:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Revenue Support Grant | **7,927** |  |  |  |  | **8,453** | 526 | 6.64 |
| Business Rates Local Share | **52,579** |  |  |  |  | **54,152** | 1,573 | 2.99 |
| BRR Tariff/top up | **1,212** |  |  |  |  | **1,648** | 436 | 35.97 |
| Business Rates Collection Fund surplus/(deficit) | **-** |  |  |  |  | **(1,816)** | (1,816) | 0 |
| Council Tax Collection Fund surplus/(deficit) | **-** |  |  |  |  | **(1,174)** | (1,174) | 0 |
| Council Tax | **173,298** |  |  |  |  | **185,090** | 11,792 | 6.80 |
| **Total** | **235,016** |  |  |  |  | **246,353** | **11,337** | **4.82** |

| **Division** | **Total Savings Proposed £000** | **Total FTE 2023/24** | **Total 2024/25 Posts Deleted FTE** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Director of Families, Children & Learning | 0 | 4.0 | 0.0 |
| Health, SEN & Disability Services | 982 | 145.8 | 2.6 |
| Education & Skills | 1,768 | 259.3 | 8.1 |
| Children's Safeguarding & Care | 2,241 | 363.9 | 2.3 |
| Quality Assurance & Performance | 0 | 27.8 | 0.0 |
| **Families, Children & Learning Total** | **4,991** | **800.8** | **13.0** |
| Adult Social Care | 3,794 | 603.2 | 21.8 |
| S75 Sussex Partnership Foundation Trust (SPFT) | 488 | 60.0 | 0.0 |
| Integrated Commissioning | 259 | 51.9 | 0.0 |
| Life Events | 0 | 40.7 | 0.0 |
| Public Health | 171 | 66.2 | 0.0 |
| **Health & Adult Social Care Total** | **4,712** | **822.0** | **21.8** |
| Transport | 978 | 268.8 | 20.6 |
| City Environmental Management | 2,301 | 553.7 | 11.6 |
| City Development & Regeneration | 950 | 99.2 | 14.9 |
| Culture, Tourism & Sport | 653 | 86.3 | 0.0 |
| Property | 1,919 | 94.5 | 9.7 |
| **Economy, Environment & Culture Total** | **6,801** | **1,102.4** | **56.8** |
| Housing General Fund | 2,042 | 152.0 | 18.0 |
| Libraries | 132 | 59.2 | 3.4 |
| Communities, Equalities & Third Sector | 581 | 13.2 | 0.6 |
| Safer Communities | 238 | 68.8 | 3.0 |
| **Housing, Neighbourhoods & Communities Total** | **2,993** | **293.2** | **25.0** |
| Chief Executive Monitoring Office | 0 | 4.0 | 0.0 |
| Policy & Communications | 24 | 21.5 | 0.4 |
| Legal & Democratic Services | 335 | 64.5 | 5.0 |
| Elections & Land Charges | 20 | 5.0 | 0.0 |
| Customer Modernisation & Performance insight | 35 | 32.4 | 1.0 |
| Finance | 144 | 42.3 | 0.6 |
| Procurement (Mobo) | 2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| HR & Organisational Development | 222 | 58.1 | 3.2 |
| IT&D (Mobo) | 649 | 85.8 | 11.0 |
| Welfare Revenue & Business Support | 327 | 229.4 | 7.5 |
| Contribution to Orbis | 0 | 47.2 | 0.0 |
| **Governance, People & Resources Total** | **1,758** | **590.2** | **28.7** |
| **Corporately-held Budgets Total** | **2,475** | **0.0** | **41.0** |
| **Grand Total** | **23,730** | **3,608.6** | **186.2** |

**Families, Children and Learning**

**Budget Strategy and Savings Proposals 2024/25**

**Service Context**

The Families, Children and Learning Directorate brings together different services for children and young people as well as support for skills and employment. Much of the education and special educational needs provision is funded through the ring-fenced Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). This budget strategy is focused on General Fund spend.

The main area of General Fund spend relates to the placement costs for children and young people in care. Spend on children’s placements is under pressure given the national placement sufficiency issues, which have been exacerbated by the pandemic. There is a national shortage of foster care placements, and this has resulted in children being placed in provision based on availability rather than need. Such placements tend to be more expensive residential provision.

Nationally the number of children with child protection plans and children being brought into care has reduced slightly over the past 12 months. Over recent years the numbers in Brighton & Hove have been reducing in the context of national rises. During 2023 there has been a slight decrease in the number of children subject to a child protection plan locally. The number of children in care, excluding unaccompanied asylum-seeking children, has decreased although the complexity of need has increased.

The impact of the pandemic and national lockdowns on family relationships, particularly in those families with adolescents has been significant and there has been a concerning decline in the emotional health and wellbeing of children There has also been an increase in the number of children with disabilities and complex needs requiring special residential provision. Further pressure on these budgets is anticipated as the impact of the pandemic continues to manifest itself over the coming years. The cost-of-living crisis is also likely to cause an increase in demand for statutory social work services given the causal link **between** poverty and child abuse and neglect.

In addition, both locally and nationally there has been an increase in the number of adolescents requiring intensive support, including high-cost residential placements. In part, this is related to the greater focus on meeting the needs of young people who are vulnerable to exploitation.

Our vision is for a Directorate that is ambitious in providing the very best services and support to children and their families, working closely with partners. We want all the city’s children and their families to be happy, healthy and safe, and to be able to fulfil their potential. Services have been redesigned to improve efficiency and reduce costs and this will continue to be a focus going forward. Inevitably, this will require difficult decisions in balancing untargeted, non-statutory support with preventative, statutory and safeguarding provision.

There are three key branches in the directorate together with a performance and safeguarding service that ensures that we meet our statutory duties and provides quality assurance and performance management information. The key branches are as follows:

**Education and Skills £12.526m**

This service area includes:

* Family Hubs, Early Years and Youth support;
* Stronger Families (Troubled Families programme);
* School Organisation and Access to Education and Hidden Children;
* Education Standards and Achievement;
* Skills and Employment;
* Virtual School for children in care and those previously in care;
* Ethnic Minority Achievement Service and Traveller Education Service.

**Health SEN and Disability Services £8.812m**

This service area includes:

* Inclusion Support Services for Schools including Education Psychology services and Schools Wellbeing services;
* Special Educational Needs services;
* Social work and early help support for children with a disability;
* Residential, short break and respite provision for children with a disability.

**Children’s Safeguarding and Care £41.836m**

This service area includes:

* Fostering, family placement and permanence services;
* Children in need and child protection social work services;
* Children in care and leaving care services;
* Unaccompanied asylum-seeking children services;
* Adolescence and youth offending services;
* Front Door for Families which includes the MASH (Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub);
* Multi-disciplinary Partners in Change Hub including the Early Parenting Assessment Programme;
* Contact and Family Group Conference Services.

**Users of Families, Children and Learning Services -**

The Directorate provides a range of different services from universal to those targeted at small groups of people with very high levels of need and/or where we are required to fulfil a statutory duty. Some of the key groups of users we interact with are as follows\*:

* 30,853 children attend city’s school (October 2023)
* 18,921 contacts were received by the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub/Front Door for Families during the year ending September 2023, of these 3,203 were safeguarding concerns that required follow up work;
* 7,496 Parents/Carers applied for school places (2022-23 academic year);
* 6,462 children receive SEND support in maintained schools (including 1,537 children who have an Education Health & Care plan) (October 2023);
* 7,341 children are eligible for free school meals (October 2023);
* 663 individual unique children attending children’s centre nurseries between April 2021 and March 2022.
* 1,151 individuals (children and young people only) open to Family Hubs from 01/04/2023 to 30/09/2023.
* 1,543 children aged under 18 supported by social work to be safe (as at 30 September 2023) 262 children are on a child protection plan (as at 30th September 2023);
* We act as Corporate Parent to 344 children in care and 373 care leavers aged between the ages of 18 and 25 (September 2023)
* We provide care for 51 unaccompanied asylum-seeking children (September 2023);
* 434 pupils in Brighton and Hove are educated at home (30th September 2023);
* There are 148 in-house foster carer households, and 23 Supported Lodgings only households as at 30-Sep-2023;
* 19 children have been adopted in the last 12 months;

\* Please note these figures are a mixture of snapshots in time or usage over a set period and are shared with the intention of being illustrative.

**Budget Strategy**

**Direction of Travel**

We will continue to work as one Families, Children and Learning directorate and together with others in the city, deliver safe and whole family services, improve outcomes, and develop inclusive and accessible provision.

To achieve this, we will:

* Recognise and address the ongoing impact of post pandemic living and the cost-of-living crisis and work with partners to continue to deliver high quality and inclusive services.
* Work with partners to tackle disadvantage, to improve outcomes for children and their families.
* Work with our schools, colleges and adult education providers to promote, support, and deliver high quality educational and skills provision.
* Continue the redevelopment of early help provision and promote whole family working through the Family Hubs.
* Deliver a robust and improving, safe and effective social work service which responds to the changing needs of children and their families.
* Work with young people and other partners to deliver high quality youth services across the city.
* Co-produce and continue to improve SEND provision and services in the city.
* Improve the diversity of our workforce.

We commission and deliver services with partners to ensure children and young people live happy, safe and positive lives, achieving their potential. This is achieved within the context of high demand and reducing resources.

Our directorate objectives are to:

1. Take a whole family approach to support safe and stable lives.

2. Improve outcomes for disadvantaged children, young people and families and adults.

3. Provide high quality and inclusive education; Special Educational Needs & Disability (SEND), and employment support; and early years, social care, youth and skills provision.

4. Develop and engage with staff and stakeholders to deliver high quality services within the directorate and across council services

**Areas of Focus for Savings**

The Directorate has looked at all the services it delivers, identifying those that are essential. Essential services include those that are statutory, those where a business case demonstrates the service is the best use of resources and those that generate income for the Council. This has led to proposals to make savings in SEND respite, youth participation, employment and skills and children’s placements.

The project to increase the number of foster placements and reduce reliance on more expensive residential provider provision is ongoing. This will enable further savings in Children’s Agency Placements:

* Ensuring value for money is obtained when using external providers; this is supported by the children's services framework contract arrangements and preferred provider guidelines.
* Relationship based social work practice and the specialist adolescence service continues to contribute to diverting children from the care system by meeting need and managing risk within the home.
* For those already in care, there is a focus on stepping down to in house and/or less expensive placements, in line with assessed need, and on returning children to their families where this is safe to do so.

Other areas identified for savings include:

* Projected increase in free entitlement income from Nurseries.
* Reprovision of services provided by Tudor House.
* Reduction in the employability service.
* Ceasing the Outreach service for children with disabilities.
* Reduction in the Youth Led Grants Programme.
* Reduction in the Youth participation service.
* Reduction in the Partners in Change hub.
* Introduction of modest Home to School Transport charging for 16–19-year-old.

**Investment in Services**

The following investment in services is planned to meet demographic and other cost increase to maintain investment in priority services and meet statutory requirements:

* Support for Children in Care £1.618m;
* Home to School Transport £1.069m;
* Support for Children with Disabilities £0.796m;
* Schools PFI Contract £0.643m;
* Legal Fees 0.150m.

**Supporting the Council’s Priorities**

The budget position is challenging. In undertaking the review of budgets to identify savings, those services supporting the most vulnerable in the city have been protected and it has been ensured that all statutory obligations can be met. Systems for managing demand led services within FCL are well established and robust. The development of Family Hubs continues to ensure that preventive work is effective at reducing the need for high-cost interventions at a later stage.

Horizon scanning, modernisation and planning for future needs is a priority. Work is underway to explore in-house options for children with a disability; this is an area where we currently experience high unit costs.

Below is a summary of work we have planned over the next three years that supports council’s priorities as set out in the City’s Council Plan and the administration’s priorities.

**A city to be proud of.**

* Work to ensure care leavers have suitable accommodation.

**A Fair and Inclusive City.**

* Lead on apprenticeship work.
* Support the employment and skills city plan.
* Support to schools in delivering equalities curriculums, including anti-racist education.
* Implementing a coproduced all ages SEND Strategy, including improving access for disabled people.

**A Healthy City where People Thrive.**

* Keep children and young children safe and ensure no child or family is left behind including recruiting more foster carers and delivering our Corporate Parenting Strategy
* Develop our prevention and family support work including delivering new Family Hubs in the city.
* Support the provision of high quality and inclusive education from early years through to adult learning.
* Work with partners to deliver ambitious employment, training and apprenticeship opportunities.

**A Responsive Council with well-run services.**

* Meeting the needs of our residents and other customers through an improved customer offer.

| **Section** | **Service Area** | **Brief Summary of Budget Proposal/Strategy and Risks** | **Total Savings Proposed 2024/25** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **£'000** |
| ***Families, Children & Learning*** | | |  |
| ***Director of Families, Children & Learning*** | | |  |
| Director of Families, Children and Learning | Salary and directorate support costs for the Director and support staff | No proposed saving - Director of Children's Services (DCS) role is a statutory requirement. | **0** |
| **Director of Families, Children & Learning Total** | |  | **0** |
| ***Health, SEN & Disability Services*** | | |  |
| Services for children with disabilities | Residential, respite and short breaks. | Re-designate Tudor House as a full-time residential care placement facility for 4 children and young people with complex needs. This would enable the service to bring 4 children currently receiving their care and education outside of the city back into local provision. The full short-breaks capacity of Drove Road is not being utilised and the aim would be to transfer those children currently receiving short breaks at Tudor House to Drove Road. See EIA 1. | **504** |
| Services for children with disabilities and Adults with learning disabilities | Management, assessment, operations and admin | No saving opportunity identified in this statutory service with a budget under pressure due to demand. | **0** |
| Services for children with disabilities | Direct payments | Efficiency saving linked to a wider review of direct payment arrangements and pending completion of a revised policy. | **50** |
| Services for children with disabilities | Family support services | Reduction of Outreach Service - supports SEND children and families and is linked to provision of extended day services. Impact would be mitigated by development of support to families around Personal Assistant use and direct payments. See EIA 2. | **115** |
| Services for children with disabilities | Contracted services, adaptations, management | Efficiencies in the reprocuring of after school provision linked to contracts formerly delivered by third parties | **32** |
| Agency placements - disabled children | Independent and non maintained children's homes, special schools and boarding school placements | Limit the number of expensive external residential placements through commissioning and brokerage work (£0.250m). Risk: this is a demand-led budget that has to respond to presenting needs, including high cost placements. See EIA 3. | **250** |
| Special educational needs | Special Educational Needs | No saving opportunity identified in this statutory service with a budget under pressure due to demand. | **0** |
| Inclusion Support Service | Inclusion Support Service. Including Educational Psychology Service and Child & Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) | No proposed savings - includes some statutory services (Ed Psychologists) and support for C&YP around Early Help and Well-being | **0** |
| Inclusion Support Service | Inclusion Support Service. Including Educational Psychology Service and Child & Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) | Funding provided through a Public Health contribution to services delivered in the Inclusion Support Service. | **31** |
| **Health, SEN & Disability Services Total** | |  | **982** |
| ***Education & Skills*** | | |  |
| Schools PFI | This budget accounts for credit payments from the DfE to cover the 25 year PFI program for 3 secondary schools. | No saving possible. The DfE credits are required to meet the final costs of the PFI programme at the end of the 25-year programme and there is already a forecast cost pressure upon its realisation. | **0** |
| Standards & Achievement | Funds core LA school improvement team who support and challenge schools in line with statutory duties outlined in the Education Act 2005,2006 and Schools Causing Concern guidance 2021. It also leads disadvantaged education strategy and educational partnership. This also includes support for the delivery of the Brighton & Hove Environmental Education service | School improvement, monitoring and intervention. Modest efficiency saving of £20k from the General Fund budget but no reduction to the de-delegation monitoring grant from Dedicated Schools Grant.  Second, a proposal to cease the Environmental Education Service which has staffing implications. Risk: Reduction in support to schools around environmental issues and closure of ‘Our City, Our World’ website which is reasonably well utilised by schools. See EIA 4. | **61** |
| School Organisation and Admissions. | This includes our staffing costs to support the delivery of our statutory school organisation responsibilities in relation to pupil place planning, school admissions, free school meal eligibility checking and duties placed upon the council in relation to school attendance, exclusions, alternative provision and the responsibility to ensure pupils not in school receive a suitable education. | No proposal for saving given need to ensure effective support to schools and fulfil statutory responsibilities. Funding supports efficient co-ordination and liaison between central council functions and schools (e.g. Emergency Planning, Health & Safety, Finance, Property & Design, HR) Reduction would put additional pressures on those corporate services and could result in schools considering alternative options such as academisation. | **0** |
| Anti racist strategy | Council core funding for LA Adviser and seconded staff from schools to implement an agreed schools anti racism strategy for the City. Work includes direct work with the city's school providing training, challenge and support on anti racism. | This is non-statutory work. However, it supports the council's commitment to becoming anti-racist. Children & Young People Committee agreed 5-year funding to enable anti-racist school strategy to become embedded. | **0** |
| Home to School Transport | Transport arrangements for eligible children aged between 5 and 16 as per LA’s statutory duties.  Discretionary transport arrangements for young people aged between 16-18 from families experiencing low income and for young people with SEND. | Statutory service under considerable cost and demand pressures. Proposed saving in line with the income generated from the ability to charge for elements of the home to school transport service. | **23** |
| The Virtual School. | This is core councils funding that contributes to the statutory position of Head of Virtual School. All remaining funding for the position and Virtual School comes from designated schools grant. The Virtual School deliver statutory service to Children in Care and Previously Looked After. | This is a statutory duty. No saving opportunity identified. | **0** |
| Other Educational support | This includes Governor support, Redundancy and Asset management and Education & Traded services support | No savings can be made as this is a traded service with schools that recovers costs (including overheads). | **0** |
| Youth Services | Commissioned community and voluntary sector youth services provides a range of traditional youth services across the city, and include equality groups | Youth Service Grants Programme - this is linked to housing HRA funding. The contracts end in March 2025. | **0** |
| Youth Services | The Youth Led Grants Programme provides additionally funded youth activities/projects delivered by the community and voluntary sector across the city. | Cease Youth Led Grants Programme. Risks: No additional projects funded but reduction could potentially be offset through use of the Holiday Activity and Food (HAF) programme funding subject to its continuation. HAF monies could be ringfenced for youth groups to focus on providing holiday activities with a healthy meal for young people taking up free school meals. See EIA 5. | **80** |
| Youth Services | Internal council services – Youth Participation Team provide a range of services for children and young people who are/have been in care or receiving social work support; this includes youth advocacy, Children in Care Council. The service also provides wider participation activities, e.g. Youth Council, Youth Wise. The service also provides an accredited Youth Arts Programme | Review of youth structure to be completed, linked to Family Hubs development including youth arts support being provided as part of Family Hubs intervention offer. Saving to be achieved by funding through Family Hubs budget utilising the uplift of external funding through Supporting Families grant and restructuring the youth management resource and deleting a vacant youthwork co-ordinator post. | **145** |
| Independent Visitors | The Youth Participation Team provide an Independent Visitors (IV) scheme. Two IV coordinators (1.4 fte) recruit, assess, train, match and support IV's, who befriend and support children and young people who are in the care of the local authority. | Statutory service - no saving opportunity identified. | **0** |
| Early Years | Management of the early years service including council nurseries. Support for private and voluntary nurseries, childminders, out of school childcare, childcare workforce training, and management and administration of free early years entitlement for 2/3/4 year olds. Oversight of the Holiday Food and Activity Programme. Statutory duty to secure sufficient childcare places and information, advice and training to childcare providers and to complete an annual childcare sufficiency assessment. Early years providers pay for most training courses. | Switch a General Fund workforce development post to DSG funding as part of the early years funding extension. | **35** |
| Brightstart Nursery | Bright Start, 50 places full day/year. Total budget including Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) is £446k. Council subsidy 23%. Total number of children excluding babies Summer 22 - 47 including 12 funded 2 year olds, 9 Early Years Pupil Premium and 5 ASF Autumn term numbers 62 (10 under 2's, 19 2's and 33 3-4's). Located in the 40% most disadvantaged areas of the city. Average percentage of children in receipt of EYPP 27.4%. Average percentage of children living in the 0 to 20% most disadvantaged areas of the city 47.3%. Average number of disadvantaged two year olds attending who are in receipt of EYFE 10. | The proposal is to move Bright Start nursery to the Tarner Family Hub to exit an unsuitable building and reduce the overall subsidy across nursery provision. | **150** |
| Jump Start Nursery | Jump Start, Moulsecoomb, 34 places, full day/year. Total budget including DSG is £385k. Provides free meals for DSG funded children. Council subsidy is 54%. Total number of children summer 22 - 37. including 12 funded 2 year olds, 20 Early Years Pupil Premium and 5 ASF. Some children could not be offered places because unable to recruit staff. Autumn term total 27 (13 2's and 14 3-4's) Located in the 30% most disadvantaged areas of the city. Average percentage of children in receipt of EYPP 66.8%. Average percentage of children living in the 0 to 20% most disadvantaged areas of the city 80.8%. Average number of disadvantaged two year olds attending who are in receipt of EYFE 14. | Saving achievable through the announced increase in early years funding rates for this council. | **24** |
| Acorn Nursery | Acorn Nursery, North Portslade. 60 places full day/year. Total budget is £543k including DSG. Council subsidy is 23%. Total number of children summer 22 -49 including. 10 funded 2 year olds, 4 Early Years Pupil Premium and 5 ASF children Autumn term to be confirmed. Located in the 30% most disadvantaged areas of the city. Average percentage of children in receipt of early years pupil premium (EYPP) 18.5%. Average percentage of children living in the 0 to 20% most disadvantaged areas of the city 34.9%. Average number of disadvantaged two year olds attending who are in receipt of EYFE 10. | Saving achievable through the announced increase in early years funding rates for this council. | **36** |
| Cherry Tree Nursery | Cherry Tree Nursery, Hollingdean, 50 places full day/year. Total budget is £522k including DSG. Council subsidy is 26%. Total number of children summer 22 - 48 including 8 funded 2 year olds, 21 Early Years Pupil Premium and 5 ASF children. Some children could not be offered places because unable to recruit staff. Autumn term total 63 (22 under 2's, 13 2's and 28 3-4's). Located in the 40% most disadvantaged areas of the city. Average percentage of children in receipt of EYPP 49.1%. Average percentage of children living in the 0 to 20% most disadvantaged areas of the city 44.2%. Average number of disadvantaged two year olds attending who are in receipt of EYFE 16. | Saving achievable through the announced increase in early years funding rates for this council. | **27** |
| Roundabout Nursery | Roundabout Nursery, Whitehawk. 86 places full day/year. Total budget is £862k including DSG. Council subsidy is 21%. Total number of children 115 summer 22 including 32 funded 2 year olds and 40 Early Years Pupil Premium and 10. Autumn term total 110 (12 under 2's, 45 2's and 53 3-4's). Located in the 10% most disadvantaged areas of the city. Average percentage of children in receipt of EYPP 50.2%. Average percentage of children living in the 0 to 20% most disadvantaged areas of the city 74.2%. Average number of disadvantaged two year olds attending who are in receipt of EYFE 34. | Saving achievable through the announced increase in early years funding rates for this council. | **103** |
| Family Hubs including Supporting Families Grant | The Family hubs transformation completes in September 2024 with the new model in place to deliver support for children, young people and families. | It is proposed to utilise £100k funding from DSG to support EYFE extension work for the management post and service support. Also, £10k efficiencies savings from non-staffing budgets and cessation of funding for external services through SLA's including: • Brighton unemployed centre – early years childcare for disadvantaged families (£11k); • Amaze – SEND groups (£1k); • Oasis – Creche provision for families accessing the service (£2k). Risks: Removing this funding will have an impact on the delivery of these by services by VCS partners as part of the Family Hub offer and will impact on disadvantaged groups accessing services. See EIA 6. | **123** |
| Family Hubs including Supporting Families Grant | The Family hubs transformation completes in September 2024 with the new model in place to deliver support for children, young people and families. | Contribution from Public Health Grant to services provided by the Family Help Hubs | **754** |
| Skills & Employment | Adult Education Budget & Community Learning | No saving opportunity identified. This is funded directly by the Education Skills Funding Agency on an annual non-procured grant. | **0** |
| Skills & Employment | Skills and Employment Core Team | No savings are proposed. This team provides leadership on the employment and skills agenda. The council has a statutory duty to secure sufficient suitable education and training provision. | **0** |
| Skills & Employment | Apprenticeship and Pre-employment Team (Unspent levy is returned to the government on a 'use it or lose it basis’ so without this budget further levy would return. The staff support £2m of Levy - over 140 apprentices engaged for 13 months up to 5 years) | Within this budget, £0.063m funds the pre-employment scheme and paid placement opportunities for disabled people of all ages. One-off alternative funding has been identified for 24/25 to enable service to continue. For this to continue into 2025/26 alternative permanent funding will need to be identified. Risk: Service creates work experience, TLevel Placements, Supported Internships, Sector Work Based Academy programmes within the council and supports the workforce diversity agenda and the wider Fair and Inclusive strategy. | **63** |
| Skills & Employment | Employability Service-Supported Employment Team (Youth Employment, Youth Employment Hub and Supported Employment) | £0.144m savings are proposed for reduction of Supported Employment and Youth Employability provision. However, one-off alternative funding from the Shared Prosperity Fund has been identified 2024/25. Permanent alternative funding will need to be identified to meet £144k reduction in budget from 2025/26 which retains statutory functions of the Youth Employment service. | **144** |
| Print & Sign | Print & Sign Unit | Net income generator - no saving proposed. | **0** |
| **Education & Skills Total** | |  | **1,768** |
| ***Children's Safeguarding & Care*** | | |  |
| Fostering & Adoption | Payments to in-house carers for fostered and adopted children. | No savings proposed - statutory duty. Aim is to ultimately increase in-house carers to reduce Independent Foster Agency costs. | **0** |
| Fostering & Adoption | Staffing teams assessing and supporting foster carers. Allowances paid to Adopters | No savings proposed - statutory duty. | **0** |
| Adoption Southeast | Regional Adoption Agency | No savings proposed - statutory duty and important service that mitigates higher alternative costs. | **0** |
| Social Work | Social work staffing teams. | Small non-staffing efficiency proposed. | **10** |
| Social Work | Expenditure incurred under section 17 & 18 of the 1989 Children Act. | No savings proposed - statutory duty. Contributes to the council's response to welfare reforms which will become even more important with the ending/reduction of the Household Support Fund. | **0** |
| Social Work | Legal costs relating to assessment and court fees. | No savings proposed - statutory duty which achieves significant cost avoidance. | **0** |
| Contact Service | Family contact for children in care (Chic) and children in need (CIN) | Efficiency savings and deletion of 1.25fte vacancies. Risk: To deliver the statutory duty will require some use of sessional staff which could result in a budget pressure. See EIA 7. | **72** |
| Care Leavers | Services for 18-24 year olds leaving care, including staying put and ex-asylum seekers. | No savings proposed - statutory duty that meets a core priority. | **0** |
| Agency Placements | Residential, fostering and secure placements for looked after children provided by external agencies | A significant saving is proposed in respect of an ongoing project to increase the number of in-house foster placements and reduce reliance on more expensive independent providers. Economies are also sought through the provision of high quality, value for money contracted services with external providers using the children's services framework contract arrangements and preferred provider guidelines. In addition to the savings proposed, there is pressure funding for 2023/24 to cover future anticipated increased costs for existing clients.  Relationship-based social work practice and the specialist adolescence service is contributing to diverting children from the care system, and for those already in care, a stepping down to in house and/or less expensive placements. Close scrutiny of placement costs, together with an increase in in-house foster carers is contributing to a reduction in unit costs.   Delivery Risk: This is a high cost service where the failure of effective prevention and demand management would not only impact on the achievement of cost reduction but is likely to be of corporate financial significance to the council's challenging medium term financial position. The proposals set out here assume that other identified pressures on this budget will be met across the overall budget. A small number of adolescents with very significant needs continue to place pressure on these budgets combined with a national shortage of placements.  Impact on Outcomes: The council's improved practice model prevents children needing care and contributes to improved outcomes for young people. Demand management has implications for managing risk effectively to meet safeguarding requirements and statutory duties. See EIA 8. | **2,004** |
| Adolescent Service | Support and supervision to young people at risk of exploitation, some of whom are at risk of becoming involved in the Criminal Justice System and preventative work for children and young people at risk of becoming involved in offending. | The adolescent service works with the most vulnerable adolescents in the city, at risk of criminal and sexual exploitation, misusing substances and at risk of teenage pregnancy. Risk: Efficiencies are potentially manageable but may result in escalation of need which requires statutory, more expensive social work intervention, including placement in care. | **80** |
| Family group conferences | Family group conferences | No savings proposed - supports statutory duty and provides a key preventative service achieving cost avoidance. | **0** |
| Partners in Change Hub & specialist assessments | Lead practitioners and adult workers supporting social workers to manage risk effectively within families; specialist assessments to support social work decision making | Deletion of a vacancy is proposed. This service provides specialist assessments and supports social work to undertake complex work to prevent children coming into care or within care proceedings. This service provides specialist reports to court, preventing the court requesting expensive specialist externally commissioned assessments. Risk: If demand cannot be managed effectively, a reduction in the service could impact on specialist assessments requested by the court and lead to increased expense. See EIA 9 | **75** |
| Social Care Grant | Social Care Grant |  | **0** |
| **Children's Safeguarding & Care Total** | |  | **2,241** |
| ***Quality Assurance & Performance*** | | |  |
| Children's Safeguarding & Quality Assurance | Specific child protection services, the Brighton & Hove Safeguarding Children's Partnership (BHSCP) and independent reviewing officers. Note: Income of £45k from services to schools has been netted off within the gross budget. | No savings proposed. The BHSCP as it is a partnership budget, owned alongside Police and Health and is a statutory function. | **0** |
| **Quality Assurance & Performance Total** | |  | **0** |
| **Families, Children & Learning Total** | |  | **4,991** |

**Health & Adult Social Care**

**Budget Strategy and Savings Proposals 2024/25**

**Service Context**

The Health and Adult Social Care Directorate (HASC) consists of Public Health, Adult Social Care and Life Events.

Principle Adult Social Care service area responsibilities covered in this strategy include services for vulnerable adults with Care Act eligible needs including older people, physical and sensory disability, mental health, carers and all ancillary activities. Public Health work with partners throughout the City to improve and protect the health of residents of all ages. Life Events services include Registrars, Bereavement and Coroner. It is to be noted that the provision of services for adults with learning disability and autism from 25 years have been transferred back to the Health and Adult Social Care Directorate from April 2023. Services for adults with learning disability and autism up to 25 years old continue to be delivered through the Families, Children and Learning Directorate, with delegated powers within that Directorate for budget spend for this cohort. However, the whole budget for all adult social care services, including adults with a learning disability are within scope of this strategy.

The wellbeing of Brighton & Hove residents remains at the heart of our approach and is reflected in the HASC core offer, which is to:

* Lead and deliver actions to improve health, prevent ill health, reduce health inequalities and protect the health of our residents. Promote preventative and early intervention approaches to maintain health & wellbeing, insofar as this promotes independence and reduces immediate demand for more expensive, statutory services;
* Provide information and advice for all adults seeking care and support;
* Assess need and arrange help for individuals and their carers who are eligible under the Care Act for support from Adult Social Care;
* Maintain and support the local care market;
* Provide support that reduces the need for social care in the longer term and/or prevents the need for a more expensive service; and
* Safeguard vulnerable adults who are at risk of harm or abuse.
* Provide bereavement and registration services.

While there are a range of service areas across the Directorate that contribute to the delivery of this activity, there are three main budget areas, and these are detailed below, with budget figures for 2023/24:

1. **Public Health Net nil budget (Funded by grant - gross budget £22.659m)**

This service area includes:

* Drugs and alcohol treatment and recovery
* Sexual Health
* Children 0-19 Public Health programmes
* A dedicated Healthy Lifestyles team
* A range of Public Health and Health Improvement services and functions including promotion of physical activity, stop smoking, weight management, NHS Health Checks, Ageing Well, public mental health, local health protection etc.

The above services are provided by Public Health, other BHCC directorates, NHS providers and the Voluntary and Community Sector.

* producing the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and providing public health advice to Integrated Care System partners including the NHS

With respect to the Public Health ring fenced grant, whilst this budget strategy does not propose a focus on this area the grant continues to play a vital role in the overarching HASC budget strategy for the following reasons:

* The Public Health grant is ring fenced with specific criteria for spend and is considered separately from the general fund. The main and primary purpose of all spend from the grant is public health.
* Public Health services and functions are central to the preventative approach adopted in the HASC strategy and our Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy. The grant supports delivering population health outcomes and contributes to the financial stability of both the directorate and the Council.
* Public Health services and functions are critical to delivery of wider corporate and directorate priorities working with external partners and stakeholders.

1. **Adult Social Care Services (including mental health under S75 arrangement with Sussex Partnership Foundation Trust) £104.028m**

This service area includes:

* Assessment, Social Work, Occupational Therapy and community care for adults requiring physical support, mental health support, memory & cognition support and learning disability and autism.
* Community Short Term services
* Telecare and equipment services
* In house provider services

1. **Commissioning, Contracts and Performance £5.354m**

This service area includes:

* Commissioning & Performance teams
* Care Brokerage team
* Self-directed support
* Carer support
* Council management of partnership arrangements with Health including the Better Care Fund

1. **Life Events £0.249m**

This service area includes:

* Bereavement Services
* Coroner Services
* Registration Services including weddings

In total therefore HASC net budget for 2023/24 is £102.576m. The Community Care budget is £68.387m and equates to 67% of the overall HASC budget, meaning our main area of spend relates to the external provision of care for those people who have been assessed as eligible for social care support (Community Care). This covers a vast array of services and includes such areas as Residential and Nursing Care and Home Care. Adult Social Care provision is primarily commissioned rather than internally provided. HASC does manage a number of in house services, which are residential care units at Craven Vale, Ireland Lodge and Wayfield Avenue, home care with a reablement focus through Independence at Home and two hostels, New Steine Mews and Glenwood Lodge. HASC also manage 5 residential group homes and 3 supported living homes for people with learning disabilities; a day service at Wellington House, a Shared Lives service and a Community Support Service.

**Budget Context**

The activity data shown below is for the last 3 years. Data in red is updated from the HASC Budget Strategy 23/24. For purposes of comparison the updated data in the table below does not include the data from people using learning disability services.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FUNDED CARE SERVICE** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** | **2022/23** | **2023/24**  **(Apr – Sept)** |
| Adults receiving domiciliary care | 1,856 | 1,653 | 1,555 | 1,442 |
| Adults receiving residential care | 637 | 556 | 573 | 522 |
| Adults receiving nursing care | 591 | 486 | 500 | 448 |
| Adults receiving a direct payment | 432 | 436 | 448 | 439 |
| Total number of adults provided with long term funded care during the period | **3,516** | **3,131** | **3,076** | **2,851** |

Since April 2023 adult Learning Disability Services from 25+ have returned to the HASC Directorate. All adults in learning disability services from 18 and over come under the Care Act requirements, and so data will now include data for adults with a learning disability who are receiving a service. The data in the table below shows all BHCC adult social care data, with learning disability activity data now included.

**With Adults LD included – All statutory data submitted for returns.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FUNDED CARE SERVICE** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** | **2022/23** | **2023/24**  **(Apr – Sept)** |
| Adults receiving domiciliary care | 2,369 | 2,162 | 2,060 | 1,929 |
| Adults receiving residential care | 801 | 722 | 736 | 678 |
| Adults receiving nursing care | 599 | 494 | 511 | 457 |
| Adults receiving a direct payment | 600 | 610 | 627 | 609 |
| Total number of adults provided with long term funded care during the period | **4,369** | **3,988** | **3,934** | **3,673** |

We can see that the data above shows an ongoing steady trend in reduction of long-term funded care in Brighton & Hove. This is echoed across the country, and the national trend of clients in long-term support (as a % of the adult population) over the last 4 years (1.85%) has also fallen in line with BHCC figures (1.70%). However, for adults aged 18-64, BHCC (0.96%) is slightly above the England average (0.85%). As explained further below however, this reduction in demand needs to be considered within the context of increasing complexity of individual cases and the consistent increase in provider unit costs.
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The main proportion of that reduction locally is in the older (65+) age group dropping in 22/23 to near the national average, with the 18-64 age group remaining static both nationally and locally over the last 3 years. A similar drop for long-term support in the older age group can be seen within BHCC’s statistical nearest neighbours. However, this is countered in the above data by a considerable increase in the number and cost of working age adults aged 18-64.

The rising cost of services and the increasing cost pressures experienced by many of our providers means that ensuring we have the right services at a sustainable price remains challenging. This is a national picture being faced by many local authorities with Adult Social Care responsibilities. From a budget strategy perspective, inflation and cost of living for things like fuel and energy bills impact on our unit costs for both residential and nursing care. In B&H we have higher gross expenditure per head of the population compared to other local authorities in the South East (LGA Use of Resources report indicates that the B&H mean is £609, with the South East mean being £517). This is mainly driven by our unit costs for residential and nursing care for those over 65 years of age which is above average for the country (LGA Use of Resources report indicates B&H mean is £1,136 per week, our South East comparators mean is £993), and that currently in B&H there are more people residing in residential and nursing homes than our comparators. Unit costs for residential and nursing care for 18 – 64 year olds in B&H compare more favourably with our South East comparators (LGA Use of Resources report indicates the B&H average is £1,590 weekly, the South East mean is £1,596). B&H home care costs also compare favourably to the rest of the South East (LGA Use of Resources report indicates the B&H average is £20.62 per hour, the South East region mean is £20.88 per hour). This does not include the cost of reablement at home provided by our in-house home care provider, as this is a specialist service provision aimed at supporting people to reduce ongoing care needs, and therefore costs more than the average hourly rate.

This means that our budget strategy must continue to support the management of unit costs, particularly for residential and nursing care for people 65 years and over and must support keeping people well and independent and to remain at home for as long as possible for all adult age groups.

**Budget Strategy – Direction of Travel**

HASC’s vision is for everyone in Brighton & Hove to have the best opportunity to live a healthy, happy and fulfilling life, by ensuring that they are starting well, living well, ageing well and dying well, and this is set out in the joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy and the Directorate Strategy agreed Summer 2023. Our mission is to promote and improve health and wellbeing, supporting people to live independent and fulfilling lives.

In order to achieve this and meet our corporate financial responsibilities of savings and reducing pressures our budget strategy requires:

* **Demand and Complexity management** – whilst both Public Health and Adult Social Care are driven in large part by demand we will continue to adopt means that manage this effectively and equally look to the best services to support the increasing complexity of need we continue to see. This will require ongoing close working with our NHS partners and other key stakeholders. For example, the mental health JSNA shows a significant rise in demand and complexity for people with mental health needs; the Changing Futures Programme provides a multi-agency framework with financial input to support this area. In managing demand, we will focus on prevention and reablement to support and enable people to remain well and independent for as long as possible, reducing the need for long term care. We will also focus on technology enabled care to support people in the most person centred and cost-effective way. Whilst demand is increasing in some areas and not in others, more generally there is evidence of increased complexity of individual cases which often require more intensive and expensive package of care. We will continue to develop new models of working in order to reduce the pressure on workforce requirements, such as increasing and improving customers' ability to self-assess.
* **Market management** – following from the national Fair Cost of Care exercise, a review of framework rates will be undertaken alongside continued investment into other service areas such community support services and supported living provision to ensure that provision across the city remains financially sustainable. We will continue to review the in-house service offer to ensure it aligns with these commissioning intentions and provides value for money. We will continue to focus on our brokerage offer to manage unit costs for care and support. Contracts will continue to be reviewed for value for money and ensure that all contracts are delivering core business need.
* **Financial Management** – ensuring robust financial management, value for money and efficiencies. As stated above, we will focus on our in-house care delivery, ensuring effective use of these services, to manage costs and to support reducing long term care needs. We will continue with budget scrutiny and controls on spend to ensure good financial management. We will look at what we charge for services to ensure they are in line with costs and will improve collection processes to maximise income.

**Investment in Services**

The directorate has received growth funding over the past 3 years of £26.9m acknowledging a combination of increasing demand in specific areas, complexity and unit cost. HASC are requesting budget growth for 2024/25 of £10.302m for adult social care services of which £4.6m is funded by Government grants. Adult Social Care pressures are calculated on unit cost increases and increases in demand and complexity in line with trends from previous years.

In 2023/24 HASC committed to managing its pressures and reducing its budget as part of the Council’s savings programme to a net reduction of £4.316m. HASC is projected to deliver a forecast of under 1% overspend on outturn by end of 2023/24, which is in line with expectations on a demand led budget.

**Supporting the Council’s Priorities –** HASC supports a One Council approach recognising that it will lead on delivering corporate priorities in some areas working with partners and stakeholders and equally elsewhere, where it may not lead, it can still offer significant support.

**A city to be proud of**

**Investing in our city**

We recognise the importance of a healthy population to a thriving and fair economy. Our healthy lifestyles team support more than 3,700 people in the city and our physical activity strategy supports the investment of facilities in our city. We will continue our investment in partnership working with the local voluntary and community sector and build on joint community working.

The directorate has completed a workforce strategy which focuses upon improving opportunity for our internal workforce and we continue to engage constructively with the wider care sector to both encourage employment opportunity and provide jobs for adults with eligible care needs.

**An accessible, clean, and sustainable city**

Through the Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy, Adult Learning Disability Strategy, Autism Strategy, our contribution to the Accessible City Strategy, we are supporting people to have improved access to the city.

Our commissioning always considers how we can be more sustainable and contribute towards carbon reduction. We also aim to maximise social value through our commissioning.

**A Fair and Inclusive City**

**An inclusive and fairer city**

Reducing health inequalities is at the heart of our Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy and one of the key priorities of Improving Lives, the Sussex wide Health and Care strategy. We seek to continuously improve the opportunities for diverse people with lived experience to influence and improve services and we are actively embedding a coproduction approach as business as usual in all that we do. Our continued work through the Anti-racism Strategy, Accessible City Strategy and Fair and Inclusive Action Plan aim to reduce inequalities for our community and our workforce. Equalities impact assessments are crucial to ensuring we mitigate negative impacts to communities where service alterations take place.

**A city where people feel safe and welcome**

We are working with the city to develop more age and dementia friendly spaces and developing our combatting drugs strategy.

Through the Safeguarding Adults Board we are looking to continuously improve how we work across multiple agencies in the city to protect those most vulnerable to harm and abuse.

**Homes for everyone**

We are working with our housing colleagues to ensure accommodation and social care needs of residents are met. The Changing Futures multi-disciplinary team is supporting people with multiple disadvantage, many of whom experience homelessness. We aim to promote independence of adults with care and support needs so that they can live in a place that they can call home.

**A Healthy City Where People Thrive**

**A better future for children and young people**

Support to children and young people is an essential priority that we are determined to give future focus to in delivering our prevention and early intervention offers. The Healthy Child Programme is a key programme funded by Public Health and Starting Well is a key aim or our Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy. We support public Health outcomes and integrated services within the Family Hubs programme and the health visiting and school nursing is provided as part of the Healthy Child Programme.

Activities Work and Learning is a priority within the Adult Learning Disability Strategy.

**Living and ageing well**

Our prevention programmes enable people to live healthy, happy and fulfilling lives. These include physical activity, mental health promotion and suicide prevention, sexual health, physical health, tobacco, alcohol and drugs. A key focus of our budget strategy is prevention of admission into long term residential and nursing care and promoting independence in the community. This includes ensuring everyone has access to the information, advice, and services they need and our work towards integrated community teams and joined up services. We are continuously seeking to maintain and improve the quality, effectiveness, accessibility, and inclusivity of our services.

**A Responsive Council with Well Run Services**

People are at the heart of everything we do, and we strive to provide good customer service to all and make sure people have access to the information and advice they need. We work with partners across the city to focus on the health and wellbeing of our residents. Our fair and inclusive action plan and workforce strategy aim to improve the experience for our workforce. Through meticulous budget management and good governance, we aim to have resilient, safe, and effective services fit for the future.

| **Section** | **Service Area** | **Brief Summary of Budget Proposal/Strategy and Risks** | **Total Savings Proposed 2024/25** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **£'000** |
| ***Health & Adult Social Care*** | | |  |
| ***Adult Social Care*** | | |  |
| Community Care budget funding packages of care to meet statutory responsibilities across adult care groups apart from Learning Disability and Mental Health. Services include; community support, home care, supported accommodation, residential and nursing care. | Physical Support & Sensory Support  2,135 budgeted capacity for 2023/24 | Savings proposals include: £568k from increased Craven Vale reablement capacity; £335k through managing provider fee uplifts taking into account the current market fee position; £208k through the design of a different Discharge-to-Assess (D2A) model; £302k efficiencies from the Target Operating Model (TOM) and associated admission avoidance, ensuring all Extra Care and other block contract voids are effectively managed and filled throughout 2024/25; £225k from overdue Financial Assessment reviews; £69k by ensuring that reviews demonstrate support services are adequate to meet needs and represent efficiency and value for money  **Delivery risk**: The Community Care budget is demand-led and is under significant pressure which should be matched by government and service pressure funding. Craven Vale saving - the demand for reablement may reduce and there could be challenges recruiting therapist and care posts. Ther are also potential risks around provider failure / giving notice on services i.e. impacts on sufficiency. Delivery of the new TOM at Access Point will be required by 01/04/2024. See EIA 10 | **1,707** |
| Assessment and Support Teams. Social Work teams delivering statutory duties under the Care Act to assess eligible needs, intervene where people are at risk to themselves, others or the community. Deliver statutory duties under the Mental Capacity Act, Safeguarding Vulnerable Adults, Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoL's) | Assistant Director Community Short Term Services Social Work Team  Access Point Financial Assessments Rapid Response Team Hospital Discharge Service Acute Planned Response Service Carers Development Team Assessment and Reablement Deprivation of Liberty Safeguarding team Independent Living Carelink | Small increase in Public Health contribution to specialist drugs and alcohol service. | **5** |
| Assessment & Support and Intervention Team (SIT) | Community Equipment Service | Economies and efficiencies are continually explored as is recovery and refurbishment of equipment but no further saving opportunity is possible at present. | **0** |
| Hostel Accommodation | Hostel Accommodation  71 beds budgeted for in 2023/24 | Housing Benefit optimisation through increased income levels. Delivery risk: requires activity levels to be maintained. See EIA 11 | **344** |
| Memory & Cognition Support - Residential | Ireland Lodge Residential  Wayfield Ave Residential   58 budgeted capacity for 2023/24 | Reduce service to 24 beds from 34 beds currently. Delivery risk: Alternative private and independent sector provision is available. A full year saving may not be achieved due to other staffing pressures. See EIA 11 | **211** |
| Physical Support - Residential | Craven Vale Resource Centre  24 budgeted capacity for 2023/24 | No saving identified but see linked proposal above to utilise Craven Vale to achieve Community Care savings. | **0** |
| Community Short Term Services | Community Short Term Services & Independence at Home (Including Early Supported Stroke Discharge and Apportionment of Assessment Duties Budget capacity for 2023/24 assumes a max of 65 people in service at any time through 12 month period | Efficiencies in premises budget and efficiencies through deletion of vacant posts.  Delivery risk: reducing opportunity for growth and flexibility within the reablement service. See EIA 11 | **130** |
| Services for Adults with learning disabilities | Management, assessment, operations and admin | No direct saving but will be considered as part of overall 'Organisational Design' principles. | **0** |
| Community Care budget funding packages of care to meet statutory responsibilities across adult care groups apart from Learning Disability and Mental Health. Services include; community support, home care, supported accommodation, residential and nursing care. | Learning Disabilities  1,103 budgeted capacity for 2023/24 | Savings proposals include: £450k through managing provider fee uplifts taking into account the current market fee position; £141k Housing Benefit optimisation through increased income levels; £172k continuation of targeted reviews supporting adults to move from high cost placements into new living arrangements which promote independence; £50k review of existing block contracts.  Delivery risk: potential risks around provider failure / giving notice on services. See EIA 10 | **813** |
| Learning Disabilities - Community Support (Adults) | In-house Community Support Service | Proposed saving of £182k from closure of in-house Community Support Service, through alternative spot purchasing of support hours via independent sector contract framework. Redeployment of staff into existing vacancies and/or managing staffing changes through a voluntary severance process may be required.  Delivery Risk: ensuring there is enough market capacity to absorb spot purchasing and industrial relations issues delay staff moves. See EIA 11 | **182** |
| Learning Disabilities - Day Services (Adults) | In-house Day Service | Efficiencies within the service are achievable through deletion of vacant posts. See EIA 11 | **75** |
| Learning Disabilities - Residential (Adults) | In-house Residential | No saving opportunity identified for 2024/25. | **0** |
| Learning Disabilities - Residential (Adults) | In-house Respite Services | No saving opportunity identified for 2024/25. | **0** |
| Learning Disabilities - Shared Lives (Adults) | In-house Shared Lives Service | No saving opportunity identified for 2024/25. | **0** |
| Learning Disabilities - Supported Accommodation (Adults) | In-house Supported Living | Closure of Cromwell Road (£327k) - service users needs can be met within the independent sector and/or through moves within existing in-house LD Services. Staff redeployment across in-house services and/or a voluntary severance process may be required.  Delivery risk: time taken to identify suitable placement for Cromwell Rd tenant requiring another service model. See EIA 11 | **327** |
| **Adult Social Care Total** | |  | **3,794** |
| ***S75 Sussex Partnership Foundation Trust (SPFT)*** | | |  |
| Community Care budget funding packages of care, support, residential/nursing care for people suffering a cognitive impairment (mainly dementia in older people); services will include Community Support, Home Care, direct payments, supported accommodation, residential/nursing care and specialist placements | Memory & Cognition Support  396 budgeted capacity for 2023/24 | Saving proposals include: £105k through managing provider fee uplifts taking into account the current market fee position; £96k from implementing the Target Operating Model and associated Admission Avoidance, ensuring all Extra Care and other block contract voids are effectively managed and filled throughout 2024/25; £75k from overdue Financial Assessment reviews.  Delivery risk: potential risks around provider failure / giving notice on services. Community Care budget is demand-led. Delivery of the new TOM at Access Point is required by 01/04/2024. See EIA 10 | **276** |
| Community Care budget funding packages of care, support, residential/nursing care for people suffering a functional mental illness services will include Community Support, Home Care, direct payments, supported accommodation, residential/nursing care and specialist placements | Mental Health Support   527 budgeted capacity for 2023/24 | Saving proposals include: £110k through managing provider fee uplifts taking into account the current market fee position; £102k by implementing the Target Operating Model and associated Admission Avoidance, ensuring all Extra Care and other block contract voids are effectively managed and filled throughout 2024/25.  Delivery risk: potential risks around provider failure / giving notice on services. Community Care budget is demand led. Delivery of the new TOM at Access Point is required by 01/04/2024. See EIA 10 | **212** |
| Assessment, Support and Intervention Team (SIT). Social Work teams delivering statutory duties under the Care Act to assess eligible needs, intervene where people are at risk to themselves, others or the community. Deliver statutory duties under the Mental Capacity Act, Mental Health Act Safeguarding Vulnerable Adults, Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoL's) | Section 75 Staffing teams Including:  Mental Health Homeless Team Assessment Treatment Service Living Well with Dementia Service Adult Mental Health Practitioners (AMHP) Crisis Resolution Home Treatment Team (CRHTT) Mental Health Management | No saving identified due to high pressure on service. | **0** |
| **S75 Sussex Partnership Foundation Trust (SPFT) Total** | |  | **488** |
| ***Integrated Commissioning*** | | |  |
| Commissioning & Contracts | Support to Carers | No saving identified due to cost avoidance provided by this budget. | **0** |
| Commissioning & Contracts | Adults Commissioning & Performance Team Executive Director Adult Services Safeguarding Team | Alternative delivery of absence management service. See EIA 11 | **28** |
| Commissioning & Contracts | Integrated Commissioning | Savings proposed include: £140k Public Health funding for UOK contract; £40k Community Transport contract - end current grant contribution to this service (See EIA 12); £10k Support with confidence contract - end funding. This is being picked up in the wider Direct Payments review and commissioning work (See EIA 13). £41k Sensory Support Contracts - end funding for these services (See EIA 14). | **231** |
| Commissioning & Contracts | Learning Disability Development Fund | No saving possible. | **0** |
| **Integrated Commissioning Total** | |  | **259** |
| ***Life Events*** | | |  |
| Life Events | Bereavement Services | No saving identified due to pressure on income budgets. | **0** |
| Life Events | Coroner Services | No saving identified due to additional costs expected from 2024/25. | **0** |
| Life Events | Registrars | No saving identified due to pressure on income budgets. | **0** |
| **Life Events Total** | |  | **0** |
| ***Public Health*** | | |  |
| Public Health | Ring-fenced Public Health Grant | Ring-fenced grant funding deployed as shown below. | **0** |
| Substance Misuse | Substance Misuse services |  | **0** |
| Sexual Health | Commissioning of sexually transmitted infection (STI) prevention and treatment, contraception, HIV prevention and advice services. |  | **0** |
| Children 0-19 Public Health Programmes |  | Cessation of recurrent Public Health funding for Free Swimming Scheme for 0-18s. Funding for continuing provision in 2024/25 and 2025/26 will be from the one-off Public Health reserve funding and the scheme will be reviewed in 2024/25. | **0** |
| Health Improvement |  | General Fund funding provided for Public Health will be discontinued and cost of programmes going forward will be met from Public Health ringfenced grant. | **171** |
|  |  | Cessation of Public Health funding for ASC Prevention contracts including Shopmobility and Disability Advice Centre. See EIA 12. | **0** |
|  |  | Reprofiling of demand-led locally commissioned services in NHS budgets to reflect current and future anticipated activity (no impact on current service provision). Recurrent funding for Healthy Pharmacy Scheme will be removed and funded from Public Health ringfenced budget reserve for 2024/25 and 2025/26 (no impact on service delivery during this period). | **0** |
| **Public Health Total** | |  | **171** |
| **Health & Adult Social Care Total** | |  | **4,712** |

**Economy, Environment & Culture**

**Budget Strategy and Savings Proposals 2024/25**

**Service Context**

The Economy, Environment & Culture directorate’s focus is on making the city a vibrant place where people want to live, visit and do business, and where the unique character of Brighton and Hove is celebrated and enhanced. This includes making the city an accessible and sustainable place where people are well-connected and can enjoy an attractive, well-maintained built and natural environment.

The directorate is driving the city’s progress towards achieving net zero carbon by 2030 and working with partners to create the right conditions for a prosperous Brighton and Hove by supporting local innovation, enterprise and investment. With a focus on providing reliable, well-run services to the public, as well as protecting and regenerating key assets, the directorate works to preserve the city’s resources for future generations and promotes pride in place.

This is achieved through delivering the following services:

**City Development & Regeneration**

City Development & Regeneration leads on many of the council’s built environment functions. The service shapes development in the city through the statutory plan making process, development management and building control to ensure good urban design and protection of heritage, as well as compliance with building regulations to ensure safety. Driving the city’s progress towards net zero by 2030, the focus is on delivery of high impact projects to address the effects of climate change and sustainable development, as well as major regeneration and investment projects, including development of new affordable homes through the Homes for Brighton & Hove joint venture and New Homes for Neighbourhoods Programme. The team leads on the council’s work with Greater Brighton and city partners to develop a flourishing and inclusive local economy that attracts sustainable investment and nurtures business and innovation.

* One of the top twenty busiest unitary authority Planning services in England, dealing with 3000+ applications and 600+ enforcement case each year
* 15 projects and 269 new council homes via New Homes for Neighbourhoods, with planning approval for 264 more homes and a further 100 homes in the pipeline.
* Planning consent granted for the Phase 1 restoration of Madeira Terraces as an outdoor visitor destination, including 28 of the historic arches.
* Managing the UK’s only urban UNESCO Biosphere Region covering 390km2 on behalf of the Living Coast Partnership.
* Engaging over 200 stakeholders in developing a citywide Economic Strategy for 2024-27 to grow a more thriving and inclusive economy, capitalising on the city’s comparative advantages.
* Supporting more than 1,700 entrepreneurs during 2023/24 (against a target of 750) through the Business & Intellectual Property Centre (BIPC) Sussex.

**City Transport**

City Transport develops clear plans to address the city’s current and future transport needs, working closely with Transport for The South East (TfSE) and other transport partners to delivers major highway infrastructure projects on key travel routes, such as Valley Gardens. A key priority is to maintain and improve the city’s transport network to transform user experience, increase resilience and extend the life of key highway assets, including managing the risks posed by flooding and protecting coastal highway structures. The service also ensures the city keeps moving though regulating road use, managing on-street and off-street parking and ensuring that all works are coordinated on the highway. Influencing people’s travel choices to reduce congestion and support improvements in air quality is also an important focus, providing sustainable transport options including enhancements in public transport, walking and cycling schemes, concessionary travel and an electric vehicle charging network.

* Managing highway infrastructure worth £4bn, including 624km of carriageway, 38km of cycle lanes and 1,200km of footways.
* Delivering a £28m Bus Service Improvement Programme.
* Issuing and enforcing approximately 4,000 skips, scaffold and tables & chairs licences on the highway.
* Monitoring air quality in 6 areas across the city where levels of nitrogen dioxide are too high.
* 350+ on-street electric vehicle charging points installed and 3 rapid charging hubs across the city.
* Monitoring 240+ CCTV cameras to manage traffic throughout the city.
* £9m+ invested in concessionary travel each year and 10,000+ concessionary bus passes issued.
* Managing 37,000+ resident parking permit accounts and 44,000+ on and off-street car park spaces.

**City Environmental Management**

City Environmental Management delivers recycling, refuse and street cleaning services to improve the cleanliness of the city and meet the council’s environmental obligations. This includes traded commercial, bulky and garden waste services to residents and businesses across the city. Through delivery of the Fleet Strategy the service is leading the decarbonisation of council vehicles and ensures they are well maintained and legally compliant. The service also manages and conserves the city’s parks and open spaces, including the delivery of the Stanmer Park Masterplan, and management of the city’s tree stock.

* Carrying out 5 million refuse collections and 2.5 million recycling collections each year.
* Providing power to fuel 25,000 homes a year from incineration of waste.
* Management and maintenance of 500+ council vehicles, including 66 electric vehicles.
* Maintaining and cleaning 700 miles of pavement.
* Maintaining 34 public toilet sites and delivering a £4.5m refurbishment programme.
* Issuing around 4,000 fixed penalty notices each year for environmental offences
* Managing 147 parks and gardens, 74 outdoor spaces, 8 cemeteries and more than 3,000 allotments.
* Maintaining 53 playgrounds and delivering a £3m playground refurbishment programme
* Managing more than 12,000 street trees and over 500 hectares of woodland.

**Property & Design**

Property & Design leads the council’s property strategy with an emphasis on investment that delivers new revenue streams from council assets, supports local businesses and enables city regeneration. It also supports the overall budget strategy through a corporate programme of operational and commercial disposals. The service manages the council’s property and land portfolio which includes operational assets such as council offices, town halls, heritage, schools and leisure centres, commercial properties, and agricultural farmlands. Maintaining operational buildings to ensure they remain safe and fit for purpose is a key function, as well as designing and delivering major capital re-development projects and programmes with a focus on sustainability and affordability. The team leads on the delivery of the City Downland Estate Plan to promote natural capital investment, support biodiversity and tackle climate change.

* Landlord to over 650 commercial urban buildings and over 1000 tenants.
* Managing 13,500 acres of City Downland Estate, including 78% farmland.
* Responding to over 11,000 repair requests each year on the council’s operational estate.
* Corporate Landlord to over 550 operational buildings.
* Delivering c.£6.5m of capital receipts per annum to contribute to the council’s Capital Investment Strategy and programme.
* Reduced co2 emissions on council’s corporate portfolio by 17.9% in 22/23.
* Ensuring that a school place is available in the city for every child that needs one.

**Culture, Tourism & Sport**

Culture, Tourism & Sport manages the city’s visitor economy assets including the Brighton Centre, seafront and the destination marketing service Visit Brighton to ensure the city remains a leading national and international visitor destination. It delivers an annual programme of varied and inclusive outdoor events to promote the city and manages partnerships with key culture providers, including the Royal Pavilion Museums Trust, Brighton Dome Brighton Festival, and the Keep, to ensure they have a diverse reach and contribute to the city’s economic ambitions. The service also leads the delivery of the council’s ten-year plan for revitalised sports facilities and manages investments in key leisure assets, including Kingsway to the Sea. Supporting artists and creative business in the city to flourish is also a key role of the service, facilitating inclusive communication, collaborative planning, and driving investment in cultural and creative industries.

* Sports facilities with over 1.5 million attendances in the city each year.
* Co-ordinating approx. 250 outdoor events each year, with over 1m attendees.
* Approx. 70,000 resident visits to the Royal Pavilion and Museums equating to 24% of the city’s population.
* Sharing resources and information with more than 1,600 creative businesses and artists in the city, and funding local creatives through grant schemes such as Exhale, as part of Brighton & Hove’s commitment to being an anti-racist city.
* 13 km of seafront, working 365 days per year with 200 properties under management.
* Brighton Centre delivering £50-£60m of economic impact for the city per annum and sells 250,000 tickets each year.
* Visit Brighton has 375 business partners, promoting the city to visitors and attracting high value conferencing.
* Tourism worth nearly £1bn economic benefit and supporting 17.5% of city jobs.

**Budget Strategy**

**Direction of travel**

The directorate fulfils a specific place making role for Brighton and Hove, leading the city towards achieving net zero carbon, building people’s pride in place and supporting the growth of a diverse and resilient economy. Key directorate objectives for 2024/25 include:

* Investing in a programme of high impact projects that will increase the city’s resilience to, and address, climate change.
* Working across the council and the city to support the transition to a circular and more equitable economy.
* Delivering key improvements to the council’s sports facilities in line with the Sports Facilities and Investment Plan.
* Developing a new sustainable local Transport Plan for the city.
* Implementing progressive service changes as part of the City Environmental Improvement Programme.
* Developing a new Cultural Strategy for the city.
* Embedding a new Economic Strategy for the city.
* Progressing the city’s major regeneration and infrastructure projects.
* Delivering new council homes and affordable homes through the New Homes for Neighbourhood Programme and Homes for Brighton & Hove joint venture.

To ensure the directorate can achieve its objectives the budget strategy focuses on reducing costs, maximising income and exploring alternative service delivery models, in particular:

* Delivering core services effectively and efficiently, pursuing all opportunities for collaboration, innovation and streamlining through improved use of technology, or bringing together areas of work, skills and expertise.
* Investing in services to modernise them for the future and ensuring we continue delivering the best for our customers whilst reducing running costs and lowering our carbon footprint.
* Adopting a more entrepreneurial approach to secure new sources of funding and maximise existing income streams.
* Making the best use of council assets, including disposing of premises where this is a viable option.
* Reviewing standards of service and exploring new partnerships or contractual arrangements to support service delivery, as well as opportunities to have community-le services.
* Supporting staff and their professional development to ensure the directorate has a diverse, resilient workforce and one with the relevant skills, knowledge and expertise to deliver its core objectives.

**Areas of Focus for Savings**

Savings for the directorate will be achieved through a mixture of commercial approaches to generating income, service redesigns and efficiencies, and changes in contractual arrangements.

Redesigning and increasing efficiencies in key business areas, including cityclean, parking, planning and sustainability. This involves reorganising staffing structures to streamline decision making. Further savings from the removal of vacant posts across transport, city parks, and property and design will enable these service areas to continue operating within a reduced budget, whilst meeting council priorities.

An uplift in parking fees and charges will help to maximise income whilst meeting traffic management objectives, including improving air quality, reducing demand and congestion, as well as achieving a higher turnover of spaces and supporting the local economy. Reviewing charges for traded waste services alongside marketing and extending these will also generate further income.

Taking a more entrepreneurial approach to leisure and tourism facilities and the sale of event/ commercial activity space in the city will increase revenues. Coupled with a review of the council’s agreements with its cultural partners and options to generate income from cultural consultancy in the planning process, income will be bolstered.

Savings will also be made from ending services that are no longer delivering a sufficient return and looking at opportunities to transfer assets out of the council to partners or communities.

A corporate disposal programme of operational and commercial assets will also support the budget strategy. Reviewing the council’s operational assets will continue to support changes in service delivery across the council, reducing spend on running costs, delivering potential capital receipts through the sale of vacant properties, and rationalising the council’s corporate offices. A review of commercial assets in conjunction with the One Public Estate agenda, working with other public sector organisations, will also release sites for regeneration or comprehensive redevelopment.

As a result of decommitted and delayed spend on capital projects the council’s capital programme will diminish, and budget savings on consultancy and professional fees will follow.

**Areas for investment**

* Long term capital investment to renew and strengthen the infrastructure of the city will continue, to ensure effective management of the highway network and improve air quality, along with the delivery of major regeneration projects to bring about quality new affordable housing and business space whilst generating income from land and property assets and increasing business rate and council tax returns.
* Continued investment in the development of new Council housing through the New Homes for Neighbourhood Programme and new living wage rent housing through the Homes for Brighton & Hove joint venture.
* Delivering major regeneration programmes to generate further revenues each year in new council tax and business rates.
* Investment in Seafront Infrastructure, including £12m investment in the eastern seafront at Black Rock and progressing the restoration of Madeira Terraces.
* Implementation of the new 10-year Sports Facilities Investment Plan, including progressing the delivery of a new Leisure Centre to replace the King Alfred.
* Delivery of £1.76m Shared Prosperity Funding to eligible local businesses or communities to improve pride in place and level up people's life chances.
* Implementing £9.5m of government Levelling Up funding for the £13 million regeneration of Kingsway to the Sea.
* Implementation of the City Downland Estate Plan with over 60 actions prioritised into a short-, medium- and long-term programme of projects, using natural capital and generating income.
* Continued investment in the city’s cultural assets.
* Delivery of the Royal Pavilion Estate Masterplan and £35m capital investment programme.
* Delivery of in the Local Transport Plan capital programme to deliver integrated transport projects and a maintenance programme of carriage and footway resurfacing works on the transport network.
* Continued investment in the city’s electric vehicle charging network utilising government grant funding.
* Continued investment in the Brighton Marina to River Adur coastal protection scheme in partnership with other Authorities and with significant investment from the Environment Agency.
* Investment in the city’s playgrounds, parks and open spaces including the Stanmer Park Master Plan restoration project.
* Investment into commercial asset to optimise income.
* Investment in energy efficiency measures for the council’s operational estate with further phases of the Solar PV and decarbonisation programmes on the council’s corporate buildings.
* Investment in the Fleet Strategy to progress the decarbonisation of the council’s fleet.
* Investment in the city’s tree collection to tackle the impacts of elm disease and ash dieback.
* £3m capital investment in the city’s public toilets.
* Continued investment in City Environment infrastructure and operational sites to improve the working environment and impact on the service’s carbon footprint.
* Investment in business systems to improve service performance and customer experience.

**Supporting the Council’s Priorities**

The directorate’s action plan and budget strategy can support the Council Plan priorities as follows:

**A city to be proud of: Investing in our city**

* Develop Brighton & Hove as a place where people want to live, work, and learn.
* Grow a diverse and sustainable city economy.
* Promote and protect what makes Brighton & Hove unique.

**A city to be proud of: An accessible, clean and sustainable city**

* Keep our city clean and manage waste.
* Work towards carbon net zero.
* Protect and enhance the city’s natural environment.
* Make it easier for people to move around the city.

**A fair and inclusive city: A city where people feel safe and welcome**

* Create safe public spaces that are accessible for all.
* Homes for everyone.
* Increase housing supply.

**A city that helps people to thrive: A better future for children and young people**

* Support the provision of high quality and inclusive education from early years through to adult learning.

**A responsive council with well-run services: Good governance and financial resilience**

* Good governance and financial resilience.

| **Section** | **Service Area** | **Brief Summary of Budget Proposal/Strategy and Risks** | **Total Savings Proposed 2024/25** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **£'000** |
| ***Economy, Environment & Culture*** | | |  |
| ***Transport*** | | |  |
| Head of City Transport | Head of City Transport | No saving identified but service will be reviewed as part of overall 'Organisational Redesign' principles. | **0** |
| Policy & Strategy | Policy & Strategy | Deletion of vacant Transport & Highway Development Manager post. Duties of the post will be redistributed within Traffic Management. The function is important for fulfilling the statutory highway authority role in the planning and development process. RISK: Will reduce technical capacity within the service. | **70** |
| Policy & Strategy | Policy & Strategy | Public Health contribution for active travel and road safety. | **2** |
| Policy & Strategy | Policy & Strategy | Delete a vacant SO1/2 Transport Monitoring & Research Officer post. RISK: Impact on the delivery and analysis of Parking and wider Transport consultations that is likely to affect the timetable for delivering projects/ service changes. | **47** |
| Transport Projects & Engineering | Transport Projects & Engineering | Capitalise the costs of the Streetlighting Manager. RISK: The council's capital programme is diminishing. Will create an in-year budget pressure if there are not projects to capitalise against. | **58** |
| Transport Projects & Engineering | Transport Projects & Engineering | Reduce support for extended bus services. Exploring funding from the Bus Service Improvement Plan to support the reduction. RISK: No Bus Service Improvement Plan funding guaranteed after 2026/27. See EIA 15. | **58** |
| Transport Projects & Engineering | Transport Projects & Engineering | Review and restructure resources focused on modal shift initiatives to deliver an efficiency. This will involve the deletion of a vacant Senior Project Manager post. RISK: Impact on ability to successfully access and deliver Capability grant funding. | **40** |
| Traffic Management | Traffic Management | Delete two vacant posts - Highway Enforcement Officer and Highway Inspector. RISK: Will reduce technical capacity in the service. | **86** |
| Parking | Parking | Increase all parking permits, on-street, and off street paid parking by on average 5% to maintain income in real terms. Allowing for impacts on demand, this provides £1.33m which meets the council's assumed inflationary target of 3.5%. RISK: Demand loss could be higher than projected which may lead to a budget pressure. A 5% increase reflects the level of demand loss in previous years following increased charges. | **n/a** |
| Parking | Parking | Increase all parking permits, on-street, and off-street paid parking by an additional 1% to increase on average by 6% overall. This accounts for £1.33m which is the 3.5% inflationary increase required, and also additional income of £190k.  RISK: Demand loss could be higher which may lead to a budget pressure. See EIA 16. | **190** |
| Parking | Parking | Parking permits - Remove Norton Road staff passes, increase dispensations from £100 to £150,and increase the price of a car club bay for companies to reflect the resident permit cost. RISK: Operational or financial impact on services that rely on dispensations to deliver an effective response. Complaints from residents, staff and car club company. See EIA 16. | **30** |
| Parking | Parking | Increase light touch parking schemes to a price nearer to full schemes (which will be frozen for 2024/25) to reflect the utilisation of parking spaces and generate £60k income per annum taking into account demand loss. Changes will require a notice of intention so could not be implemented until May. See EIA 16. | **60** |
| Parking | Parking | Introduce penalties for unauthorised bay suspensions. RISK: Further modelling of income deliverability required. May be difficulties in practically enforcing the penalty. See EIA 16. | **60** |
| Parking | Parking | Review of localised parking to generate additional revenues.  RISK: Could impact businesses, and resident and visitor patronage. See EIA 16. | **77** |
| Parking | Parking | Restructure Parking Services to ensure the structure and resource is in place to protect and maximise existing revenue streams, and explore new, innovative revenue areas to meet budgetary demands. This will reduce net staffing within the service with the aim of "delivering more with less" through improved workflow and processing. RISK: This may have some effect on customer service performance. | **200** |
| **Transport Total** | |  | **978** |
| ***City Environmental Management*** |  |  |  |
| Head of City Environmental Management |  | No saving opportunity identified. | **0** |
| City Clean | Collections | Service redesign in Cityclean collections as per below. RISK: Managing industrial relations through effective consultation and engagement is key to delivery. | **0** |
| City Clean | Collections | Efficiencies in Cityclean operations leading to a reduction in the use of agency staff. RISK: Reduced contingency resource to cover unplanned absence and other service disruptions. | **225** |
| City Clean | Collections | Management redesign in Operations. Includes a review of facility time staffing at the depot. RISK: Requires effective consultation and engagement with recognised unions. | **103** |
| City Clean | Collections | Delete vacant Driver Supervisor posts in Cityclean collections. RISK: Increased pressure on remaining resources. | **100** |
| City Clean | Public Toilets | Change public toilets opening hours to end early opening and enable single, daytime staff shifts. A service redesign will be required. This saving is based on alternative investment for Royal Pavilion Garden toilets pending the garden redevelopment and new facility. It also does not include opening the Level toilets, as these are to be part of The MacLaren Pavilion and operated by the cafe tenant. RISK: Impact on events in some public spaces near public toilets. See EIA 17. | **178** |
| City Clean | Trade Waste | Increase trade waste collection charges to deliver additional income.  RISK: May risk impacting existing customers and is dependent on market conditions. | **75** |
| City Clean | Garden Waste | Market and extend the garden waste collection service to expand the customer base and deliver additional income. RISK: Dependent on levels of demand. | **75** |
| City Clean | Street Cleansing | No saving opportunity identified. | **0** |
| City Parks | Operations | End school grounds maintenance contract. This would reduce the staffing costs by the equivalent of 2 fte gardeners.  RISK: Could increase costs for schools. | **30** |
| City Parks | Operations | No saving opportunity identified in 2024/25. | **0** |
| City Parks | Operations | Charge allowable staffing expenditure to Stanmer Park parking income. This will reduce the gardener resource that is funded from core staffing budgets. RISK: Reduces overall annual surplus for further investment at Stanmer Park. | **44** |
| City Parks | Operations | Transfer of Bowling Greens to clubs (or closure) to save maintenance costs. RISK: Subsequent loss of income from bowling greens. See EIA 18. | **10** |
| Fleet | Fleet | Introduce an accident reduction policy and training to limit accident damage to the council's fleet, aiming to reduce wear and tear and driver error. RISK: Dependent on resource to develop the policy and support changes to driver behaviour. | **10** |
| Fleet | Fleet | Reduction in fleet maintenance costs through use of an in-house brake and calibration machine and provision of commercial brake testing service. RISK: Dependent on demand and market conditions. | **25** |
| CEM Strategy and Service Improvement | CEM Strategy and Service Improvement | Deletion of a vacant Assistant Business Support Manager post. This saving is to offset a service pressure from introducing a new team which is essential to managing digital CityClean. RISK: Increased pressure on remaining business support resource and customer service levels. | **46** |
| CEM Strategy and Service Improvement | CEM Strategy and Service Improvement | Deletion of vacant posts in the CityParks Project Team. RISK: Increased pressure on remaining resources to deliver City Parks projects. | **80** |
| Waste PFI | Waste PFI (saving will be shown in Waste PFI and not revenue budgets) | Reduce household waste through circular economy and increasing recycling initiatives to reduce overall disposal costs. RISK: Dependent on a number of investment streams, national legislation and resident behaviour. Difficult to calculate potential savings due to a variety of external factors such as global recycling markets; success of behaviour change; inflation etc. | **100** |
| Waste PFI | Waste PFI (saving will be shown in Waste PFI and not revenue budgets) | Increase in energy income from the Waste PFI contract. £500k is assumed to be one-off at this stage but will be kept under review during 2024/25. | **1,200** |
| **City Environmental Management Total** | |  | **2,301** |
| ***City Development & Regeneration*** | | |  |
| Regen and Major Projects | Regen and Major Projects | Increase target for capitalisation of project support. RISK: Will create an in-year budget pressure if there are not sufficient projects to capitalise against. | **70** |
| International & Sustainability | International & Sustainability | Redesign the council's sustainability function to focus on achieving Net Zero by 2030 and prioritise the delivery of transformational projects. Also protect the unique natural environment of the UNESCO Biosphere. RISK: The Carbon Neutral Programme will be redesigned and biodiversity and climate adaptation work will reduce due to affordability constraints. Some staff will potentially be at risk of redundancy. | **200** |
| Planning | Planning | Restructure the Planning service to meet future needs. RISK: May result in impacts on performance in the short term and could affect investors' and developers' confidence in the city's planning system. This might see the service standards reduce and become 'just-acceptable'. Some staff will potentially be at risk of redundancy. | **380** |
| Planning | Planning | Increase planning fees by 25% in line with additional regulatory powers. RISK: Continuing fall in demand is likely to affect ability to achieve income, as reflected in service pressures. | **300** |
| Business Development & Customer Services | Business Development & Customer Services | No saving identified but service will be reviewed as part of overall 'Organisational Redesign' principles. | **0** |
| Economic Development | Economic Development | No saving opportunity identified for 2024/25. Service also needs to understand the implications of Local Enterprise Partnerships ending. | **0** |
| Director EEC | Director EEC | No saving identified but service will be reviewed as part of overall 'Organisational Redesign' principles. | **0** |
| **City Development & Regeneration Total** | |  | **950** |
| ***Culture, Tourism & Sport*** | | |  |
| Head of Culture, Tourism & Sport | Head of Culture, Tourism & Sport | No saving identified but service will be reviewed as part of overall 'Organisational Redesign' principles. | **0** |
| Arts Development | Arts Development | Restructure Arts Development team to provide a focus on Culture & Planning to oversee public art consultancy with developers, making a case for and managing S106/CIL culture investments in new developments, and leading work on Culture at Risk with Property/Regeneration/Planning.  RISK: Income not realised. | **15** |
| Museums and Culture | Museums and Culture | No saving in 2024/25 but potential savings in annual contributions to Royal Pavilion & Museums Trust due to a renegotiation of the service fee may be possible from 2026/27. | **0** |
| Museums and Culture | Museums and Culture | 5% reduction in the Council's contributions to the Keep RISK: Potential impact on scale / breadth of offer. The Keep would need to find other sources of funding. Saving is subject to negotiating a revised agreement. | **15** |
| Museums and Culture | Museums and Culture | Release of heritage legacy funds. | **355** |
| Tourism & Venues | Tourism & Venues | Increase Brighton Centre ticket levy from £1.50 to £2.00 (extra 50p on every ticket).  RISK: Facility fee cannot be increased beyond 2024/25 for at least 3 years to ensure it is well established and there is no negative impact on ticket sales. See EIA 19. | **25** |
| Tourism & Venues | Tourism & Venues | Reduction in subvention to the Brighton Centre. Shortfall will need to be made up through additional commercial activity or savings on expenditure budgets. RISK: Potential reduction in service quality and impact on the relationship with city partners and businesses. Need to ensure competitive rates and review this again in 2026/27. | **100** |
| Tourism & Venues | Tourism & Venues | Review longer term options for future delivery model of the Brighton Centre. Savings cannot be determined until full options appraisal is undertaken. Commercially sensitive and requires significant resources to undertake review and timelines/feasibility. | **0** |
| Tourism & Venues | Tourism & Venues | No saving opportunity identified for 2024/25. | **0** |
| Tourism & Venues | Tourism & Venues | No saving opportunity identified for 2024/25. | **0** |
| Tourism & Venues | Tourism & Venues | No saving opportunity identified for 2024/25 but a review of the Visit Brighton operating model is planned to consider future options. | **0** |
| Events | Events | Increase fees for filming in the city and explore an increase in targets for filming. RISK: Fees need to be competitive to attract film producers. | **35** |
| Events | Events | Increase income from brand activations across the city.  RISK: Demand for activation space does not meet projections. | **28** |
| Sport & Leisure | Sport & Leisure | Income from the introduction of a transfer fee as part of the new, standardised licence for beach hut owners payable to the council upon the sale of their beach hut. The new standardised licence arrangements, including the transfer fee, were agreed by the Culture, Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Economic Development Committee on 9 November 2023, following a period of consultation with beach hut owners. RISK: Anticipated income from the transfer fee is jeopardised by a reduction in the number beach hut sales See EIA 20. | **20** |
| Sport & Leisure | Sport & Leisure | Increased income from new lettings on the seafront from Sea Lanes and food beverage concessions. RISK: Fall in demand for concessions. | **40** |
| Sport & Leisure | Sport & Leisure | Introduce parking charges at Withdean Sports Complex car park. Income is shared with the leisure provider, Freedom Leisure. RISK: May impact resident and visitor patronage. May push car parking to on-street. | **20** |
| **Culture, Tourism & Sport Total** | |  | **653** |
| ***Property*** | | |  |
| Property & Design | Property & Design | Review of staffing and administrative support in line with 'Organisational Design' principles. RISK: Increased pressure on remaining resources. | **32** |
| Estates | Estates & Premises | Beech Cottage: Service-led relocation of Health & Adult Social Care team in occupation, which also delivers building-related savings on this budget line. Once vacant possession is obtained, options to relet or sell the property will be explored. RISK: Service-led dependency leading to delays obtaining vacant possession, delays in disposal, costs incurred in achieving both. | **10** |
| Estates | Estates | Bartholomew House: new tenant and heads of terms have been agreed for leasing of 3rd & 4th Floor Barts House. 2023/24 savings have been reprofiled for 2024/25 onwards. Savings are a combination of rent and occupational costs and will occur at start of 2024/25.  RISK: Turnover rent is based on 80% occupancy but may be lower and the service charge costs estimated, may be higher. Capital costs for building reconfigurations (shared with new tenant) may increase. | **310** |
| Facilities & Building Services | Print & Courier | Deletion of vacant Post & Courier hours. | **20** |
| Corporate Landlord | Corporate Landlord | Increased charge to Public Health for Corporate Landlord support. | **2** |
| Building Surveying & Utilities Management | Building Surveying - Planned Maintenance Budget | Capitalise £0.7m of the revenue Planned Maintenance Budget for one year using cash balances in lieu of borrowing until rates are favourable. RISK: An overspend on the capital budget will have an impact on the revenue Planned Maintenance Budget. | **700** |
| Building Surveying & Utilities Management | Fee income PPT269 | Reduce Building Surveying expenditure budget on consultancy including associated savings on Norton Road car park passes. | **168** |
| Building Surveying & Utilities Management | Fee income PPT269 | Reduce Building Surveying & Utilities Management team including deleting two vacant Building Surveyor posts and 1vacant Graduate Building Surveyor post. This will enable the team to cover their operational costs, subject to the removal of the current £323k income target service pressure that drives fee generation over and above the operating costs from internal clients. There are currently annual programmes of essential maintenance for all non-housing properties and statutory property requirements that will persist.  RISK: loss of fee earning potential due to possible reduction of central government funding for the educational capital programme. Saving dependent on service pressure funding. | **150** |
| Architecture & Design | Fee income PPT075 | Reduce the Architecture and Design team in line with a diminishing capital programme (incl. deletion of 2 vacant Architects and 3 vacant Architectural Technician posts) and establish the principle that all council departments shall seek to use the internal service as the first port of call before options to procure architecture and design services externally are explored. There is recognition that the Architecture & Design service represents cost avoidance for the council and added value. This will enable the remaining team to cover their operational costs, subject to the removal of the current £578k income pressure that drives fee generation over and above the operating costs. RISK: loss of fee earning potential, further reductions in capital programme and government grants. Reduction of in-house professional expertise. Saving dependent on service pressure funding. | **222** |
| Architecture & Design | Fee income PPT075 | Reduce Architecture and Design expenditure on professional fees. The need for consultancy should reduce as the council's capital programme diminishes and different construction procurement routes are explored and used. The costs largely relate to the Strategic Partnership which runs until September 2024.  RISK: Diminishing programmes and reduction in professional expertise. | **260** |
| Education Capital | In-house maintenance budget | Reduce the in-house maintenance budget for education capital. RISK: Will impact on statutory maintenance requirements. | **45** |
| **Property Total** | |  | **1,919** |
| **Economy, Environment & Culture Total** | |  | **6,801** |

**Housing, Neighbourhoods & Communities Directorate**

**Budget Strategy and Savings Proposals 2024/25**

**Services and Responsibilities**

The HNC Directorate includes the following services:

* Housing Management, the council housing landlord service comprising : Tenancy Services, including the Travellers Service; Housing Repairs & Maintenance; Housing Investment & Asset Management;
* Housing Needs & Supply (New Homes, Private Sector Housing, Temporary Accommodation, Supported [Commissioned] Accommodation, Homelessness and the Housing Register);
* Libraries and Information services, including the Business Intellectual Property Centre (BIPC);
* Safer Communities (Environmental Health, Licensing, Trading Standards, Emergency Planning, Prevent, ASB and Casework team and Domestic Violence services);
* Communities, Equalities & Third Sector.

The directorate focuses on the issues affecting neighbourhoods and communities, aiming to be a landlord of choice, develop closer and better relationship with communities, drive improvement in customer satisfaction and develop the council’s working with community and public service partners. In addition to the General Fund activities, much of the housing- related tenancy functions are funded by the ring-fenced Housing Revenue Account.

The directorate has responsibility for:

* Delivering landlord services to council housing residents and improving the quality, sustainability, health and safety of council homes;
* Increasing housing supply, supporting provision of additional council homes and development of other new affordable homes across the city;
* Improving the quality of private rented homes and delivering housing adaptations to help people live independently;
* Providing advice and support to reduce homelessness, and providing temporary & supported accommodation;
* Delivering statutory library services across the city and developing libraries as neighbourhood hubs;
* Supporting the third sector to support and empower the city’s communities, especially residents that fall below statutory thresholds for council support;
* Licensing many of the businesses in the city to sell alcohol, provide taxis, street trading;
* Providing environmental health services;
* Coordinating community safety including leading the council’s ‘Prevent’ agenda; the approach to anti-social behaviour and tackling domestic abuse and VAWG;
* Leading the equalities and inclusion agenda for the council ensuring fair and equitable services and outcomes for residents, and inclusive leadership and employment by the council;
* Improving customer satisfaction, complaints resolution and neighbourhood well-being across council services;
* Deepening the understanding across all services of city demographics and the practical measures to support communities of identity and place.

**Service Context**

**Housing**

Housing affordability is a major issue in the city, with Brighton & Hove becoming increasingly unaffordable for a significant proportion of the population, in particular those at risk of, or experiencing homelessness.

There are currently more than 17,900 social rented properties in the city. The council’s social landlord duties cover approximately 12,000 rented properties and 2,700 leasehold properties and the council remains the largest social landlord.

* Housing sees approximately 4,000 homeless households each year who need help with housing. Early intervention and prevention work is reducing levels of homelessness. However, levels of demand for assistance for homeless households are unprecedented in line with national trends. Numbers of households in temporary accommodation is high but the proportion of households where homelessness is not prevented is reducing;
* Currently license 2,100 Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) across the city;
* The Private Sector Housing team received 537 requests for assistance between April 2023 and December 2023;
* We are on target to achieve 283 new units of affordable council homes for 23/24;
* Annual HRA rents and service charges of £74m per year; let over 600 homes (639 in 2022/23) per annum, over 50 per month; deliver over 30,000 repairs annually, on average of over 2,500 repairs per month or 82 repairs every calendar day in normal circumstances;
* Average capital programme of around £57m a year improving homes over 5 years; Proposed investment in major and planned works to council homes of £102m over the next 3 years; Proposed investment in health & safety of council homes of £35m over the next 3 years; proposed investment of £58m in new homes over the next five years to 2028/29. However, there are likely to be new urgent investment requirements during this period.

**Libraries & Information Services**

The Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964 requires Local Authorities to deliver a public library service which is a ‘comprehensive and efficient’ service for all persons in the area who want to make use of it, to promote this service, and to lend books and other written materials free of charge. This aligns to our Corporate Plan objective of 'Investing in Our City' and will be delivered as part of our Libraries Strategy.

* Network of 13 libraries across the city;
* 93% of users tell us our library services are excellent or good;
* On target for over 1 million visits to libraries 2023-24. Pre Covid achieved 1.4 million visits;
* On target for over 1 million items loaned 2023-24. On target for over 400,000 e-audio, e-book and e-magazine loans in 2023-24On target for 1.5 million visits to library web pages 2023-24;
* 74% of all library transactions last year were online (i.e., joining, reservations and renewals);
* Volunteers will have contributed over 4,000 volunteer hours in 2023-24;
* Over 30,000 people will take part in libraries events, outreach and online activities in 2023-24;
* BIPC (Business and Intellectual Property Centre) Sussex has worked to deliver advice and information to businesses sand supported 1888 attendees in 2022/2023 (exceeding the target of 1002) and is on track to exceed targets again in 2023-24.

**Safer Communities**

Safer communities provides a broad range of services including environmental health and protection, licensing and trading standards, food safety services and emergency planning as well as services to directly support the community safety plan such as violence against women and girls services, anti-social behaviour casework, and the government’s Prevent and Channel programmes.

* Over 83% of the 3,200 food businesses in the city rated 3 or above on the national Food Hygiene Rating Scheme;
* Community Safety Casework Team, Anti-Social Behaviour and hate incidents –533 initial reports and enquiries dealt with between January and October 2023;
* 85% of people affected by domestic violence and abuse felt safe upon leaving refuge;
* 1,400 premises licensed venues and 278 gambling premises licensed in the city. 1200 licensed taxi drivers. 580 Hackney Carriage and 370 private hire vehicles licensed;
* Over 3000 noise complaints including both domestic and commercial requiring investigation in 2023;
* Obtained £104,000 worth of refunds and compensation for vulnerable consumers in 2023.

**Communities, Equalities & Third Sector (CETS)**

This team provides services squarely aligned to achieving the council plan’s objective of a fair, accessible and inclusive city, leading corporately on community engagement and collaboration, equality, diversity and inclusion and support to achieve a more sustainable, efficient and effective community and voluntary sector. All focused on achieving the council plan’s wider priorities of a city to be proud of, a health city where people thrive and a responsive council that listens to its communities and delivers positive result for the city.

* Supporting community and voluntary sector organisations, projects and action that promotes inclusion and provide opportunities for everyone to grow and thrive;
* Working alongside communities, listening and understanding their experiences and what needs changing, to tackle inequality and injustice, and alleviate hardship;
* Supporting services – strategically and operationally - to change and adapt to deliver better outcomes for people who fair worse in the city because of their identity, their background, their socio-economic status or where they live;
* Leading on strategic and systemic change through the delivery of the council’s Anti-Racism Strategy, and Accessible Strategy, and development of a new Gender Equality Strategy focusing on removing barriers, sometimes multiple, that exclude people from services;
* Collaborating with the community and voluntary sector and our public sector partners to continue as a City of Sanctuary and participant in government resettlement programmes, welcoming and supporting refugees and migrants to settle and thrive.

**Budget Strategy**

The council plan 2023 to 2027 sets out a vision for a better Brighton & Hove for all. We want to become a city we can all be proud of, somewhere that is fair and inclusive and a healthy place where people can thrive. We aim to be a responsive council with well-run services. With **Homes for Everyone** firmly stated as a council plan priority, **Housing Management** and **Housing Needs & Supply** are working to a goal of achieving improved housing quality, increased housing supply and improved housing support for residents.

A Housing Strategy is being developed, for consultation in March 2024, which will set out how we will achieve these. The draft strategic priorities being:

* Improve housing quality, safety and sustainability;
* Deliver the homes our city needs;
* Prevent homelessness and meet housing need;
* Support improved health & wellbeing for residents and communities;
* Provide resident focused housing services;
* Invest in building and fire safety to meet new duties under the Building Safety Act;
* Ensure the council complies with anticipated new social housing regulations;
* Complete post pandemic recovery including reducing backlog of housing repairs and the number of empty properties;
* Improve the energy performance of council homes through our capital works programme;
* Improve the sustainability of our housing stock;
* Optimise the local benefits and social value of our in-house repairs and maintenance service.

The Council’s Housing Revenue Account (HRA) comprises rental and service charge income from our tenants and leaseholders and funds our landlord services. This includes both capital investment in improving the housing stock and providing much-needed new affordable housing. The HRA budget proposals 2024/25 reflect significant legislative and regulatory changes impacting social housing landlords following the Grenfell Tower tragedy. This includes substantial investment being undertaken in relation to building, health and fire safety compliance and in anticipation of the strengthened role of Regulator of Social Housing, ensuring adherence to their Consumer Standards. The proposed budget also continues to support investment in new housing supply and sustainable homes as well as in the work of our Tenancy, Repairs & Maintenance and Housing Investment and Asset Management services on behalf of our tenants and residents. The HRA Capital Investment Programme supports programmes of work that are necessary to meet the new regulations now coming into force and the requirements of these with investment of £57.955m over the next five years.

The Housing General Fund budget is under pressure because of the level of homelessness demand and the rising costs of rented properties in the City impacting both on the availability of affordable homes and the length of time households stay in TA. There is also a need to improve the quality of housing in the private sector and in particular sustainability and work to support carbon reduction. Budget priorities align with the projects and requirements of the agreed Housing Committee Work Plan.

For **Libraries** the implementation of the Libraries Strategy 2022-25, in particular, the immediate priorities of increasing library usage, increasing income, and developing skills and confidence of staff and volunteers.

Libraries have already extensively modernised, reducing costs significantly while increasing accessibility for the public particularly though developing Libraries Extra unstaffed access. Savings were made in 2023-24 from closure of Mile Oak Library and a reduction in staffed days across the community libraries. A large proportion of the budget is linked to the grant funded PFI scheme which benefits from significant PFI grant funding and where savings have already been achieved. The service will continue to look at how costs can be kept down without adversely affecting services through use of new technologies. Income continues to be generated from the provision of conference rooms and the Booklover retail space in Jubilee Library and room rental in community libraries. These income sources are being extended with a pop-up shop in Hove Library and room rental in the BIPC producing additional income in 2024-25. There will be a further review of spaces and revised charges in conjunction with a substantial funding bid in 2024-25. The Jubilee Library PFI contract supports library revenue budgets because it attracts a government grant of £1.505M which effectively funds services across the city. A comprehensive external review of this was carried out in 2018 to ensure that it continued to deliver value for money. Jubilee Library, which is the fourth most visited public library in the country (CIPFA data 2019/20) also attracts a large amount of income which further supports library services across the city.

The bulk of the budget in **Safer Communities** is linked to statutory functions to provide a wide range of Environmental health and regulatory services. The Community Safety Strategy was approved in September 2020 and is updated annually with a focus on early action to prevent crime and disorder, issues that have the biggest impact on people, reducing fear crime and meeting victims’ needs. Demand for a range of community safety services from dealing with ASB to risks to community cohesion is increasing, and the new duties around tackling domestic abuse have also required the service to coordinate and collaborate with a wide range of partners.  
  
The regulatory services are still dealing with the backlog of work arising from the pandemic so is focussing on more efficient and effective working whilst both catching up on the work delayed and continuing to provide the full range of both statutory and non-statutory functions as required by the Council.

**CETS** is focussed on the impact of the cost-of-living crisis on the community and voluntary sector with a rise in demand on their services both in terms of number of and the increasing complexity of need of their beneficiaries, combined with challenging fundraising and income generation climate. With limited resources, the focus is on investing strategically in the third sector to help it survive and thrive and be able to support the most vulnerable residents in the city. Inequality issues have been exacerbated during the last year and there are a range of specific and complex impacts for communities. There is a need to respond by making more progress in bridging equality gaps with a particular focus on the experiences and concerns of Black and Racially Minoritised residents, refugees and migrants and making the city a more accessible and welcoming place. An Anti-Racism Strategy and an Accessible City Strategy were approved last year focused on making sustainable and systemic change over the next five years. A gender equality strategy will be developed over the next 12 months and the council will apply for re-accreditation as a City of Sanctuary.

**Areas of focus for savings**

**Housing Needs & Supply :** Phase 2 of the Homelessness Transformation Programme commenced in Q3 2023/24, and consultation on a new target operating structure will begin in February 2024. It is anticipated this would deliver £285k savings in 2024/25, while also improving the focus on homeless prevention and the consequent need to provide temporary accommodation.

The new commissioning cycle for the Single Homelessness Pathway has also provided the opportunity to review the services being delivered, in relation to need. These are non-statutory services. Only prioritising the elements that directly offer accommodation and/or have the greatest impact on reducing households in temporary accommodation has identified a further £521k of savings in 2024/25.

There remains a priority within Housing Needs to reduce the number of households in temporary accommodation, and (where provided) the cost of this and a substantial saving of over £1m will be required in 2024/25. A TA Strategy, incorporating actions to reduce households coming into TA; increase move-on from TA; improve rent collection in TA; secure better (cost) value TA; and reduce void turnaround is being worked to. However, this is within the wider national context of there now being more households in Temporary Accommodation than ever before, and unprecedented levels of demand.

We will progress a review of the arrangements with Seaside Homes to develop more cost-effective ways of providing temporary housing. And public consultation reviewing the existing Allocations Policy, is dues to commence in February 2024, with one intended aim being to increase incentives for households who do not take up Temporary Accommodation.

**Housing Management :**The HRA budget aims to balance the priorities of the council and its tenants and leaseholders and reflects a range of council policies and programmes on customer service, repairs and planned maintenance, capital investment in housing and engagement. There are no savings required in the HRA overall, however budget pressures in particular activities such as building, health and safety compliance works, means there will be impacts on other areas of the budget in the medium term.

**Libraries:** The immediate focus for savings is on efficiencies that will not adversely impact the services available across the extensive network of libraries in the city. Staffing is the highest area of spend for the service; a restructure of management levels and review of specialist IT roles will meet the savings targets for 2024-25. Developing the Libraries Strategy has provided a framework for future funding decisions, for instance where a library is not well used by the local community, consideration could be given to whether moving services to a nearby library or moving the library to a more accessible location for the public might better meet the needs of that community.

Further opportunities for income generation are being explored including co-working facilities and making better commercial use of space in all library buildings.

**Safer Communities:** Non-statutory services can provide savings but are closely linked to key Council priorities particularly in delivering the Community Safety Partnership strategy. A review of some of the non-statutory regulatory functions has identified some savings. There are some limited opportunities for efficiency savings and improvement to some income streams not limited by regulation or linked to economic recovery that will be reviewed.

**Communities, Equalities & Third Sector:** The majority of budgets in the service are associated with support to and grant funding of the third sector in the city and the wide range of services they provide. However, this is discretionary spend and therefore savings in these budgets have been identified for 2024/25 and future years. There are limited opportunities for efficiency savings.

**Investment in services**

Investment in **Housing** needs services will be needed to improve homelessness prevention, manage the TA service, identify move on accommodation and speed up moves within the housing stock to improve the customer journey and save money through more efficient use of the TA and permanent housing stock. Some of the changes required are being identified through the Homelessness Transformation Programme where investment has already started to have a significant impact on overall expenditure.

The new Housing strategy will inform investment needs in the medium term and there may be immediate investment needs arising from new policy initiatives such as the extension of PRS licensing schemes.

A strategy to improve, integrate and rationalise IT systems across housing is vital to meet services challenges including delivery of better repairs and maintenance services, transformed homelessness services and an efficient housing allocations service. This is being developed following an external review and will require investment over the next few years.

It will be important to align capital investment in new accommodation for TA use with a strategic approach to the TA placements and management functions and in the longer term, the strategic approach to providing new permanent homes. Investment to increase the TA stock directly managed or accessed by the Council has the potential to provide cost savings, through reducing emergency accommodation costs.

The **HRA** Capital Programme seeks to provide substantial investment in the council’s housing stock and improve the quality of homes for 2024/25 for which the total budget to be approved is £57.955m. The proposed programme will take account of significant investment required as a result of the implementation of the Building Safety Act and Fire Safety (England) Regulations, including in relation to works requirements expected to arise from compliance surveys currently being undertaken on Large Panel System (LPS) and some other blocks. The Programme reflects the delivery of health & safety, sustainability, planned maintenance, improvement programmes and major capital projects to council housing informed by a recent stock condition survey and ongoing surveys of the council’s housing stock. An updated Asset Management Strategy is currently being developed.

Investment in IT to automate systems for licensing may provide opportunities for future savings in **Safer Communities** services. Additional investment to coordinate work to deal with unauthorised encampments across the city would reduce costs and delays in dealing with this problem and combining enforcement functions is being rolled out. Investment in the Emergency planning may be required as with fewer than 2 FTE there are increasing demands, for instance with both summer and winter preparedness planning, more severe weather crises, a growing number of threatened health emergencies (Covid 19, Monkey pox, avian flu) increased business continuity planning requirements and wider resilience activities. A review of this function is underway.

Investing in **Library** community spaces would both enhance the community hub role of the city’s extensive library network and increase rental income generation potential. The success of a bid for substantial government grant investment to provide a co-working business based at Jubilee would provide the basis for a new approach in income generation.  
  
Options for investing in **CETS** include:

* + Step change improvement in the capture and application of equality data, embedding a high quality process as standard practice across key council services to help services ‘get it right first time’
  + improve the co-ordination of refugee, migrant and asylum seeker work across the council to deliver better outcomes for the people and reduce wasted time and effort by services
  + Pilot a corporate engagement team to design and deliver high quality engagement for council services to remove burden on frontline services and improve council’s reputation.

**Supporting the Council’s Priorities**

**A city to be proud of.**

* Develop strategies and business cases to provide genuinely affordable homes
* Improve access for disabled people to services and the housing estate
* Increase participation in civic and community life through neighbourhood engagement and participatory strategies
* Tackle crime and antisocial behaviour in our city

**A fair and inclusive city.**

* Taking a leading role in increasing equality and inclusion in the council and across the city’ and ‘challenge inequality in the city and within the council’
* Promote a City Equalities Standard together with our partners to promote fair employment practice to tackle the under representation of people from BME communities and disabled people
* Supporting the international refugee crisis through driving delivery of the recommendations of the international migrant needs assessment, participation in the global refugee programme and continuing to be an asylum seeker dispersal area
* Improve council housing quality and sustainability
* Make better use of existing housing capacity

**A healthy city where people thrive.**

* Improve private rented housing quality and sustainability
* Reduce homelessness and rough sleeping

**A responsive council with well-run services.**

* Develop more customer-focussed and responsive housing advice and homelessness service
* Improve customer contact systems throughout the directorate
* Provide more accessible information on key services for residents
* Continue to monitor and improve customer responses
* Ensure equalities data is monitored and informs service improvement

| **Section** | **Service Area** | **Brief Summary of Budget Proposal/Strategy and Risks** | **Total Savings Proposed 2024/25** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **£'000** |
| ***Housing, Neighbourhoods & Communities*** | | |  |
| ***Housing General Fund*** | | |  |
| Housing Services | Executive Director HNC and Business Support | No saving identified but service will be reviewed as part of overall 'Organisational Redesign' principles. | **0** |
| Housing Services | Housing Service wide saving | Service redesign - a new staffing structure is being designed as part of the Homelessness Transformation Programme. A 5% saving will be factored in, but at this stage there is uncertainty as to what impact this will have on staffing as it will be dependent on redesign and consultation. It is anticipated the impact could be approximately 13 FTE although 4 FTE are currently vacant. Incorporating other vacancies across the service should further minimise the risk of redundancies. See EIA 21. | **285** |
| Housing options | Homelessness - Housing Options and Homemove - supporting vulnerable households | Proposed savings will be part of the wider service redesign above. | **0** |
| Temporary Accommodation & Allocations | Temporary Accommodation (TA) | Proposed savings will be part of the wider service redesign above. | **0** |
| Temporary Accommodation & Allocations | Temporary Accommodation (TA) | Use of 20 vacant HRA properties for short term TA, saving on higher leasing costs. | **70** |
| Temporary Accommodation & Allocations | Temporary Accommodation (TA) | Reduction in TA numbers with a range of measures to convert TA placements into settled accommodation. | **623** |
| Temporary Accommodation & Allocations | Temporary Accommodation (TA) | Reduction in TA costs, by providing accommodation in the private rented sector (PRS). Landlord incentives will be less than the current costs of TA. . | **453** |
| Supported Accommodation | Commissioned Services for Single Homeless, including specialist services for Rough Sleepers | Review and reduce the range of services commissioned through Supported Accommodation. See EIA 22. | **521** |
| Housing Strategy & Development | Housing Strategy & Development - enabling & delivering increased housing supply & quality. | Proposed savings will be part of the wider service redesign above. | **0** |
| Private Sector Housing (PSH) | Private Sector Housing & Integrated Housing Adaptations Service - improving housing quality in private rented homes, enabling accessibility & supporting independent living across all tenures. | Review of how staff costs are recharged to the HRA and the capital programme (incl. Disabled Facilities Grant). | **50** |
| Travellers | Travellers | Reduced security costs. | **40** |
| **Housing General Fund Total** | |  | **2,042** |
| ***Libraries*** | | |  |
| Libraries | Library PFI | No saving opportunity identified in 2024/25 but the PFI is closely monitored for future opportunities. | **0** |
| Libraries | Staffing and operational costs | Library service restructure including deletion of the equivalent of approximately 3.8 FTE posts and changes of grading for some roles. Consultation and engagement will be undertaken with the aim of implementing by April 24. | **129** |
| Libraries | Bookstart | Bookstart offer no longer managed by Library Service - remaining budget not required. | **3** |
| Libraries | Income Generation | No savings identified as the service is currently not meeting income targets in most areas. The service is working to increase income from room rental, conferencing and the Booklover retail spaces, to offset the challenge of standard library charged services reducing (e.g. DVD and CD rental, PC use and printing) | **0** |
| **Libraries Total** | |  | **132** |
| ***Communities, Equalities & Third Sector*** | | |  |
| Communities and Third Sector | Communities and Third Sector Development Commission | No Inflation uplift to be provided and a reduction in the spend on the Third Sector Commission of 10% in 2024/25 (subject to appropriate notice being given). See EIA 23 | **205** |
| Communities and Third Sector | Community engagement team (GF proportion) | Increase funding of 1 x Sc 5 officer to 100% HRA funding. | **10** |
| Communities and Third Sector | Communities Fund | Cessation of the Communities Fund due to affordability constraints. See EIA 24. | **302** |
| Communities and Third Sector | Equality & Cohesion & Head of Service | 25% recharge of Head of service to the grant funded resettlement programme. 25% reduction in initiatives budget, and voluntary reduction of the 3 FTE posts in the service to 30 hours thereby reducing staffing costs. | **64** |
| Communities and Third Sector | Healthwatch | No Budget saving available - contract at minimum price. | **0** |
| Communities and Third Sector | Refugee grant programmes | No saving opportunity identified as the service is wholly funded by ringfenced government grant. | **0** |
| **Communities, Equalities & Third Sector Total** | |  | **581** |
| ***Safer Communities*** | | |  |
| Safer Communities | Environmental Health & Licensing | Increased license fees as per the report to committee 12/10/23. See EIA 25. | **20** |
| Safer Communities | Environmental Health & Licensing | Cessation of pest control service as it does not recover costs. See EIA 26. | **38** |
| Safer Communities | Prevent | No saving opportunity identified for 2024/25 | **0** |
| Safer Communities | Environmental Protection | No saving opportunity identified for 2024/25 | **0** |
| Safer Communities | Trading Standards | No saving opportunity identified for 2024/25 | **0** |
| Safer Communities | Civil Contingencies | No saving opportunity identified for 2024/25 | **0** |
| Safer Communities | Reducing Violence against Women and Girls Commissioning. (VAWG) | Economies through a review of commissioned services for Domestic Violence. See EIA 27. | **120** |
| Safer Communities | Casework Team | It is proposed to stop funding of 3rd Party Reporting Centres. See EIA 28. | **60** |
| **Safer Communities Total** | |  | **238** |
| **Housing, Neighbourhoods & Communities Total** | |  | **2,993** |

**Governance, People & Resources (GPR)**

**Budget Strategy and Savings Proposals 2024/25**

**Service Context**

The Governance, People & Resources (GPR) Directorate provides a full range of support service functions together with front line services including local land charges, welfare support, housing benefit administration, and tax collection and administration.

The GPR Directorate’s vision is to enable a well-run council and its mission is to: ‘**Provide trusted services to all customers, councillors and staff to enable the council to deliver strategic and operational priorities through optimising resources and ensuring robust governance.**’

Support Service functions operate at both a service level, providing essential business support to front-line services, and at a corporate level supporting the council to meet statutory obligations, maintain strong governance and stewardship, and develop effective strategic plans and tactics. This means operating as a ‘Strategic Business Partner’ to the council and its service directorates and supporting them through complex changes by being involved in the development of options and their evaluation, through to decision-making and supporting implementation.

Key metrics for the Governance, People & Resources Directorate are as follows:

**Corporate Communications and Public Relations**

* A public and internal service that communicates information and other content about the council, it’s decisions, policies, priorities and services, to enable the council’s role as a civic leader, public service provider and employer.
* Provides a statutory “warning and informing” crisis communications service, working in partnership with emergency services to keep staff, residents and communities prepared and supported before, during and after major incidents and build greater community resilience.
* Manages the council’s communication channels with communities and supports delivery of council policy and services through informing, marketing, campaigning, consulting, brand management, media relations and reputation management. Internal communications and engagement that drives organisational change, supports the leadership to reach and communicate to staff, builds employee engagement with council priorities, provides staff with the news and information they need and promotes strategic initiatives to deliver the council’s People Promise including recruitment and retention activities.
* Graphic design and branding to manage the council’s identity so that services are clearly recognized, creating powerful, visual, branded content that stands out and reaches audiences across a range of media.
* Digital content design to publish essential information across our digital platforms, enable customer access to digital services on our website and intranet, ensure compliance with digital accessibility legislation and support council wide and service digital transformation
* Consultation, engagement and public affairs. Designing interactive and creative processes to gather an understanding of peoples’ needs and views and building advocacy and influence.

**Democratic Services, the Civic Office and Electoral Services**

* Co-ordination and administration of a transparent, legally compliant, democratic decision-making process.
* The co-ordination of support to Members including training & development.
* Administering of School Appeals, which can range from 300-500+ in a year.
* The Members’ Allowances Scheme and support to the Independent Remuneration Panel.
* The Civic Office co-ordinates support to the Mayor, ensuring that all Civic engagements are managed effectively.
* Electoral Services provide end-to-end management of local elections with a primary aim of delivering safe and compliant elections & referendums.

**Finance and Internal Audit & Counter Fraud**

* Finance, including the statutory Section 151 Chief Financial Officer role, oversees the delivery of the council’s Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) and annual budget setting process and delivers the Targeted Budget Management (TBM) process in order to monitor budgets on an ongoing basis. It also produces the annual Financial Statements and supports the external audit process.
* Finance supports the 5 service directorates including over 250 budget managers, as well as 66 schools, and provides Treasury Management for over £200m cash balances and associated investments and over £0.5 billion money market transactions, and annually procures and negotiates over £1.8 billion insurance cover through premiums (£1.6m p.a.).
* Internal Audit & Counter Fraud (an Orbis Partnership service) provides over 1,000 audit days for circa 50 internal audit reviews providing assurance to management and the authority. It is a highly integrated Orbis function that includes specialist support in areas of counter fraud and IT audit.

**Human Resources & Organisational Development (HROD)**

* HROD provides services to around 9,000 staff across the council and in schools, including a comprehensive advisory, development and policy service to 750 people managers and 66 schools in the City;
* Delivery of ‘Our People Promise’ which includes the council’s development offer for staff, and aims to help improve the council’s performance;
* Health & Safety advice and support for all council services and schools;
* Provides support for developing and managing industrial relations including pay and policy negotiations;
* Provides support for developing and managing HR policies and processes including supporting grievance, capability and absence management procedures.

**IT & Digital (Orbis Partnership Service)**

* Maintains and supports the mission critical underpinning IT infrastructure used to run back-office services and deliver services to residents. This includes the management and procurement of devices (e.g., laptops), software (e.g., Microsoft O365), network connectivity, telephony (mobile, contact centre and office), data centre and data storage services, Always on VPN (AOVPN remote access) and other contracts;
* Supports the day-to-day provision use of hardware, software and IT applications;
* Provides cyber resilience through the procurement and use of cyber monitoring and filtering technologies, as well, as the provision of secure remote connection that enables remote access to council systems and data;
* Provides traded IT support and training services to schools in the City of Brighton and Hove;
* Delivers projects and programmes to support the adoption of new IT and digital capabilities to enable service improvement and improved resident experience;
* Support the council’s adherence to IT and data regulation and compliance standards including GDPR (General Data Protection Regulation), FOI (Freedom of Information) and PSN (Public Service Network) code of connection services.

**Legal Services**

* Provides legal advice and representation across all of the council’s functions as well as the Monitoring Officer function;
* Supports statutory adult and children’s safeguarding functions through the management of all Council Care, Court of Protection and Coroner Court proceedings;
* Supports the statutory enforcement functions of the Council through prosecution proceedings in the Criminal and Civil Courts (including Anti Social Behaviour, Blue Badge, Trading Standards and environmental breaches);
* Protects the Council from challenge, for example in relation to homelessness, housing & health & safety, employment and judicial review;
* Delivers commercial legal advice across property, procurement & planning & highways functions generating approx. £600k per annum of external income
* Supports the good governance of the council through advice to Members, officers and committees and manages the investigation and reporting of complaints under the Code of Conduct for Members;
* Achieves efficiencies through membership of the Orbis Public Law collaborative partnership.

**Customer, Modernisation & Performance Insight**

* Drives continuous improvement and efficiency across the organisation to support strong corporate governance, minimise the adverse impact of financial challenges on customers, avoid costly mistakes and better protect the council’s reputation.
* Manages the statutory responsibility for ensuring objective resolution of customer dissatisfaction and takes the strategic lead in improving customer experience
* Processes approx. 2,200 Stage 1 complaints and 1,400 compliments and investigates approx. 210 Stage 2 complaints and assists the Ombudsman with approx. 100 cases.
* Managed the statutory responsibility for ensuring compliance with requests from external customers in relation to Freedom of Information (FOI), Subject Access Requests (SAR) and data breaches.
* Processes approx. 1700 FOI requests, 230 SAR requests, 700 disclosures, 260 data breaches
* The Performance Team drives the corporate and directorate planning and monitoring processes covering 5 Directorate Plans and 60 Corporate Key Performance Indicators.
* Manages the council’s Risk Management Framework which currently includes strategic and directorate level risks.
* Production of the statutory Annual Governance Statement (AGS) evidencing effectiveness of corporate governance.
* Manages and co-ordinates support for around 20 corporate modernisation projects and programmes across the organisation.

**Policy, Partnerships & Scrutiny**

* Leads on the creation and implementation of Council wide strategies and plans, including the Corporate Plan and Business Framework.
* Plays a key role in developing, guiding and internally promoting key strategies such as the Economic Strategy, Housing Strategy, Employment & Skills Plan, Local Transport Plan, and Carbon Neutral 2030 programme.
* Acts as a liaison between the Administration and officers to drive policy development on behalf of the council’s Administration and provides research, analytics and policy development support to directorates, for example, through the Corporate Policy Network and Policy Bulletins.
* Enables city-wide engagement with key partners including through running the City Management Board and Brighton & Hove Connected, through relationship management, events, and partnership development support, in addition to running thematic partnerships (such as the Transport Partnership and Health & Wellbeing Board) - supporting the council to be more outward facing.
* The Scrutiny function leads on the statutory health scrutiny function (HOSC).

**Procurement (Orbis Partnership service)**

* Supports procurement of goods and services to the value of approximately £300m per annum;
* Supports circa 250 contract managers together with Legal Services including the provision of targeted contract management support for higher risk contracts;
* Supports the development of procurement strategy and policies including sustainability, Environmental, Social & Governance strategy, social value and modern slavery;
* Manages and authorises waivers of Contract Standing Orders;
* Supports the Member Procurement Advisory Board to scrutinise significant procurements and consider procurement route options.

**Welfare, Revenues & Business Support (WRBS)**

The Welfare, Revenues & Business Support (WRBS) service has a wide range of internal and external customers, including many vulnerable and low income households, but is also of strategic importance.

* Provision of strategic support and policy development for responding to welfare reforms, as well as direct delivery of local welfare support, assistance and advice;
* Collection and recovery of £164m Council Tax (and Council Tax Reduction Scheme);
* Collection and recovery of £104m Business Rate income;
* Processing of £113m Housing Benefit claims and managing the transfer to Universal Credit;
* Collection and recovery of Housing Benefit Overpayments;
* Developing and improving the council’s Corporate Debt Policy and approach to debt recovery and collection, with a greater focus on pre-enforcement support and advice, debt prevention, welfare rights and financial inclusion;
* Collection and recovery of Adult Social Care and Sundry Debts (Business and Personal) (Accounts Receivable);
* Payroll services to over 9,000 staff across the council, schools and other external organisations;
* Processing over 200,000 payments to the council’s suppliers and providers (Accounts Payable);
* Provision of banking, purchasing card and urgent payment services and the management of corporate financial information systems.

Many of the services above are also involved in providing a wide range of traded or contracted services to schools, South Downs National Park Authority, the Coast to Capital LEP, Worthing & Adur Councils, East Sussex Fire & Rescue, Horsham District Council and others which generate significant incomes.

**Budget Strategy**

**Direction of Travel**

The directorate’s budget strategy will continue to adopt the strategies below in an attempt to meet an increasing volume and complexity of demands efficiently and effectively. However, this is increasingly requiring effective demand management, which is generally managed through prioritisation and risk stratification.

* The WRBS service brought together the Revenues & Benefits service with the Business Operations service following the latter’s withdrawal from the Orbis Partnership on 1 April 2022. The bringing together of the services under WRBS has progressed reasonably well but current recruitment and retention issues are creating an additional challenge together with the enormous additional demands placed on the service including distributing Energy Boost payments, managing distribution of Household Support Funds and being the primary hub supporting hardship support and the Homes for Ukrainians programme.
* All services continue to explore further opportunities for collaboration, innovation and efficiency through improved use of technology, closer working with other directorates to design improved customer journeys and experience and exploring opportunities to bring services or skills together.
* Similarly, continued implementation of systems developments, automation and digital services to improve customer service and deliver potential efficiencies. In particular, GPR has embarked on a major procurement process for the replacement of the council’s Corporate Information Systems (e.g. HR, Finance, Payroll, Procurement) which is expected to be concluded in spring 2023 with implementation of new systems by April 2025.
* Continued investment in enhanced Business Partnering skills and ongoing realignment of the workforce skill mix to support the aim of being an effective Strategic Business Partner to the organisation.
* Utilising external peer challenge and reviews (at corporate and service level) to assist the authority in identifying strategic opportunities for improvement.
* To deliver debt prevention, welfare reform and cost of living responses that minimise the financial and administrative costs of supporting financial vulnerable households across all council services.
* Continued focus on maintaining and, where possible, increasing external income streams including renewal of contracts to existing customers including South Downs National Park and East Sussex Fire & Rescue Service alongside the pursuit of new income streams from other authorities. However, this must not be at the expense of service quality to the council and its residents and customers.
* Investing in a new case management system to secure ongoing ability to work remotely, efficiently and sustainably.
* Recruiting new trainees, apprentices and internships to mitigate the challenges of recruiting qualified professional staff.

**Areas of Focus for Savings**

**All Services:** Services continue to explore opportunities to generate income and contribute to corporate overheads. Services are already provided to Adur & Worthing Councils, South Downs National Park, schools and other authorities. Bidding for new work has to carefully balance the value of the income generated with the potential impact on capacity to support the council.

**Corporate Policy & Communications:** The Policy & Communication teams have undergone respective restructures to reduce team size to meet budget cuts. Further savings will be made which will reduce the level of support that can be provided to services and limit the ability to meet the council's partnership, communication and engagement ambitions. The Policy team will deliver further savings to the organisation through developing plans and strategies for service areas that would otherwise be out commissioned to consultants at a higher cost. The Communications team will deliver further savings to the organisation through managing a single online engagement platform for the council, in place of service areas commissioning separate systems.

**Procurement:** This Orbis service is implementing a modernisation programme aimed at stratifying (banding) support to procurement projects based on size, complexity and risk as well as creating specialist services to improve efficiency and collaboration including a central policy team, the Sourcing Solutions team managing lower value commissions, and a Procurement Hub able to flex resources to support customer departments. Additional contract management resources were previously approved and provide targeted support to contract managers for higher risk contracts and develop the procurement approach to Community Wealth Building.

**Welfare, Revenues & Business Support (WRBS):** Continued roll-out of the Universal Credit caseload to the DWP and continued investment in digital customer developments and automation are required to support the achievement of efficiencies in this service which will accelerate over the next 4 years subject to no further delays to the transfer. The impact of the cost of living has been very significant on the service which has administered vouchers and hardship funds for the city funded from Household Support Fund tranches, which will continue in 2023/24.

The withdrawal of the former Business Operations service from the Orbis Partnership on 1 April 2022 created a significant cost pressure due to the disaggregation of some integrated posts and services, and the need to address unachieved Orbis Business Plan savings. This budget pressure will need to be addressed in the 2023/24 General Fund budget but in the longer term, bringing together Business Operations and Revenues & Benefits services is expected to generate efficiencies through improved use of digital and application technologies to reduce costs and improve customer service over the medium term, particularly with the implementation of replacement corporate systems in 2025.

**IT&D:** Further contractual savings are sought in all re-procurements undertaken by IT&D across the Orbis Partnership. Opportunities for joint procurement and licensing are explored and waivers are used judiciously to align contract expiries to facilitate this. However, the historic under-investment in IT infrastructure, devices, network upgrades and access security have added significantly to IT&D costs while there is a need to continue investment in digital developments and platforms, the wide area network (Link replacement) and major corporate systems. These and other investments require step increases in funding to be provided within the Medium Term Financial Strategy and therefore the aim of the service is to minimise these increases through the actions above.

**Legal, Finance and HR Services:** These services are under considerable pressure due to the high level of change and business activity across the organisation which is increasing year-on-year driven by growing financial pressures across services, significantly increased industrial relations activity, and new or strengthened legislation requiring legal support and casework. The services will continue to use demand management tactics such as restricting legal involvement to more complex or high risk issues and automating processes wherever possible, stratifying support to more complex or higher risk areas of work, and reducing failure demands (non-valued added processes). There is also continued exploration of opportunities to increase in income from external work but bidding for new work has to carefully balance the value of the income generated with the potential impact on capacity to support the council. These services will also introduce ‘vacancy factors’ recognising historic turnover and recruitment trends.

**Customer, Modernisation & Performance:** It is proposed to review the service based on priorities and customer demand which will enable compliance within the information rights team. A significant element of the service is not core funded, being supported by the Modernisation Fund.

**Areas for Investment**

Investment in ‘Our People Promise’ and the supporting development activities and actions are proposed to be maintained in 2023/24 utilising capital receipt flexibilities through the Modernisation Fund. This funding is inclusive of £0.120m that funds the Policy, Pay and Reward team.

As noted earlier, substantial investment in IT&D and the Digital Strategy will be required and this will ultimately require step increases of £0.500m per annum in financing costs and for increases in IT&D revenue budgets to be built into the council’s Medium Term Financial Strategy. However, this may be funded through the Modernisation Fund in the short term subject to available recurrent revenue resources. This will cover necessary upgrades to the IT infrastructure, equipment replacement programmes, re-procurement of the Wide Area Network (The Link), funding for the digital development function, and licensing of major application suites (e.g. Office 365).

Expert advisory was commissioned to help the council review and determine the future of its corporate information systems including the Financial System and the HR/Payroll system. The review concluded that the systems (well over 10 years old) are not fit for purpose and that replacement with an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system (highly integrated systems) would be likely to provide the best solution and opportunities for efficiencies in future. However, the cost v benefit of an ERP need to be assured and therefore other ‘best of breed’ options will be kept open through the procurement process which has commenced and will be resourced through capital investment, including through to implementation of any procured replacement.

The recent decision by Orbis Partners to withdraw Finance, Business Operations and HROD services from the Orbis partnership will require additional investment to re-create sovereign functions in BHCC. The 2023/24 budget includes an estimated £0.700m additional cost due to the disaggregation of integrated services, sharing of unachieved Orbis Business Plan savings, and other losses due to disintegration of management structures, and reduced economies of scale. However, it should be noted that the Orbis Partnership has generated cashable savings of £12m over the last 3 years which were highly unlikely to be achievable from outside of the partnership.

Legal Services is struggling to recruit qualified staff into new roles and has been unable to recruit to a number of lawyer roles resulting in high locum costs. A recently approved Market Supplement will cost around £0.400m but will ensure the council is able to recruit and retain skilled legal expertise across a number of fields including children’s legal work, contract law, employment law and democratic and constitutional matters.

More generally and where appropriate, GPR services will develop business cases for invest-to-save support from the Modernisation Fund where these can help the directorate modernise its services to improve customer satisfaction, improve efficiencies and/or achieve financial savings.

During 2024-25 the Policy & Communications team will conduct a strategic review of income generation opportunities.

**Supporting the Council’s Priorities**

GPR services support and facilitate other services to deliver against the 4 Council Plan priorities, including the aim of being a responsive council with well-run services at both a strategic and operational level. Helping the council to develop robust financial strategies, workforce plans, digital customer strategies, conduct effective communication, engagement and partnership working, and effective welfare reform responses is critical to maintaining sustainable, financially resilient and accessible council services.

A key determinant of the demands placed on GPR services is therefore the level of change experienced across the organisation. This has been and remains at very high levels due to the cumulative effect of the growing financial challenges in local government requiring ever greater innovation in everything from digital services to corporate debt management to financing strategies that help resources and services go further. This creates a tension between the need to provide cost effective support functions while ensuring that the council and its services have the support to make sound business judgements and decisions that minimise legal, financial, employment, equality, health & safety, governance, internal control and other risks. Evidence of growing risks and poor mitigation of risks, as seen elsewhere, usually leads to reputational issues and ultimately service delivery failure as well as external audit and other scrutiny or challenge.

The escalation of the cost of living and welfare support are also a major part of the directorate’s work at all levels and are becoming increasingly complex, leading to a fundamental re-think of how to provide debt prevention, and responses to welfare reform and cost of living impacts to maximise their strategic and operational impact. This has become particularly apparent during the pandemic, and now the cost of living situation, which have inevitably exacerbated inequalities but have resulted in a very effective welfare and emergency assistance response supported by the Welfare, Revenues & Business Support service and other professionals.

GPR services underpin the authority’s governance framework, ensuring safe and legally compliant decision-making, as well as maintaining reviewing and improving the council’s internal control environment. Advisory and Business Partnering services within Finance, HR, IT&D and Procurement help the organisation to maximise its use of resources, fully evaluate options, avoid costly fines, mistakes or non-compliance occurrences, and thereby deliver cashable and non-cashable savings or cost-avoidance. Similarly, Programme Management resources ensure effective oversight and delivery of major improvement programmes funded by the Modernisation Fund or Capital Investment.

These services are integral to front line delivery and work best when operating as a trusted Strategic Business Partner as part of both corporate and directorate management teams’ roles in developing strategic responses and solutions for delivery.

**A city to be proud of**

* The Policy team supports the development of underpinning plans and strategies, such as the Housing Strategy and Economic Strategy.
* The Communications team plays a key place-shaping role in delivering this outcome including priority areas such as waste minimisation, promoting sustainability, publicising and consulting on regeneration and major developments, promoting cultural events and city travel.
* The directorate will play a key role in reviewing potential re-financing options for Seaside Homes as well as supporting financial modelling and financing strategies for a wide range of initiatives including Home Purchase, New Homes for Neighbourhoods, the Housing Joint Venture and other estate regeneration and emergency and temporary accommodation schemes.

**A fair and inclusive city**

* The Policy & Communications team will refresh our strategic approach to community engagement, including our approach to digital engagement and consultation – enabling a more agile approach to listening and responding.
* The Policy & Communications team will work directly with communities to hear their ideas to improve the city through the council’s [Reimagine](https://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/brighton-hove-city-council-plan-2023-2027/re-imagine-brighton-hove) engagement programme
* The Policy team will reinvigorate partnership working across the city to support collaboration across city systems and drive positive change
* The Policy team will publish a Cost-of-Living Action Plan to set out how the council will help tackle the challenges exacerbated by the cost of living crisis
* The Communications team has a key role implementing anti-racism and accessible city strategies through internal and external communications.
* Through procurement, ensuring that the city council's spending power is used to secure good value for money and, as far as possible with contract regulations and market conditions, to procure local services, and improve sustainability and social value.
* Embed policies and practice concerning Social Value, Community Wealth Building, Sustainability and Modern Slavery across all contracts.

**A healthy city where people thrive**

* The Policy team support the development of the Employment and Skills Plan
* The Policy team will deliver the scrutiny function for the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee and oversee the Health and Wellbeing Board
* Communications is an essential part of promoting health and wellbeing in the city and enabling behaviour change.
* The people strategy for the organisation is delivered through ‘Our People Promise’ led by HROD. This programme is designed to ensure we have an engaged and motivated workforce who are able to deliver their best to the city enable all priorities to be supported. As a series of 5 commitments, it underpins HROD’s work in terms of wellbeing, equalities, development, reward and engagement.
* HROD also manages the Fair and Inclusive Action Plan (FIAP) which supports the organisation to become reflective of the community, and to improve the experience of all staff, including embedding the council’s Anti-Racism Strategy and approach in all council policies.
* Actively supporting the corporate aim of diversifying the workforce at all levels, recruiting and retaining staff from all of the city's communities.
* Supporting the organisation to have a reward framework in place that enables successful recruitment and retention of staff while ensuring a fair and transparent system.
* The HROD service takes a lead in managing industrial relations, ensuring issues are dealt with fairly and transparently, and where necessary supporting the resolution of disputes.
* Supporting the organisation to ensure it fulfils its legal and moral health & safety responsibilities to provide a safe working environment where staff are supported to be happy and well.
* Providing a comprehensive learning and development offer that supports employees through from induction to planning for retirement. The offer also supports the culture change of the organisation, and in particular the work to ensure the council is fairer and more inclusive.

**A responsive council with well run services**

* The Policy & Communications team will help the council to proactively listen and respond to resident concerns, increase the use of digital channels of communication and enable collaboration with partners to support prevention and demand management.
* The directorate provides a wide range of traded services to schools, from HR and payroll to health & safety advice and support, to help them manage and administer a safe and effective school environment.
* Finance plays a key role in working with the Schools Forum to develop the annual Schools Budget across the 4 blocks of the Dedicated Schools Grant.
* The Customer, Modernisation & Performance Insight service is central to corporate governance driving improvements in customer experience, modernisation and performance and risk management
* Enable the successful delivery of digital improvement projects and programmes through the co-design and co-delivery of underpinning technologies, platforms and services in IT&D to support services in delivering corporate priorities.
* Develop a scalable and resilient IT&D technical architecture which provides a secure, highly available platform for business services.
* Exploring alternative financing options for low or zero carbon initiatives through the government’s emerging Green Investment proposals as well as local financing options and other viable business cases.
* Assisting in the development of a 5-Year Capital Investment Programme that supports the council’s priorities including Housing, Sustainable Transport and Zero Carbon schemes, Regeneration & Employment, Schools & Learning, and IT & Digital.
* Continue to respond to the impact of the cost of living crisis and welfare reforms, including oversight of the council’s welfare and hardship support and assistance, working across services and with CVS partners.
* Identify ways to increase support for those struggling to afford the cost of housing. This will include making full use of discretionary payments and/or distributing government hardship funds as well as supporting the development of new build housing programmes and business cases.
* Continue to work on examining the impacts of energy and food poverty on individuals and communities and co-develop strategies, lobbying tactics, and action plans with partners to assist those living in poverty including providing access to advice and support.

| **Section** | **Service Area** | **Brief Summary of Budget Proposal/Strategy and Risks** | **Total Savings Proposed 2024/25** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **£'000** |
| ***Governance, People & Resources*** | | |  |
| ***Chief Executive Monitoring Office*** | | |  |
| Chief Executive & Monitoring Officer | Chief Executive, Monitoring Officer and support. | No saving identified but the service will be reviewed as part of overall 'Organisational Redesign' principles. | **0** |
| **Chief Executive Monitoring Office Total** | |  | **0** |
| ***Policy, Communications & Leadership Support Office*** | | |  |
| Policy Partnership & Scrutiny | The PPS team runs a policy, partnership, strategy and scrutiny service - priorities include setting the city vision and strategy, council plan, service strategy development (e.g. housing strategy), research and policy development (e.g. Cost of Living action plan), overseeing strategic cross city partnership working (e.g. the City Management Board, Brighton & Hove Connected) as well as running thematic partnerships (e.g. Transport Partnership, Health & Wellbeing Board), in addition to fulfilling a scrutiny function (HOSC). | The service is experiencing a budget pressure that needs to be managed as this is a non-statutory function. A small reduction in resources is required which will impact the team’s ability to support the council's partnership and engagement ambitions and will reduce support to service areas. | **0** |
| Leadership and Support Office | The Leadership Support office ensures the efficient and effective running of the Leadership Office, ensuring effective systems and processes are in place to provide strategic and operational support. | No saving identified but the service will be reviewed as part of overall 'Organisational Redesign' principles. | **0** |
| Communications | The Communications team supports delivery of council policy and services and the external relations of the whole council through strategic communications and public relations. Functions include: campaigns, marketing and copywriting; internal communications; media relations; social media management; digital content design; consultation; emergency and crisis communications. | There is currently a pressure on the budget for the service that needs to be managed as this is a non-statutory function. However, reducing resources in the Comms team budget will potentially increase budget pressures for services, weaken organisational resilience (e.g. to manage crisis and emergency comms) and mean that service needs cannot be fully met, reducing the impact of delivery. The proposed change to the service to manage pressures (and provide some saving), will likely lead to increased costs for other service areas and the loss of supporting systems (such as media monitoring and social listening). However, these costs are more easily managed and mitigated when spread across a wide range of services. | **11** |
| Graphic Design Tean | Creating visual and accessible communications across digital and print media and animations to enable effective communications by the council and it's services to target audiences. The team also manage and protect the council's corporate brand guidelines to ensure consistency, recognition and positive reputation across it's communications and customer interactions with citizens, stakeholders and staff. | The team successfully operate on a completely self-funding business model through internal recharges and income from external clients such as NHS partners. The team are paid through competitive charges for every creative design and print project needed by services or external customers and this model is now being replicated by other local authorities. The team are currently scoping how this business model can be scaled to part-fund the corporate communications team. | **13** |
| **Policy & Communications Total** | |  | **24** |
| ***Legal & Democratic Services*** | | |  |
| Democratic & Civic Services | Democratic & Civic Services | A review of discretionary/statutory services highlighted that support to the Leadership and Political Groups is flagged as a Business Critical but non-statutory, discretionary function and therefore its affordability must be considered in the current financial context. A reduction of this support is therefore proposed. | **194** |
| Legal Services – Commercial | Legal Services – Commercial | Proposal: Remove a vacant Lawyer (Commercial) post from structure. Risk: High demand and inexperience in this area could impact on service delivery and ability to complete commercial work within reasonable deadlines. | **68** |
| Legal Services – Litigation & Safeguarding | Legal Services – Litigation & Safeguarding | Proposal: Remove a vacant Lawyer (Litigation & Safeguarding) post from the structure. Risk: High demand in this area. May impact on service delivery and the ability to initiate/undertake litigation in-house. £1k increased charge to Public Health for legal services. | 73 |
| Members Allowances | Members Allowances | No saving opportunity identified for 2024/25. | **0** |
| **Legal & Democratic Services Total** | |  | **335** |
| ***Elections & Land Charges*** | | |  |
| Elections | Elections | Proposal: Remove a vacant apprentice post from the Team Structure. Currently vacant and current Team working well following redesign. | **20** |
| Land Charges | Land Charges | No saving opportunity identified for 2024/25. | **0** |
| **Elections & Land Charges Total** | |  | **20** |
| ***Customer Modernisation & Performance insight*** | | |  |
| Customer Experience & feedback | Customer Experience & feedback | No saving identified but the service will be reviewed as part of overall 'Organisational Redesign' principles. | **0** |
| Customer and Performance | Customer and Performance | No saving identified but the service will be reviewed as part of overall 'Organisational Redesign' principles. | **0** |
| Corporate Programme Management Office | Corporate Programme Management Office | No saving identified but the service will be reviewed as part of overall 'Organisational Redesign' principles. | **0** |
| Information Rights Team | Information Rights Team | Deletion of a vacant Information Rights Case Officer post. Currently the organisation is not complying with all ICO expectations and this will further add to compliance risks. There may be a risk to reputation if the demand continues to rise and the compliance rate falls significantly below the ICO expectations. | **35** |
| **Customer Modernisation & Performance insight Total** | |  | **35** |
| ***Finance*** | | |  |
| Financial Services | Provides a full range of financial services including the S1551 Chief Finance Officer, Financial Advice (Business Partnering) support to services, Medium-term Financial Planning and Annual Budget Preparation, Treasury Management, Taxation and Insurance services, management accounting, reporting and forecasting (TBM), account maintenance, and completion of statutory government returns and grant claims. It also provides contracted Services to Schools, South Downs National Park Authority, the Coast to Capital LEP and the Housing Joint Venture. | Review the balance of support to services based on a further refinement of the risk-based approach to monitoring and advice. This will see some Budget Holders supported by a lower staffing FTE through deletion of a vacancy with a focus on prioritising support to higher risk, more complex budgets. Delivery Risk: Key risk is to customer service where budget holders will have reduced support and access to advice. There is also a potential impact on meeting deadlines such as monitoring timelines, grant claim or other government return deadlines. There will also be a review of the capitalisation of support costs for the capital programme to align with other corporate and service charges to capital schemes following the very substantial increase in both the size, complexity and number of schemes in recent years and the associated increase in monitoring requirements, including advice to and monitoring of capital bids and awards. | **144** |
| Audit (MOBO) | This budget relates to a number of small items including NAFN and training retained by BHCC. All other Internal Audit budgets are held within Orbis (See 'Contribution to Orbis'. | No saving opportunity identified for 2024/25. | **0** |
| Insurance (MOBO) | This budget relates to a number of small items including system licences retained by BHCC. All other Insurance budgets are held within Orbis (See 'Contribution to Orbis'. | No saving opportunity identified for 2024/25. | **0** |
| **Finance Total** | |  | **144** |
| ***Procurement (Mobo)*** | | |  |
| Procurement | This budget relates to a number of small items including system licences retained by BHCC. All other Procurement budgets are held within Orbis (See 'Contribution to Orbis'. | No saving opportunity identified for 2024/25. | **2** |
| **Procurement (Mobo) Total** | |  | **2** |
| ***HR & Organisational Development*** | | |  |
| Health & Safety and Occupational Health | Provision of competent H&S advice in accordance with legislation, maintaining the councils H&S Policy, Standards & safety management framework Team Safety and undertaking a programme of audit activity to report on assurance. Carrying out incident investigations & reporting to the Health & Safety Executive (HSE) in accordance with legislation | Proposal: reduction in hours for posts permanently funded by City Environment Management and Health & Safety (supported by the service) - work allocation within CEM will be reprioritised accordingly. Delivery risk: Some impact on capacity on a permanent basis. | **7** |
| Learning & Organisational Development | Delivery of Organisational Development and training for the organisation and wider social care sector. Supports the organisation to transform and modernise, develop skills for the future workforce and ensure current training and development is delivered to maintain necessary skills | Proposal - Deletion of part-time vacant Learning & OD consultant for Families, Children & Learning, and integration of the work into a full time consultant role by increasing a 0.8 consultant FTE to 1.0 FTE. Saving of £27k, plus £3k reduction in operating budgets. Delivery risk - reduction in capacity to progress training commissioning. | **30** |
| HR Reward, Policy, Strategy, Advisory and Business Partnering | Delivery of the full HR service, including policy changes, advisory services and Business Partnering ensuring the organisation is supported with BAU support, and the development of strategies, plans and actions to develop the workforce of the future and enabling transformation and modernisation | Proposal - Deletion of vacant Wellbeing Manager role. The wellbeing aspects of the role that relate to protecting staff will transfer to Health and Safety, the Occupational Health and EAP contract management will transfer to the Contract Manager, with operational support for the contract being provided by the Advisory Service. Delivery risk - impact on workloads across HR, particularly on resources that are required to support change and transformation across the organisation. Second proposal - Deletion of a vacant post from advisory, including the regrading of a scale 6 post to SO1/2. Delivery risk - Impact on resource available to manage change and transformation. Third proposal - reduction in Business Partnering hours by 0.4 FTE in lieu of a reduction in hours by team member. Delivery risk - reduction in resource that will be needed to support the organisation to manage change and transformation | **139** |
| Trades Union Support | Trade Union facility time to support consultation, negotiation and individual case work across the council | Proposal - Deletion of 1 FTE post from each recognised Trade Union to bring costs more in line with authority averages. The budget for one post sits as part of the HR budget and therefore a saving of 1 FTE post shows on this budget line. Delivery risk: Requires effective consultation and engagement with Trade Unions to help understand how casework can be managed. Second proposal - cease payment to GMB for accommodation as council accommodation is available if required. | **46** |
| Recruitment Team |  | No saving opportunity identified for 2024/25. | **0** |
| **HR & Organisational Development Total** | |  | **222** |
| ***IT&D (Mobo)*** | | |  |
| Contracts | Software contracts for Council IT hardware, software and infrastructure. | No saving opportunity identified for 2024/25 due to pressure on budgets but improved value for money from all contracts is sought when renewals or re-procurements are due. | **0** |
| Staffing | Staff Budget | Current vacancies were reviewed and the lowest impact /lowest risk posts identified for permanent deletion. Five vacant posts will be deleted as follows:  1 x Analytics Platform Lead - impacts to the ability to create and amend business intelligence and insight reports and dashboards, possible delays to the roll-out and adoption of Power BI).  1 x Apprentice within the cyber and IG compliance team - impacts to career opportunities and capacity to respond to data compliance and cyber resilience matters). 2 x ICT Project Officer - impacts include removal of junior project co-ordination capacity, greater workload on remaining project managers, further delays in starting and undertaking projects.  1 x Senior Technician - impacts to speed of device (laptops etc) deployment and fixes).  The overall impact is a further deterioration of the IT&D core service offer: support call resolution and project work will take longer; capability gaps will be created exacerbating gaps created during previous savings; heightened reliance upon capital /project funding for agency resource to carry out specialist work; reduced operational resilience and heightened risks of service failures resulting from single points of failure and reduced cover during peak leave periods or unplanned absences such as sick leave. | **190** |
| Other | Misc. operational expenditure incl. hardware, software and subscriptions | Target reduction of £25k from a contingency budget held to meet unplanned, urgent procurements of hardware and software. This reduces the council's resilience and ability to respond to unforeseen demands for hardware or software resources. Also, a potential target saving of £19k linked to a review and upward adjustment of recharges to Public Health for IT&D goods and services. | **44** |
| Income | Traded income and service recharges | Explore all possible options to ensure the costs of the service are covered by the income received from schools, and to remove the need for the general fund to subsidise the service by achieving a £415k saving. | **415** |
| **IT&D (Mobo) Total** | |  | **649** |
| ***Welfare Revenue & Business Support*** | | |  |
| Accounts Payable, Accounts Receivable and Banking teams | Collection and administration of all debts through the corporate debt system. Payments to creditors and suppliers. Administrative support and controls for banking and payments systems within the council. | No saving opportunity identified in 2024/25. Significant savings were delivered during the period the service was within the Orbis Partnership. Future savings are dependent on decisions around the future of the council's major corporate financial systems. | **0** |
| Corporate Debt Team | Overseeing and monitoring the overall organisations debt performance. Targeted data analysis, training and intervention to improve performance. | No saving opportunity identified in 2024/25. This small team ensures effective oversight and recovery of debt to minimise arrears and losses. | **0** |
| Payroll & Pensions | Administration of officer renumerations and retired officer renumerations. | No saving opportunity identified in 2024/25. This service has been and remains under severe pressure. Future savings are dependent on decisions around the future of the council's major corporate financial systems and necessary improvements to workflow automation. | **0** |
| WRBS Technical Systems teams | Technical Systems support for all WRBS teams including general ledger, creditors, debtors, banking, human resources, payroll, council tax, business rates and housing benefits | No saving identified but the service will be reviewed as part of overall 'Organisational Redesign' principles. | **0** |
| Housing Benefit Administration | Statutory administration of national and local benefit schemes | No saving opportunity identified in 2024/25. This service has been and remains under severe pressure with significant backlogs. Efforts are focused on reducing backlogs and improving customer response times. | **0** |
| Council Tax Collection Teams | Statutory collection of council tax income | No saving opportunity identified in 2024/25. This service has been and remains under severe pressure with significant backlogs. Efforts are focused on reducing backlogs and improving customer response times. | **0** |
| Business Rates Collection Team | Statutory collection of business rates income. Bailiffs service also included on this line. | No saving opportunity identified in 2024/25. This service has been and remains under severe pressure with significant backlogs. Efforts are focused on reducing backlogs and improving customer response times. | **0** |
| Council Tax S13A discounts | Locally funded section 13A council tax discounts awarded for care leavers, difficult to let properties, and exceptional/unexpected situations, such as flooding). | No saving opportunity identified as the budget supports key council priorities. | **0** |
| Local Welfare Assistance Schemes | Awards of discretionary benefits and cost of living support schemes to lower income households. | Review the funding of welfare support resources to consider the provisional ending/reduction of the Household Support Fund which current provides all the funding for discretionary awards by this team. Without a significant discretionary fund to distribute, the remaining welfare resources will concentrate on prevention solutions i.e.. Welfare Advisory work, working in collaboration with other directorates and CVS partners. Delivery Risk: Welfare support staff provide support to various cohorts of residents including those in hardship, those in need of welfare rights support, those affected by the Benefit Cap and other benefit related issues. While CVS support and resources are available, the overall quantum of support across the council and CVS would be reduced. | **256** |
| Welfare Framework | The organisation of local authority response to cost of living and welfare demands. Responding to government monitoring. Data Analysis to enable targeted welfare responses. Provision of resource and linkage to mental health and debt advice aspects of the response. | No saving opportunity identified - externally funded service. | **0** |
| Welfare Advisory | Specialist advice given to maximising income and claiming and appealing entitlements. Holistic solutions for low income households. | No saving opportunity identified. Service enables optimisation of welfare benefits which has financial benefits for the council. | **0** |
| WRBS Management & Operations Support | Admin and Operations support team. | Reduction of senior management team by deleting a vacant Benefits Manager role. Delivery Risk: Achievable through management reshuffling but results in the loss of an experienced, senior resource which will impact service delivery, organisation and performance. | **71** |
| **Welfare Revenue & Business Support Total** | |  | **327** |
| ***Contribution to Orbis*** | | |  |
| Orbis Services | Orbis Services refers to the Orbis Operational Budget which covers Internal Audit, Procurement and the Integrated elements of IT&D, as well as Finance 'Centres of Expertise' for Treasury and Insurance. The contribution is based on an agreed contribution ratio (ACR) as specified in the Inter-Authority Agreement (IAA). There are also Sovereign-held budgets managed by Orbis services on behalf of the partners but where overall control rests with the funding authority (these are known as 'Mobo' budgets). | No saving opportunity identified for 2024/25. Reduction of Orbis budgets can only be through agreement with partners. The services are kept under annual review but no saving is proposed at this time. | **0** |
| **Contribution to Orbis Total** | |  | **0** |
| **Governance, People & Resources Total** | |  | **1,758** |

| **Section** | **Service Area** | **Brief Summary of Budget Proposal/Strategy and Risks** | **Total Savings Proposed 2024/25** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **£'000** |
| ***Corporately-held Budgets*** | | |  |
| ***Bulk Insurance Premia*** | | |  |
| Insurance | Premiums & Excesses/deductibles/self insurance |  | **0** |
| **Bulk Insurance Premia Total** | |  | **0** |
| ***Capital Financing Costs*** | | |  |
| Capital Financing Costs | Debt and investment interest |  | **0** |
| **Capital Financing Costs Total** | |  | **0** |
| ***Levies & Precepts*** | | |  |
| Levies & Precepts | Levies & Precepts including: Sussex Inshore Fisheries & Conservation Area, Environment Agency and Enclosure Committees |  | **0** |
| **Levies & Precepts Total** | |  | **0** |
| ***Unallocated Contingency & Risk Provisions*** | | |  |
| Contingency & Risk Provisions | Risk Provisions & other contingency items |  | **0** |
| **Unallocated Contingency & Risk Provisions Total** | |  | **0** |
| ***Unringfenced Grants*** | | |  |
| Unringfenced Grants | Unringfenced grants including: S31 Business Rates Retention (BRR) Scheme, New Homes Bonus and DLUHC Services Grant. |  | **0** |
| **Unringfenced Grants Total** | |  | **0** |
| ***Housing Benefit Subsidy*** | | |  |
| Housing Benefits | The costs and subsidy income relating to payment of Rent Allowances and Rent Rebates under Housing Benefit regulations. Also includes income received from recovery of overpayments. |  | **0** |
| **Housing Benefit Subsidy Total** | |  | **0** |
| ***Other Corporate Items*** | | |  |
| Corporate Pension Costs | Corporate pension costs - historic retirement decisions |  | **0** |
| Contribution from Reserves | Budgeted contribution from reserves to support revenue budget. |  | **0** |
| Other corporate budgets | Budget for annual unallocated income (e.g. returned cheques). |  | **0** |
| VFM Savings - Senior Management | 2023/24 council wide saving aimed at achieving a further management reduction or delayering across the council's senior management tiers. | A significant programme of Organisational Redesign will be undertaken in the context of the authority's financial context and needing to operate with a lower level overall staffing. While staffing proposals are contained elsewhere within services, this saving will focus on organisational design principles that will review management spans and layers, the efficiency of administrative and business support roles, and potential rationalisation and efficiencies across around 11 functional areas, for example, commissioning and contract management and customer service roles. | 2,475 |
| **Other Corporate Items Total** | |  | **2,475** |
| **Corporately-held Budgets Total** | |  | **2,475** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Year 1 Budget | Year 2 Budget | Year 3 Budget | Year 4 Budget | Year 5 Budget |
| **Capital Investment Programme** | **2024/25** | **2025/26** | **2026/27** | **2027/28** | **2028/29** |
|  | **£000** | **£000** | **£000** | **£000** | **£000** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Approved Schemes** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Families, Children & Learning | 6,986 | 9,112 | - | - | - |
| Health & Adult Social Care | 5,200 | 3,703 | - | - | - |
| Economy, Environment & Culture | 67,393 | 30,872 | 4,000 | 2,500 | 2,500 |
| Housing, Neighbourhood & Communities - GF | 1,849 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 |
| Governance, People & Resources | 6,680 | 2,320 | 1,570 | 40 | 40 |
| Housing, Neighbourhood & Communities - HRA | 35,557 | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Identified Schemes Not Yet approved** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Families, Children & Learning | 4,750 | 4,700 | 4,650 | 4,600 | 4,600 |
| Health & Adult Social Care | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 |
| Economy, Environment & Culture | 23,792 | 36,164 | 16,500 | 12,674 | 15,237 |
| Housing, Neighbourhood & Communities - GF | 2,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| Governance, People & Resources | 3,331 | 260 | 260 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| Housing, Neighbourhood & Communities - HRA | 53,432 | 70,806 | 60,281 | 60,945 | 63,091 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total** | **211,470** | **159,937** | **89,261** | **83,759** | **88,468** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Funded by:** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Government Grants (non ringfenced) | 16,890 | 18,112 | 12,950 | 8,900 | 9,080 |
| Government Grants (ringfenced) | 34,538 | 10,625 | 2,180 | 2,180 | 2,000 |
| Capital Receipts | 21,576 | 5,983 | 4,550 | 3,590 | 2,500 |
| Capital Reserves | 693 | - | - | - | - |
| Specific Reserves | 1,942 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| External Contributions | 6,992 | 2,614 | - | 2,000 | 455 |
| Direct Revenue Funding - General Fund | 1,070 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 |
| HRA Revenue Contribution to Capital | 16,516 | 17,345 | 18,255 | 19,098 | 20,017 |
| Borrowing | 111,253 | 103,758 | 49,826 | 46,491 | 52,916 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total Funding** | **211,470** | **159,937** | **89,261** | **83,759** | **88,468** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Year 1 Budget | Year 2 Budget | Year 3 Budget | Year 4 Budget | Year 5 Budget |
| **Families, Children & Learning** | **2024/25** | **2025/26** | **2026/27** | **2027/28** | **2028/29** |
|  | **£000** | **£000** | **£000** | **£000** | **£000** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Approved Schemes** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brighton Youth Centre | 1,300 | - | - | - | - |
| Schools Investment | 2,000 | 6,112 | - | - | - |
| Universal Free School Meals | 192 | - | - | - | - |
| High Needs Provision Capital | 2,534 | 3,000 | - | - | - |
| Education Capital Maintenance 2023/24 | 364 | - | - | - | - |
| Impulse Education Management System | 95 | - | - | - | - |
| Cardinal Newman 4G Pitch & Changing Rooms | 500 | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Identified Schemes Not Yet approved** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Education Capital Maintenance Grant | 3,750 | 3,700 | 3,650 | 3,600 | 3,600 |
| Devolved Formula Capital Grant | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 |
| Structural Maintenance Contribution | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 |
| Brighton Youth Centre | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Total Families, Children & Learning** | **11,736** | **13,812** | **4,650** | **4,600** | **4,600** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Year 1 Budget | Year 2 Budget | Year 3 Budget | Year 4 Budget | Year 5 Budget |
| **Health & Adult Social Care** | **2024/25** | **2025/26** | **2026/27** | **2027/28** | **2028/29** |
|  | **£000** | **£000** | **£000** | **£000** | **£000** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Approved Schemes** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Knoll House Building Works | 5,200 | 3,703 | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Identified Schemes Not Yet approved** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Better Care Funding - Capital Grant | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 |
| **Total Health & Adult Social Care** | **5,700** | **4,203** | **500** | **500** | **500** |

|  | Year 1 Budget | Year 2 Budget | Year 3 Budget | Year 4 Budget | Year 5 Budget |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Economy, Environment & Culture** | **2024/25** | **2025/26** | **2026/27** | **2027/28** | **2028/29** |
|  | **£000** | **£000** | **£000** | **£000** | **£000** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Approved Schemes** |  |  |  |  |  |
| *City Development & Regeneration* |  |  |  |  |  |
| New England House Project Support | 164 | - | - | - | - |
| Falmer Released Land Project Support | 12 | - | - | - | - |
| Redevelopment of King Alfred Swimming Pool | 81 | - | - | - | - |
| Madeira Terraces Regeneration | 5,941 | 3,500 | - | - | - |
| Madeira Terraces Crowd Funding Contribution | 456 | - | - | - | - |
| Madeira Terraces Regeneration - Carbon Neutral Fund | 290 | - | - | - | - |
| Madeira Terraces Bequest Funding | 30 | - | - | - | - |
| Black Rock Enabling Works | 400 | - | - | - | - |
| *City Environmental Management* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Downland Initiative Programme | 10 | 10 | - | - | - |
| Public Conveniences | 1,922 | - | - | - | - |
| On-Street and Communal Bin Infrastructure | 1,000 | 250 | - | - | - |
| Pavilion and Mess Room Refurbishment Programme | 1,400 | 1,250 | - | - | - |
| Hollingdean Deport Office Accommodation | 2,228 | 300 | - | - | - |
| CNF - Improving WEEE recycling | 36 | - | - | - | - |
| CNF - Improving the Communal Bin System | 395 | 395 | - | - | - |
| Stanmer Pond Restoration & Access Improvement | 76 | - | - | - | - |
| Playground Refurbishment programme 2021-2025 | 608 | - | - | - | - |
| Parks and Open Spaces Investment | 1,555 | 1,552 | - | - | - |
| CNF - Woodland Creation Scheme | 135 | - | - | - | - |
| CNF - St Ann's Well Café Sustainable Improvements | 74 | - | - | - | - |
| Procurement of City Fleet Vehicles | 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,500 |
| *Culture, Tourism & Sport* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Royal Pavilion Estate (Phase 1) | 1,486 | - | - | - | - |
| Brighton Museum & Art Gallery Works | 1,432 | - | - | - | - |
| Royal Pavilion Estate Development (Phase 2 Gardens) | 4,700 | 1,320 | - | - | - |
| Seafront Railings Upgrade | - | 170 | - | - | - |
| Levelling Up Fund - Kingsway to the Sea | 7,143 | - | - | - | - |
| King Alfred Main Pool Reinforcement | 674 | - | - | - | - |
| Prince Regent Investment | 700 | - | - | - | - |
| Withdean Sports Complex Swimming Pool | 451 | - | - | - | - |
| Brighton Centre Essential Maintenance | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | - | - |
| *Property* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hollingdean Depot Health & Safety | 10 | - | - | - | - |
| Statutory DDA Access Works Fund | 40 | - | - | - | - |
| Legionella Works | 22 | - | - | - | - |
| Madeira Terrace Structural Repairs | 196 | - | - | - | - |
| Solar Panels Corporate Buildings | 678 | - | - | - | - |
| Workstyles Phase 4 | 271 | 200 | - | - | - |
| Phoenix House Investment | 693 | - | - | - | - |
| Moulsecoomb Hub and Housing Development | 4,200 | 8,000 | - | - | - |
| CNF - Moulsecoomb Hub and Housing Sustainability Measures | 100 | - | - | - | - |
| CNF - Schools Energy Efficiency Reinvestment fund | 400 | - | - | - | - |
| CNF - Carbon Reduction Measures to Operational Buildings | 1,267 | 1,000 | 500 | - | - |
| Hove Town Hall Planned Maintenance | 50 | - | - | - | - |
| Industrial House Planned Maintenance | 20 | - | - | - | - |
| Imperial Arcade Planned Maintenance | 210 | - | - | - | - |
| Mile Oak Community Centre Planned Maintenance | 105 | - | - | - | - |
| South Downs Riding School – Environmental Management | 12 | - | - | - | - |
| Commercial Asset Investment Fund | 750 | - | - | - | - |
| *Transport* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brighton Marina to River Adur Works | 100 | - | - | - | - |
| Integrated Transport Schemes (LTP) | 2,000 | - | - | - | - |
| Structural Maintenance of Carriageways (LTP) | 413 | - | - | - | - |
| Street Lighting Maintenance (LTP) | 1,000 | 400 | - | - | - |
| Valley Gardens Phase 1&2 (LTP) | 92 | - | - | - | - |
| Valley Gardens Phase 3 (LTP) | 5,824 | 5,000 | - | - | - |
| Hove Station Footbridge | 500 | - | - | - | - |
| Active Travel Fund - Tranche 2 | 230 | - | - | - | - |
| Brighton Bikeshare Replacement Programme | 215 | - | - | - | - |
| Citywide Strategic Transport Model | 205 | - | - | - | - |
| Seafront Heritage Lighting Renewal Programme | 1,562 | - | - | - | - |
| Active Travel Fund - Tranche 3 | 1,204 | - | - | - | - |
| Bus Service Improvement Scheme | 2,556 | 2,100 | - | - | - |
| Active Travel Fund - Tranche 4 | 2,994 | - | - | - | - |
| Safer Road Fund Round 3 - A2010 Brighton | 300 | - | - | - | - |
| Low Traffic Neighbourhoods – Elm Grove / Queens Park Road | 350 | - | - | - | - |
| Zebra 2 - Zero Emissions Buses | 1,925 | 1,925 | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Identified Schemes Not Yet approved** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weekly Food Waste Collections Capital Grant | 2,444 | - | - | - | - |
| Strategic Investment Fund | 150 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 |
| New England House - City Deal | 2,068 | 8,000 | - | - | - |
| Royal Pavilion Estate Development (Phase 3 Museum) | - | - | 4,000 | - | - |
| Volks Railway Disabled Access Carriage | 100 | - | - | - | - |
| CNF - Levelling Up Fund - Kingsway to the Sea | 700 | - | - | - | - |
| Withdean Sports Complex Swimming Pool | - | 5,349 | - | - | - |
| Asset Management Fund | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| Planned Maintenance of operational buildings | 1,500 | 1,500 | 1,500 | 1,500 | 1,500 |
| Planned Maintenance - Social Services Buildings | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 |
| Commercial Asset Investment Fund (CAIF) | - | 750 | 750 | 750 | 750 |
| Local Transport Plan - Capital Grant | 4,538 | 4,500 | 4,500 | 4,500 | 4,500 |
| Pothole Action Fund - Capital Grant | 1,455 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 |
| Incentive Funding - Highways Capital Grant | 364 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 |
| Highways Maintenance Funding - Network North | 413 | - | - | - | - |
| Marina to River Adur Coast Protection Works | 7,960 | 10,000 | 1,000 | - | - |
| A27 Junction Improvements | 600 | 3,515 | 2,200 | 3,374 | 5,937 |
| **Total Economy, Environment & Culture** | **91,185** | **67,036** | **20,500** | **15,174** | **17,737** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Year 1 Budget | Year 2 Budget | Year 3 Budget | Year 4 Budget | Year 5 Budget |
| **Housing, Neighbourhood & Communities - GF** | **2024/25** | **2025/26** | **2026/27** | **2027/28** | **2028/29** |
|  | **£000** | **£000** | **£000** | **£000** | **£000** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Approved Schemes** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disabled Facilities Grants | 317 | - | - | - | - |
| LDV On-Going Costs - Community Homes (B&HSCH) | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 |
| Warm Safe Homes Grant | 331 | - | - | - | - |
| Travellers Site Fund | 505 | - | - | - | - |
| Housing IT Strategy | 196 | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Identified Schemes Not Yet approved** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disabled Facilities Grant (Better Care Funding) - Capital Grant | 2,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| **Total Housing, Neighbourhood & Communities - GF** | **3,849** | **1,500** | **1,500** | **1,500** | **1,500** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Year 1 Budget | Year 2 Budget | Year 3 Budget | Year 4 Budget | Year 5 Budget |
| **Governance, People & Resources** | **2024/25** | **2025/26** | **2026/27** | **2027/28** | **2028/29** |
|  | **£000** | **£000** | **£000** | **£000** | **£000** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Approved Schemes** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Digital Organisation Programme | 1,500 | 100 | 100 | - | - |
| IT Equipment for Members | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| Laptop Refresh Programme | 1,950 | 1,000 | 250 | - | - |
| IT&D Data Programme | 100 | - | - | - | - |
| IT&D Projects | 310 | 250 | 250 | - | - |
| Digital Data & Technology Investment | 2,380 | 930 | 930 | - | - |
| Electronic Document Management Replacement System | 400 | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Identified Schemes Not Yet approved** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Managing Staff Changes (Restructure / Redundancy) | 1,000 | - | - | - | - |
| Modernisation Enablers | 1,050 | - | - | - | - |
| Invest to Save Plans | 571 | - | - | - | - |
| IT&D Data Programme | 260 | 260 | 260 | - | - |
| Local Area Network Hardware Refresh | 450 | - | - | - | - |
| IT&D Future Fund | - | - | - | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| **Total Governance, People & Resources** | **10,011** | **2,580** | **1,830** | **1,040** | **1,040** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Year 1 Budget | Year 2 Budget | Year 3 Budget | Year 4 Budget | Year 5 Budget |
| **Housing, Neighbourhood & Communities - HRA** | **2024/25** | **2025/26** | **2026/27** | **2027/28** | **2028/29** |
|  | **£000** | **£000** | **£000** | **£000** | **£000** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Approved Schemes** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Windlesham Close | 1,771 | - | - | - | - |
| Upgrading Residential CCTV Systems | 80 | - | - | - | - |
| Lifts Refurbishment | 482 | - | - | - | - |
| New Build Refurbishment (Converting Spaces in Existing Buildings) | 1,971 | - | - | - | - |
| Structural Repairs | 5,972 | - | - | - | - |
| House Purchase Scheme | 9,756 | - | - | - | - |
| Moulsecoomb Hub - Housing | 8,408 | - | - | - | - |
| HRA Owned Playgrounds Refurbishment | 165 | - | - | - | - |
| Palace Place Redevelopment | 1,626 | - | - | - | - |
| Frederick Street | 384 | - | - | - | - |
| Rotherfield Crescent | 1,225 | - | - | - | - |
| Eastergate Road | 66 | - | - | - | - |
| Kubic Apartments | 209 | - | - | - | - |
| EICR Compliance Programme | 3,444 | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Identified Schemes Not Yet approved** |  |  |  |  |  |
| HRA Capital Investment Programme 2024-25 | 53,432 | - | - | - | - |
| HRA Capital Investment Programme 2025-26 | - | 70,806 | - | - | - |
| HRA Capital Investment Programme 2026-27 | - | - | 60,281 | - | - |
| HRA Capital Investment Programme 2027-28 | - | - | - | 60,945 | - |
| HRA Capital Investment Programme 2028-29 | - | - | - | - | 63,091 |
| **Total Housing, Neighbourhood & Communities - HRA** | **88,989** | **70,806** | **60,281** | **60,945** | **63,091** |

**Capital Strategy 2024/25 to 2028/29**

1. **Background**
   1. CIPFA’s Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities and DLUHC’s Investment Guidance, require all local authorities to prepare a Capital Strategy report which should demonstrate that the authority:
      * takes capital expenditure and investment decisions in line with service objectives;
      * takes account of stewardship, value for money, prudence and affordability;
      * sets out the long term context in which capital expenditure and investment decisions are made;
      * gives due consideration to both risk and reward and the impact on the achievement of priority outcomes.
   2. The aim of the Capital Strategy is to ensure that all members on the full Council understand the overall long-term policy objectives and resulting capital strategy requirements, governance procedures and risk appetite.
   3. The Prudential Code and the Treasury Management Codes were updated in 2021. The updates included:
      * Local authorities are required to acknowledge that they will not borrow for projects where the primary purpose is for commercial return;
      * Further transparency is required for non-treasury investments, including new indicators that demonstrate the proportionality of non-treasury investments to the council’s other activities;
      * Creation of Investment Management Practices (IMPs), which are similar to the existing Treasury Management Practices (TMPs). The IMPs will outline the processes, practices and governance that will be followed in the management and decision making for non-treasury investments.
   4. This Capital Strategy is reported separately from the Treasury Management Strategy Statement which ensures the separation of the core treasury function under security, liquidity and yield principles, and the policy and commercial investments usually driven by expenditure on assets.
   5. CIPFA have updated the definition of investments within the Treasury Management Code to now include “non-treasury”, or commercial investments. These non-treasury investments are held primarily for financial returns, such as investment property portfolios. This strategy covers any non-treasury investments that the organisation holds or is planning to invest in. Treasury investments and associated risks are covered under the council’s Annual Investment Strategy, which forms part of Appendix 3 to General Fund budget report.
   6. Under the Prudential Code and Treasury Management Code, the council is required to set parameters around the council’s borrowing and treasury activity, including an authorised borrowing limit for each year which cannot be breached. These parameters are set out in the prudential indicators within Annex C to this strategy. These indicators ensure that any borrowing undertaken is prudent, affordable and sustainable.
   7. Additionally, when funding capital expenditure through borrowing, the council is required to set aside a sum from revenue each year to repay the debt, known as the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP). The policy for making the annual MRP should be prepared in line with the MRP guidance published by DLUHC. The council’s MRP policy for 2024/25 is consistent with the current guidance and is included in Appendix 3 of the budget report for approval.
2. **Governance & Risk Frameworks**
   1. The council’s Financial Regulations set out the framework of control, responsibility and accountability for the proper administration of the council’s financial affairs. Under the Financial Regulations, the Chief Finance Officer is responsible for ensuring a capital programme is prepared and considered by Strategy, Finance & City Regeneration Committee and approved by full Council annually.
   2. Further to this, the council’s Standard Financial Procedures define the key controls around the management of the council’s financial affairs, including the capital programme. The key controls for the capital programme are:
      * Specific approval by full Council for the programme of capital expenditure, in conjunction with the annual revenue budget process, outlining the phasing of expenditure and the sources of funding and financing;
      * A scheme and estimate, including options appraisal, project plan, progress targets and associated revenue expenditure are prepared for each capital project;
      * No capital scheme to proceed unless necessary approvals have been obtained;
      * Proposals for improvements and alterations to buildings must be approved by the appropriate Chief Officer in consultation with the Assistant Director Property & Design;
      * An officer-led Capital Programme Board has been implemented during 2023/24. The board reviews new schemes, business plans and all variations to the Capital Investment Programme prior to approval at the Strategy, Finance & City Regeneration (SFCR) Committee. The Board comprises of the Chief Executive, Directors and relevant Senior Officers for all departmental capital programmes.
      * Major rolling programmes of capital expenditure will require a detailed report to be submitted to SFCR Committee covering all of the schemes within each programme of works. This will include, but not be limited to, the programmes for the housing stock, Education, Asset Management Fund, Corporate Planned Maintenance (PMB), Commercial Asset Investment Fund (CAIF), Information Technology & Digital (IT&D) Funds, Strategic Investment Funds and the Local Transport Plan. These may be reported separately or as part of a Targeted Budget Management (TBM) report;
      * The development and implementation of an Asset Management Plan;
      * A nominated, accountable budget holder for each scheme and/or component of the programme;
      * Monitoring of progress on capital schemes and comparison with approved budget and remedial action taken to address overspends, reporting monthly to Chief Officers and at least quarterly to the SFCR Committee;
      * Compliance with the council’s Corporate Procurement Strategy and Contract Standing Orders.
   3. Since June 2016 a Corporate Risk and Assurance Framework (CRAF) has provided a structured approach to help Members and senior managers discharge their responsibility for the management of key risks with potential to affect achievement of the council’s priorities and expected outcomes. The CRAF requires the council to be proactive and have arrangements in place through its senior officers for robust arrangements for managing its business. Specifically the CRAF is designed to:

* help the council avoid costly mistakes, better protect its reputation and contribute to keeping the council safe;
* set out for stakeholders, including members, how the council complies with best practice (the International Standard for Corporate Governance) and, as such, the CRAF forms an appendix within the council’s statutory Annual Governance Statement.

**Management of Risk**

* 1. The council provides a number of critical services and its core purpose is to meet its statutory duties for the benefit of the citizens of the City. The council’s key priority is to protect the delivery of these services. Therefore, the council needs to take a measured approach to balancing the risks of any capital investment decisions with the resources available for delivering key services against the benefits accruing from the investment.
  2. The council’s Risk Management Process is managed by:

1. assigning accountability to key officers to enable review, and challenge processes and assurances;
2. using a “three lines of defence” model to map out how it gains assurance over its activities, processes and risks. This is reported as the Corporate Risk Assurance Framework (CRAF) appendix within the Annual Governance Statement. An example is given below on using the three lines of defence to structure and categorise assurances for procurement.

An organisation might identify contract management as a key risk. The assurance map would then set out the sources of assurance that enable senior management and members to satisfy themselves that this risk is being managed. Under the three lines of defence, these assurances are categorised as follows:

**First line:** controls and processes followed by service managers who own and manage risks. In this case, these would be the controls and processes followed by contract managers who are responsible for procuring and managing contracts.

**Second line:** controls and processes operated by managers responsible for overseeing risks. These typically monitor the first line of defence operated by managers and in this case might include risk management and procurement compliance functions.

**Third line:** functions providing independent assurance. This is a key role for Internal Audit and is sometimes considered to include external inspectorates.

1. monitoring and tracking delivery of the assurances throughout the year to help strengthen the risk management and control environment through the Risk Reporting Timetable that sets out the specific review period for risks at Directorate Management Teams (DMT) and the Executive Leadership Team (ELT). Directorate and strategic risks are reviewed by DMTs, with newly identified risks, escalated risks, suggested amendments to strategic risks and the Directorate Risk Registers are reported to ELT as part of their risk review. Risks are reported to the relevant service committee for review annually.

The Audit & Standards Committee have oversight of the risk management process and review the Risk Management Framework annually.

* 1. Risks specific to the delivery of the capital programme and Capital Strategy are managed by a range of processes and groups:
     + Financial risks (e.g. overspending, slippage and re-profiling) are managed through the council’s Targeted Budget Management (TBM) process which is reported at least quarterly to SFCR Committee.
     + The progress of major infrastructure projects is monitored through the officer led Capital Programme Board.
     + Any significant changes to the direction, or financial or legal risks of any major scheme, are reported back to SFCR Committee.

1. **Capital Strategy** 
   1. Capital resources are available to the council for investment in assets. They play an important role in helping to achieve Council Plan priorities. This section sets out the strategy and plans for capital expenditure. The council’s Capital Strategy outlines the process for the prioritisation and evaluation of capital investment projects. A summary of these priorities is detailed as follows and aims to:

* seek to protect as far as possible capital grant funding for education, housing transport and the public realm investment;
* pool all remaining non ring-fenced capital resources and allocate these to priority areas for investment;
* allocate approximately £0.250m per annum to ‘major projects’ investment through a Strategic Investment Fund. These projects support the economy through regeneration of key sites which can often lever in housing development;
* allocate £1.000m per annum towards the Information Technology & Digital Fund to address the funding of central network support and improvements to the IT&D infrastructure identified in the Digital Data and Technology Strategy;
* allocate £0.750m per annum towards the Commercial Assets Investment Fund (CAIF) to support essential property repairs, maintenance and improvements to existing commercial and agricultural properties to protect and potentially enhance commercial revenue income.
* allocate £1.000m per annum to the Asset Management Fund to support essential property improvements, minimise backlog maintenance, improve sustainability and energy efficiency of buildings where possible, and reduce longer term maintenance costs;
* similarly, allocate a minimum of £2.000m per annum through borrowing to support investment in planned maintenance in operational and social care buildings;
* Assess the potential social value of surplus or underperforming assets against the potential disposal value and where possible maximise the use of assets to enhance social value across a 4-year asset management plan;
* Subject to an assessment of the potential social value, generate capital receipts from the disposal of surplus or under-performing assets and to deploy the proceeds from the sale of capital assets:
  + for reinvestment in the capital investment programme, or;
  + for modernisation of council services including using the government’s ‘capital receipt flexibilities’ that allows revenue costs to be capitalised and funded from capital receipts where this generates efficiencies, or;
  + for repayment of debt or for investment, for example, to offset any loss of rental income in the revenue budget;
* the net receipts from ‘right to buy’ sales from council housing are reinvested directly into additional housing;
* use unsupported borrowing for:
  + service improvements where a business case has been developed and approved, and can demonstrate that the investment will provide value for money and that the additional financing costs are reflected in the revenue budget;
  + purchase of vehicles and plant where an options appraisal demonstrates borrowing provides the best value for money and the financing costs are reflected in the revenue budget;
  + investment to support Council Plan priorities where the financial impact of any decision is treated as a commitment in future years’ budgets and is affordable;
  + restructuring the funding of the approved capital programme when this provides a more efficient use of capital and revenue resources;
* explore all funding options including partnerships and one-off bidding processes. The council can bid for capital investment through funding streams such as the National Heritage Lottery Fund, Arts Council and the Levelling Up Fund (LUF). Other Government initiatives that may be considered include the Highways Maintenance Challenge Fund and the Housing Infrastructure Fund. The council can use its land to facilitate private sector or partnership based investments;
* explore capital investment opportunities to support the city’s net zero carbon objectives and incorporate in future capital investment plans.
  1. The financial resources used to fund the 2024/25 capital expenditure programme of £211.470m are included at Annex A and the 5-year capital projections are incorporated in Appendix 1 of the budget report.

***Housing Revenue Account (HRA)***

* 1. The HRA Capital Strategy focuses on meeting the Council Plan (2023-27) priorities and Housing Strategy priorities. The Council Plan ‘Homes for Everyone’ outcome aims to: improve housing quality, increase housing supply and improve housing support for residents. This includes to: Invest in building and fire safety to meet new duties under the Building Safety Act; Ensure the council complies with anticipated new social housing regulations; Improve the energy performance of council homes through our capital works programme; Improve the sustainability of our housing stock; Increase the number of new affordable homes delivered by the council and other registered providers, and; Buy back council homes sold through the right to buy policy. These key priorities of the Council Plan and the council’s Housing Strategy inform the Housing Revenue Account Capital Investment Programme 2024/25. An updated Asset Management Strategy is currently being developed for Housing & New Homes Committee consideration and approval.
  2. The Housing Capital Programme seeks to provide substantial investment in the council’s housing stock and improve the quality of homes. The implementation of the proposed capital programme will reflect significant legislative and regulatory changes impacting social housing landlords following the Grenfell Tower tragedy. This includes substantial investment being undertaken in relation to building, health and fire safety compliance and in anticipation of the strengthened role of Regulator of Social Housing, ensuring adherence to their Consumer Standards. The programme also looks to provide investment to reduce the carbon footprint of council housing and to increase the number of affordable homes available across the city to help tackle the City’s housing crisis. The capital investment proposal covers the following areas:
* Health and safety works
* Delivery of planned and major works programmes
* Sustainability & caron reduction
* Delivery of additional council homes
  1. In October 2018, the Minister for Housing, Communities & Local Government issued a determination – The Limits on Indebtedness (Revocation) Determination 2018. This came into force on 29 October 2018 and removes the restrictions on borrowing for the HRA. The removal of the ‘debt cap’ has enabled the potential for substantial growth in the number of homes that can be built or purchased within the HRA with continued investment in the existing housing stock. However, the HRA remains subject to the Prudential Framework and as such all new HRA borrowing decisions will need to be affordable, prudent, and sustainable and therefore will be subject to business cases and viability tests.
  2. Since 2012 the HRA has operated on ‘self-financing’ principles and the capital programme is funded from a variety of HRA sources including revenue surpluses (rental incomes), borrowing, capital receipts, reserves, and other grants. These resources are part of the HRA ring-fenced account to be spent on council-owned stock. Further detail on the priorities and proposed investments can be found in the ‘HRA Budget and Capital Investment Programme 2024/25 and Medium Term Financial Strategy’ report.

1. **Capital Investment Plans 2024/25 to 2028/29**
   1. All capital expenditure plans are approved in accordance with the council’s Standard Financial Procedures by full Council with detailed proposals and any changes approved by SFCR Committee through either separate project reports or as part of regular Targeted Budget Management (TBM) reports.
   2. The capital investment plans for 2024/25 to 2028/29 are included at Appendix 1 of the budget report and a summary of the investment plans is provided in section 7 of the main budget report.
2. **Approach to Non-Treasury Investments**
   1. The council’s primary non-treasury investments relate to its commercial property portfolio, details of which are covered in Section 6 of the strategy. The council will explore other opportunities to enable developments that support the delivery of council priorities.
   2. The council uses its property assets, both operational and investment, to enable a number of major infrastructure projects to deliver key assets for the city such as the King Alfred Leisure Centre; or to support regeneration to enable housing and business development and in turn increase council tax and business rates receipts such as the Kingsway to the Sea and New England House schemes.
   3. In addition, the council is able to provide third party loans and financial guarantees in order to enable external projects which support Council Plan priorities and outcomes. The current portfolio and risks of these types of arrangements are outlines in sections 7 and 8 of the strategy.
   4. Whilst income generation is often necessary to support the business case of certain capital investments, the council will not invest in activities where the primary purpose is to generate a yield. The council may, however, invest in existing commercial assets (such as the existing investment property portfolio) where investment is required to maintain the assets and therefore protect the income streams. This approach is in response to both HM Treasury’s change to PWLB lending arrangements and CIPFA’s revision of the Prudential and Treasury Management Codes.
   5. All non-treasury investment opportunities are subject to a due diligence process, including business case appraisal, risk assessment and sensitivity analysis and assessment of legality including state aid compliance.
   6. All proposals are approved by SFCR Committee and the delivery of major schemes is overseen by the officer-led Capital Programme Board.
   7. The council’s approach to fees and charges includes a commercial view where there is a competitive market and encourages managers to explore new income streams to enable the council to become more self-sufficient.
3. **Investment Property Portfolio** 
   1. The council has a total portfolio of commercial property assets valued at £286.0m generating an annual income of £12.6m which is therefore an important income source supporting council services. These figures are based upon the value as at the end of March 2023. The council maintains a Corporate Property Strategy and Asset Management Plan which links the council’s property holdings to its corporate priorities and strategic goals. The key aims outlined in these documents are to maximise income whilst supporting improved service delivery. Its corporate property objectives include “*to optimise the value received from non-operational urban and agricultural commercial portfolios*”.
   2. One of the strategies had been to re-balance the urban portfolio through a programme of disposals of under-performing assets and investing in primary assets generating a healthy income to support service delivery. However, the changes introduced by HM Treasury and CIPFA remove the council’s ability to be able to invest in new commercial assets through borrowing.
   3. Before the pandemic, the council’s urban commercial portfolio had performed well, with low levels of voids, arrears and bad debt. Despite the economic impact of the pandemic, performance in most sectors, including retail and industrial, has remained strong, however there is currently a high level of voids within the multi-let office properties. In addition, there are a number of tenants on payment plans having deferred their rent payments to assist their financial cashflow. The council is therefore holding a higher level of debt which is at risk.
   4. In addition to the impact of the pandemic, the portfolio has inherent risks within it, which include:
      * An unbalanced portfolio with an over-reliance on one market sector;
      * An over-reliance on retail, which is experiencing significant change and a downturn in performance due to external factors;
      * A high level of tertiary properties with low covenant tenants who are at higher risk of failure;
      * An older and aging portfolio with high levels of obsolescence and repair requirements as well as investment needs to meet statutory compliance;
      * A high level of secondary and tertiary properties with limited prospect of rental growth.
   5. There is an increased risk of voids and bad debt, low income growth and even a potential decline in income in some areas as well as an increased capital investment requirement from the council as a result of the current balance of the portfolio. Options will be explored in order to mitigate the risk as outlined above and the establishment of the Commercial Asset Investment Fund from 2024/25 will support this.
   6. The table below shows the current composition of the commercial property portfolio according to both property value and income. The table demonstrates that the retail sector (including Primary, Secondary, Tertiary and Neighbourhood Shops) comprises 40% of the income stream from commercial property.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Portfolio** | | **Income**  **£’000** | **Income as a % of total income** | **Property Value**  **£’000** | **Value as % of total Value** | **Average Yield of portfolio** |
| Agricultural | All | 872 | 7.14% | 61,101 | 29.95% | 1.43% |
| Seafront | Commercial property & concessions | 2,550 | 20.89% | 30,027 | 14.72% | 9.39% |
| Beach huts & chalets | 270 | 2.21% |
| Commercial property managed by GVA | Prime Shops | 2,208 | 18.09% | 36,094 | 17.69% | 6.12% |
| Secondary Shops | 1,525 | 12.49% | 21,858 | 10.71% | 6.98% |
| Tertiary Shops | 779 | 6.38% | 5,717 | 2.80% | 13.62% |
| Neighbourhood Shops | 330 | 2.70% | 3,084 | 1.51% | 10.69% |
| Offices | 1,123 | 9.20% | 15,796 | 7.74% | 7.11% |
| Industrial | 939 | 7.69% | 10,359 | 5.08% | 9.07% |
| Leisure | 293 | 2.40% | 6,431 | 3.15% | 4.56% |
| Miscellaneous | 135 | 1.11% | 2,279 | 1.12% | 5.92% |
| Mixed Use | 48 | 0.39% | 714 | 0.35% | 6.72% |
| Residential | 17 | 0.14% | 457 | 0.22% | 3.64% |
| New England House | 1,054 | 8.64% | 9,385 | 4.60% | 11.24% |
| Car Parking/Garages | 64 | 0.52% | 704 | 0.35% | 9.03% |
| **Total** | | **12,206** | **100%** | **204,006** | **100%** | **7.54%** |

*Note – the table excludes a number of sites managed “in-house” such as community centres, car parks and legacy sites belonging to the council.*

* 1. The council’s Corporate Property Strategy and Asset Management Plan will be reviewed and redrafted for presentation to Members for consideration and ratification in the context of the changed rules from HM Treasury regarding PWLB borrowing. In advance of this, any disposals which seek to mitigate risk will be identified on a case-by-case basis. The council holds contracts with Avison Young to manage its urban portfolio and Savills to manage its agricultural portfolio. A key provision within these contracts is for the providers to work with the in-house property team to identify appropriate assets for disposal.
  2. Any opportunities explored that result in an expected asset disposal are presented and approved by SFCR Committee in accordance with the council’s Scheme of Delegation, and executed in accordance with the council’s Financial Regulations.

1. **Loans to External Bodies**
   1. The council has the ability to provide capital loans to external bodies and organisations for the purpose of supporting activities undertaken that are aligned to the council’s Local Plan and/or service objectives. For example, a loan may be given to support a project which generates economic growth in Brighton and Hove.

***Governance***

* 1. The Local Authorities (Capital Finance and Accounting) (England) Regulations 2003 direct that a loan to an external organisation to fund any expenditure that would be treated as capital expenditure if it were incurred by the local authority must be treated as capital. As a result, all loans to external parties are subject to the governance requirements of all capital expenditure incurred by the council, as described in section 2 of the strategy.
  2. Any loan to external organisations must be compliant with the Subsidy Control rules. Advice from legal and finance officers is sought in each instance to ensure loans are compliant.

***Decision making & procedure***

* 1. Loans to external organisations are undertaken on a case-by-case basis and are subject to a thorough due diligence process to ensure:
     + the business plan receives adequate scrutiny by finance, legal and service officers, including external advisory where necessary, in order to evaluate the level of risk;
     + the loan is compliant with the Subsidy Control regime;
     + the recipient of the loan can afford the repayments.
  2. As all external loans are classed as capital expenditure, SFCR Committee is ultimately responsible for agreeing the loan as part of the capital programme and will receive a report outlining the relative risks, benefits and financial and legal implications in each instance.
  3. The council has an obligation to review all outstanding loans to external bodies as under accounting requirements it is required to review the risk of non-repayment of all outstanding debt and make a provision for impairment where there is a probability that part or all of a loan will be irrecoverable.
  4. No overall parameters have been set on the total loan value that can be provided to external bodies which are assessed and agreed on a case-by-case basis.

***Current portfolio***

* 1. The council has the following loans to external bodies outstanding as at 31 December 2023:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Organisation** | **Loan Value at 31 Dec 2023**  **£m** | **Purpose of loan & link to council priorities / service objectives** | **Meeting at which loan approved** |
| The i360 Company \* | 50.033 | To build the i360 observation tower, unlocking economic regeneration on the seafront and increasing business rate income. This includes the novated loan from C2CLEP. | 1. Special Policy & Resources Committee, 6 March 2014. 2. Special Policy & Resources Committee 27 February 2023 |
| Wave Community Bank (formerly East Sussex Credit Union) | 0.250 | To increase the reserves base for the organisation to increase affordable lending to local people and businesses, and to increase the provision of crisis loans to Brighton and Hove residents. | 1. PR&G Committee, 21 January 2016 2. Extended to March 2036 by Policy & Resources Committee on 16 March 2023. |
| Housing Joint Venture | 0.500 | Joint venture partnership with Hyde Housing Association for the delivery of 1,000 affordable homes within the City. This will be fully repaid during 2023/24. | 1. PR&G Committee, 12 October 2017 2. P&R Committee 21 October 2020 |
| Royal Pavilion & Museum Trust | 2.000 | To provide a cash flow loan facility for the Royal Pavilion and Museum Trust. | Special P&R Committee, 30 July 2020 |
| Brighton Dome & Brighton Festival Ltd | 2.704 | To support the capital redevelopment works to the Corn Exchange and Studio Theatre. | P&R Committee 13 October 2016 |

\* Note the loan value above refers to the value of the debt outstanding to the i360 Company. This is not the same as the value of the underlying PWLB debt undertaken by the council in respect of the facility.

* 1. The loan to the i360 company represents a financial risk as reported to Policy & Resources Committee in February 2023. P&R committee agreed to restructure the loan to provide the best financial outcome to the City Council in July 2022. However this revised loan agreement was not finalised due to further financial difficulties of the attraction. The report in February 2023 noted the change in business model that was being put in place by i360 Limited and updated the committee on the i360 Company’s financial position and performance. The 2024/25 budget makes full provision for the associated borrowing costs of the debt irrespective of i360 Ltd’s financial position and this is reflected in the revised Minimum Revenue Provision policy included at Appendix 3 of the budget report.
  2. The council is providing a (maximum) £4.0m cash flow loan facility to the Royal Pavilion & Museums Trust (RPMT) to be drawn down over a three-year period and repaid over a maximum period of 10 years. This was agreed at the Special P&R Committee of 30 July 2020 in response to the potential cash flow impacts of the pandemic. To date the RMPT has drawn down £2.0m to help manage its cash flows.
  3. The council has provided a loan of £2.704m to Brighton Dome & Brighton Festival Ltd toward capital works for the redevelopment of the Corn Exchange and Studio Theatre. The loan supported match funding toward a successful National Heritage Lottery and Arts Council grant for the project.

1. **Financial and other Guarantees**
   1. The council has provided guarantees against the underlying performance of the following arrangements:
      * ***Brighton & Hove Seaside Community Homes (BHSCH)***

The council has provided a rent guarantee to underwrite the rental income where Local Housing Allowance rates do not keep pace with inflation. The amount outstanding as at 31 December 2023 under this rent guarantee was £0.970m. The contract stipulates that the rent guarantee will be returned to the council when BHSCH achieves a level of surpluses as defined by the contract and business plan. However, a joint Housing and Policy & Resources Committee on 27 February 2023 agreed to explore options to end the Local Delivery Vehicle (BHSCH) and return properties to council control.

1. **Other schemes**

The primary objectives of the following schemes are not for financial return purposes, but to support meeting the council’s strategic priorities for the city. However, each project is expected to create net revenue income for the council and have therefore been included for completeness.

***Housing Joint Venture***

* 1. The council has entered into a joint venture with Hyde Housing Association for the delivery of 1,000 affordable homes for the city. The Homes for Brighton & Hove LLP’s (LLP) business plan and legal arrangements were agreed by the former Policy, Resources & Growth committee at its meeting of 12 October 2017 and included a projected investment by the council of £59.7m for 50% of the homes, net of receipts from shared ownership sales. Subsequently on 21 October 2020 a joint Policy & Resources and Housing committee meeting approved that the business plan be amended for the development of the first 2 sites at Coldean Lane and Portslade, delivering 346 homes. The approval given was for 50% of the homes to be purchased by the HRA for an investment of up to £41.0m, including fees, and utilising Homes England Grant funding.
  2. The LLP’s business plan to deliver the remaining 654 homes has since been updated following a review to enable the new development company delivery model for future developments. Significant changes to the LLP agreement is a reserved matter and requires Policy & Resources (now Strategy, Finance & City Regeneration) Committee approval. At the 7 July 2022 Policy & Resources meeting approval was given to amend the business plan accordingly. The revised business plan adopts the development company model for future projects with HBH developing homes and selling back to the Council and Hyde; all new projects require individual sign off Strategy, Finance & City Regeneration Committee before progressing to the development stage.

1. **Proportionality & Summary of Risk Exposure**
   1. The Capital Strategy provides an opportunity to demonstrate the totality and proportionality of the council’s non-treasury investments in one place.
   2. The Prudential Code now requires authorities to report a new indicator showing the expected income from non-treasury investments compared to the net budget. This is shown in the table below.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Net income from Non-Treasury Investments to Net Revenue Stream** | **2024/25**  **Estimate**  **£m** | **2025/26**  **Estimate**  **£m** | **2026/27**  **Estimate**  **£m** |
|  |  |  |  |
| Income from commercial properties | 13.242 | 13.725 | 14.137 |
| *Net revenue budget* | ***246.353*** | ***267.445*** | ***273.228*** |
| ***Ratio of net income from non-treasury investments to net revenue budget*** | ***5.4%*** | ***5.1%*** | ***5.2%*** |

* 1. The council’s underlying need to borrow is portrayed by its Capital Financing Requirement (CFR). The CFR increases each year by capital expenditure that is not funded by new or existing resources (i.e. results in borrowing). The CFR reduces each year by the MRP set aside to repay borrowing as described in paragraph 1.7
  2. Any non-treasury investments funded by borrowing will increase the council’s CFR. The table below demonstrates the proportion of the General Fund CFR (excluding PFI liabilities) outstanding at 31 March 2023 (and forecast to be outstanding at 31 March 2024) including CFR relating to commercial investments. That is, this represents the outstanding debt relating to the council’s commercial activity where MRP has not yet been applied.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **As at 31/03/23** | **Forecast to 31/03/24** |
| General Assets CFR | 78% | 84% |
| i360 | 18% | 12% |
| Phoenix House | 2% | 2% |
| Lyndean House | 2% | 2% |
| **Total General Fund CFR** | **100%** | **100%** |

1. **Knowledge & Skills**
   1. The council’s Section 151 Officer has delegated responsibility for the council’s treasury and capital activities. This requires the post-holder to be a qualified accountant. The Section 151 Officer is a CIPFA qualified accountant who follows an ongoing programme of Continuous Professional Development (CPD) and is appointed by the full Council.
   2. The council’s treasury and capital strategies are produced and maintained by a team of officers who are professionally qualified accountants and who have extensive local authority experience. The council has a contract with Link Asset Services for the provision of specialist advice regarding its treasury investment and borrowing activity and for technical advice. Officers involved in treasury management ensure their knowledge is updated through Continuous Professional Development (CPD).
   3. All of the council’s commercial projects have project teams made up of officers from relevant professional disciplines from across the council. These project teams access external specialist advice regarding commercial projects where required.
   4. The council’s investment property portfolios are managed by Savills (agricultural) and Avison Young (Commercial), two of the UK’s leading property companies. They administer their contracts for Estates Management Services through the provision of a dedicated team of chartered surveyors who have extensive property knowledge and expertise as well as experience of acting for local authority clients. Each local team is supported by a range of “head office” specialist services within their own organisation, including market experts, planning consultants, H&S/FM services, accountancy, agency and so on, ensuring the council has access to a wide range of services to meet all of our property requirements.
   5. Training is available for members who are responsible for decision making and scrutiny of treasury decisions to ensure their skills and knowledge are kept up to date for their involvement in this area. Training was last provided to members on 19 January 2024.
2. **S151 Officer Assurance Statement**
   1. This Capital Strategy is compiled in line with the requirements of the 2021 CIPFA Prudential Code and the 2021 Treasury Management Code.
   2. The Section 151 Officer has reviewed the strategy against best practice advice from CIPFA and expert advisers and considers the strategy to be prudential, sustainable and affordable within the risk framework of the council and has ensured that it is fully integrated with the council’s Medium Term Financial Strategy and Treasury Management Strategy Statement.
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**ANNEX A**

**Capital Resources 2024/25**

A fully financed Capital Investment Programme is proposed for 2024/25 assuming that existing approved capital projects spend in-line with approved budgets and certain net usable receipts of £19.450m in total are achieved. Table 1 below shows how the programme can be financed in 2024/25. The position for the years 2025/26 onward is less certain until future Government Grant allocations are confirmed. All Government support is allocated through capital grants and all grants are unringfenced with the exception of Devolved Schools Capital Grant which must be allocated to schools.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TABLE 1: Capital Resources** | **2024/25**  **£ million** |
| Capital Grants: |  |
| - Capital grant announcements in previous years and profiled for spend in 2024/25 | 26.357 |
| - New capital grants | 25.071 |
| **Total Government Support** | **51.428** |
| Capital Receipts Reserve | 21.576 |
| Capital Reserves | 0.693 |
| Specific Reserves | 1.942 |
| External Contributions | 6.992 |
| Direct Revenue Funding – Housing Revenue Account | 16.516 |
| Direct Revenue Funding – Service Departments | 1.070 |
| Council Borrowing | 111.253 |
| **Total Capital Resources** | **211.470** |

**Capital Grants**

The Government distributes capital grants towards the financing of certain capital expenditure. In 2024/25, it is anticipated that the council will receive new capital grants of £25.071m as summarised in Table 2 below, and £26.357m from grants already announced where the spending of these grants is now profiled in 2024/25.

It is possible that other capital grants may be received during the year and these will be reported through TBM budget monitoring reports to SFCR Committee as and when they are announced.

The new capital grants are in three main areas:

* Education funding of £4.250m (estimated and due to be announced) for investment in the maintenance of educational buildings and Children’s Centres;
* Transport funding of £10.820m (estimated and due to be announced) to include transport related schemes and highways maintenance. The grant comes in the form of Highways Maintenance and Integrated Transport block grant plus assumed levels of investment for pothole maintenance and support from the Highways Maintenance Incentive fund. There are further allocations for road safety, bus service improvements and emissions reductions.
* Better Care grant funding that supports the Disabled Facilities Grant programme and Adult Social Care investment to be confirmed.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TABLE 2: New Grants announced for 2024/25** | **£ million** |
| Education Capital Maintenance \* | 3.750 |
| Schools Devolved Capital \* | 0.500 |
| Disabled Facilities Grant & Better Care \* | 2.500 |
| Highways Maintenance Block Allocation (LTP) | 1.455 |
| Integrated Transport Block Allocation (LTP) | 3.083 |
| Pothole Action Fund (LTP) | 1.455 |
| Highways Maintenance Incentive Fund (LTP) | 0.364 |
| Bus Service Improvement Grant | 2.100 |
| Zebra 2 Zero Buses Emissions | 1.650 |
| Road Safety Fund | 0.300 |
| Highways Maintenance – Network North | 0.413 |
| Defra Weekly Food Waste Collections Grant | 2.444 |
| Land Release Funding Grant HRA | 1.797 |
| Royal Pavilion Phase 2 Gardens NLHF | 3.080 |
| Energy Grants for HRA | 0.180 |
| **Total** | **32.035** |

*\* Funding to be confirmed by government*

**Capital Receipts**

The funding of the capital investment programme assumes estimated net capital receipts of £19.450m in 2024/25. This includes receipts associated with the transfer of sites to the HRA for the Moulsecoomb redevelopment, the disposal of Patcham Court Farm and Montague Place. There is also a lease re-gear at Moulsecoomb Way and potential HRA transfer of land at Portslade. There are a number of surplus properties identified for disposal as part of the Residential Property Strategy and the Commercial Investment Property Strategy approved at this committee 7 December 2023. These receipts are planned for investment in future years’ capital programmes. Progress will be closely monitored throughout the year for all receipts and reported through the regular TBM budget monitoring reports. Failure to achieve some of these receipts will require the capital allocations for future years to be reviewed.

The net receipts from ‘right to buy’ sales are reinvested directly in delivering additional housing.

**Capital Reserves**

The level of reserves relates purely to unspent resources carried forward from previous years which have already been earmarked for specific schemes. The council monitors these resources over a rolling period by continually updating projections and comparing these against the level of commitments within the approved Capital Investment Programme.

**Specific Reserves**

Specific reserves will be used to support schemes directly related to the purpose of the reserve or to support corporate priorities. Specific reserves relate to the refurbishment and maintenance of properties managed by the Brighton and Hove Seaside Community Homes with the costs being met in accordance with the housing agreement. The Property service charge reserve will support investment into Phoenix House for the commercial portfolio. The Madeira Terrace crowdfunding reserve supports the Madeira Terraces development. A contribution from the Sports Facilities reserve will support maintenance works at Prince Regent. Finally, the Income Leaseholder and Earmarked Rent reserves will support delivery of the HRA Capital Investment programme.

**External Contributions**

The council will utilise external contributions totalling £6.992m in 2024/25 associated with donations, partner and private contributions including S106 contributions. Contributions are forecast for the Brighton Museum and Art Gallery Works of £1.332m from Arts Council England. Private donations will support the Royal Pavilion Estate Phases 1 and 2 development works.

S106 contributions are forecast for the Kingsway to the Sea development, Stanmer pond restoration, the playground refurbishment programme. There are also commuted sums associated with the Home Purchase Policy for the HRA of £1.6m.

**Direct Revenue Funding**

The General Fund and Housing Revenue Account budget proposals include direct revenue funding of £17.586m. A summary of the allocations by service is shown in the table below.

| **TABLE 3: Direct Revenue Funding 2024/25** | **£ million** |
| --- | --- |
| Schools Services – Structural maintenance for schools | 0.500 |
| City Environment Management – Playground Refurbishment Programme | 0.354 |
| Culture, Tourism and Sports – Prince Regent Mechanical Equipment Replacement | 0.162 |
| Housing General Fund – IT Strategy System | 0.054 |
| **Total General Fund Services** | **1.070** |
| Housing Revenue Account | 16.516 |
| **Grand Total** | **17.586** |

**Council Borrowing under the Prudential Code**

Council borrowing under the Prudential Code can be undertaken only when it can be demonstrated that it is affordable, for example, where the investment leads to greater efficiency in future service provision and generates revenue savings or reductions in budgeted spend. For 2024/25 it is proposed that the council will undertake borrowing of £111.253m to finance capital expenditure plans as detailed in table 4.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TABLE 4: Council Borrowing in 2024/25** | **£ million** |
| ***Housing, Neighbourhood & Communities*** |  |
| Housing Revenue Account – 2024/25 | 62.002 |
| Safe Homes Grant | 0.331 |
| ***Health & Adult Social Care*** |  |
| Knoll House Resource Centre Supported Housing | 4.877 |
| ***Families, Children & Learning*** |  |
| Cardinal Newman 4G Pitch & Changing Rooms | 0.500 |
| Brighton Youth Centre project | 1.300 |
| Impulse Education Management System | 0.093 |
| ***Economy, Environment & Culture***  *City Environment Management* |  |
| Replacement Programme Vehicles | 2.500 |
| Pavilion and Mess Room Refurbishment Programme | 1.400 |
| Parks and Open Spaces Investment | 1.555 |
| Public Conveniences | 1.866 |
| On Street and Communal Bin Infrastructure | 1.000 |
| Hollingdean Deport Office Accommodation and Site Surface | 2.229 |
| Communal Bin and WEE Recycling | 0.431 |
| Woodland Creation Scheme | 0.135 |
| St Ann’s Well Café Sustainable Improvements | 0.074 |
| *City Development & Regeneration* |  |
| New England House Development | 2.232 |
| Madeira Terrace Development Implementation Works | 6.231 |
| Black Rock Enabling Works | 0.300 |
| *Culture, Tourism & Sport* |  |
| Kingsway to the Sea | 3.200 |
| Royal Pavilion Estate Phase 2 Gardens | 0.250 |
| King Alfred Main Pool Reinforcement | 0.674 |
| Prince Regent Capital Works | 0.130 |
| Brighton Centre Essential Maintenance | 1.000 |
| Withdean Sports Complex Swimming Pool | 0.451 |
| Volks Railway Disabled Access Carriage | 0.100 |
| *Transport* |  |
| Street Lighting Invest to Save Scheme | 1.000 |
| Seafront Heritage Lighting Renewal Programme | 1.562 |
| Brighton Bikeshare Replacement Programme | 0.215 |
| Citywide Strategic Transport Model | 0.205 |
| Valley Gardens Phase 3 | 1.144 |
| Hove Station Footbridge | 0.500 |
| Elm Grove/ Queens Park Road Improvements | 0.350 |
| Zebra 2 – Zero Emissions Buses | 0.275 |
| A27 Junction Works (to be approved) | 0.600 |
| *Property* |  |
| Planned maintenance for Corporate and Social Care Buildings | 2.000 |
| Planned Maintenance for Corporate Buildings 2023/24 reprofiled | 0.603 |
| Workstyles Phase 4 including Office Accommodation Strategy | 0.271 |
| Phoenix House Improvements | 0.332 |
| Carbon Reduction in Operational Buildings | 1.267 |
| Schools Energy Efficiency Reinvestment Fund | 0.400 |
| Moulsecoomb Hub Sustainability Measures | 0.100 |
| Solar Panels on Corporate Buildings | 0.678 |
| ***Finance & Resources*** |  |
| IT&D Programme and Investment for Desktop and Laptop Replacement Programme | 3.660 |
| Custmomer Digital | 0.380 |
| Electronic Document Management Replacement System | 0.400 |
| Local Area Network Hardware Refresh | 0.450 |
| **Total for Capital Programme** | **111.253** |

**ANNEX B**

**List of current non-treasury Investments**

This list is reviewed on an on-going basis by finance officers to ensure risks are monitored and updates are escalated through the Strategic Delivery Board and Corporate Investment Board where required.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Investment Type** | **Scheme Name** | **Value** |
| Investment Property Portfolio | Urban & Agriculture Property Portfolios | £286.014m\* |
| Loan to external body | i360 Company | £50.033m |
| Loan to external body | The Wave Community Bank (formerly ESCU) | £0.250m |
| Loan to external body | Royal Pavilion and Museums Trust | £2.000m |
| Loan to external body | Corn Exchange & Studio Theatre | £2.704m |
| Financial Guarantee | Brighton & Hove Seaside Community Homes | £0.970m\*\* |
| Housing Property Joint Venture | Housing Joint Venture | £0.500m\*\*\* |

**\*** Value as at 31 March 2023

\*\* Estimated value of debtor at 31 March 2023

\*\*\* This will be fully repaid by 31 March 2024

**ANNEX C**

**List of planned non-treasury Investments**

This list is reviewed on an on-going basis by finance officers to ensure risks are monitored and updates are escalated through the Strategic Delivery Board and Corporate Investment Board where required.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Investment Type** | **Scheme Name** | **Value** |
| Cash flow support (third party loan) | Cash flow support to Royal Pavilion Museums Trust | £2.000m |
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* **INTRODUCTION**
  + ***Background***

The council is required to set a balanced budget, which broadly means that cash raised and received during the year will meet cash expenditure. Part of the treasury management operation is to ensure that this cash flow is adequately planned, with cash being available when it is needed. Cash can often be set aside (e.g. reserves) or received ahead of when it is required, for example, government capital grant funding, and therefore cash balances are invested in counterparties or instruments commensurate with the council’s risk appetite, and always prioritising adequate liquidity before considering investment return.

The second main function of the treasury management service is the funding of the council’s capital plans. These capital plans provide a guide to the borrowing need of the council, essentially the longer-term cash flow planning, to ensure that the council can meet its capital spending obligations. This management of longer-term cash may involve arranging long or short-term loans or using longer-term cash flow surpluses. On occasion, when it is prudent and economic, any debt previously drawn down may be restructured to meet council risk or cost objectives.

The contribution that the treasury management function makes to the authority is critical, as the balance of debt and investment operations ensure liquidity and the ability to meet spending commitments as they fall due, either on day-to-day revenue spending or for larger capital projects. The treasury operations will see a balance of the interest costs of debt and the investment income arising from cash deposits affecting the available budget. Since cash balances generally result from holding reserves and balances, it is paramount to ensure adequate security of the sums invested, as a loss of principal will in effect result in a direct loss to the General Fund.

CIPFA defines treasury management as:

*“The management of the local authority’s borrowing, investments and cash flows, its banking, money market and capital market transactions; the effective control of the risks associated with those activities; and the pursuit of optimum performance consistent with those risks.”*

Whilst any commercial initiatives or loans to third parties will impact on the treasury function, these activities are generally classed as non-treasury activities (arising usually from capital expenditure) and are separate from the day-to-day treasury management activities.

* + ***Reporting Requirements***
    - ***Capital Strategy***

The CIPFA 2021 Prudential and Treasury Management Codes require all local authorities to prepare a capital strategy report, to provide the following:

* a high-level long-term overview of how capital expenditure, capital financing and treasury management activity contribute to the provision of services;
* an overview of how the associated risks are managed;
* the implications for future financial sustainability.

The aim of the strategy is to ensure that all the Authority’s elected members fully understand the overall long-term policy objectives and resulting Capital Strategy requirements, governance procedures and risk appetite.

This Capital Strategy is reported separately from the Treasury Management Strategy Statement with non-treasury investments being reported through the former. This ensures the separation of the core treasury function under security, liquidity and yield principles, and the policy-driven and commercial investments usually driven by expenditure on an asset.

* + - ***Treasury Management reporting***

The Council is currently required to receive and approve, as a minimum, three main treasury reports each year, which incorporate a variety of policies, estimates and actuals.

1. **Prudential and treasury indicators, and treasury strategy** (this report) - The first, and most important report, is forward looking and covers:

* the capital investment plans, (including prudential indicators);
* a Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy, (how residual capital expenditure is charged to revenue over time);
* the Treasury Management Strategy, (how the investments and borrowings are to be organised), including treasury indicators; and
* an Annual Investment Strategy, (the parameters on how investments are to be managed).

1. **A mid-year treasury management report** – This is primarily a progress report and will update members on the capital position, amending prudential indicators as necessary, and whether any policies require revision. In addition, this Authority will receive quarterly update reports.
2. **An annual treasury management report** – This is a backward looking review document and provides details of a selection of actual prudential and treasury indicators and actual treasury operations compared to the estimates within the strategy.

*This Council delegates responsibility for implementation and monitoring of treasury management to the Strategy, Finance & City Regeneration Committee (SFCR) and responsibility for the execution and administration of treasury management decisions to the Section 151 Officer. SFCR therefore receives the mid-year report in December and the annual report in July each year.*

The above reports are required to be adequately scrutinised before being recommended to the Council. This role is undertaken by the SFCR Committee.

**Quarterly reports** – In addition to the three major reports detailed above, from 2023/24 quarterly reporting is also required. However, these additional reports do not have to be reported to Full Council but are required to be adequately scrutinised. This role is undertaken by the SFCR Committee and reporting will be incorporated into relevant Targeted Budget Management (TBM) budget monitoring reports at month 5 (August) and month 9 (December) presented in October and February of each year, with the other quarters already being fulfilled by the mid-year and annual end of year reports.

* + ***Treasury Management Strategy for 2024/25***

The strategy for 2024/25 covers two main areas:

* + - ***Capital issues:***
* the capital expenditure plans (section 2) and the associated prudential indicators (Annex C);
* the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy (Section 3).
  + - ***Treasury management issues:***
* the current treasury position (section 1.5);
* treasury indicators which limit the treasury risk and activities of the council (Annex C);
* prospects for interest rates (Annex B);
* the borrowing strategy (section 2);
* policy on borrowing in advance of need (section 2.5);
* debt rescheduling (section 2.6);
* the investment strategy (section 4);
* creditworthiness policy (section 4.4); and
* the policy on the use of external service providers (section 5.3).

These elements cover the requirements of the Local Government Act 2003, the CIPFA Prudential Code, DLUHC MRP Guidance, the CIPFA Treasury Management Code and DLUHC Investment Guidance.

* + ***Treasury Management Policy Statement***

The policies and objectives of the council’s treasury management activities are as follows:

1. This council defines its treasury management activities as:

*‘The management of the authority’s investments and cash flows, its banking, money market and capital market transactions; the effective control of the risks associated with those activities; and the pursuit of optimum performance consistent with those risks’.*

1. This council regards the successful identification, monitoring and control of risk to be the prime criteria by which the effectiveness of its treasury management activities will be measured. Accordingly, the analysis and reporting of treasury management activities will focus on their risk implications for the council, and any financial instruments entered into to manage these risks.
2. This council acknowledges that effective treasury management will provide support towards the achievement of its business and service objectives. It is therefore committed to the principles of achieving value for money in treasury management, and to employing suitable comprehensive performance management techniques, within the context of effective risk management.
   * ***Current Treasury Portfolio Position***

A summary of the council’s borrowing & investment portfolios as at 31 December 2023 and forecast at the end of the financial year is shown in **Table 1** below:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 1** | **Actual at 31 December 2023** | | | **Forecast to 31 March 2024** | | |
|  | **£’000** | **% of portfolio** | **Average Rate\*** | **£’000** | **% of portfolio** | **Average Rate** |
| **Treasury Investments** | | | | | | |
| UK Banks | 55.324 | 41.0% | 5.55% | 34.324 | 34.6% | 5.65% |
| Non-UK Banks | 30,000 | 22.2% | 5.36% | 30,000 | 30.2% | 5.36% |
| Building Societies | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Authorities | 15,000 | 11.1% | 2.55% | 5,000 | 5.0% | 2.05% |
| Money Market Funds (Including VNAV) | 24,676 | 18.3% | 5.34% | 20,000 | 20.1% | 5.30% |
| Royal London Funds\*\* | 10,000 | 7.4% | -0.72% | 10,000 | 10.1% | -0.72% |
| **Total Investments** | **135,000** | **100.0%** | **4.67%** | **99.324** | **100%** | **4.67%** |
| **Borrowing** | | | | | | |
| PWLB loans | 334,617 | 90.5% | 2.78% | 334,617 | 90.5% | 2.78% |
| Market loans | 35,000 | 9.5% | 4.33% | 35,000 | 9.5% | 4.33% |
| Local Authorities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total external Borrowing** | **369,617** | **100.0%** | **2.92%** | **369,617** | **100.0%** | **2.92%** |

*\* Average rate is taken as a snapshot as at 31 December 2023*

*\*\* The Royal London Funds show a negative return as a result in a decline in capital value because fixed income funds such as these reduce in value in a rising interest rate market. The council is still receiving an appropriate level of revenue income from these funds, and the decline in capital value is expected to be short term and therefore not expected to result in an actual capital loss.*

* **BORROWING STRATEGY**

The capital expenditure plans set out in the Capital Strategy provide details of the service activity of the Authority. The treasury management function ensures that the Authority’s cash is organised in accordance with the relevant professional codes, so that sufficient cash is available to meet this service activity and the Authority’s Capital Strategy. This will involve both the organisation of the cash flow and, where capital plans require, the organisation of appropriate borrowing facilities. The strategy covers the relevant treasury / prudential indicators, the current and projected debt positions, and the Annual Investment Strategy.

Any capital investment that is not funded from new and/or existing resources (e.g. capital grants, receipts from asset sales, revenue contributions or earmarked reserves) potentially increases the council’s need to borrow, represented by the council’s Capital Financing Requirement (CFR). However, external borrowing does not have to take place immediately to finance its related capital expenditure: the council can utilise cash being held for other purposes (such as earmarked reserves and working capital balances) to temporarily defer the need for external borrowing. This is known as ‘internal borrowing’ or ‘under-borrowing’.

The council’s primary objective is to strike an appropriate balance between securing cost certainty and securing low interest rates.

The council operates a two-pool approach for borrowing following the introduction of the HRA Self-Financing regime in March 2012.

* + ***Capital Prudential Indicators***

The Authority’s capital expenditure plans are a key driver for Treasury Management activity. The output of the capital expenditure plans is reflected in the prudential indicators, which are designed to assist members’ overview and confirm capital expenditure plans.

Tables 2, 3 and 4 show the capital expenditure plans of the Authority, and the implications of these on the Capital Financing Requirement over the 3-year period to 2026/27. These indicators have been included in the Treasury Management Strategy for a number of years to demonstrate the affordability and sustainability of the Authority’s capital activity.

A further prudential indicator now required is the Liability Benchmark. This benchmark measures the Authority’s external debt levels net of the external investments, with the inclusion of a liquidity buffer against the Authority’s CFR projection. This measure assumes that the authority will internally borrow almost all its available cash held in reserves and balances, with an allowance ensure it is able to meet is cash obligations.

There are four components to the Liability Benchmark:

1. **Existing loan debt outstanding:** the Authority’s existing loans that are still outstanding in future years.
2. **Loans CFR:** this is calculated in accordance with the loans CFR definition in the Prudential Code and projected into the future based on approved prudential borrowing and planned MRP.
3. **Net loans requirement:** this will show the Authority’s gross loan debt less treasury management investments at the last financial year-end, projected into the future and based on its approved prudential borrowing, planned MRP and any other major cash flows forecast.
4. **Liability benchmark (or gross loans requirement):** this equals net loans requirement plus short-term liquidity allowance.

The Liability Benchmark has been produced for both the General Fund and HRA separately, and are shown below in sections 2.2.2 and 2.3.2 with notes to explain each element and the Authority’s assumption and forward view.

* + ***General Fund Borrowing Position and Strategy***

The General Fund has been carrying an internal borrowing position (i.e. where the General Fund borrows cash from its own reserves) for a number of years. The General Fund entered into planned borrowing from the PWLB to reduce the internal borrowing position during 2021/22 and 2022/23 in preparation for it increasing again during the current period of high interest rates, to reduce the need to enter into borrowing at higher rates.

Table 2 below demonstrates that the General Fund has a borrowing need of £34m to support the 2023/24 capital programme. No new external borrowing has been undertaken for the General Fund during the year, and no new external borrowing is expected to be undertaken during the remainder of 2023/24.

* + - ***General Fund Borrowing Strategy for 2024/25***

The General Fund (GF) capital programme 2024/25 to 2026/27 forecasts a total of £242m capital investment, £128m of which will be met from existing or new resources. The GF borrowing need over this period is therefore £114m as shown in **Table 2** below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2023/24**  **Projected** | **Table 2 – Borrowing Requirement** | **2024/25**  **Estimate** | **2025/26**  **Estimate** | **2026/27**  **Estimate** | **Total** |
| **£m** | **£m** | **£m** | **£m** | **£m** |
| 89 | GF Capital Expenditure | 122 | 90 | 30 | 242 |
| (55) | **Financed by:**  New & existing resources | (72) | (36) | (20) | (128) |
| - | Financing not yet identified | - | - | - | - |
| **34** | **GF Borrowing Need** | **50** | **54** | **10** | **114** |

Of the £114m borrowing need shown, £35m is for projects that are awaiting approval or detailed analysis. Therefore, the timing of borrowing is uncertain, and borrowing decisions for these projects will form part of the viability and due diligence process.

For the remaining borrowing need, the strategy will initially focus on meeting this borrowing need from internal borrowing. i.e. avoiding external borrowing by utilising the council’s own cash balances, or by short-term borrowing where required.

Officers continually review the level of internal borrowing that the General Fund is able to support in the context of prevailing and forecast interest rates, economic outlook and the expected movement in reserves. Modelling of the movement of reserves and the council’s capital expenditure plans demonstrates that the General Fund’s long-term reserves and balances can support a level of approximately £75m of internal borrowing in the medium term. This will mitigate the increase in the cost of borrowing and reduce counterparty risk within the council’s investment portfolio by reducing the portfolio size.

The internal borrowing position needs to be carefully and continually reviewed to avoid incurring higher borrowing costs in the future at a time when the authority may not be able to avoid new borrowing to finance capital expenditure or refinance maturing debt.

* + - ***General Fund Liability benchmark***

The Liability Benchmark graph for the General Fund is shown below:
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1. **External Debt –** The maturity profile of the current portfolio of general fund external debt is shown by the bars which show how this is currently made up of PWLB, LOBO and Market Loans. The debt has a fairly gradual maturity profile which means that there are no requirements to pay back exceptionally large amounts of debt in any one year.
2. **Loans CFR –** This is the projections of the General Fund’s underlying borrowing requirement (or CFR) based on the current capital plans, and is shown by the dotted line. The 2023/24 opening Loans CFR was £211m, and it is expected to peak at £316m in 2025/26. This only shows the Loans CFR projection based on the current 5-year capital programme of the council, therefore if ongoing borrowing is required beyond 2028/29 then the CFR would rise further and for longer.
3. **Net Loans Requirement –** This is the expected net treasury position as shown by the bottom blue line. This shows a projection of the loans requirements measured by opening external debt for 2023/24 less the opening external investments for 2023/24. The projections are then based on the expected borrowing within the capital programme and the expected movement in reserves and balances and shows the borrowing requirement if the council were to utilise all of its reserves and balances for internal borrowing. This shows that the General Fund had more external debt than external investments as at 31/03/23. Based on the current forecast, the net loans requirement peaks at £198m in 2028/29. This suggests that if reserves and balances are fully utilised for internal borrowing, the general fund requires an additional maximum of £46m of external borrowing to sustain the current capital plans.
4. **Liability Benchmark –** The liability benchmark shows the Net Loan Requirement, but with a buffer of £50m incorporated to ensure the General Fund has sufficient cash to meet its cash obligations. This measure shows the level to which the council can internally borrow based on the projection of the capital programme, movement of reserves and allowing for a liquidity buffer. Where the liability benchmark rises above the current debt portfolio, this shows a need for external borrowing, and where the benchmark reduces back below the current portfolio, it shows that the council will be over-borrowed based on current plans.

This graph demonstrates that the General Fund may not need to externally borrow until 2024/25, and that the external borrowing requirement will peak at £248m in 2028/29, before falling. The graph also shows that based on current plans, new borrowing will be required until 2039/40, a shorter period than the council historically borrows over.

Whilst the Liability Benchmark is a good indicator of the General Fund’s direction of travel in terms of borrowing need, it assumes that capital borrowing stops after the current capital planning period and ignores future borrowing beyond the planning period. Therefore, it should not be used in isolation when making long term decisions, but as part of a range of factors.

* + ***Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Borrowing Position and Strategy***

The Housing Revenue Account (HRA) carries a fully funded borrowing position (i.e. the HRA does not borrow from its own reserves, but instead undertakes borrowing for its entire borrowing requirement). Table 3 demonstrates that the HRA has a borrowing need of £35m to support the capital programme in 2023/24. At the end of 2022/23, the HRA was temporarily over-borrowed by £10m as a result of borrowing in advance of need during 2022/23 in order to take advantage of attractive interest rates in a rising interest rate environment. No further external borrowing has been undertaken for the HRA during the year. Therefore, up to £25m of new borrowing is expected to be required for the remainder of 2023/24, either borrowed externally, or temporarily from the General Fund.

* + - ***HRA Borrowing Strategy for 2024/25***

The HRA Capital Programme 2024/25 to 2026/27 forecasts a total £220m of capital investment over the next three years with £68m met from existing or new resources. The increase in the HRA’s borrowing need over this period is therefore £152m as shown in **Table 3** below. It is expected that this borrowing need will be met from a combination of borrowing externally and from the General Fund. The extent to which the HRA can borrow from the General Fund is dependent on the level of liquid resources the General Fund has available to lend to the HRA and additionally will depend on the view of interest rate prospects:

* If it is considered that there is a significant likelihood of reducing long term interest rates, long term borrowing should be postponed;
* If it is considered that there is a significant risk of sharply increasing long term interest rates, long term borrowing should be considered.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2023/24**  **Projected** | **Table 3 – HRA Borrowing Requirement** | **2024/25**  **Estimate** | **2025/26**  **Estimate** | **2026/27**  **Estimate** | **Total** |
| **£m** | **£m** | **£m** | **£m** | **£m** |
| 69 | HRA Capital Expenditure | 89 | 71 | 60 | 220 |
| (34) | **Financed by:**  New & existing resources | (27) | (21) | (20) | (68) |
| **35** | **HRA Borrowing Need** | **62** | **50** | **40** | **152** |

* + - ***HRA Liability Benchmark***

The Liability Benchmark graph for the HRA is shown below:

**A graph of a line graph

Description automatically generated**

1. **External Debt –** The maturity profile of the current portfolio of HRA external debt is shown by the bars which show how this is currently made up of PWLB, LOBO and Market Loans. The debt has a fairly gradual maturity profile which means that there are no requirements to pay back large amounts of debt in any one year.
2. **Loans CFR –** This is the projection of the HRA’s underlying borrowing requirement (or CFR) based on the current capital plans, and is shown by the dotted line. The 2023/24 opening Loans CFR was £204m, and it is expected to peak at £473m in 2028/29. This only shows the Loans CFR projection based on the current capital programme of the council, therefore if ongoing borrowing is required beyond 2028/29 then the CFR would rise further. The CFR is maintained at £473m as the HRA is not required to set aside MRP, and the current assumption is that the HRA will re-finance maturing debt. This strategy is subject to review, depending on the expectation of the long-term borrowing need in the HRA capital programme.
3. **Net Loans Requirement –** The expected net treasury position is shown by the bottom blue line. This shows a projection of the loans requirements measured by opening external debt for 2023/24 less the opening HRA reserves for 2023/24. The projections are then based on the expected borrowing within the capital programme and the expected movement in reserves and balances and shows the borrowing requirement if the HRA were to utilise all of its reserves for internal borrowing. This line tracks very closely to the Loans CFR due to the borrowing requirement being proportionality high compared to the HRA reserves.
4. **Liability Benchmark –** The liability benchmark shows the Net Loan Requirement, but with a buffer of £5m incorporated to ensure the HRA has sufficient cash to meet its cash obligations. This measure shows the level to which the HRA can internally borrow based on the projection of the capital programme, movement of reserves and allowing for a liquidity buffer. The HRA liability benchmark demonstrates that the HRA needs to externally borrow for nearly all of its borrowing requirement, which is the current strategy.

The graph demonstrates that the HRA has an ongoing external borrowing requirement to the extent of its CFR.

* + ***Capital Financing Requirement***

**Table 4** below shows the actual expected external debt compared to the capital financing requirement over the next 3 years for both the General Fund and the HRA. This demonstrates that the HRA CFR is expected to be fully funded to 2026/27, and the General Fund is expected to maintain an under-borrowed position:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2023/24** | **Table 4** | **2024/25**  **Estimate** | **2025/26**  **Estimate** | **2026/27**  **Estimate** |
| **Estimate** |
| **£m** | **£m** | **£m** | **£m** |
| **General Fund** | | | | |
| 180 | GF Debt at 1 April | 168 | 200 | 241 |
| (12) | Expected change in Debt | 32 | 41 | (4) |
| **168** | **GF Debt at 31 March** | **200** | **241** | **237** |
| 212 | GF CFR\* at 1 April | 237 | 276 | 317 |
| 34 | Borrowing need (Table 2) | 50 | 54 | 10 |
| (9) | MRP | (11) | (13) | (14) |
| **237** | **GF CFR\* at 31 March** | **276** | **317** | **313** |
| **69** | **Under / (Over) borrowing** | **76** | **76** | **76** |
| **29.1%** | **% Under-borrowed** | **27.5%** | **24.0%** | **24.3%** |
| **Housing Revenue Account** | | | | |
| 214 | HRA Debt at 1 April\*\* | 239 | 301 | 351 |
| 25 | Expected change in Debt | 62 | 50 | 40 |
| **239** | **HRA Debt at 31 March** | **301** | **351** | **391** |
| 204 | HRA CFR at 1 April | 239 | 301 | 351 |
| 35 | Borrowing need (Table 3) | 62 | 50 | 40 |
| 0 | MRP | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **239** | **HRA CFR at 31 March** | **301** | **351** | **391** |
| **-** | **Under / (Over) borrowing** | **-** | **-** | **-** |

* *GF CFR in Table 4 is the underlying need to borrow and excludes PFI and lease arrangements, which are included in the CFR figure in the Prudential Indicators in Annex C.*
  + ***Policy on Borrowing in Advance of Need***

The council will not borrow purely in order to profit from investment of sums borrowed in advance of need. Any decision to borrow in advance will be within approved Capital Financing Requirement estimates and will be considered carefully to ensure that value for money can be demonstrated and that the council can ensure the security of such funds. Risks associated with any borrowing in advance activity will be subject to prior appraisal and subsequent reporting.

* + ***Debt Rescheduling***

Officers continue to regularly review opportunities for debt rescheduling but there has been a considerable widening of the difference between new borrowing and repayment rates, which has resulted in far fewer opportunities to realise any savings or benefits from rescheduling PWLB debt.

The reasons for any rescheduling to take place will include:

* the generation of cash savings and / or discounted cash flow savings;
* helping to fulfil long term treasury strategy aims;
* enhancing the balance of the portfolio (amending the maturity profile and/or the balance of volatility).

The strategy is to continue to seek opportunity to reduce the overall level of the council’s debt where prudent to do so, thus providing in future years cost reduction in terms of lower debt repayment costs, and potential for making savings by running down investment balances to repay debt prematurely as short term rates on investments are likely to be lower than rates paid on current debt. All rescheduling will be agreed by the S151 Officer.

* + ***Interest Rate Risk & Continual Review***

The council’s total borrowing need of £266m is identified in **Tables 2 & 3.** This borrowing need, together with the debt at risk of maturity shown in **Table 5**, is the extent to which the council is subject to interest rate risk over the next three years.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 5** | **2024/25** | **2025/26** | **2026/27** |
| **£m** | **£m** | **£m** |
| Maturing Debt | 14 | 5 | 8 |
| Debt Subject to early repayments options | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| **Total debt at risk of maturity** | **19** | **10** | **18** |

Officers continue to review the need to borrow taking into consideration the potential increases in borrrowing costs, the need to finance new capital expenditure, the need to refinance maturing debt, and the cost of carry that might incur a revenue loss between borrowing costs and investment returns.

Against this background and the risks within the economic forecast, caution needs to be exercised. The S151 Chief Finance Officer will therefore continue to monitor interest rates in financial markets and adopt a proactive approach to changing circumstances as follows:

* if it was considered that there was a significant risk of a forthcoming sharp fall in long and short-term rates (e.g. due to a marked increase in the risk of a relapse into recession or increasing risk of deflation), then long term borrowing will be postponed and potential rescheduling from fixed rate funding into short-term borrowing will be considered;
* if it was considered that there was a significant risk of a much sharper rise in long and short-term rates than currently forecast, then the portfolio position will be re-appraised with the likely action that borrowing would be undertaken and fixed rate funding drawn on whilst interest rates are still lower than they are expected to be in the next few years.
* **MINIMUM REVENUE PROVISION POLICY STATEMENT**

The council is required to pay off an element of the accumulated General Fund capital spend each year (the Capital Financing Requirement - CFR) through a revenue charge (the Minimum Revenue Provision - MRP). Department of Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) regulations require the full Council to approve an MRP Statement in advance of each year. A variety of options are available to councils, so long as the principle of any option selected ensures a prudent provision to redeem its debt liability over a period which is commensurate with the period over which capital assets are estimated to provide benefits (i.e. the estimated useful life of the asset being financed).

The Council is recommended to approve the following MRP Statement for 2024/25:

**For all debt where the government has provided revenue support (supported capital expenditure), the MRP policy will be:**

* Provision on a straight-line basis over 50 years.

**For all debt where the government does not provide revenue support:**

* Where the debt relates to an asset, the council will set aside a sum equivalent to repaying the debt over the life of the asset either in equal instalments or on an annuity basis over a maximum life of 50 years. The method to be adopted will be determined according to which is the most financially beneficial to the council over the life of the asset.
* Where the debt relates to expenditure which is subject to a capitalisation direction issued by the government, the council will set aside a sum equivalent to repaying the debt over a period consistent with the nature of the expenditure on an annuity basis.
* In the case of assets under construction, MRP will be delayed until the relevant asset becomes operational.

**Where the debt relates to capital loans to a third party:**

* The repayments of principal will be set aside as capital receipts to finance the initial capital advance in lieu of making a MRP.
* Where the debt relates to the i360 Limited, the council will set aside MRP on an annuity basis over the shorter of the remaining asset life or remaining loan period.

**Where the debt relates to the Living Wage Joint Venture:**

* Where the Living Wage Joint Venture develops housing but disposes of these assets on completion, the council will set aside the capital receipt at the point of transfer in lieu of making an MRP payment.
* Where the Living Wage Joint Venture develops or acquires housing and retains these assets and future rental streams, the council will set aside, in equal instalments, a sum which is equivalent to repaying the debt at the end of year 40 within the 60 year business plan. Set aside will commence, at the latest, in the year in which net surpluses are modelled for each individual tranche of borrowing.

**For on-balance sheet PFI schemes and leases, the MRP policy will be:**

* Asset Life Method (annuity method) - the MRP will be calculated according to the flow of benefits from the asset, and where the principal repayments increase over the life of the asset. Any related MRP will be equivalent to the “capital repayment element” of the annual charge payable.

There is the option to charge more than the prudential provision of MRP each year through a Voluntary Revenue Provision (VRP).

* **ANNUAL INVESTMENT STRATEGY**

DLUHC and CIPFA have extended the meaning of ‘investments’ to include both financial and non-financial investments. This report deals with financial investments. Non-financial investments are covered in the Capital Strategy (Appendix 2 of the budget report).

The council’s investment policy has regard to the following:

* DLUHC’s Guidance on Local Government Investments (the “Guidance”);
* CIPFA Treasury Management in Public Services Code of Practice and Cross Sectoral Guidance Notes 2021 (the “Code”);
* CIPFA Treasury Management Guidance Notes 2021.

**The council’s investment priorities will be the security of capital first, portfolio liquidity second and then yield (return).** The Authority will aim to achieve the optimum return (yield) on its investments commensurate with proper levels of security and liquidity and with regard to the Authority’s risk appetite.

* + ***Annual Investment Strategy for 2024/25***

Investments will be made with reference to the core balance and cash flow requirements and the outlook for short-term interest rates (i.e. rates for investments up to 12 months).

Greater returns are usually obtainable by investing for longer periods. However, based on the forecast of Bank Rate below, it is recommended that an “agile” investment strategy is adopted as an appropriate way of optimising returns.

While most cash balances are required in order to manage the ups and downs of cash flow, where cash sums can be identified that could be invested for longer periods, the value to be obtained from longer term investments will be carefully assessed:

* If it is predicted that Bank Rate is likely to rise significantly within the time horizon being considered, then consideration will be given to keeping most investments on short term or variable terms.
* Conversely, if it is predicted that Bank Rate is likely to fall within that time period, consideration will be given to locking in the higher rates currently obtainable, for longer periods.

It is currently expected that the Bank Rate will remain at the current level (expected to be the peak) during the remainder of 2023/24, with the prospect for Bank Rate to fall in the second half of 2024/25, and gradually reducing into 2025/26. Link Asset Service’s (LAS) Bank Rate forecasts for financial year ends (March) are:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **2023/24** | **2024/25** | **2025/26** | **2026/27** |
| Bank Rate | 5.25% | 3.75% | 3.00% | 3.00% |

Link Asset Service’s (LAS) view on the prospect for interest rates, including their forecast for short term investment rates is appended at Annex B.

The primary principle governing the council’s investment criteria is the security of its investments but return on investment is also important. After this main principle, the council will ensure that:

* It maintains a policy covering both the categories of investment types it will invest in and the criteria for choosing investment counterparties with adequate security, and monitoring their security;
* It has sufficient liquidity in its investments.
  + - ***Approach for 2024/25***

Investment balances had been inflated between 2019/20 and 2022/23 as a result of a number of factors, but primarily due to support measures taken by central government during the pandemic to ensure Local Authorities had the necessary resources to deliver a response to the pandemic. As expected, this support was removed during 2022/23. Additionally, increased planned internal borrowing and repayment of one of the authority’s LOBO loans has reduced the investment balances further still during 2023/24.

The environment for investment has been more attractive during 2023/24 as a result of sharp increases in the Bank of England Base Rate as a reaction to inflationary pressures. The returns on investments have gradually been increasing over the year as maturing investments are rolled into new investments that reflect the increases in investment rates. The council’s treasury advisors have provided their forecast for investment rates in Annex B. Interest rates are thought to have peaked at 5.25%, with expectations of interest rate reductions during the calendar year of 2024.

Investment balances are expected to reduce further in 2024/25. This is primarily due to the expectation of further increases in internal borrowing to avoid as far as possible, entering into long-term borrowing at a time where interest rates are expected to be at their highest. Investment income will fall as a result of the combination of reducing interest rates and reducing balances. Work is therefore being undertaken to try and maximise cash to ensure investment income is protected as far as possible. This work includes measures to improve the working capital (that is, the timing differences between the council paying its suppliers and receiving money from its customers), and a review of the timing of capital projects, undertaken by the officer led Capital Programme Board. The Financing Costs budget for the medium term has been prepared on the basis of these measures.

In February 2021, £10.0m was invested across two short term bond funds managed by Royal London Asset Management. There has been a fall in the capital value as a result of the increase in interest rates. However, there is no impact on the council’s income from these funds, and the current statutory override means that there is no impact on the council’s budget as a result of this change in value. The investment time horizon is expected to be at least 3 years, and therefore it is expected that the capital value will recover before divesting from the funds.

* + - ***Changes from 2023/24 Strategy***

There are no changes proposed to the 2024/25 Annual Investment Strategy.

* + ***Investment Policy – Management of risk***

The guidance from DLUHC and CIPFA outlined in 4 places a high priority on the management of risk. The Council has a prudent approach to managing risk and defines its risk appetite by the following means:

1. Minimum acceptable credit criteria are applied in order to generate a list of high creditworthy counterparties. This also enables diversification and thus avoids a concentration of risk. The key ratings used to monitor counterparties are the short term and long-term ratings.
2. Other information: ratings will not be the sole determinant of the quality of an institution; it is important to continually assess and monitor the financial sector on both a micro and macro basis and in relation to the economic and political environments in which institutions operate. The assessment will also take account of information that reflects the opinion of the markets. To achieve this consideration the council will engage with its advisors to monitor market pricing such as “credit default swaps” (CDS) and overlay that information on credit ratings.
3. Other information sources used will include the financial press, share prices and other such information pertaining to the banking sector in order to establish the most robust scrutiny process on the suitability of potential investment counterparties.
4. Where there is a significant or sudden deterioration in one or more indicators (such as CDS prices), officers will undertake a review and, where necessary take action. This action may take the form of temporary suspension of a counterparty from the council’s approved lending list, or a restriction of the maximum period and investment limits.
5. This authority has defined the list of types of investment instruments that the treasury management team are authorised to use.
   1. **Specified investments** are those with a high level of credit quality and subject to a maturity limit of one year. The limits and permitted instruments for specified investments are listed within Table 6.
   2. **Non-specified investments** are those with less high credit quality, may be for periods in excess of one year, and/or are more complex instruments which require greater consideration by members and officers before being authorised for use. The limits and permitted instruments for non-specified investments are listed within Table 7.
6. Lending limits (amounts and maturity) for each counterparty will be set through applying the credit criteria matrix (within Table 7).
7. This authority will set limits for the amount of its investments:
   1. which are invested for longer than 365 days, detailed in the Treasury Indicators in Annex C;
   2. which are invested in any one sector (paragraph 4.5);
   3. which are invested in any one counterparty within its relevant sector (paragraph 4.5).
8. Investments in Non-UK Banks will only be placed with counterparties from countries with a specified minimum sovereign rating of AA (paragraph 4.3).
9. Investments in UK banks will only be placed with counterparties with a minimum credit rating of BBB.
10. This authority has engaged external consultants, (see paragraph 5.3), to provide expert advice on how to optimise an appropriate balance of security, liquidity and yield, given the risk appetite of this authority in the context of the expected level of cash balances and need for liquidity throughout the year.
11. All investments will be denominated in sterling.
12. As a result of the change in accounting standards under IFRS 9, this Authority will consider the implications of investment instruments which could result in an adverse movement in the value of the amount invested and resultant charges at the end of the year to the General Fund (see paragraph 5.6).
13. The application of a risk benchmark (paragraph 4.7) to monitor the expected potential loss within the investment portfolio on an ongoing basis.

However, this authority will also pursue value for money in treasury management and will monitor the yield from investment income against appropriate benchmarks for investment performance (see paragraph 4.8). Regular monitoring of investment performance will be carried out during the year.

* + ***Sovereign Credit Ratings***

For 2024/25 it is recommended to maintain the policy of lending to sovereign nations and their banks which hold at least an AA- credit rating. The list of countries that qualify using this credit criteria (as at the date of this report) are shown below:

**AAA** Australia, Denmark, Germany, Netherlands, Singapore, Sweden & Switzerland

**AA+** Finland, Canada & United States,

**AA** France & United Arab Emirates

* + ***Creditworthiness Policy***

Each counterparty included on the council’s approved lending list must meet the criteria set out below. Without the prior approval of the Council, no investment will be made in an instrument that falls outside the list below.

**Table 6** below summarises the types of specified investment counterparties available to the council, and the maximum amount and maturity periods placed on each of these. A full list of the council’s counterparties and the current limits for 2024/25 are appended at Annex A.

When assessing credit ratings to ascertain limits for each counterparty, the lowest short and long-term ratings from each of the three ratings agencies is applied. For simplicity, the ratings for Standard & Poor’s are used in the tables below.

* + - ***Criteria for Specified Investments***

All specified investments will be sterling denominated, with maturities up to a maximum of 1 year, meeting the minimum ‘high’ rating criteria where applicable:

| **Table 6** | **Country/**  **Domicile** | **Minimum Capital Require-ments** | **Min. Credit Criteria**  **(L/term / S/term)** | **Max Amount** | **Max. maturity period** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Debt Management and Deposit Facilities (DMADF) | UK | N/A | N/A | unlimited | 6 months |
| UK Local Authorities | UK | N/A | UK Sovereign Rating | £20m per LA | 12 months |
| UK Banks – part nationalised\* | UK | UK government must own majority shareholding | N/A | £30m | 12 months |
| UK Banks & credit rated Building Societies | UK | Must meet minimum credit criteria | AA- / A-1+ | £30m | 12 months |
| A / A-1 | £20m | 12 months |
| BBB / A-2 | £15m | 6 months |
| Banks – Non-UK | Those with sovereign rating of at least AA\* | Must meet minimum credit criteria | AA- / A-1+ | £30m | 12 months |
| Non-rated Building Societies | UK | Must have an asset base of at least £5bn at the time of investment | N/A | £5m | 6 months |
| Money Market Funds (CNAV and LVNAV) | UK / Ireland / EU domiciled | Must meet minimum credit criteria | AAA | £20m per fund | Liquid |
| Ultra Short Dated Bond Funds | UK / Ireland / EU domiciled | Must meet minimum credit criteria | AA | £20m per fund | Liquid |

\*See Paragraph 4.3 for full list of countries that meet these criteria

* + - ***Lending to the council’s operational banking service provider***

An additional operating limit of £2m and an additional investment limit of £5m will be provided for the council’s provider of transactional banking services (currently Lloyds Bank plc). It is unavoidable that the £2m operational limit will be breached from time to time, however, officers will endeavour to keep this to an absolute minimum.

* + - ***Part-Nationalised Banks***

The council can lend up to £30m for up to 12 months to any bank in which the UK Government holds a majority shareholding regardless of the credit rating due to the implied government support of those entities. The Royal Bank of Scotland PLC & National Westminster Bank PLC are the two entities currently treated as part-nationalised.

* + - ***Non-Specified investments***

These are any other types of investment that are not defined as specified.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 7** | **Instrument Type** | **Minimum credit criteria (L/term / S/term)** | **Maxixum Amount 2024/25** | **Period**  **(Years)** |
| UK Local Authorities | N/A | N/A | £20m per LA | 5 |
| UK Banks &  Non UK Banks | Fixed Deposits | AA+ / A-1+ | £30m | 3 |
| AA- / A-1+ | £30m | 2 |
| Negotiable Instruments | AA- / A-1+ | £30m | 5 |
| Short Dated Bond Funds | UK / Ireland / EU domiciled | Short Dated bond funds are not rated. A selection process will evaluate relative risks & returns. Security of the council’s money and fund volatility will be key measures of suitability | £15m per fund | Liquid |

A full list of counterparties that meet the council’s criteria for both specified and non-specified investments are listed in Annex A.

* + ***Other Limits***

In order to mitigate concentration risk, there are a number of other limits imposed within the investment strategy. **Table 8** sets out the maximum permitted investment for each sector at the time of investment:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table 8 – Other Limits** | |
| **Sector** | **Max total of portfolio** |
| Banking sector | 100% |
| Building Society Sector | 75% |
| Local Authority Sector | 100% |
| Money Market Funds (MMF) | 100% |
| Short Dated & Ultra Short Dated Bond Funds | 50% |
| Debt Management Account Deposit Facility (DMADF) | 100% |

In addition to these limits:

* no more than 25% of the portfolio can be invested for more than 1 year; and
* with the exception of MMF & the DMADF, no one counterparty may have more than 25% of the relevant sector maximum at the time the investment is made.
  + ***Approved Methodology for adding and removing counterparties***

A counterparty shall be removed from the council’s list where a change in their credit rating results in a failure to meet the criteria set out above.

A new counterparty may only be added to the list with the written prior approval of the Chief Finance Officer and only where the counterparty meets the minimum criteria set out above.

A counterparty’s exposure limit will be reviewed (and changed where necessary) following notification of a change in that counterparty’s credit rating or a view expressed by the credit rating agency warrants a change.

A counterparty’s exposure limit will also be reviewed where information contained in the financial press or other similar publications indicates a possible worsening in credit worth of a counterparty. The review may lead to the suspension of any counterparty where it is considered appropriate to do so by the Chief Finance Officer.

* + ***Investment Risk Benchmarking***

The weighted average benchmark risk factor for 2024/25 is recommended to be 0.05%. This is unchanged from 2023/24. This is a measure of the percentage of the portfolio deemed to be at risk of loss by reference to the maturity date, value of investment, and credit rating of the individual investments within the portfolio compared to the historic default data for those credit ratings.

This benchmark is a simple target (not limit) to measure investment risk and so may be breached from time to time, depending on movements in interest rates and counterparty criteria. The purpose of the benchmark is that the in-house treasury team can monitor the current and trend position and amend the operational strategy depending on any changes. Any breach of the benchmarks will be reported with supporting reasons in the mid-year or end-of-year reviews.

This matrix will only cover internally managed investments, excluding externally managed cash that has been subject to an individual selection process. It also excludes funds lend to other Local Authorities, consistent with the CIPFA Accounting Code.

For any investment where there is a direct and legal offset against an existing financial liability, the investment will be assumed to have a benchmark risk of 0.00%.

* + ***Investment Performance Benchmarking***

The performance of the Council’s investment portfolio will be measured against the overnight SONIA Rate, an industry standard benchmark.

* **OTHER TREASURY MATTERS** 
  + ***Banking Services***

Lloyds Bank plc currently provides banking services for the council.

* + ***Training***

The CIPFA Treasury Management Code requires the responsible officer to ensure that members with responsibility for treasury management receive adequate training in treasury management. This especially applies to members responsible for scrutiny.

The scale and nature of this will depend on the size and complexity of the organisation’s treasury management needs. Organisations should consider how to assess whether treasury management staff and board / council members have the required knowledge and skills to undertake their roles and whether they have been able to maintain those skills and keep them up to date.

As a minimum, authorities should carry out the following to monitor and review knowledge and skills:

* Record attendance at training and ensure action is taken where poor attendance is identified.
* Prepare tailored learning plans for treasury management officers and board/council members.
* Require treasury management officers and board/council members to undertake self-assessment against the required competencies.
* Have regular communication with officers and board/council members, encouraging them to highlight training needs on an ongoing basis.”

In further support of the revised training requirements, CIPFA’s Better Governance Forum and Treasury Management Network have produced a ‘self-assessment by members responsible for the scrutiny of treasury management’, which is available from the CIPFA website to download.

Training was last provided and offered to all members on 19 January 2024.

The training needs of treasury management officers are periodically reviewed.

A formal record of the training received by officers central to the Treasury function and members who are responsible for decision making and scrutiny of the Treasury function is maintained by the Principal Accountant -Treasury.

A monthly Treasury Management Bulletin is provided to lead Finance members of the main political groups.

* + ***Policy on the use of External Service Providers***

The council uses Link Asset Services as its external treasury management advisors.

The council recognises that responsibility for treasury management decisions remains with the council at all times and will ensure that undue reliance is not placed upon our external service providers. It also recognises that there is value in employing external providers of treasury management services in order to acquire access to specialist skills and resources. The council will ensure that the terms of their appointment and the methods by which their value will be assessed are properly agreed and documented, and subject to regular review.

* + ***Lending to Third Parties***

The council has the power to lend monies to third parties subject to a number of criteria. These are not treasury investments, rather they are policy investments. Any activity will only take place after relevant due diligence has been undertaken, as described in the Capital Strategy (Appendix 2 to the budget report).

* + ***Updates to the Codes of Practice 2021***

CIPFA published the revised Treasury and Prudential codes in 2021. Full adoption of the new Codes was fully incorporated within the strategy from 2023/24.

* + ***Updates to Accounting Requirements***

***IFRS 9 – local authority override – English local authorities***

The MHCLG (DLUHC) initially enacted a statutory over-ride from 1 April 2018 for a five-year period until 31 March 2023 following the introduction of International Financial Reporting Standard (IFRS) 9 in respect of the requirement for any unrealised capital gains or losses on marketable pooled funds to be chargeable in year. This has now been extended to 31 March 2025 and has the effect of allowing any unrealised capital gains or losses arising from qualifying investments to be held on the balance sheet until 31 March 2025: this is intended to allow authorities to initiate an orderly withdrawal of funds if required. In addition, IFRS 9 impacts on the write-down in the valuation of impaired loans.

***IFRS 16 – Leasing***

The CIPFA LAASAC Local Authority Accounting Code Board has deferred implementation of IFRS 16 until 1 April 2024, the 2024/25 financial year. Once implemented, this has the following impact on the Treasury Management Strategy:

* The MRP Policy sets out how MRP will be applied for leases bought onto the balance sheet;
* The Council’s Capital Financing Requirement authorised limit and operational boundary expectations for 2024/25 onwards have been increased to reflect the estimated effect of this change.

**ANNEX A - Approved List of Counterparties 2024/25**

| **Counterparty** | **Specified /Non-specified** | | **Short-term** | | | | **Long-term** | | | **Lending Limit** | **Fixed deposit duration limit (months)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***F=Fitch M=Moody’s SP=Standard & Poor’s*** | | | | | | |
| **F** | **M** | **SP** | **F** | | **M** | **SP** |
| 1. **UK Banks** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lloyds Banking Group: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bank of Scotland PLC (RFB) | Specified | | F1 | P-1 | A-1 | A+ | | A1 | A+ | £25m | 12 |
| Lloyds Bank PLC (RFB) | Specified | | F1 | P-1 | A-1 | A+ | | A1 | A+ | £25m | 12 |
| Lloyds Bank Corporate Markets PLC (NRFB) | Specified | | F1 | P-1 | A-1 | A+ | | A1 | A | £25m | 12 |
| Total Max. exposure to Lloyds Banking Group | | | | | | | | | | £25m | 12 |
| Barclays Banking Group: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Barclays Bank PLC (NRFB) | Specified | | F1 | P-1 | A-1 | A+ | | A1 | A+ | £20m | 12 |
| Barclays Bank UK PLC (RFB) | Specified | | F1 | P-1 | A-1 | A+ | | A1 | A+ | £20m | 12 |
| Total Max. exposure to Barclays Banking Group\*\* | | | | | | | | | | £20m | 12 |
| HSBC Group: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSBC Bank PLC (NRFB) | Specified | | F1+ | P-1 | A-1 | AA- | | A1 | A+ | £20m | 12 |
| HSBC UK Bank PLC (RFB) | Specified | | F1+ | P-1 | A-1 | AA- | | A1 | A+ | £20m | 12 |
| Total Max. exposure to HSBC Group\*\* | | | | | | | | | | £20m | 12 |
| RBS/Natwest Group: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Natwest Markets PLC (NRFB) | Specified | | F1 | P-1 | A-1 | A+ | | A1 | A | £20m | 12 |
| National Westminster Bank PLC (RFB) | Specified | | F1 | P-1 | A-1 | A+ | | A1 | A | £30m | 12 |
| The Royal Bank of Scotland PLC (RFB) | Specified | | F1 | P-1 | A-1 | A+ | | A1 | A | £30m | 12 |
| Total Max. exposure to RBS/Natwest Group\*\* | | | | | | | | | | £30m | 12 |
| Close Brothers Ltd | Specified | F2 | | P-1 |  | A- | | Aa3 |  | £15m | 6 |
| Clydesdale Bank PLC | Specified | F2 | | P-2 | A-2 | A- | | A3 | A- | £15m | 6 |
| Goldman Sachs International Bank | Specified | F1 | | P-1 | A-1 | A+ | | A1 | A+ | £20m | 12 |
| Handelsbanken PLC | Both | F1+ | |  | A-1+ | AA | |  | AA- | £30m | 24 |
| Santander UK PLC | Specified | F1 | | P-1 | A-1 | A+ | | A1 | A | £20m | 12 |
| Standard Chartered Bank | Specified | F1 | | P-1 | A-1 | A+ | | A1 | A+ | £20m | 12 |
| SMBC Bank International Plc | Specified | F1 | | P-1 | A-1 | A- | | A1 | A | £15m | 6 |
| 1. **Building Societies+** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Coventry (2) | Specified | | F1 | P-1 |  | A- | | A2 |  | £15m | 6 |
| Leeds (5) | Specified | | F1 | P-2 |  | A- | | A3 |  | £15m | 6 |
| Nationwide (1) | Specified | | F1 | P-1 | A-1 | A | | A1 | A+ | £20m | 12 |
| Principality (6) | Specified | | F2 | P-2 |  | BBB+ | | Baa1 |  | £15m | 6 |
| Skipton (4) | Specified | | F1 | P-1 |  | A- | | A2 |  | £15m | 6 |
| Yorkshire (3) | Specified | | F1 | P-2 |  | A- | | A3 |  | £15m | 6 |
| **(3) Non-UK Banks** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Toronto Dominion (Canada) | Both | | F1+ | P-1 | A-1+ | AA- | | Aa1 | AA- | £30m | 24 |
| Nordea Bank Abp (Finland) | Both | | F1+ | P-1 | A-1+ | AA- | | Aa3 | AA- | £30m | 24 |
| Landwirtschaftliche Renenbank (Germany) | Both | | F1+ | P-1 | A-1+ | AAA | | Aaa | AAA | £30m | 36 |
| NRW.BANK (Germany) | Both | | F1+ | P-1 | A-1+ | AAA | | Aa1 | AA | £30m | 24 |
| Bank Nederlandse Gemeenten (The Netherlands) | Both | | F1+ | P-1 | A-1+ | AAA | | Aaa | AAA | £30m | 36 |
| Nederlandse Waterschapsbank N. V. (The Netherlands) | Both | |  | P-1 | A-1+ |  | | Aaa | AAA | £30m | 36 |
| DBS Bank Ltd (Singapore) | Both | | F1+ | P-1 | A-1+ | AA- | | Aa1 | AA- | £30m | 24 |
| Overseas Chinese Banking Corporation Limits (Singapore) | Both | | F1+ | P-1 | A-1+ | AA- | | Aa1 | AA- | £30m | 24 |
| United Overseas Bank Limited (Singapore) | Both | | F1+ | P-1 | A-1+ | AA- | | Aa1 | AA- | £30m | 24 |
| Svenska HandelsBanken AB (Sweden) | Both | | F1+ | P-1 | A-1+ | AA | | Aa2 | AA- | £30m | 24 |
| First Abu Dhabi Bank PJSC | Both | | F1+ | P-1 | A-1+ | AA- | | Aa3 | AA- | £30m | 24 |
| Bank of New York Mellon (USA) | Both | | F1+ | P-1 | A-1+ | AA | | Aa1 | AA- | £30m | 24 |

Ratings as advised by Link Asset Services 19 January 2024

+ UK Building Societies ranking based on Total Asset size – Source: Building Societies Association Jan 2023

\*\* Where there are multiple counterparties within a banking group, exposure to the overall group will be the largest limit, but exposure to individual counterparties within the group will be based on the individual counterparty limit. E.g., exposure to RBS Banking Group can be up to £30m, but max exposure to Natwest Markets PLC will be £20m.

**ANNEX B - ECONOMIC OVERVIEW & INTEREST RATE VIEW**

**Provided by Link Asset Services January 2024**

* The third quarter of 2023/24 saw:
* A 0.3% m/m decline in real GDP in October, potentially partly due to unseasonably wet weather, but also due to the ongoing drag from higher interest rates. Growth for the second quarter, ending 30th September, was revised downwards to -0.1% and growth on an annual basis was also revised downwards, to 0.3%;
* A sharp fall in wage growth, with the headline 3myy rate declining from 8.0% in September to 7.2% in October, although the ONS “experimental” rate of unemployment has remained low at 4.2%;
* CPI inflation continuing on its downward trajectory, from 8.7% in April to 4.6% in October, then again to 3.9% in November;
* Core CPI inflation decreasing from April and May’s 31 years’ high of 7.1% to 5.1% in November, the lowest rate since January 2022;
* The Bank of England holding Bank Rate at 5.25% in November and December;
* A steady fall in 10-year gilt yields as investors revised their interest rate expectations lower.
* The revision of GDP data in Q2 to a 0.1% q/q fall may mean the mildest of mild recessions has begun. Indeed, real GDP in October fell 0.3% m/m which does suggest that the economy may stagnate again in Q3. The weakness in October may partly be due to the unseasonably wet weather. That said, as the weakness was broad based it may also be the case that the ongoing drag from higher interest rates is more than offsetting any boost from the rise in real wages.
* However, the rise in the flash composite activity Purchasing Managers Index, from 50.7 in November to 51.7 in December, did increase the chances of the economy avoiding a contraction in Q3. The improvement was entirely driven by the increase in the services activity balance from 50.9 to 52.7. (Scores above 50 point to expansion in the economy, although only tepid in this instance.) The press release noted that this was primarily driven by a revival in consumer demand in the technological and financial services sectors. This chimes with the further improvement in the GfK measure of consumer confidence in December, from -24 to -22. The services PMI is now consistent with non-retail services output growing by 0.5% q/q in Q3, but this is in stark contrast to the manufacturing sector where the output balance slumped from 49.2 to 45.9 and, at face value, the output balance is consistent with a 1.5% q/q fall in manufacturing output in Q3.
* The 0.3% m/m fall in retail sales volumes in October means that after contracting by 1.0% q/q (which was downwardly revised from -0.8% q/q) in Q2, retail activity remained weak at the start of Q3. That suggests higher interest rates are taking a bigger toll on real consumer spending.
* Higher interest rates have filtered through the financial channels and weakened the housing market but, overall, it remains surprisingly resilient with the Halifax house price index recently pointing to a 1.7% year on year increase whilst Nationwide’s December data pointed to a -1.8% year on year decrease. However, the full weakness in real consumer spending and real business investment has yet to come as currently it is estimated that around two thirds to a half of the impact of higher interest rates on household interest payments has yet to be felt.
* Overall, we expect real GDP growth to remain subdued throughout 2024 as the drag from higher interest rates is protracted but a fading of the cost-of-living crisis and interest rate cuts in the second half of 2024 will support a recovery in GDP growth in 2025.
* The labour market remains tight by historical standards, but the sharp fall in wage growth seen in October will reinforce the growing belief in markets that interest rates will be cut mid-2024. Wage growth eased in October much faster than the consensus expected. Total earnings fell by 1.6% m/m, which meant the headline 3myy rate eased from 8.0% in September to 7.2% in October. This news will be welcomed by the Bank of England. Indeed, the timelier three-month annualised rate of average earnings growth fell from +2.4% to -1.2%. Excluding bonuses, it fell from 5.3% to 2.0%. Furthermore, one of the Bank’s key barometers of inflation persistence, regular private sector pay growth, dropped from 7.9% 3myy to 7.3%, which leaves it comfortably on track to fall to 7.2% by December, as predicted by the Bank in November.
* The fall in wage growth occurred despite labour demand being stronger in October than expected. The three-month change in employment eased only a touch from +52,000 in September to +50,000 in October. But resilient labour demand was offset by a further 63,000 rise in the supply of workers in the three months to October. That meant labour supply exceeded its pre-pandemic level for the first time, and the unemployment rate remained at 4.2% in October. In the three months to November, the number of job vacancies fell for the 17th month in a row, from around 959,000 in October to around 949,000. That has reduced the vacancy to unemployment ratio as demand for labour eases relative to supply, which may support a further easing in wage growth in the coming months.
* CPI inflation fell from 6.7% in September to 4.6% in October, and then again to 3.9% in November. Both these falls were bigger than expected and there are clear signs of easing in domestic inflationary pressures. The fall in core CPI inflation from 5.7% to 5.1% in November was bigger than expected (consensus forecast 5.6%). That’s the lowest rate since January 2022. Some of the decline in core inflation was due to the global influence of core goods inflation, which slowed from 4.3% to 3.3%. But some of it was due to services inflation falling from 6.6% to 6.3%. The Bank views the latter as a key barometer of the persistence of inflation and it came in further below the Bank’s forecast of 6.9% in its November Monetary Policy Report. This will give the Bank more confidence that services inflation is now on a firmly downward path.
* The Bank of England sprung no surprises with its December monetary policy committee (MPC) meeting, leaving interest rates at 5.25% for the third time in a row and pushing back against the prospect of near-term interest rate cuts. The Bank continued to sound hawkish, with the MPC maintaining its tightening bias saying that “further tightening in monetary policy would be required if there were evidence of more persistent inflationary pressures”. And it stuck to the familiar script, saying that policy will be “sufficiently restrictive for sufficiently long” and that “monetary policy is likely to need to be restrictive for an extended period of time”. In other words, the message is that the MPC is not yet willing to endorse investors’ expectations that rates will be cut as soon as May 2024.
* Looking ahead, our colleagues at Capital Economics forecast that the recent downward trends in CPI and core inflation will stall over the next few months before starting to decline more decisively again in February. That explains why we think the Bank of England won’t feel comfortable cutting interest rates until H2 2024.
* The fall in UK market interest rate expectations in December has driven most of the decline in 10-year gilt yields, which have fallen in line with 10-year US Treasury and euro-zone yields. 10-year gilt yields have fallen from 4.68% in October 2023 to around 3.70% in early January, with further declines likely if the falling inflation story is maintained.
* Investors’ growing expectations that the Fed will cut interest rates soon has led to an improvement in risk sentiment, which has boosted the pound and other risky assets. In addition, the rise in the pound, from $1.21 in November to $1.27 now, has also been supported by the recent relative decline in UK wholesale gas prices.
* The further fall in 10-year real gilt yields in December has supported the recent rise in the FTSE 100. That said, the index remains 5% below its record high in February 2023. This modest rise in equities appears to have been mostly driven by strong performances in the industrials and rate-sensitive technology sectors. But UK equities have continued to underperform US and euro-zone equities. The FTSE 100 has risen by 2.2% in December, while the S&P 500 has risen by 3.8%. This is partly due to lower energy prices, which have been a relatively bigger drag on the FTSE 100, due to the index’s high concentration of energy companies.

In the chart below, the rise in gilt yields across the curve in the first half of 2023/24, and therein PWLB rates, is clear to see, prior to the end of year rally based on a mix of supportive domestic and international factors.

**PWLB RATES APRIL TO DECEMBER 2023**



**Prospect for Interest Rates**

The Authority has appointed Link Group as its treasury advisor and part of their service is to assist the Authority to formulate a view on interest rates. Link provided the following forecasts on 08 January 2024. These are forecasts for Bank Rate, average earnings and PWLB certainty rates (gilt yields plus 80 bps).



*Additional notes by Link on this forecast table: -*

* Our central forecast for interest rates was previously updated on 7 November and reflected a view that the MPC would be keen to further demonstrate its anti-inflation credentials by keeping Bank Rate at 5.25% until at least H2 2024. We expect rate cuts to start when both the CPI inflation and wage/employment data are supportive of such a move, and when there is a likelihood of the overall economy enduring at least a slowdown or mild recession over the coming months (although most recent GDP releases have surprised with their on-going robustness).
* Naturally, timing on this matter will remain one of fine judgment: cut too soon, and inflationary pressures may well build up further; cut too late and any downturn or recession may be prolonged.
* In the upcoming months, our forecasts will be guided not only by economic data releases and clarifications from the MPC over its monetary policies and the Government over its fiscal policies, but also international factors such as policy development in the US and Europe, the provision of fresh support packages to support the faltering recovery in China as well as the on-going conflict between Russia and Ukraine, and Gaza and Israel.

**PWLB RATES**

* The short and medium part of the gilt curve has rallied since the start of November as markets price in a quicker reduction in Bank Rate through 2024 and 2025 than held sway back then. This reflects market confidence in inflation falling back in a similar manner to that already seen in the US and the Euro-zone. At the time of writing there is c70 basis points difference between the 5 and 50-year parts of the curve.

**The balance of risks to the UK economy: -**

* The overall balance of risks to economic growth in the UK is even.

**Downside risks to current forecasts for UK gilt yields and PWLB rates include: -**

* **Labour and supply shortages** prove more enduring and disruptive and depress economic activity (accepting that in the near-term this is also an upside risk to inflation and, thus, could keep gilt yields high for longer).
* **The Bank of England** hasincreased Bank Rate too fast and too far over recent months, and subsequently brings about a deeper and longer UK recession than we currently anticipate.
* **Geopolitical risks,** for example in Ukraine/Russia, the Middle East, China/Taiwan/US, Iran and North Korea, which could lead to increasing safe-haven flows.

**Upside risks to current forecasts for UK gilt yields and PWLB rates: -**

* Despite the tightening in Bank Rate to 5.25%, the **Bank of England allows inflationary pressures to remain elevated** for a long period within the UK economy, which then necessitates Bank Rate staying higher for longer than we currently project.
* **The pound weakens** because of a lack of confidence in the UK Government’s pre-election fiscal policies, which may prove inflationary, resulting in investors pricing in a risk premium for holding UK sovereign debt.
* Projected **gilt issuance, inclusive of natural maturities and QT,** could be too much for the markets to comfortably digest without higher yields compensating.

**LINK GROUP FORECASTS**

We expect the MPC will keep Bank Rate at 5.25% until the second half of 2024, to combat on-going inflationary and wage pressures, even if they have dampened somewhat of late. We do not think that the MPC will increase Bank Rate above 5.25%.

**Gilt yields and PWLB rates**

The overall longer-run trend is for gilt yields and PWLB rates to fall back over the timeline of our forecasts, as inflation continues to fall through 2024.

Our target borrowing rates are set **two years forward** (as we expect rates to fall back) and the current PWLB (certainty) borrowing rates are set out below: -

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PWLB debt | Current borrowing rate as at 08.01.24 p.m. | Target borrowing rate now  (end of Q4 2025) | Target borrowing rate previous  (end of Q3 2025) |
| 5 years | 4.53% | 3.70% | 3.80% |
| 10 years | 4.67% | 3.90% | 3.80% |
| 25 years | 5.19% | 4.20% | 4.20% |
| 50 years | 4.97% | 4.00% | 4.00% |

**Borrowing advice:** Our long-term (beyond 10 years) forecast for Bank Rate remains at 3% and reflects Capital Economics’ research that suggests AI and general improvements in productivity will be supportive of a higher neutral interest rate. As all PWLB certainty rates are currently significantly above this level, borrowing strategies will need to be reviewed in that context. Overall, better value can be obtained at the shorter end of the curve and short-dated fixed LA to LA monies should be considered. Temporary borrowing rates will remain elevated for some time to come but may prove the best option whilst the market continues to factor in Bank Rate reductions for 2024 and later.

Our suggested budgeted earnings rates for investments up to about three months’ duration in each financial year are set out below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Average earnings in each year | Now | Previously |
| 2023/24 (residual) | 5.30% | 5.30% |
| 2024/25 | 4.55% | 4.70% |
| 2025/26 | 3.10% | 3.20% |
| 2026/27 | 3.00% | 3.00% |
| 2027/28 | 3.25% | 3.25% |
| 2028/29 | 3.25% | 3.25% |
| Years 6 to 10 | 3.25% | 3.25% |
| Years 10+ | 3.25% | 3.25% |

As there are so many variables at this time, caution must be exercised in respect of all interest rate forecasts.

Our interest rate forecast for Bank Rate is in steps of 25 bps, whereas PWLB forecasts have been rounded to the nearest 10 bps and are central forecasts within bands of + / - 25 bps. Naturally, we continue to monitor events and will update our forecasts as and when appropriate

**ANNEX C - PRUDENTIAL AND TREASURY INDICATORS** **2024/25 to 2026/27**

The council’s capital expenditure plans are a key driver of treasury management activities. The output of the capital expenditure plans are reflected in prudential indicators. Local authorities are required to ‘have regard to’ the Prudential Code and to set Prudential Indicators for the next three years to ensure that the council’s capital investment plans are affordable, prudent and sustainable. The Code sets out the indicators that must be used but does not suggest limits or ratios as these are for the authority to set itself.

The Prudential Indicators for 2024/25 to 2026/27are set out in **Table A** below:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table A** | **2024/25**  **Estimate** | **2025/26**  **Estimate** | **2026/27**  **Estimate** |
| **General Fund (GF) Prudential Indicators** | | | |
| **GF Capital Expenditure £m (gross)**  General Fund capital expenditure plans | £122m | £90m | £30m |
| **GF Capital Financing Requirement £m\***  Measures the underlying need to borrow for capital purposes (including PFI & Leases) | £319m | £356m | £347m |
| **GF Ratio of financing costs to net revenue stream\*\***  Identifies the trend in the cost of capital (borrowing and other long term obligation costs net of investment income) against net revenue stream | 7.03% | 7.76% | 8.36% |
| **Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Prudential Indicators** | | | |
| **HRA Capital Expenditure £m (gross)**  HRA capital expenditure plans | £89m | £71m | £60m |
| **HRA Capital Financing Requirement £m\***  Measures the underlying need to borrow for capital purposes | £301m | £351m | £391m |
| **HRA Ratio of financing costs to net revenue stream\*\***  Identifies the trend in the cost of capital (borrowing and other long term obligation costs net of investment income) against net revenue stream | 12.08% | 14.67% | 16.22% |

*\* From 2024/25, the CFR includes an estimate for leases that will be bought onto the balance sheet under a change in leasing accounting regulations.*

*\*\* The ratio of financing costs to net revenue stream illustrates the percentage of the Council’s net revenue budget being used to finance the council’s borrowing. This includes interest costs relating to the council’s borrowing portfolio and MRP. Previously this was shown net of the investment income from the council’s investment portfolio, but this has been removed following changes to the Treasury Management Code.*

The Treasury Management Code requires that Local Authorities set a number of indicators for treasury performance in addition to the Prudential Indicators which fall under the Prudential Code. The Treasury Indicators for 2024/25 to 2026/27 are set out in **Tables B & C** below. These have been calculated and determined by Officers in compliance with the Treasury Management Code of Practice:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table B – Prudential Indicators** | **2024/25**  **Estimate** | **2025/26**  **Estimate** | **2026/27**  **Estimate** |
| **Authorised Limit for External Debt £m\***  The council is expected to set a maximum authorised limit for external debt. This represents a limit beyond which external debt is prohibited, and this limit needs to be set or revised by Full Council. | £680m | £766m | £798m |
| **Operational boundary for external debt £m\***  The council is required to set an operational boundary for external debt. This is the limit which external debt is not normally expected to exceed. This indicator may be breached temporarily for operational reasons. | £630m | £716m | £748m |
| **Principal Sums invested for longer than 365 days** | £40m | £40m | £40m |

*\*From 2024/25 The Authorised Limit and Operational Boundary includes an estimate for leases that will be bought onto the balance sheet under a change in leasing accounting regulations.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table C – Prudential Indicators** | | |
| **Maturity Structure of fixed interest rate borrowing\***  The council needs to set upper and lower limits with respect to the maturity structure of its borrowing. | | |
|  | Lower | Upper |
| Under 12 months | 0% | 40% |
| 12 months to 2 years | 0% | 40% |
| 2 years to 5 years | 0% | 50% |
| 5 years to 10 years | 0% | 75% |
| Over 10 years | 40% | 100% |

**ANNEX D - SCHEME OF DELEGATION**

1. **Full Council**

* Approval of Annual Investment Strategy, Treasury Management Strategy Statement, Capital Strategy, Treasury Management Policy Statement;
* Approval of the Minimum Revenue Provision Policy;
* Approval of the Prudential and Treasury indicators, including the Affordable borrowing limits;
* Approval of the annual revenue budget for financing costs.

The requirements are all contained within this appendix (TMSS incorporating the AIS) and Appendix 2 (Capital Strategy) of the budget report.

* Any changes to the Annual Investment Strategy during the year require approval by full Council.
* Full Council are able to delegate the implementation and monitoring of the treasury management function. This function is delegated to the Strategy, Finance & City Regeneration Committee.

1. **Strategy, Finance & City Regeneration Committee**

* Approval of/amendments to the organisation’s adopted clauses, treasury management policy statement and treasury management practices;
* Budget development, consideration and approval;
* Approval of the division of responsibilities;
* Receiving and reviewing regular monitoring reports and acting on recommendations.

SFCR Committee receives the following reports in order to fulfil these requirements:

* A **Mid-Year Review Report** – an update on progress of the treasury and investment strategy against budget and the treasury & prudential indicators for the first six months of the year. Any amendments to the indicators or investment strategy require SFCR committee to recommend that full Council approve the changes.
* **End of Year Review report** – an update regarding the actual outturn of the treasury position provides details of a selection of actual prudential and treasury indicators and actual treasury operations compared to the estimates within the strategy.
* **Regular TBM reports** - includes the revenue impact of the financing cost budget.

SFCR Committee is the body held responsible for the scrutiny of the actual performance of the treasury activities against the strategy.

1. **Role of the Section 151 Officer**

The council’s appointed Section 151 Chief Financial Officer is responsible for:

* recommending clauses, treasury management policy/practices for approval, reviewing the same regularly, and monitoring compliance;
* submitting regular treasury management policy reports;
* submitting budgets and budget variations;
* receiving and reviewing management information reports;
* reviewing the performance of the treasury management function;
* ensuring the adequacy of treasury management resources and skills, and the effective division of responsibilities within the treasury management function;
* ensuring the adequacy of internal audit, and liaising with external audit;
* recommending the appointment of external service providers.

There are further responsibilities for the S151 Officer identified within the 2021 Code in respect of non-financial investments. They are identified and listed in the Capital Strategy where relevant.

**Review of Reserves**

***Adequacy of Reserves and Working Balance***

The working balance is recommended to be maintained at £9m over the period of the Medium Term Financial Strategy. The consequences of not keeping a minimum prudent level of balances can be serious and in the event of a major problem or a series of events, the council would run a serious risk of a deficit or of being forced to cut spending during the year in a potentially damaging and arbitrary way. The working balance was used to fund the 2022/23 General Fund overspend and therefore replenishing it is a high priority and this will be completed over the next 3 financial years. The budget for 2024/25 includes a first year repayment of £1.125m.

The current level of balances has been based on the robustness of estimates information and the Corporate Risk Register. In addition, the other strategic, operational and financial risks taken into account when considering the minimum level of the working balance include:

1. The level of mitigation against the ongoing financial impacts of the pandemic;
2. The complexity and degree of uncertainty associated with planned economy and efficiency measures and/or service changes and the likelihood of achieving them in full;
3. The level of balances required to complement resources potentially available under the Bellwin Scheme for Emergency Financial Assistance to Local Authorities in the event of a major emergency;
4. Risks of rising demand, increasing costs and/or falling income due to economic conditions or potential legislative changes;
5. The risk of major legal challenges, both current and in the future;
6. Risks in the financial inter-relationship between NHS partners and the council;
7. The need to retain a general contingency to provide against unforeseen circumstances that may arise, for example, delays in council tax billing which could arise from a major systems or power outage;
8. The need to retain reserves for general day-to-day cash flow needs.

In addition, the cash flow risk for unitary authorities is significant given the full range of services provided. Taking all of these factors into account, a £9m working balance is considered the minimum appropriate, representing about 2.5 weeks of council tax revenue.

***Schools’ Balances***

Schools’ balances, while consolidated into the council’ s overall accounts, are a matter for Governing Bodies. Nevertheless, under the council’s Scheme for Financing Schools the council has a duty to scrutinise whether any school holds surplus balances. The council’s Scheme for Financing Schools is in line with the requirements of the Secretary of State for Education and the arrangements in place are considered adequate.

***Estimated Earmarked General Fund Revenue Reserves***

Processes are in place to regularly review the council’s earmarked revenue reserves. Details of the review of reserves are included in the table below.

The Chief Finance Officer is required, under Section 25 of the LG Act 2003, to review the adequacy of reserves and provisions. The review of reserves assesses the purpose and appropriateness of holding a reserve or provision and assesses the level of the reserve against identified risks and commitments. Following the review, £0.545m can be released from the following reserves in 2024/25:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reserve** | **Amount to be Released £’000** |
| Section 106 Interest | 500 |
| Customer Access & Accommodation Strategies & The Link Network Upgrade Reserve | 25 |
| Portslade Adult Learning | 20 |
| **Total Reserves to be released** | **545** |

|  | **Estimated Balance as at 01/04/24 £'000** | **Planned Use 2024/25 £'000** | **Estimated Balance as at 31/03/25 £'000** | **Review Arrangements** | **Conclusion** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **General Fund Reserves** | | | | | |
| General Fund Working Balance/General Reserves | 5,624 | 1,125 | 6,749 | Reviewed against the register of financial risks, taking into account the requirements of the Local Government Act 2003. | A minimum working balance of £9.000m is recommended by the Chief Finance Officer in accordance with the requirements of Section 25 of the Local Government Act 2003. The Working Balance is being replenished over three years with the first repayment included in the 2024/25 budget. |
| Capital Receipts Reserve | 2,720 | 4,524 | 7,244 | Ongoing review as part of TBM process. | Committed to fund the Capital Investment programme including HRA Capital Programme and support for the council's modernisation investment plans. |
| Library PFI Reserve | 825 | -158 | 667 | Following closure of accounts. | Use for funding the project over the lifetime of the PFI scheme. Expected to be increased contributions from reserves, due to inflationary pressures. Contributions to the reserve may be required in future years. |
| Waste PFI Project Reserve | 7,463 | -266 | 7,197 | Following closure of accounts. | Use for funding the project over the lifetime of the PFI. This reserve has been used to fund the Term Time only costs and will be replenished in time to meet existing Waste PFI commitments. |
| Section 106 Receipts (Revenue) | 608 | 0 | 608 | Reviewed throughout the year to reflect agreed liabilities and new agreements. | Retain for specified purpose. |
| Section 106 Interest | 531 | -31 | 500 | Reviewed throughout the year to reflect agreed liabilities and new agreements. | **Release £0.500m to support the 2024/25 budget**. This reserve relates to accumulated interest on S106 receipts. A review of the council's obligations to accrue interest has allowed the release of the majority of the funds which would otherwise have been reflected in the Financing Costs budget. |
| Developer Contributions Unapplied (S106 Capital) | 346 | 0 | 346 | Reviewed throughout the year to reflect agreed liabilities and new agreements. | Retain for specified purpose. |
| Brighton Centre Redevelopment Reserve | 287 | -287 | 0 | Following closure of accounts. | This reserve has been redirected to support essential maintenance at the Brighton Centre which is included in the 2023/24 and 2024/25 capital programme. |
| Customer Access & Accommodation Strategies & The Link Network Upgrade Reserve | 25 | 0 | 25 | Following closure of accounts. | **Release £0.025m to support the 2024/25 budget.** The balance of this reserve is no longer required. |
| ICT Investment Reserve | 546 | -300 | 246 | Following closure of accounts. | Held to support planned IT&D expenditure over the next two years. |
| Winter Maintenance | 371 | 0 | 371 | Following closure of accounts. | Held to fund exceptional costs of extreme weather. |
| Dome Planned Maintenance | 210 | 0 | 210 | Following closure of accounts. | Retain - subject to lease agreement with Brighton Dome & Festival Society. |
| Hove Park 3G Pitch Renewal | 15 | 0 | 15 | Following closure of accounts. | Held to replace pitch at the end of its useful life. Timing to be confirmed. |
| Surface Water Management Plan Reserve | 405 | -161 | 244 | Following closure of accounts. | Retain to support planned SWMP related works, emergency work and to contribute to any carbon neutral opportunities. This reserve is retained to meet our statutory obligations as the Lead Local Flood Authority. |
| Sports Facilities Reserve | 358 | -200 | 158 | Following closure of accounts. | Retain to support Sports Facilities. |
| Licensing - other reserve | 18 | 0 | 18 | Following closure of accounts. | Retain for specified purpose - to fund potential future deficits or repayment to licensees. Reserve irons out fluctuations in volumes of licences issued each year. |
| Taxi Licensing | 61 | 0 | 61 | Following closure of accounts. | Retain for specified purpose - to fund potential future deficits or repayment to licensees. This smooths out fluctuations in volumes of licences issued each year. |
| Trading Standards Seized Goods | 7 | 0 | 7 | Following closure of accounts. | Retain for specified purpose - to fund potential future repayments. |
| Stanmer Park Parking Surplus | 250 | 0 | 250 | Following closure of accounts. | Ringfenced to support expenditure on Stanmer Park as part of the Heritage Lottery funding agreement. |
| East Brighton Parking Surplus | 0 | -63 | -63 | Following closure of accounts. | Retain to support expenditure on East Brighton Park |
| Preston Park Parking Surplus | 187 | -80 | 107 | Following closure of accounts. | Retain to support expenditure on Preston Park. |
| Road Works Permit Scheme | 53 | 0 | 53 | Following closure of accounts. | The reserve is required to ensure that the permit scheme can meet its costs as in accordance with the legislation. The service is demand led depending on the volume of works in the city and the reserve reduces this risk of pressure on the wider council’s revenue budgets. |
| Overdown Rise Footpath Maintenance | 20 | 0 | 20 | Following closure of accounts. | Hold for future years maintenance costs of the foot path at Overdown Rise |
| HMO Licensing Fees Reserve | 456 | -75 | 381 | Following closure of accounts. | Retain to support annual inspections of HMO licenses - this is a statutory function |
| Phoenix House Sinking Fund | 60 | 0 | 60 | Following closure of accounts. | Tenants’ contributions to be retained for maintenance requirements at Phoenix House. |
| Damage Deposit Guarantee Scheme | 94 | 0 | 94 | Reviewed during the year as part of budget monitoring process | Retained for specified purpose but required level will continue to be reviewed. |
| RP&M Trust Sinking Fund | 402 | 0 | 402 | Following closure of accounts. | Retain - subject to lease agreement with RPMT |
| Cemeteries Maintenance Reserve | 59 | -5 | 54 | Following closure of accounts. | Retain for maintenance of cemeteries, tree clearance etc |
| Travellers Site Capital Reserve | 79 | -50 | 29 | Following closure of accounts. | Contribution each year to reserves for future major works costs of the Travellers site. |
| Restructure Redundancy Reserve | 86 | 0 | 86 | As part of closure of accounts. | Restructure & Redundancy costs are funded within the capital programme as part of the capitalisation direction. |
| CIL - Neighbourhood reserve | 491 | 0 | 491 | Following closure of accounts. | Allocations from the Neighbourhood Reserve will be made in accordance with the agreed process which involves ward councillors. |
| CIL - Strategic reserve | 2,623 | 0 | 2,623 | Following closure of accounts. | Allocations from the Strategic reserve will be made in line with the strategic objectives set out in the initial scheme and will be approved by committee. |
| **Total General Fund Reserves** | **25,280** | **3,973** | **29,253** |  |  |
| **Schools / DSG Reserves** | | | | | |
| Portslade Adult Learning | 20 | 0 | 20 | Following closure of accounts. | **Release £0.020m to support the 2024/25 budget**. Historic reserve no longer required for its original purpose. |
| **Total Schools / DSG Reserves** | **20** | **0** | **20** |  |  |
| **TOTAL RESERVES** | **25,300** | **3,973** | **29,273** |  |  |
| **General Fund Provisions** | | | | | |
| Hostel Accommodation Dilapidations | 82 | 0 | 82 | Following closure of accounts. | Held for dilapidation costs for West Pier Hostel following retendering of service. |
| 10 Year lease revenue costs Provision | 78 | 39 | 117 | Review of annual contribution to this provision at closedown. | This is required to pay back the borrowing costs when 10 year leases finish in 2032/33.These are 30 properties leased through Rough Sleeping Accommodation Programme partly funded by DCLG. |
| Voluntary Severance Provision | 1,000 | -1,000 | 0 | Following closure of accounts. | To fund cost of potential severance agreements from 2024/25 Budget plans. |
| Insurance Provision | 4,076 | -100 | 3,976 | The Insurance Fund is subject to a bi-annual health check by the actuaries. The last health check was completed in March 2023. | The level of the Insurance Fund will be adjusted in line with the recommendations of the actuary as part of the 2023/24 outturn report. |
| Homewood College Academisation Provision | 350 | 0 | 350 | Following closure of accounts. | Hold to fund potential costs of academisation. |
| **Total General Fund Provisions** | **5,586** | **-1,061** | **4,525** |  |  |
| **TOTAL ALL FUNDS** | **30,886** | **2,912** | **33,798** |  |  |

**APPENDIX 5**

**ASSESSMENT OF BUDGET AND MEDIUM TERM RISKS**

The Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) of a large public sector organisation with many demand-led services and complex, uncertain funding streams will always contain significant and varying degrees of risk. The legacy of the pandemic, the cost of living crisis and very high inflation has significantly impacted the council’s expenditure and income throughout 2023/24. This includes higher than anticipated pay awards, higher costs of social care provision, impacts on fees & charges, continued high levels of Council Tax Reduction claimants (i.e. taxation losses), and continued high levels of support for hospital discharges and homelessness in particular. These pressures have resulted in unprecedented predicted in-year overspends requiring early adoption of robust recruitment and expenditure controls to help mitigate the financial position. This highlights the need to recognise the financial risks of unexpected events and the impact this has on the resilience of the authority.

Many of the pressures experienced in the current year are expected to continue over the medium term and the government has recognised these pressures in part by providing additional funding to support social care and the flexibility to increase council tax through a further Adult Social Care levy in 2024/25. However the scale of financial challenges the council faces means that even with these additional resources, the council will need to make substantial savings in 2024/25 and future years.

For businesses within the city, the government has provided further Business Rates reliefs to help the business sector and has frozen the Small Business Rates Multiplier.

For 2024/25 the government has again announced a one-year settlement, the sixth in succession, on 18 December 2023.

In general, other factors that can have a material effect on the medium term financial position of an authority include:

* The lack of certainty in future resource levels;
* Changes in function and/or funding;
* Changes in the economy including the impact on business rates income and/or Council Tax Reduction claimant numbers or collection rates;
* Similarly, impacts on the levels of house building which affects both Council Tax and New Homes Bonus or a successor mechanism;
* The level of future successful appeals against the business rating list;
* Changes in employer costs e.g. pension or national insurance changes;
* Achievement of performance targets for performance-related grant or partnership funding;
* Delivery and achievement of savings and modernisation programmes;
* Ability to manage identified demand-led service pressures;
* Decisions on council tax increases and the council tax reduction scheme;
* Democratic support for change including partnership working and integration.

Risks to the MTFS arise from both external and internal factors. External risks include, for example, Government policy decisions that can have an adverse financial impact on the council. External risks are generally the most difficult to manage or plan for.

Internal risks can also arise for a number of reasons, such as cost overruns, underachievement of savings plans, changing political or service priorities or ineffective systems of demand management. They may also be influenced by external factors. It is vital to have adequate mechanisms to manage internal risks if financial stability is to be achieved. There are a number of ways in which the effects of risks can be managed, and these are set out in the following risk table.

The forecasts within the MTFS are based on prudential assumptions that reflect the most likely position based on current knowledge and data. There are therefore risks of over or under stating expenditure or income estimates which are considered below.

The identified risks are scored for Likelihood (L) and Impact (I). The scores are multiplied to give a resulting risk score. The key to the scores is given below:

Key:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Likelihood (L)**  (of occurrence): | 1 – Almost impossible  2 – Unlikely  3 – Possible  4 – Likely  5 – Almost certain |
| **Impact (I):** | 1 – Insignificant  2 – Minor  3 – Moderate  4 – Major  5 – Catastrophic or fantastic |
| **Risk Score (L) x (I):**  (Overall rating) | 1 to 3 Low  4 to 7 Moderate  8 to 14 Significant  15 to 25 High |

Risk Scores above at the midpoint of the range or higher (12 or higher) are highlighted (shaded) in the table below.

| **Risk** | **Likelihood (L)** | **Impact**  **(I)** | **Risk =**  **(L) x (I)** | **Possible Impact on Financial Strategy** | **Mitigation / Management** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Potential Risks affecting 2024/25 onwards** | | | | | |
| Council Tax base is lower than anticipated e.g. higher caseload for CTRS (Council Tax Reduction Scheme) discounts, lower number of new properties, more student exempt properties, more SMI exemptions, or more discounts awarded resulting in a deficit on the collection fund | 3 | 3  0.1% reduction in council tax = £0.185m | 9 | Would require reductions in budgets (increased savings) for the following year | Close monitoring of the collection fund and checking validity of exemptions and discounts particularly new property developments, student numbers, CTRS discounts and empty property discounts.  Through major projects, working with further education establishments to encourage development of more dedicated student accommodation. |
| Collection of council tax, including CTRS claimants, falls due to its impact on household budgets alongside other Welfare Reform impacts, resulting in a deficit on the collection fund | 3 | 3  0.1% reduction in council tax collection = £0.185m | 9 | Would require reductions in the budget (increased savings) for the following year | Close monitoring of the collection fund, including claimants under the CTRS. Appropriate communications, advice (linked to Welfare Reform advice services) and collection strategies have been agreed to minimise impact. |
| Services fail to operate within set budgets due to increased service demands or weak systems of demand management | 3 | 4  1% gross expenditure on demand led budgets = £2.8m | 12 | Excess service pressures would have to be met through additional resources, such as reserves, or through unplanned savings having to be made elsewhere. Possible need for emergency spending and/or recruitment restrictions with potential impacts on service delivery and quality. Reduction in reserves / working balance. Value for Money qualification of accounts through not securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the use of resources. | Close monitoring and analysis of demand-led budgets and overall budget through budget monitoring (TBM).  Identify action plans to mitigate cost pressures.  Health & Social Care system management activity prioritised through integrated commissioning and working towards an Integrated Care System. Strategic Council Plan investments provided for ASC, Children’s Social Care, Homelessness and Home-t-School Transport demand-led pressure areas. |
| Services fail to operate within set budgets due to unachievable income or poor collection performance | 3 | 3  1% of fees and charges income = £1.2m | 9 | Income pressures that can only be met through additional resources, such as using reserves, or savings being made elsewhere in the budget. Possible need for emergency spending and/or recruitment restrictions with potential impacts on service delivery and quality.  Reduction in reserves / working balance.  Value for money qualification of accounts by not securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the use of resources. | Monitoring of income budgets and collection performance (rates) through TBM reporting. Identify action plans to mitigate unachievable income, price variations and exceptional legal costs.  In-year review of charging policy and revised charges could be approved if absolutely necessary.  Internal Audit review of services where performance issues or financial concerns are identified. |
| Services fail to operate within set budgets due to increased labour or supply chain costs, contract price variations or other inflationary impacts | 4 | 4  1% gross expenditure = £5.0m | 16 | Excess costs would have to be met through additional resources, such as reserves, or through unplanned savings having to be made elsewhere. Possible need for emergency spending and/or recruitment restrictions with potential impacts on service delivery and quality. Reduction in reserves / working balance. Value for Money qualification of accounts through not securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the use of resources. | Close monitoring of budgets and overall spend through budget monitoring (TBM).  Identify Financial Recovery action plans to mitigate specific areas experiencing cost pressures.  Focus contract management resources to areas of concern.  Consider unilateral financial management controls (short of restrictions) such as vacancy management and additional spending controls. |
| Services fail to operate within set budgets due to unachievable savings arising from:   * Over-estimate of the savings potential; * Higher than estimated costs to implement the savings opportunity. | 3 | 3  5% of GF savings = £1.2m | 9 | Overspending that can only be met from additional resources such as reserves or savings being made elsewhere in the budget. Possible need for emergency spending and/or recruitment restrictions with potential impacts on service delivery and quality. Reduction in reserves / working balance. | Monitor savings through TBM and identify action plans and/or alternative measures to mitigate the unachievable savings.  Potentially refer back to members for decisions on alternative savings proposals where these are significant or cannot be mitigated elsewhere. |
| Pay assumptions for 2024/25 are lower than finally agreed pay awards and other pay related costs.  Note: pay award assumptions generally follow government inflation predictions. | 3 | 3  0.5%  change in  pay award  = £0.8m for the general fund | 9 | Pay award pressures can only be met through additional resources, such as reserves, or savings being made elsewhere in the budget. Possible need for emergency spending and/or recruitment restrictions with potential impacts on service delivery and quality. Reduction in reserves / working balance. | Monitor progress on pay award negotiations and wider national settlements.  Lobby government for more funding if nationally negotiated pay awards are significantly higher than local or national assumptions (e.g. assumed within the Chancellor’s Autumn Statement and inflation assumptions).  As with 2023/24, higher pay awards need to be addressed in-year through financial management controls and then built into budget planning (MTFS) for future years. |
| PFI Waste tonnages higher than projected resulting in additional disposal costs | 2 | 3  1% increase in tonnage per annum = £0.154m p.a. over life of PFI contract | 6 | Would increase the waste disposal budget and compensating savings would need to be identified elsewhere in the budget. | Provision (contingency) for higher tonnages made in the assessment of the waste PFI reserve for future years.  Monitor and identify specific areas of growth and undertake waste minimisation and further recycling measures.  Trends are monitored and reflected in the MTFS for future years. |
| The uncertainties within the housing market, changes in housing benefit and welfare reform create spending pressures within the budget e.g. homelessness | 4 | 3  10% increase in net temporary accommodation and rough sleeping budget = £1.3m | 12 | Would create additional pressures in the Housing Strategy and potentially other related budgets which would need to find compensating savings. | Continue to assess and monitor the potential impact of changes to the welfare benefit system and plan and respond to government consultations accordingly. A range of additional discretionary funds continue to be set aside to be directed to the most appropriate area as needed including CTRS and DHP. |
| Increased property related insurance premiums as a result of national or international storm damage claims over the longer term | 3 | 2  10% further increase = £0.120m | 6 | Would require compensating savings to be identified in 2024/25 and future years. | Insurance premiums have been retendered and are reviewed annually. Budget increased in 2024/25 as price increases expected.  Continued emphasis on risk management to help prevent future claims. |
| Long term borrowing rates higher than anticipated | 2 | 2  0.1% higher = £0.02m for £20m borrowing | 4 | Would increase borrowing costs budget over the long-term.  Would hinder business cases involving borrowing and make invest-to-save schemes less financially attractive | Closely monitor long term borrowing rates and future borrowing requirements to help identify the best time to borrow, supported by independent advisors. Shorter term borrowing used to avoid locking into longer term higher rates. Under-borrowing (using available cash balances) remains a viable medium term strategy. |
| Major civil incident occurs e.g. storm, flooding, riot | 2 | 3  Estimated “Bellwin” threshold = £0.4m | 6 | Budget overspend / reduction in reserves / working balance.  Pressures on other budgets.  The council would have to meet the costs of uninsured risks in addition to the “Bellwin” threshold. | Ensure adequate levels of useable reserves and working balance to cover threshold expenditure.  Ensure appropriate insurance cover is in place and that the Insurance Fund is sufficient to cover uninsured risks. |
| Severe winter weather places additional spending pressures on winter maintenance and other budgets across the council | 2 | 3  Depends on severity of weather event | 6 | Need to use Working Balance and/or reserves. | Advance planning to minimise possible disruption. A plan to replenish the Working Balance in future years would be required. |
| Cost overruns occur on schemes in the agreed capital programme | 3 | 2  1% cost overrun on total programme = £2.1m | 6 | Reserves or other capital resources redirected to fund overspend.  Unable to meet capital investment needs.  Increased borrowing requirement. | Effective cost control and expenditure monitoring.  In the first instance, use flexibility within or across programmes to re-profile expenditure if necessary.  Flexing Capital Financing Strategy or HRA self-financing strategy as appropriate. |
| Capital receipts lower than anticipated | 4 | 3  10% reduction in receipts = £2.0m | 12 | Fewer resources available for regeneration programmes, Workstyles, Modernisation, Digital and IT infrastructure and corporate Capital Funds | Flexible capital programme that allows plans to be reduced or re-profiled.  Alternative site disposal plans are capable of being accelerated if necessary.  Borrowing is an option for invest-to-save schemes. |
| Capital Programmes are not delivered on time or in accordance with the expected payment profile or delivery timeline due to limitations on officer capacity, supply chain issues and/or contractual issues | 3 | 3  1% cost overrun on total programme = £2.1m | 9 | Corporate Plan priorities not achieved.  In the short-term slippage may reduce financing costs but in the medium term there may be cost over-runs due to delays in delivery while construction or other inflation is high or due to an increase in borrowing costs due to interest rate risk (i.e. risk of rates increasing over time). | If affordable, may require additional short-term resources to ensure delivery on time.  Use flexibility within or across programmes to re-profile expenditure if necessary.  Flexing Capital Financing Strategy or HRA self-financing strategy as appropriate. |
| Income from business rates is lower than expected due to successful rating appeals / higher levels of relief awarded / redevelopment of existing sites gives temporary reduction / collection performance declines | 3 | 3  1% of forecast retained business rates income = £0.8m | 9 | Would require an increased budget gap to be addressed in the following financial year. | Make appropriate provisions in resource forecasts.  Detailed monitoring of business rates yield and collection to ensure it reflects the latest known position.  Corporate approach to economic development and city regeneration. |
| **Further risks affecting 2025/26 onwards** | | | | | |
| The Government’s Fair Funding Review (or other Local Government Funding review) is progressed and results in lower Relative Needs leading to a reduced distribution of government resources including:   * Reduced grant funding * Lower Business Rates top-up payment or change to tariff payment | 3 | 3  1% reduction in Settlement Funding Assessment = £0.7m | 9 | Would require an increased budget gap to be addressed in the following financial year/s. | Engage fully in government consultations. Ensure core data used to determine relative needs is accurate and up to date. This is now likely to be progressed by a new Government following a General Election. The council would lobby for damping and transitional mechanisms if the outcome is unfavourable. |
| Business Rates revaluation appeals result in losses of business rate income in excess of the provision for appeals. | 3 | 3  1% of forecast retained business rates income = £0.8m | 9 | Would require an increased budget gap to be addressed. Limited protection from safety net is afforded at 7.5% below baseline funding. | Respond to any government consultation on changes to the distribution mechanism.  Continued liaison with Valuation Office Agency (VOA) to ensure good access to data.  Monitor the impact of appeals throughout the remaining revaluation period. |
| MTFS pay assumptions for 2025/26 onwards are lower than agreed pay awards and other pay related costs | 3 | 3  0.5%  change in  pay award  = £0.85m for the general fund | 9 | Impact on budget gap if pay provisions are insufficient to meet increased ongoing costs arising from transformation, pay awards and/or impact of the National Living Wage. | Monitor progress on pay award negotiations and wider national settlements.  Consider revising assumptions in future years based on CPI trends and forecasts. |
| Forecast resources from 2025/26 onwards lower than forecast in the MTFS | 2 | 3  1% reduction in Settlement Funding Assessment  = £0.7m | 6 | Would require an increased budget gap to be addressed in the following financial year/s. | Lobby Local Government Association (LGA) and government over future spending totals, particularly long term funding of social care.  Lobby for greater overall share of Settlement Funding Assessment (SFA) and respond in detail to any further consultation |
| Government changes to business rates (e.g. cap on multiplier, enhanced or new reliefs) are not fully funded through ongoing section 31 compensation grants | 2 | 4  Estimated value of Section 31 grant = £18m | 6 | Would require an increased budget gap to be addressed in the following financial year/s. | Lobby DLUHC to ensure any new measures impacting on business rates income are fully funded. |
| Energy and fuel prices increase above budgeted provision | 3 | 2  10% increase to the general fund = £0.45m | 6 | Would reduce resources within budgets creating the need to find compensating savings.  However, higher electricity prices would mean that the share of electricity income from the Energy from the Waste PFI plant will increase to offset some of the cost increase. | Reduce consumption and implement measures to generate energy.  Monitor energy/fuel market contracts closely and consider alternative procurement routes if necessary.  Service pressures provide some cover for higher inflation. |
| Investment interest rates lower than anticipated | 2 | 3  0.1% lower investment return = £0.13m | 6 | Would need more reserves to cover any shortfall in the investment interest budget. | Keep investment strategy under constant review as investment rates have rapidly increased with base rate increases but will reverse if base rates reduce in the future.  Work with Treasury Advisers to maximise return within agreed risk parameters.  Seek decisions from members for changes to risk appetite, counterparties or investment strategy if market availability moves outside of current parameters. |

**Appendix 6**

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2024/25 – Service Users**

The Budget EIA process is a legal duty supporting good financial decision-making. It assesses how proposals may impact on specific groups differently (and whether/how negative impacts can be reduced or avoided) so that these consequences are explicitly considered. Decisions must be informed by accurate, well-informed assessment of likely impacts so that they are fair, transparent, and accountable. Budget EIAs provide a record of this assessment and consideration.

*Members are referred to the full text of s149 of the Equality Act 2010 – included at the end of this document – which must be considered when making decisions on budget proposals.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Equality impact assessments describing impacts on service-users** | | |
| **Directorates** | **Services** | **EIA no.** |
| **Families, Children and Learning** | **Drove Road and Tudor House** | **1** |
| **Outreach services** | **2** |
| **Disability placements** | **3** |
| **School improvement – environmental education** | **4** |
| **Youth led grants** | **5** |
| **Family hubs** | **6** |
| **Contact service** | **7** |
| **CSC placements** | **8** |
| **Partners in Change** | **9** |
| **Health & Adult Social Care** | **Community care** | **10** |
| **Provider services** | **11** |
| **Commissioning grant** | **12** |
| **Commissioning support with confidence** | **13** |
| **Sensory services** | **14** |
| **Environment, Economy and Culture** | **Supported buses** | **15** |
| **Parking** | **16** |
| **Public toilets** | **17** |
| **Bowling greens** | **18** |
| **Brighton Centre facility fee** | **19** |
| **Beach hut transfer fee** | **20** |
| **Housing, Neighbourhoods and Communities** | **Homelessness transformation** | **21** |
| **Supported accommodation** | **22** |
| **Third sector commission** | **23** |
| **Communities** | **24** |
| **Fees and charges** | **25** |
| **Pest control** | **26** |
| **VAWG** | **27** |
| **Third party reporting centres** | **28** |

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2024/25 – Service Users**

Budget Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | Residential, respite and short breaks |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Georgina Clarke-Green, Assistant Director Health, Special Educational Need and Disability |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Families, Children and Learning, Special Educational Needs and Disability  In house provider services |
| Budget proposal no. | 1 |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

|  |
| --- |
| To reduce the spend by £504k across the council’s in-house respite provisions Tudor House and Drove Road. This will be achieved through changing the purpose of Tudor House to a full-time residential placement for four young people who will be brought back from high cost out of city care placements, and by maximising the accommodation at Drove Road with the intention of providing more short breaks for a wider range of families that will include neurodiverse children without a learning disability.  It is also intended that the flat at Drove Road once vacated will provide an emergency bed for any child or young person who needs to be taken into care on an emergency basis. This will allow more time for the commissioning team to identify a suitable longer-term placement for the child/young person. This should lessen the need for children to placed outside the city and the use unregulated placements. |
| Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionally negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable: |
| There will be a positive impact for those children and young people returning to the city from out of city care placements as they will be nearer their families and can attend their local special school. This will reduce the amount of accommodation available for the provision of short breaks. However, with the remodelling of Drove Road we aim to be able to continue to support those young people who will no longer be able to attend Tudor House and provide some overnights for neurodiverse children and young people without a learning disability. |

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
| A review will be undertaken by Freedom Training and Consultancy who are experienced in the running of children’s homes to consider the proposed model and make recommendations as to how this re-design will be achieved. The views of all stakeholders will be included within the scope of the review, this includes parents/carers who currently access the provision and children and young people where possible. This is due to take place in February 2024. Once this has been completed a consultation will need to take place in March 2024 with staff and unions. |

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

|  |
| --- |
| Disability Placements Budget EIA |

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | YES |
| **Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not** | YES |
| **Ethnicity, ‘Race’, ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)** | YES |
| **Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism** | YES |
| **Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)** | YES |
| **Gender Reassignment** | YES |
| **Sexual Orientation** | YES |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | Not applicable |
| **Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)** | Not applicable |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | No |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** | YES |
| **Carers** | YES |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** | YES |
| **Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)** | YES |
| **Socio-economic Disadvantage** | YES |
| **Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability** | YES |
| **Human Rights** | YES |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | YES |
| **Lone parents** | YES |
| **Carers** | YES |
| **People facing literacy and numeracy barriers** | YES |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| We will seek to establish data on whether the families who are accessing these provisions are Armed Forces personnel, their families or veterans. This can be undertaken through the social care assessment process. |

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| The monitoring of impact will be undertaken at every step of the re-design process. The recommendations of the review will be considered carefully with a stakeholder panel that will include representatives from PaCC. The transition process will also be monitored through bi-weekly meetings with the home managers and surveys that will be sent out to the families who are receiving the service to ensure the outcomes identified are being achieved. The children and young people impacted by the changes will also have the support of their Social Worker and review assessments will be undertaken to ensure their needs will continue to be met either within the re-designed in house placements or elsewhere. |

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assess impact for different population groups** | **Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?**  **State Yes or No** | **Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith**  **OR**  **If no impact is identified, briefly state why.** |
| **Age**  including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | Yes | Both providers are registered for young people between the ages of 8 and 18. Therefore, there are several children and young adults who may not benefit from the short break residential provision. However, we do have a respite adult provider in the city Beach House that can support those young people who are 18+.  There will be strong links between Drove Road and Beach House to ensure that there are adequate transitions for those young people reaching 18+ moving into the adult provision.  We can also explore changing the registration to support those children over the age of 5 years old. |
| **Disability** includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities. | No | Both provisions are accessible to those children and young people with disabilities. There may be some need to adapt some of the physical environment in Drove Road and Tudor House to ensure that both properties are fully accessible in all areas of the provision for the service users.  Drove Road will also be accessible to those children and young people who have autism without a learning disability. This will increase the range of disability the short breaks provision currently provides in the city.  Some of our parents/carers may have a disability themselves and therefore we need to ensure that Easy Read versions of information will be made available so that they fully understand the proposed changes. |
| **Ethnicity, ‘**Race’, ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers | Yes | 18% of children and young people with an Education Health and Care plan are either Black or from the Global Majority. Therefore, we need to ensure that both homes reflect the SEND population and that those children and young people who are either Black or from the Global Majority have equitable access to the new respite/ residential provision.  There are several young people who are either Black or from the Global Majority that currently access both homes and Social Workers will work closely with families to ensure that they continue to receive an offer that meets their child’s needs.  All families will be part of the review and we will ensure that language support, as well as an interpreter, will be sourced upon receiving confirmation and consent from those who would need it.  The Council will ensure that information is made clear and accessible for all, including translated materials in key languages for the city’s migrant populations.  If children and/or parents/carers indicate that they are experiencing discrimination, there will be signposting in place to ensure that they have the relevant support that they need or access to a relevant discriminatory community group that they can contact for assistance. |
| **Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief** | Yes | The Specialist Community Disability Service and the Safeguarding and Care service hold data on their children and young people they support in terms of their religion or belief. It is likely there will be range of religions and belief systems within the cohort who may access the short breaks and the residential home provision.  It is important that both Drove Road and Tudor House actively engage and celebrate religious and faith celebrated days to affirm children to engage further with the communities.  When looking at placements, consideration will be given to the observance of religious days of significance to ensure that there is ability for children and young people to access the short break provision at a time that fits in with this.  All activities will ensure observance of religion or belief and will sensitively and inclusively considerations towards dietary, spiritual and/or attire.  Information will be made clear and accessible for all, including translated materials in key languages for the city’s migrant populations, and for all front-line services to be aware of support available and signpost accordingly.  If children and/or parents/carers indicate that they are experiencing religious or belief discrimination, there will be signposting in place to ensure that they have the relevant support that they need or access to a relevant community group that they can contact for assistance. |
| **Gender and Sex** including non-binary and intersex people | No | The gender split of children and young people with SEN and Disabilities is 29% Female and 71% Male. We would therefore expect to see a similar proportionate gender split in those children and young people attending the short breaks respite provision and the residential care home.  Where young people have identified as non-binary or intersex both homes will need to work closely with families and social care to ensure they have the right advice and support them appropriately and adapt any material or make any necessary adjustments to the home environment to meet their needs.  Allsorts is available for support for children in the city and can provide support and advice for home staff should they require it.  We are aware that parents/carers may be in situations where they are in non-binary families. This doesn’t directly impact on short break arrangements. Where we are aware of any circumstances where individuals need support, we will accommodate any bespoke needs. |
| **Gender Reassignment** | No | We have not yet identified any disproportionate impacts on this group because the data available about parents/children’s gender reassignment is inconclusive.  We know that parents/carers may not want to disclose information about gender reassignment for reasons such as the perceive lack of support, fear of discrimination, personal choice.  We will take this into account and ensure that very situation is dealt with compassionately and fairly and that bespoke assistance is available if individuals request this.  Brighton & Hove’s Trans Toolkit may also be helpful to home managers and their teams and could be adapted to meet the individual needs of children and young people in their care.  If parents/children indicate they need support and assistance, then they will be signposted to the relevant support or discriminatory community group that they can contact for additional assistance. |
| **Sexual Orientation** | No | We have not yet identified any disproportionate impacts on this group because the data available about parents/children’s sexual orientation is inconclusive. However, we are aware that discrimination against sexual orientation remains a prevalent issue.  Same sex parent/carers couples or LGBTQ single parents are part of the demographic.  We will need to ensure materials aimed at parents/carers reflect the diversity in the city and that parents/carers and their children are referred to and treated with respect reflecting their family situations.  There is likely to be young people attending the both homes who identify as LGBTQ as we have a high demographic in the city.  If we are aware of any circumstances were individuals need support, we will ensure that this group is supported and that the school is also supported in guiding people through to resources and signposting support.  Allsorts is available for support for children in the city. Both Drove Road and Tudor House will be able to work with Allsorts to support any young people who identify as LGBTQ and adapt any material to ensure it meets their individual needs. |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | No | We have not yet identified any disproportionate impacts on this group because the data available about parent/carer marital or civil partnership status is inconclusive.  There may be discrimination around civil partnerships and gay marriages and families. If we are aware of any circumstances where individuals need support, home staff will ensure that this group is supported and guided to resources.  The young people attending the short breaks provision, or the residential home will be between the ages of 8 and18. It is unlikely this would apply. However, if a young person who is between the ages of 16 and 18 and has parental consent to enter a marriage or civil partnership support will be provided to the young person and family concerned. A Mental Capacity assessment will be completed if required. |
| **Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility** (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum) | No | We are aware that parents/carers may be in situations where they are on maternity/paternity leave or caring for younger children.  Parents/carers who are pregnant or on maternity leave may find it difficult to get children/young people to the provision. We will work to accommodate any bespoke needs and provide support to all those where we are aware that their circumstances mean that they require additional support.  As the children and young people accessing short breaks or a residential placement will be between the ages of 8 and 18, we do not expect pregnancy, maternity and paternity to apply.  However, there are likely to be children and young people who have been fostered or adopted accessing these provisions and where this is the case the appropriate support will be provided through the BHCC fostering and adoption team. |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | No | We have not yet identified any disproportionate impacts on this group because the data available about parent/carer profession is not available. |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No | There is no comprehensive data available and further work needs to be undertaken into whether any of the children or young people who will be accessing Drove Road and Tudor House are Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers or Refugees.  Families from with these backgrounds may have experienced previous trauma and / or racism and children and young people and their families may need additional support. Language support will be provided for families and an interpreter can be sourced upon receiving confirmation and consent from those who would need it.  If children or parents/carers indicate that they are experiencing discrimination, there will be signposting in place to ensure that they have the relevant support that they need or access to a relevant discriminatory community group that they can contact for assistance.    Information to be made clear and accessible for all, including translated materials in key languages for the city’s migrant populations, and for all front-line services to be aware of support available and signpost accordingly. |
| **Carers**considering for age, language, and various intersections | No | More children should be able to access short breaks through maximising the occupancy at Drove Road. This should help support carers for children and young people with a disability. |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No | The children and young people in the residential home will all be looked after children. There will only be a positive impact upon this group as they will be returning to their city, be nearer to their families and attend their local school.  There may also be children and young people who are being fostered accessing the short breaks provision. As Corporate Parent, there is a collective responsibility and demonstrable commitment to ensure that children and young people with care experience are enabled to have the same opportunities as any other child or young person and we need to ensure that those children/young people in foster care have access to respite provision.  Those leaving care at the age of 18 will be supported by the Care Leavers team or the 14 -25 PoD for transitions in the Specialist Community Disability Service. |
| **Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors** | No | It there are children or young people accessing the short breaks provision who are living in a home where there is domestic abuse or sexual violence, having a break in provision may impact upon family life these families will be supported by their social workers and a review assessment will be undertaken to mitigate against any risk. |
| **Socio-economic disadvantage** considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections | No | Additional burdens due to the cost of living could have disproportionate impact on women due to the nature of their employment types and barriers to employment for those with sole childcare. Having a child with a disability and being a single parent/carer can place additional pressure on the family and their ability to cope. This can then lead to a breakdown of the family.  Having a child with a disability also has an impact on a family’s potential earnings as one parent or carer often is the primary carer. This can make families with children who are disabled less financially resilient and place additional pressure on the home and the ability to manage.  Therefore, it is important that the accommodation the Council has is used efficiently and that we ensure we are using all capacity to maximum effect. The additional overnight breaks should support families who are on low incomes or who are disadvantaged to have a short break from caring for their child. |
| **Homeless and rough sleepers** considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | No | As far as we are aware none of the families who access short breaks are currently homeless or rough sleeping. Therefore, there is no impact upon this group. |
| **Human Rights** | No |  |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** |  |  |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

|  |
| --- |
| This proposal would support the £250k saving against the Disability Placements Budget as more families would be able to access overnight short breaks if we were to use Drove Road to its full capacity. It would also contribute managing the spend on this budget as we are bringing back children and young people from high-cost care placements.  If we are aware of any circumstances were individuals need support, we will ensure that this group is supported and that the school is also supported in guiding people through to resources and signposting support. Where there are multi layered impacts, we are willing to assess this on a case-by-case basis with bespoke resources and support to address these barriers. Individual action plans may be appropriate for certain children. |

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

|  |
| --- |
| SMART action 1:  Ensure that the review undertaken by Freedom Training and Consultancy includes and considers all stakeholders views, lived experience and ideas to ensure that the transition from two in house short breaks/ respite homes to a residential and short breaks provision is a smooth process. Completed by March 2024 |
| SMART action 2:  The Council will undertake biannual surveys of parents/carers undertaken by the homes to ensure that the transition is a positive experience and that any issues/concerns have been addressed. |
| SMART action 3:  The Council will undertake further intersectional data insights work into the race and ethnicity of those children who will be accessing Drove Road and Tudor House to ensure that there is at least proportionate representation and equity of access of those children who identify as Black or from the Global Majority. This will monitored through our quarterly performance boards. |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal’s impact score: | 3 |

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

|  |
| --- |
| n/a |

Directorate and Service Approval

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name and Job Title:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Responsible Lead Officer:** | Georgina Clarke-Green | 19-01-24 |
| **Accountable Manager:** | Lorraine Hughes | 19-01-24 |

**EDI Review and Approval:**

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service:** | Emma McDermott | 23-01-24 |

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) Template 2024/25 – Service Users**

Budget Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | Family Support Services |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Georgina Clarke-Green, Assistant Director Health, SEN and Disability |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Families, Children and Learning, SEN and Disability  Outreach service |
| Budget proposal no. | 2 |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

|  |
| --- |
| To achieve savings of £115k by ceasing funding the Outreach service. The service provides a range of opportunities for disabled children and young people within the community. The service supports those children and young people with complex needs to access a variety of activities and experiences. The service currently supports 11 families and has two staff. Most sessions are on a 1:1 or 2:1 basis and for 3 hours per week or fortnightly. There is a small waiting list for this service. |
| Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionally negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable: |
| The Outreach Service currently supports 11 families. 5 of the 11 families are Black and from the Global Majority. 10 of the 11 children and young people using the service are male. There are several single parents/carers receiving respite through this service, these are predominantly women.  As part of this work, we are looking to redesign our in-house respite services and we are anticipating there may be an increased number of respite sessions available to support these families (see in house respite re-design budget EIA). In addition, we are seeking to have a more varied holiday offer through the work the council is undertaking on short breaks and holiday activities. Further work is also planned regarding a new Personal Assistant Co-ordinator role which will help support families to recruit and retain Personal Assistants. All these pieces of work will help to mitigate the impact upon families should this service cease. |

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
| Consultation with staff will be completed by the 31 March 2024.  A consultation with the families who use this service will also be undertaken in February 2024 as well as a review of their care plans which will be undertaken by their Social Worker to ensure equality impacts including intersectional impacts are fully understood. This will be to ensure that we are planning with the families concerned what other support can be provided if the Outreach Service ceases to operate. |

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

|  |
| --- |
| In house residential provision budget EIA. |

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | YES |
| **Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not** | YES |
| **Ethnicity, ‘Race’, ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)** | YES |
| **Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism** | YES |
| **Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)** | YES |
| **Gender Reassignment** | YES |
| **Sexual Orientation** | YES |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | Not applicable |
| **Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)** | Not applicable |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | No |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** | YES |
| **Carers** | YES |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** | YES |
| **Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)** | YES |
| **Socio-economic Disadvantage** | YES |
| **Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability** | YES |
| **Human Rights** | YES |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | YES |
| **Lone parents** | YES |
| **Carers** | YES |
| **People facing literacy and numeracy barriers** | YES |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| We will seek to establish data on whether the families who are accessing these provisions are Armed Forces personnel, their families or veterans. This can be undertaken through the social care assessment process. |

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Reviews of care plans will be undertaken by Social Workers for all the children who access this service to ensure that we are planning with the families concerned what other support can be provided if the Outreach Service ceases to operate. The impact on these families will be monitored through regular reviews by Social Workers. |

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assess impact for different population groups** | **Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?**  **State Yes or No** | **Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith**  **OR**  **If no impact is identified, briefly state why.** |
| **Age**  including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | Yes | The service will no longer be operational and will impact upon those children and young people under 18 who are accessing the service.  However, as part of the SEND Short Break commissioning process we will be exploring with our providers their ability to support those families who will be affected. Social workers will work with the families to put a package of support in place that will help to mitigate the loss of their weekly or fortnightly session. When going out to the market the council has also sought providers that will support young people up to the age of 25 so we expect to increase the age range. |
| **Disability** includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities. | Yes | All the children impacted by the service ceasing will have learning disabilities and complex needs. Therefore, there will be an impact for this group.  As part of the SEND Short Break commissioning process we will be exploring with our providers their ability to support those families who will be impacted and working towards putting a package of support in place for them. We have specifically asked for providers that can support children and young people with complex needs and expect to have these within our new offer.  Family hubs are also bringing together different services in a ‘one stop shop’ for support and information from a variety of services making it easier to help families.  The remodelling of our in-house provision will also support more short break overnight capacity. |
| **Ethnicity, ‘**Race’, ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers | Yes | 5 of the 11 children being supported by the Outreach Service are either Black or from the Global Majority. Therefore, there will be a disproportionate impact upon this population. We will be working closely with these families to ensure that we provide other support that will meet the needs of their children.  Language support, as well as an interpreter, will be provided should it be required when working with these families to ensure that information on other opportunities for support are accessible include translated materials should they be required.  We will also ensure that all social workers supporting the families are aware of support available and signpost accordingly. If children and/or parents/carers indicate that they are experiencing discrimination, there will be signposting in place to ensure that they have the relevant support that they need or access to a relevant discriminatory community group that they can contact for assistance.  As part of the SEND Short Break commissioning process we will be exploring with our providers their ability to support those families who will be affected, and we have asked for expressions of interest from providers that would like to run specific sessions for Black and Global Majority children and young people with SEND.  The remodelling of our in-house provision will also support more short break overnight capacity. |
| **Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief** | Yes | The Specialist Community Disability Service and the Safeguarding and Care service hold data on their children and young people they support in terms of their religion or belief. It is likely there will be range of religions and belief systems within the cohort who may have accessed or be accessing the support currently.  We will be working closely with these families to ensure that we provide other support that will meet the needs of their children.  We will also ensure that all social workers supporting the families are aware of support available and signpost accordingly. If children and/or parents/carers indicate that they are experiencing discrimination, there will be signposting in place to ensure that they have the relevant support that they need or access to a relevant discriminatory community group that they can contact for assistance.  As part of the SEND Short Break commissioning process we will be exploring with our providers their ability to support those families who will be affected.  We expect any new providers supporting these children to make any adjustments required to ensure observance of their religion or belief system and this will be sensitively and inclusively incorporated into the activities of their placement. This includes dietary, spiritual and/or attire.  The remodelling of our in-house provision will also support more short break overnight capacity. |
| **Gender and Sex** including non-binary and intersex people | Yes | The gender split of children and young people with SEN and Disabilities is 29% Female and 71% Male. The service currently supports 10 males and 1 female. This is primarily because we only have male staff members and are not able to offer support to females currently. Therefore, there may be an impact on males.  There are no children and young people accessing the service who identify as non-binary or intersex. |
| **Gender Reassignment** | No | There are currently no children or young people who identify as trans within the current group of children being supported by this service. Therefore, there should be no disproportionate impact. |
| **Sexual Orientation** | No | There are currently no children or young people who identify as LGBTQ within the current group of children being supported by this service. Therefore, there should be no disproportionate impact on this group. |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | No | It is unlikely there will be any disproportionate impact within this group as 8 of the children and young people supported by this service are under 16 with only 3 over the age of 16. These are under 18 and would require the consent of their parents/carers and may need a Mental Capacity assessment. |
| **Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility** (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum) | Yes | We do not hold data about pregnancies of the parents/carers. However, we are aware that parents/carers may be in situations where they are pregnant, on maternity/paternity leave or caring for younger children. It may be that families who have children accessing this service are in within this grouping. When working with the families to identify new provision will ensure we will accommodate any bespoke needs and provide support to all those where we are aware that their circumstances mean that they require additional support.  There are likely to be children and young people who have been fostered or adopted who have accessed this service and where this is the case the appropriate support will be provided through the BHCC fostering and adoption team and their social worker. |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | No | There are no disproportionate impacts identified for this group at this time. |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** considering for age, language, and various intersections | Yes | We are not aware that any of the families using this service are from within these groups. However, should this be the case there may an impact upon this population. We realise that this group may be particularly vulnerable, and we will be working closely with these families to ensure that we provide other support that will meet the needs of their children.  Language support, as well as an interpreter, will be provided should it be required when working with these families to ensure that information on other opportunities for support are accessible include translated materials should they be required.  We will also ensure that all social workers supporting the families are aware of support available and signpost accordingly. If children and/or parents/carers indicate that they are experiencing discrimination, there will be signposting in place to ensure that they have the relevant support that they need or access to a relevant discriminatory community group that they can contact for assistance.  As part of the SEND Short Break commissioning process we will be exploring with our providers their ability to support those families who will be affected.  The remodelling of our in-house provision will also support more short break overnight capacity. |
| **Carers** considering for age, language, and various intersections | Yes | Carers may rely on this support to have a short break from their caring duties. Therefore, there is likely to be an impact upon this group.  Social Workers will be working closely with these families to ensure that we provide other support that will meet the needs of their children.  As part of the SEND Short Break commissioning process we will be exploring with our providers their ability to support those families who will be affected.  The remodelling of our in-house provision will also support more short break overnight capacity, which may also be of benefit to this group. |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No | There are no children being supported by this service who are looked after by the local authority or who are care leavers or in foster care. Therefore, there should be no disproportionate impact upon this group. |
| **Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors** | Yes | We are not aware of any children open to the outreach team who live in homes where there is domestic and/or sexual abuse. However, if this were the case closing the outreach service could put further pressure on these families. To mitigate against this social work and assessment support will be provided. |
| **Socio-economic disadvantage** considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections | Yes | Additional burdens due to the cost of living could have disproportionate impact on women due to the nature of their employment types and barriers to employment for those with sole childcare. Having a child with a disability and being a single parent/carer can place additional pressure on the family and their ability to cope.  Having a child with a disability also has an impact on a family’s potential earnings as one parent or carer often is the primary carer. This can make families with children who are disabled less financially resilient and place additional pressure on the home and the ability to manage.  There are several single parents/carers who benefit from this service and therefore they will be impacted upon. To mitigate against this social work and assessment support will be provided.  As part of the SEND Short Break commissioning process we will be exploring with our providers their ability to support those families who will be affected. Financial support will be provided for those families who have a low income or who are disadvantaged to access these provisions.  The remodelling of our in-house provision will also support more short break overnight capacity, which may also be of benefit to this group. |
| **Homeless and rough sleepers** considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | No | The families who will be impacted by this saving are not homeless or rough sleepers. |
| **Human Rights** | No |  |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** |  |  |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

|  |
| --- |
| Increasing the access to respite provision through the re-design of Drove Road and Tudor House will mean there may be more opportunities for families to have a short break that may help to mitigate against loss of the outreach service.  We are looking to redesign our in-house respite services and we are anticipating there may be an increased number of overnight respite sessions available to support these families (see in house respite re-design budget EIA). In addition, we are seeking to have a more robust and varied holiday offer. Further work is also planned regarding PA support which should also help to mitigate the service ceasing. |

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

|  |
| --- |
| SMART action 1:  The council will work with providers to look at how we will address the gaps in provision left by the ceasing of the Outreach Service from March 2024. |
| SMART action 2:  Over the next 6 months the council will continue its work with Family Hubs and in house short breaks providers to develop an improved Early Help offer to prevent family breakdown. |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal’s impact score: | 3 |

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Directorate and Service Approval

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name and Job Title:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Responsible Lead Officer:** | Georgina Clarke-Green | 19-01-24 |
| **Accountable Manager:** | Lorraine Hughes | 19-01-24 |

**EDI Review and Approval:**

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service:** | Emma McDermott | 23-01-24 |

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2024/25 – Service Users**

Budget Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | Disability Placements |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Georgina Clarke-Green, Assistant Director Health, Special Educational Needs and Disability |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Families, Children and Learning, Disability Placements |
| Budget proposal no. | 3 |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

|  |
| --- |
| Achieve £250k of savings through limiting the number of expensive external residential placements through commissioning and brokerage work. This is a demand led budget that must respond to presenting needs, including high-cost placements. This reduction in budget will impact only on children with a learning disability in the care of the local authority. |
| Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionally negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable: |
| £795k pressure funding will offset the £250k saving and this will essentially mean the overall budget will increase by £545K.  Over the last three years we have seen national sufficiency issues regarding placements and a significant increase in the unit cost for a placement with new placements averaging between £7,000 and £10,000 per week for children and young people with complex needs. This is placing great pressure on the system. To assist in bringing down these costs we have a new Head of Commissioning for the Families, Children and Learning Directorate. This post will take a strategic approach that maximises the commissioning opportunities and capitalises on the overlaps in delivery within lower cost early intervention provision and services such as alternative provision, short breaks, and family hubs, with aim of reducing the need of out of city care placements. A focus on cross boundary commissioning of services/provision will also further support efficiency savings through providing a wider base from which to support and challenge private providers.  The re-design of our in-house respite provision is intended to provide more opportunities for respite for families to provide them with a short break and help prevent children coming into care, with the proposal to make Tudor House a full-time residential provision we would be increasing the provision for full time care placement. In addition, we are developing a new short break offer which should provide a wider range of providers that parents/carers will be able to access through their direct payments. Further work is also being undertaken to develop the role of Personal Assistant Co-ordinator to help support families recruit and retain Personal Assistants.  These early intervention measures will help to achieve the savings as fewer children and young people with complex needs should need to come into care. |

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
| No consultation is planned as savings will need to be achieved through negotiating lower costs with providers and using our own in-house provision more efficiently. |

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

|  |
| --- |
| In house residential provision budget EIA. |

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | YES |
| **Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not** | YES |
| **Ethnicity, ‘Race’, ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)** | YES |
| **Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism** | YES |
| **Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)** | YES |
| **Gender Reassignment** | YES |
| **Sexual Orientation** | YES |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | Not applicable |
| **Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)** | Not applicable |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | No |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** | YES |
| **Carers** | YES |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** | YES |
| **Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)** | YES |
| **Socio-economic Disadvantage** | YES |
| **Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability** | YES |
| **Human Rights** | YES |
| **Another relevant group:** | YES |
| **Lone parent** | YES |
| **Carers** | YES |
| **People facing literacy and numeracy barriers** | YES |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| We will seek to establish data on whether the families who are accessing these provisions are Armed Forces personnel, their families or veterans. This can be undertaken through the social care assessment process. |

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| A robust process is in place for children needing to come into care through the Entry to Care panel, decisions are made at this panel as to whether a child comes into care and whether a foster care or residential care placement is sought. Regular ‘Me and My World’ reviews are undertaken by Independent Reviewing Officers with all children in care, and placement support meetings are held when required. These meeting include any changes to support needs and negotiations with providers. Social Workers visit children every 6 weeks in their care placement to ensure their needs are being met.  Monthly budget monitoring meetings are in place to monitor spend on providers. Continue to collect and analyse equality data of children in care through quarterly Directorate Management Team performance boards. Impact of early intervention measures will be monitored through quarterly contract meetings with providers. |

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assess impact for different population groups** | **Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?**  **State Yes or No** | **Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith**  **OR**  **If no impact is identified, briefly state why.** |
| **Age**  including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | Yes | All the children and young people this will impact will be under 18 they will have complex needs and be vulnerable needing to be in care and at risk of requiring a high-cost placement due to their needs.  It is hoped that the impact in part will be mitigated by a wider range of early intervention provision/ services that will help support families keep their children at home. |
| **Disability** includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities. | Yes | All of the children will have learning disabilities and complex needs. Many of them will also have medical needs that will incur joint funding arrangements with the Integrated Care Board. Because of the complexities in need and the pressure families are under some of these young people will need externally provided specialist placements.  It is hoped that the impact in part will be mitigated by a wider range of early intervention provision/ services that will help support families keep their children at home. |
| **Ethnicity, ‘**Race’, ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers | Yes | 41% (7 out of 17) of children and young people who are currently in a disability residential care placement are either Black or from the Global Majority. Therefore, the reduction in funding is likely to impact upon this population.  Further work needs to be undertaken to identify why such a high percentage of children and young people with a disability who are Black or from the Global Majority are in residential care. This work will inform our commissioning strategy so that we are putting in effective early intervention from a care perspective specifically for these families. This work should help to prevent children coming into care.  As part of the SEND Short Break commissioning process we will be exploring with our providers their ability to support those families who will be affected, and we have asked for expressions of interest from providers who would like to run specific sessions for Black and Global Majority children and young people with SEND.  The remodelling of our in-house provision will also support more short break overnight capacity and we need to ensure that the access to this provision reflects the diversity within the city. |
| **Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief** | Yes | The Specialist Community Disability Service and the Safeguarding and Care service hold data on their children and young people they support in terms of their religion or belief. It is likely there will be range of religions and belief systems within the cohort who may require specialist residential placements. Therefore, there may be an impact on this group.  Further work will need to be undertaken on this data to inform our commissioning of provision going forward and to ensure that providers actively engage and celebrate religious and faith celebrated days to affirm children to engage further with the communities.  We would expect all activities to ensure observance of religion or belief and will sensitively and inclusively show considerations towards dietary, spiritual and/or attire. This will be an area that is kept under review through the Me and My World process. |
| **Gender and Sex** including non-binary and intersex people | No | The gender split of children and young people with SEN and Disabilities is 29% Female and 71% Male. However, the decision to place is based upon need and the gender of the child would not negatively impact upon the commissioning of a placement. |
| **Gender Reassignment** | Yes | Some children in care identify as non-binary or trans as well as having complex needs, their vulnerability may require placement in more specialist residential provision and therefore a reduction in budget may impact upon residential placements for these young people.  It is hoped that the impact in part will be mitigated by a wider range of early intervention provision/ services that will help support families keep their children at home. By keeping young people local access to the Brighton & Hove’s Trans Toolkit may also be helpful and could be adapted to meet the individual needs of children and young people. |
| **Sexual Orientation** | No | We have not yet identified any disproportionate impacts on this group because the data available about children and young people’s sexual orientation is inconclusive. However, we are aware that discrimination against sexual orientation remains a prevalent issue. When placing with providers we need to be assured that if there are any circumstances where individuals need support, that they are supported and get access to the right guidance and resources that have been adapted to meet their needs. |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | No | The young people attending in care placements will be under the age of 18. It is unlikely this would apply. However, if a young person who is between the ages of 16 and 18 and has parental consent to enter a marriage or civil partnership support will be provided to the young person and family concerned. A Mental Capacity assessment will be completed if required. |
| **Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility** (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum) | No | However, there are likely to be children and young people who have been adopted in care placements and where this is the case the appropriate support will be provided through the BHCC adoption team and their Social Worker. |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | No | There are no disproportionate impacts identified for this group at this time. |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** considering for age, language, and various intersections | Yes | Families from with these backgrounds may have experienced previous trauma and / or racism and children and young people and their families may need additional support. These are a vulnerable group, and some children and young people may need to come into care.  Further work needs to be undertaken as to the prevalence of this group within the specialist disability service so that it can inform our commissioning strategy and our work with providers going forward. Specific early intervention work will need to be commissioned that will help to support these families to prevent family breakdown.  The remodelling of our in-house provision will also support more short break overnight capacity and we need to ensure that the access to this provision reflects the diversity within the city. |
| **Carers** considering for age, language, and various intersections | Yes | There may be delays to accessing care placements through not being able to secure a suitable placement and local packages of support will need to be agreed and implemented with carers until a placement can be identified. Therefore, there is likely to be an impact on this group.  The remodelling of our in-house provision will also support more short break overnight capacity, and this is likely to help carers. |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** considering for age, language, and various intersections | Yes | All children in this cohort will be looked after children. Care leavers will continue to be supported through our 14-25 transitions PoD and/or the Care Leavers team and may be impacted upon. |
| **Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors** | Yes | A reason for children or young people being placed in full times care could be where they are living in a home where there is domestic abuse or sexual violence. Therefore, this group may be impacted. These families will be supported by their social workers and a review assessment will be undertaken to mitigate against any risk. |
| **Socio-economic disadvantage** considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections | Yes | Additional burdens due to the cost of living could have disproportionate impact on women due to the nature of their employment types and barriers to employment for those with sole childcare. Having a child with a disability and being a single parent/carer can place additional pressure on the family and their ability to cope. This can then lead to a breakdown of the family.  Having a child with a disability also has an impact on a family’s potential earnings as one parent or carer often is the primary carer. This can make families with children who are disabled less financially resilient and place additional pressure on the home and the ability to manage.  Therefore, it is likely that this cohort may be impacted upon.  It is hoped that the impact in part will be mitigated by a wider range of early intervention provision/ services that will help support families keep their children at home. |
| **Homeless and rough sleepers** considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | No | The children and young people who will be impacted by this saving are not likely to be homeless or rough sleepers as they will be in care. |
| **Human Rights** | No |  |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** |  |  |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

|  |
| --- |
| Increasing the access to respite provision through the re-design of Drove Road and Tudor House will mean there may be more opportunities for families to have a short break that may help prevent children coming into care. There will also be an emergency placement available should a child need an emergency placement in a crisis. Our aim is that the re-design of Tudor House will increase the number of full-time care placements in the city.  The removal of the Outreach Service could exacerbate the situation as this will reduce the support for 11 families and therefore will potentially impact upon the family’s ability to manage. However, every child will be supported by their social worker and review assessment of their needs will be undertaken. This will also be mitigated by the development of a range of early interventions mentioned previously. |

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

|  |
| --- |
| SMART action 1: The Council will continue to negotiate with providers on the framework on reducing the costs of high-cost packages and to develop local providers and provision. The new Head of FCL Commissioning will continue to address seek further ways to make these processes more efficient. |
| SMART action 2: The Council will continue to work with Family Hubs and in house short breaks providers and external providers to develop an improved Early Help and short breaks offer to prevent family breakdown. |
| SMART action 3: The Council will explore developing a complex needs in-house foster carer service to reduce reliance on more expensive independent provider provision. This will happen within the next 6 months. |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal’s impact score: | 3 |

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Directorate and Service Approval

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name and Job Title:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Responsible Lead Officer:** | Georgina Clarke-Green | 19-01-24 |
| **Accountable Manager:** | Lorraine Hughes | 19-01-24 |

**EDI Review and Approval:**

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service:** | Emma McDermott | 22-01-24 |

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2024/25 – Service Users**

Budget Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | School Improvement (Environmental Education) |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Mark Storey, Head of Education Standards and Achievement |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Families, Children and Learning, Education and Skills |
| Budget proposal no. | 4 |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

|  |
| --- |
| A total saving of £61,000 from a budget of £335,000 is proposed in the School Improvement budget. This comprises:   1. £20,000 efficiency savings and new source of income. This can be done with negligible impact on staff or service users. 2. £41,000 on Environmental Education. This will impact on schools.   This EIA refers to the Environmental Education budget saving only (£41,000 which is 100% of amount spent on Environmental Education). This funds:   * a part-time Environmental Education Officer who designs and delivers the city’s Climate Change, Sustainability and Environmental Education programme * training, advice and support to school leaders and teachers * the development and regular updating of a dedicated [website](https://www.ourcityourworld.co.uk/) to share resources and best practice * opportunities for school staff and pupils from across the city to network with each other and external organisations to initiate change   It does not provide a service directly to children and young people or the public.  There is no statutory requirement for schools to provide environment and sustainability education. The content and breadth is not stipulated in any way. Schools will however still continue to provide environmental education, however it will no longer be co-ordinated centrally and teachers will not have the support of an expert council officer. |
| Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionally negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable: |
| This saving may impact on children and young people as it contributes to their education and helps to give them a voice in an area that is a huge concern to many of them.  We cannot measure the impact as there is no GCSE or other assessment of pupils in this area. |

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
| This saving was proposed in January 2024 so there has been insufficient time for detailed consultation. We expect schools and young people to object to the proposal.  There will be consultation as part of the appropriate HR process when deleting a post. This includes consultation with post holder. |

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

|  |
| --- |
| None |

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | YES |
| **Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not** | Not applicable |
| **Ethnicity, ‘Race’, ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)** | Not applicable |
| **Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism** | Not applicable |
| **Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)** | Not applicable |
| **Gender Reassignment** | Not applicable |
| **Sexual Orientation** | Not applicable |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | Not applicable |
| **Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)** | Not applicable |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | Not applicable |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** | Not applicable |
| **Carers** | Not applicable |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** | Not applicable |
| **Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)** | Not applicable |
| **Socio-economic Disadvantage** | Not applicable |
| **Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability** | Not applicable |
| **Human Rights** | Not applicable |
| **Children and Young People** | Not applicable |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Not applicable |

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| We will meet with the headteachers from the Brighton & Hove Education Partnership in 2024/25 to hear their feedback on the impact of this saving. |

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

Data and analysis sources may include (not an exhaustive list):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assess impact for different population groups** | **Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?**  **State Yes or No** | **Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith**  **OR**  **If no impact is identified, briefly state why.** |
| **Age**  including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | Yes | This service supports school leaders and teachers and not children and young people directly. This cut could mean the quality of ‘environmental and sustainability education’ that pupils receive is not as robust or effective as it would be had the service continued.  It could also mean some young people have less opportunity to have their voice heard |
| **Disability** includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities. | No | Not applicable |
| **Ethnicity, ‘**Race’, ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers | No | Not applicable |
| **Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief** | No | Not applicable |
| **Gender and Sex** including non-binary and intersex people | No | Not applicable |
| **Gender Reassignment** | No | Not applicable |
| **Sexual Orientation** | No | Not applicable |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | No | Not applicable |
| **Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility** (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum) | No | Not applicable |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | No | Not applicable |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No | Not applicable |
| **Carers** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No | Not applicable |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No | Not applicable |
| **Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors** | No | Not applicable |
| **Socio-economic disadvantage** considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections | No | Not applicable |
| **Homeless and rough sleepers** considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | No | Not applicable |
| **Human Rights** | No | Not applicable |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** |  |  |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

|  |
| --- |
| No |

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

|  |
| --- |
| SMART action 1:  The Education Adviser for PSHE will pick up the topic of environment and education within schools’ PSHE networks from April 2024. Materials of use that are received by the council will be disseminated via the Schools’ Bulletin or the PSHE network. As far as possible we will encourage conversation on this topic at this network. |
| SMART action 2:  The Head of Education Standards and Achievement will add environment and sustainability to headteacher meeting agendas on an annual basis. At these meetings we will aim to share activity and ideas that are happening with the city. |
| SMART action 3:  The Head of Education Standards and Achievement will request that schools pick up some of this work including the running of networks for sharing practice; opportunities for young people to have their voice heard; running of a website. This will be addressed in the chairs of partnerships meeting by May 2024. |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal’s impact score: | 3 |

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

Directorate and Service Approval

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name and Job Title:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Responsible Lead Officer:** | Mark Storey  Head of Education Standards & Achievement | 18/01/2024 |
| **Accountable Manager:** | A close-up of a signature  Description automatically generated with medium confidence  Jo Lyons  Assistant Director, Families Children & Learning (Education & Skills) | 19/01/2024 |

**EDI Review and Approval:**

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service:** | Emma McDermott | 23-01-24 |

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2024/25 – Service Users**

Budget Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | Youth led grants |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Jo Templeman, Head of Family Hubs |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Families, Children and Learning, Family Hubs |
| Budget proposal no. | 5 |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

|  |
| --- |
| The proposal is to cease the Youth Led Grants funding in total; a saving of £80,000.  Young people are responsible for the distribution of funding allocated to the annual Youth Led Grants programme. Young people take a lead on how this money is spent, making decisions on the priorities, framework for allocating funds, and writing and evaluating the bids. The current agreed priorities for this programme are:   * Improving young people’s mental health · * Reducing the harm from young people’s alcohol and substance misuse * Increasing volunteering and work experience opportunities * Increasing opportunities for young people to participate in new and challenging experiences * Supporting young people who have faced additional disadvantage due to Covid-19   The eligibility criteria include:   * Benefiting young people aged 11-19 (up to 25 if they have special educational needs) * Ensuring distribution of funding takes into account the geographical areas of the city and groups of young people facing challenges in their lives, particularly around equality issues * Working in partnership with one of the lead Youth Service Grant Providers listed above * Succeeding in encouraging participation with the voice of young people being embedded across all work, broadening the area of influence for young people. Your project will have a clear approach as to how young people are involved in and shape the activities and be part of the offer. * Operating in a manner compliant with the Equalities Act 2010 (see below) |
| Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionally negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable: |
| All funded projects target disadvantaged young people. A reduction in funding would result in between 20 -25 different youth projects/activities not being funded, and this would impact on young people aged between 11 – 19 years (up to 25 if they have special educational needs), particularly those with SEND, those financially disadvantaged, Black and Global Majority young people, gender specific groups and those impacted by Covid (particularly worsened mental health). |

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
| There has been no consultation regarding this saving. |

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

|  |
| --- |
| 23/24 budgets savings EIA for this same grant programme. |

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | YES - 11 to 25 years olds |
| **Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not** | yes |
| **Ethnicity, ‘Race’, ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)** | yes |
| **Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism** | Not applicable |
| **Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)** | yes |
| **Gender Reassignment** | NO |
| **Sexual Orientation** | NO |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | Not applicable |
| **Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)** | Not applicable |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | Not applicable |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** | NO |
| **Carers** | NO |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** | NO |
| **Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)** | NO |
| **Socio-economic Disadvantage** | yes |
| **Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability** | NO |
| **Human Rights** | NO |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | NO |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Equal opportunities is part of the application and assessment process. |

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Feedback from organisations currently receiving a grant via this programme. |

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assess impact for different population groups** | **Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?**  **State Yes or No** | **Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith**  **OR**  **If no impact is identified, briefly state why.** |
| **Age**  including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | Yes | This will impact on young people aged between 11 years – 19 years (up to 25 years if they have special educational needs). There will be no funding for project for this group. |
| **Disability** includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities. | Yes | This programme awards funding to specific programmes for young people with SEND. There will be no funding for project for this group. |
| **Ethnicity, ‘**Race’, ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers | Yes | This programme awards funding to activities for Black and Global Majority young people. There will be no funding for project for this group. |
| **Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief** | No | No disproportionate impact for this group. |
| **Gender and Sex** including non-binary and intersex people | Yes | This programme awards funding to activities for young women and men re: gender-related issues and disadvantages. There will be no funding for project for this group. |
| **Gender Reassignment** | No | No disproportionate impact for this group. |
| **Sexual Orientation** | No | No disproportionate impact for this group. |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | n/a |  |
| **Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility** (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum) | n/a |  |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | n/a |  |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** considering for age, language, and various intersections | Yes | This programme awards funding to activities for Black and Global Majority young people, within this cohort of young people some will identify as refugee and or migrant. There will be no funding for project for this group. |
| **Carers** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No | Groups currently funded by in house council funding, so not impacted by youth led grants. |
| **Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors** | n/a |  |
| **Socio-economic disadvantage** considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections | Yes | Young people financially disadvantaged are particularly targeted for the funded projects. There will be no funding for project for this group |
| **Homeless and rough sleepers** considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | n/a |  |
| **Human Rights** | n/a |  |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** |  |  |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

|  |
| --- |
| The Youth Service Grants Programme 2021-2025 aims to assist organisations financially so that they can deliver the desired outcomes, building on the assets of the third sector, promoting enterprise and social value.  This funding is to:   * Provide safe physical, digital and outreach spaces in the community that delivers open access, non-formal education to young people that will support their personal and social development through activities that young people need, want and value. * Deliver regular activities and opportunities for young people to participate in decision making forums, social action and volunteering. * Provide targeted and specialist youth work to engage young people with specialist needs, disadvantaged young people or marginalised population groups. * Work in partnership with the Council, other youth providers and specialist agencies, acting as a bridge and supporting young people to access other services and being part of a multi-agency group where appropriate. * Empower young people to co-design and co-produce activities, projects and services   This funding is sustained for 24/25 and will ensure services are still delivered and help mitigate the impact of this budget saving.  The significant reduction of the council’s annual grant fund to the community and voluntary sector – the Communities Fund – will likely have a worsening impact on this proposal as it will not offer a viable alternative for providers to bid to. |

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

|  |
| --- |
| SMART action 1: Youth providers will be directed to the Holiday Activities Funding which can support projects like those funded through the youth-led grant programme.  (note: HAF only applicable for young people eligible for Free School Meals) |
| SMART action 2: Youth providers will be supported to seek and apply for other funding opportunities via BHCC youth manager |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal’s impact score: | 1 |

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Directorate and Service Approval

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name and Job Title:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Responsible Lead Officer:** | Jo Templeman – Head of Service Family hubs | 22.1.23 |
| **Accountable Manager:** | Jo Lyons – Assistant director | 22.1.23 |

**EDI Review and Approval:**

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service:** | Emma McDermott | 23-01-24 |

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2024/25 – Service Users**

Budget Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | Cease funding external service level agreement with:   * Brighton unemployed families project centre £11,000 * Brighton Oasis creche support £2,000 * Amaze £1,000 |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Jo Templeman, Head of Family Hubs |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Families, Children and Learning, Family Hubs |
| Budget proposal no. | 6 |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

|  |
| --- |
| The funding for the Brighton unemployed centre supports the delivery of childcare for adults accessing the centre, withdrawing funding could impact on under 5’s, women and disadvantaged families.  The funding for the Brighton Oasis Creche provides childcare for women accessing the service provided by Oasis for substance misuse support, withdrawing funding could impact on under 5’s and women.  The funding for Amaze is to provide one off groups for early years children with SEND. |
| Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionally negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable: |
| Impact on children under 5. Removal of funding would reduce the service for under 5s via creche, childcare and stay and play session.  Removing funding from Amaze may impact on the delivery of service for children with SEND.  Any reduction in childcare provision disproportionately affects women who tend to have responsibility for these arrangements. The childcare workforce is overwhelmingly female.  Brighton Unemployed Families Project and Oasis all run in Tarner children’s centre area with a focus on supporting disadvantaged children.  Oasis provides support to women experiencing substance misuse issues. |

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
| Feedback and insight from previous dialogue with the providers has been used to inform this assessment. |

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

|  |
| --- |
| 23/24 budgets savings EIA for the same proposal. |

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | YES |
| **Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not** | No |
| **Ethnicity, ‘Race’, ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)** | No |
| **Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism** | Not applicable |
| **Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)** | Yes |
| **Gender Reassignment** | Not applicable |
| **Sexual Orientation** | Not applicable |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | Not applicable |
| **Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)** | Not applicable |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | Not applicable |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** | No |
| **Carers** | Not applicable |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** | Not applicable |
| **Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)** | Not applicable |
| **Socio-economic Disadvantage** | No |
| **Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability** | yes |
| **Human Rights** | Not applicable |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | Not applicable |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| This data will be requested from the providers. |

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Discussion with providers via monitoring meetings. |

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assess impact for different population groups** | **Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?**  **State Yes or No** | **Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith**  **OR**  **If no impact is identified, briefly state why.** |
| **Age**  including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | Yes | Impact on children under 5. Removal of funding could reduce the service for under 5’s via creche and childcare. |
| **Disability** includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities. | Yes | Removing funding from Amaze may impact on the access to service for parents/carers of disabled children. |
| **Ethnicity, ‘**Race’, ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers | Unknown | Service user data by ethnicity is unavailable and therefore impact cannot be determined. |
| **Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief** | Unknown | Service user data by faith/belief is unavailable and therefore impact cannot be determined. |
| **Gender and Sex** including non-binary and intersex people | Yes | Any reduction in childcare provision disproportionately affects women who tend to take responsibility for these arrangements. The childcare workforce is overwhelmingly female. |
| **Gender Reassignment** | N/a |  |
| **Sexual Orientation** | N/a |  |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | N/a |  |
| **Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility** (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum) | N/a |  |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | N/a |  |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** considering for age, language, and various intersections | Unknown | Service user data by immigration status is unavailable and therefore impact cannot be determined. |
| **Carers** considering for age, language, and various intersections | N/a |  |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** considering for age, language, and various intersections | N/a |  |
| **Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors** | Yes | Oasis provides services to women experiencing substance misuse. Their clients often have complex backgrounds and experiences including domestic/sexual violence. |
| **Socio-economic disadvantage** considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections | Yes | Brighton Unemployed Families Project and Oasis all run in Tarner children’s centre area with a focus on supporting disadvantaged children. |
| **Homeless and rough sleepers** considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | Unknown | Service user data by tenure is unavailable and therefore impact cannot be determined. |
| **Human Rights** |  |  |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** |  |  |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

|  |
| --- |
| None know. |

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

|  |
| --- |
| SMART action 1: Family navigators in the Family Hubs will provide support to families to access alternative support and childcare provision. |
| SMART action 2: Family Hub Community Managers to support providers to seek additional funding |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal’s impact score: | 1 |

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Directorate and Service Approval

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name and Job Title:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Responsible Lead Officer:** | Jo Templeman  Head of Service – Family Hubs | 19/01/24 |
| **Accountable Manager:** | A close-up of a signature  Description automatically generated with medium confidence  Jo Lyons  Assistant Director, Families, Children and Learning (Education & Skills) | 19/01/24 |

**EDI Review and Approval:**

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service:** | Emma McDermott | 23-01-24 |

**Notes and recommendations (if any) from Head of CETS Service reviewing this assessment:**

|  |
| --- |
| Given the lack of data and consultation available to inform this EIA it is advisable to undertake a consultation exercise before implementation of the saving. This will ensure that the impact is fully understood, and all mitigating actions considered. |

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2024/25 – Service Users**

Budget Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | Contact service |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Julie Dreher, Head of Children’s Safeguarding and Care |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Families Children and Learning, Safeguarding and Care |
| Budget proposal no. | 7 |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

|  |
| --- |
| £72k saving from contact service – combination of £22k efficiencies and possible £50k staffing (1.2 FTE posts). Work is currently underway to look at non-staffing costs, such as transport, to see if savings can be made elsewhere in the budget. |
| Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionally negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable: |
| This service provides contact to children in care whose contact with their families has to be supervised for safeguarding reasons. These children are generally below the age of 13 and often below 10. Contact is often within court proceedings, where assessment of parenting capacity is being made and is court directed.  The contact service also supervises contact where final orders have been issued, where their parents pose such a risk to the child it is not deemed safe or appropriate for their carer to oversee contact.  A reduction in posts in the contact service could result in a budget pressure (due to need to use sessional workers) in that children will continue to need to have contact at a level directed by the courts.  BHCC has corporate parenting responsibilities for children in care and has a duty to ensure regular contact with family members as appropriate. A reduction in staffing could result in a budget pressure (due to need to use sessional workers) as children must have contact in line with their needs.  A reduction in posts in the contact service may also mean that to comply with statutory responsibilities this work will fall to social workers. This is a more costly expenditure and could result in an increased workload and impact upon timeliness of statutory duties. |

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
| The contact service was reviewed in the summer of 2023, with staff consulted and work undertaken to establish the staffing level to meet the demands of the court for contact time. As a result of this the service was redesigned and a budget saving made, reduced the staffing level by 0.5fte. This budget proposal is in addition the 0.5fte identified through the review and restructure. |

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

|  |
| --- |
| Partners in Change EIA and Placements EIA |

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | YES |
| **Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not** | YES |
| **Ethnicity, ‘Race’, ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)** | YES |
| **Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism** | Not applicable |
| **Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)** | YES |
| **Gender Reassignment** | Not applicable |
| **Sexual Orientation** | Not applicable |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | Not applicable |
| **Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)** | Not applicable |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | Not applicable |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** | Not applicable |
| **Carers** | Not applicable |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** | YES |
| **Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)** | YES |
| **Socio-economic Disadvantage** | YES |
| **Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability** | YES |
| **Human Rights** | Not applicable |
| **Another relevant group : those experiencing substance misuse and living with substance misuse parents** | YES |
|  |  |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| n/a |

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| This will be reviewed through the contact service monitoring already in place. |

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assess impact for different population groups** | **Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?**  **State Yes or No** | **Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith**  **OR**  **If no impact is identified, briefly state why.** |
| **Age**  including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | Yes | Children may be impacted by this saving, particularly those under 13, where it is more likely that they will require supervised contact with their parents and those in large sibling groups. |
| **Disability** includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities. | Yes | A disproportionate number of children in care will have SEN needs, this could therefore impact on them. |
| **Ethnicity, ‘**Race’, ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers |  | There are a disproportionately number of black and global majority children in care, this could therefore impact on them |
| **Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief** | Unknown | No data and insight available at this time |
| **Gender and Sex** including non-binary and intersex people |  | This could impact on woman and mothers most as most children in care will have present mothers but not all will have present fathers and therefore could disproportionately impact on children’s contact with their mothers |
| **Gender Reassignment** | No | No disproportionate impact expected. |
| **Sexual Orientation** | No | No disproportionate impact expected. |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | No | No disproportionate impact expected. |
| **Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility** (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum) | No | No disproportionate impact expected. |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | No | No disproportionate impact expected. |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No | No disproportionate impact expected. |
| **Carers** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No | No disproportionate impact expected. |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** considering for age, language, and various intersections | Yes | This saving will only impact on children in care, as the service only support children in care to have family time with their parents and siblings. |
| **Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors** | Yes | Many children in care may have experienced and witnessed DV and are receiving support to see their parents through supervised contact. This could therefore have a significant impact on them. |
| **Socio-economic disadvantage** considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections |  | Many/most families in care proceedings will be social-economic disadvantage. |
| **Homeless and rough sleepers** considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | Yes | Some of the fathers where contact is supervised are homeless or rough sleepers. It could reduce their ability to spend time with their children. |
| **Human Rights** |  |  |
| **Another relevant group :**  **Those experiencing substance misuse and living with substance misuse parents** | Yes | Many children in care may have experienced parenting from a parent affected by substance misuse and are receiving support to see their parents through supervised contact. This could have a significant impact on them. |
| **Lone parents** | Yes | Many children in care have only one present parent, therefore will disproportionately impact on children’s contact with their lone parent. |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

|  |
| --- |
| The placement saving target could impact on the placements and may result in some placements not agreeing to supervise contact, this will put more pressure on the contact service. |

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

|  |
| --- |
| SMART action 1: Currently looking across the budget to find saving from non-staffing costs. A redesign was undertaken in summer 2023, to ensure it was working at its most effective. In doing that we took the service to the minimum staffing needed to deliver a statutory service. |
| SMART action 2: As the level of contact fluctuates dependent on the court demand, age and risks to children, size of sibling groups etc, there are periods of time where the service is busier than others. We could hold vacant posts and use sessional staff to relive the pressure in busy periods. |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal’s impact score: | 3 |

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Directorate and Service Approval

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name and Job Title:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Responsible Lead Officer:** | Julie Dreher | 18.01.23 |
| **Accountable Manager:** | Anna Gianfrancesco | 18.01.23 |

**EDI Review and Approval:**

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service:** | Emma McDermott | 26-01-24 |

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2024/25 – Service Users**

Budget Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | Placements |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Anna Gianfrancesco, Assistant Director Children’s Safeguarding & Care |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Families, Children & Learning, Safeguarding and Care |
| Budget proposal no. | *8* |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

|  |
| --- |
| A £ 2.004 m saving on the cost of agency placements for children in the care of Brighton & Hove City Council. This will be achieved by:   * continuing to work through the social work model of practice to hold the numbers of children in care. * work to further increase the number of in-house foster placements and reduce reliance on more expensive independent provider provision. * provision of high quality, value for money provision though contracted services with external providers supported by the children's services framework contract arrangements and preferred provider guidelines. * agreed commissioning framework with health for children who need specialist accommodation when discharged from hospital. * block contract commissioned placements for some Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC) * development of framework and commissioning for care leavers. * relationship based social work practice and the specialist adolescence service to continue to divert children from the care system. * for those already in care, a stepping down to in house and/or less expensive placements. * continued scrutiny of placement costs contributing to a reduction in unit costs. |
| Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionally negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable: |
| This reduction in budget will impact on children in care of the local authority. A quarter of the children receiving the service are Black and Global majority children, and a significant number of all the children in the service are disabled children with mental health illness, and some of these children are also neurodiverse.  Over the last two years we have seen national sufficiency issues regarding placements, for every 1 placement provided by external commissioned providers there are roughly 100 children seeking to be placed. This means that children with more complex problems, trauma, mental health needs are becoming more difficult to place, with providers choosing to take those children with less complex needs. It also means that providers will charge more for more vulnerable children. This is placing great pressure on the system and leaving the most vulnerable children at risk of no placement or being placed in unregistered provision, which nationally are often the only ones who will take highly vulnerable children.  A reduction in the funding and planned reduction in the use of agency placements places more pressure on foster carers to manage young people whose needs are better met in residential provision.  There has been a downturn nationally in the number of people coming forward to become foster carers. This creates pressure on the care system and results in young people who need a foster placement being difficult to place.  The budget reductions mean there is less capacity to absorb the increasing costs of independent providers. The council is part of the Department for Education initiative to develop regional fostering recruitment hubs and a Mockingbird fostering support scheme, that supports complex placements. It is hoped this will bring in more carers regionally, reduce the risk of placement breakdowns and mitigate some of the risk of this budget saving.  This saving will impact on children requiring care. It will necessitate managing high risk cases in the community especially with adolescents. While these decisions will be based on safeguarding risk, holding more risk in the community for longer puts pressure on the system, and risks burn out of staff.  In terms of a national context, from 2019 to 2023 the number of children in care has risen by 7.9%, with a decrease in fostering placements available. 93% of children homes are now run by private and voluntary sector organisations while 43% of foster carers are within the Independent Fostering sector. Spending by local authorities on residential care has increased by 105% and on foster care by 26%. |

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
| No consultation is planned, however work has been undertaken and continues with social work teams and managers to look at how we reduce the number of children in care and the need for high-cost placements, as well as work with external partners including health to reduce the demands. |

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

|  |
| --- |
| None |

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | YES |
| **Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not** | YES |
| **Ethnicity, ‘Race’, ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)** | YES |
| **Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism** | YES |
| **Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)** | YES |
| **Gender Reassignment** | YES |
| **Sexual Orientation** | Not applicable |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | Not applicable |
| **Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)** | Not applicable |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | Not applicable |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** | YES |
| **Carers** | YES |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** | YES |
| **Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)** | YES |
| **Socio-economic Disadvantage** | YES |
| **Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability** | Not applicable |
| **Human Rights** | Not applicable |
| **Another relevant group:**  **Those experiencing substance misuse** | YES |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Not applicable |

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| This will be monitored through Entry to Care and Placement Review board as well as quarterly fostering placement and permanency board which included placement budget management review. |

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assess impact for different population groups** | **Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?**  **State Yes or No** | **Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith**  **OR**  **If no impact is identified, briefly state why.** |
| **Age**  including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | yes | All the people this will impact will be under 18 and will be among the most vulnerable children in society, needing not only to be in care but those at risk of high-cost placement due to their needs |
| **Disability** includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities. | yes | Many of the complex, hard to place young people will be either neurodiverse and or have a mental health illness. This creates complexities for their care and will put placements under pressure. Often resulting in these young people needing externally provided specialist placements |
| **Ethnicity, ‘**Race’, ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers | yes | 35% of children in care in Brighton & Hove are Black or from the Global Majority. Of which there are currently 50 UASC. |
| **Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief** | no | no disproportionate impact for this group |
| **Gender and Sex** including non-binary and intersex people | Yes | A number of children in care identify as non-binary or trans. These young people will often also have additional complex needs and vulnerability and may require placement in more specialist residential provision. Cuts in residential placements will impact these young people. |
| **Gender Reassignment** | N/a | N/a |
| **Sexual Orientation** | N/a | N/a |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | N/a | N/a |
| **Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility** (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum) | N/a | N/a |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | N/a | N/a |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** considering for age, language, and various intersections | yes | It will impact on all our UASC young people and UASC are leavers.  UASC are often placed in external providers, due to their age and needs, any reduction in budget and reduction in the use of agency placements will not only affect the Black and global majority children in care but also on the commissioning of placements for the UASC young people as they arrive. |
| **Carers** considering for age, language, and various intersections |  |  |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** considering for age, language, and various intersections | yes | All the children will be looked after or care leavers and it will impact in their placements and decisions made at times will be budget led. |
| **Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors** | yes | Children in care are more likely to have come from families that have experienced DV, therefore any cuts in services that impact on children in care will impact on those children affected by DV |
| **Socio-economic disadvantage** considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections | yes | Children in care are more likely to have come from families in poverty, therefore any cuts in services that impact on children in care will impact on those children affected by childhood poverty |
| **Homeless and rough sleepers** considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | n/a | n/a |
| **Human Rights** |  |  |
| **Another relevant group:** **Substance misuse** | Yes | Children in care are more likely to have come from families who have experienced substance misuse, therefore any cuts in services that impact on children in care will impact on those children affected by childhood poverty |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

|  |
| --- |
| Cuts in the contact service may lead to additional charges in this area if we need to ask carers and care providers to supervise contact. |

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

|  |
| --- |
| SMART action 1:  We are a demand lead service and are therefore not able to reduce the demand as such, while doing everything possible to prevent children coming into care, when needed children are taken into care.  Due to the pressure above it is likely that even reducing the numbers of children in care will not see the overall costs reduce. Any reduction in budget will make it hard to place our most vulnerable young people.  However we are working with the new national program to develop a regional fostering hub and of Mockingbird, a national programme to support foster cares via small community hubs, it is anticipated this will reduce placement breakdown and enable those requiring more support that may currently need to move to residential provision stay with foster carers. These will both come on line within the next year. |
| SMART action 2: we have developed 3 support post that will come on line April 2024, they will work to prevent children coming into care or placement breakdown |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal’s impact score: | 4 |

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Directorate and Service Approval

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name and Job Title:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Responsible Lead Officer:** | Anna Gianfrancesco | 10.01.24 |
| **Accountable Manager:** | Anna Gianfrancesco | 10.01.24 |

**EDI Review and Approval:**

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service:** | Emma McDermott | 23-01-24 |

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2024/25 – Service Users**

Budget Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | Partners in Change Hub |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Tom Stibbs, Principal Children and Families Social Worker and Head of Specialist Services |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Families, Children and Learning, Safeguarding and Care, Partners in Change Hub |
| Budget proposal no. | 9 |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

|  |
| --- |
| A £75k saving on the Partners in Change Hub budget, which is equivalent to 1fte post. This will be achieved by reducing management hours and other non-staffing and staffing costs.  The Partners in Change Hub provides specialist support to social workers and families and this includes for example, input regarding domestic abuse, mental health or substance misuse. |
| Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionally negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable: |
| This reduction in budget will impact on the Partners in Change Hub’s ability to provide specialist support to social workers and families. This will have a disproportionate impact on children and young people. It will also disproportionately impact on children in care and care experienced young people, children who identify as ‘mixed / dual’ ethnicity and on parents, women, those with substance misuse and / or mental health issues and those who have experienced domestic or sexual abuse.  A reduction of support from the Hub to social workers also increases the pressures on the social work system, which already faces the challenges of the impact of poverty on families, the increase in emotional and mental health issues for young people, and the national shortage of social workers.  Due to the relatively small size of the budget saving proposal, it is possible to put in place mitigations, by reducing management costs and reviewing the structure of the Hub, which will limit the impacts of the proposals and the impact for the groups identified above. As part of the review of the Hub, key support and interventions for the vulnerable groups identified in this document will be prioritised. |

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
| Consultation is planned with the staff in the Partners in Change Hub, including an engagement event for all staff. In addition, the views of the wider service are being sought in terms of the impact of the support offered by the Partners in Change Hub. The engagement will take place across February 2024 and will include a formal consultation process. The views of families that receive support from the Hub are sought on an ongoing basis regarding their experience of the service. |

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

|  |
| --- |
| The EIAs for the budget saving proposal for the Contact and Family Time Service and for Placements for Children in Care. |

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | YES |
| **Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not** | YES |
| **Ethnicity, ‘Race’, ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)** | YES |
| **Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism** | YES |
| **Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)** | YES |
| **Gender Reassignment** | YES |
| **Sexual Orientation** | YES |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | Not applicable |
| **Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)** | YES |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | No |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** | YES |
| **Carers** | YES |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** | YES |
| **Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)** | YES |
| **Socio-economic Disadvantage** | YES |
| **Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability** | YES |
| **Human Rights** |  |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | * Lone parents * People facing literacy and numeracy barriers * People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM) * People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery * People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD) |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| It is not possible to capture armed forces data on the IT system the council uses for this service. |

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Annual reports are completed for the Partners in Change (PIC) Hub, which include consideration of protected characteristics, and these factors are also considered throughout PICs work in the delivery of specific interventions by the hub, for example mental health, substance misuse and parenting support, and at the regular reviews of these interventions. |

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assess impact for different population groups** | **Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?**  **State Yes or No** | **Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith**  **OR**  **If no impact is identified, briefly state why.** |
| **Age**  including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | yes | The Partners in Change Hub provides support to children and young people, this will include care leavers up to the age of 25, and their families or carers. The Partners in Change Hub also includes the baby team, which provides support as part of pre-birth processes and to new parents. The impact of this proposal will, therefore, have a potential negative impact on vulnerable young people and children disproportionately. |
| **Disability** includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities. | yes | Many of the children that the Partners in Change Hub supports will experience additional complexities and this includes emotional and mental health issues and/or neurodiversity. The hub provides specialist support to children and young people with emotional and mental health issues and neurodiversity and so these children would be negatively impacted by a reduction in service. |
| **Ethnicity, ‘**Race’, ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers | yes | 35% of children in care in Brighton & Hove are Black or from the Global Majority. We know that children of ‘mixed/dual’ ethnicity are over-represented as children in care. This is also reflected in the children that the Partners in Change Hub offers support to. These children would, therefore, be disproportionately impacted by any reduction in services. |
| **Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief** | no | no disproportionate impact identified. |
| **Gender and Sex** including non-binary and intersex people | yes | Social work services and the Partners in Change Hub engages with a higher number of those who identify as women than men and this is reflected in interventions such as parenting groups and domestic abuse support. Women could, therefore, be disproportionately impacted by the proposals. |
| **Gender Reassignment** | yes | A number of children in care identify as non-binary or trans and these young people will often also have additional complex needs and vulnerability, which may result in additional support from the Partners in Change Hub. |
| **Sexual Orientation** | no | no disproportionate impact identified. |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | n/a | n/a |
| **Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility** (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum) | yes | The Partners in Change Hub includes the baby team, which provides support as part of pre-birth processes and to new parents. The impact will, therefore, have a potential negative impact on parents. The Partners in Change Hub also provides specialist support to permanence processes within social work services, including decisions regarding adoption care plans for children and so this would be negatively impacted if these services were reduced. |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | Unknow | No data or insight |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** considering for age, language, and various intersections | yes | The Partners in Change provides specialist support to Unaccompanied Asylum-Seeking Children and Care Leavers seeking asylum. |
| **Carers** considering for age, language, and various intersections | yes | As well as support to parents, the Partners in Change Hub provides support to other adults that are in caring roles, whether these are formal or informal, as well as children that take on caring responsibilities |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** considering for age, language, and various intersections | yes | The Partners in Change Hub provides support to children in care, care leavers and care experienced children as well as children in need and children with child protection plans. These children would, therefore, be negatively impacted by a reduction in the service offered by the Hub. |
| **Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors** | yes | The Partners in Change Hub provides specialist support to adults and children who have experienced domestic or sexual abuse and so these survivors would be impacted if these services were reduced. |
| **Socio-economic disadvantage** considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections | yes | The [Child Welfare Inequalities Project](https://research.hud.ac.uk/institutes-centres/cacs/projects/child_welfare_inequalities), has shown that children who receive social work support are more likely to have experienced socio—economic disadvantage. If services are reduced from the Partners in Change hub these children would be negatively impacted. |
| **Homeless and rough sleepers** considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | no |  |
| **Human Rights** | no |  |
| **Another relevant group:** | Parents with substance misuse and / or mental health issues | The Partners in Change Hub provides support to parents with substance misuse and / or mental health issues and these parents and their children would be negatively impacted if these services were reduced. |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

|  |
| --- |
| Budget proposals to reduce funding for the contact service and placements may have a negative impact on children in care and, therefore, worsen the impact of any reduction of support from the Partners in Change Hub for these children, especially within the context of increased poverty and the national context of increasing numbers of children in care. |

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

|  |
| --- |
| SMART action 1: The budget savings proposal to be partially met by a reduction in management hours and a restructure of the Partners in Change Hub to support this change – consultation process to be completed in February 2024 |
| SMART action 2: A review of the Partners in Change Hub budget to take place to confirm any non-staffing savings that can be made – January 2024 |
| SMART action 3: If budget savings proposal cannot be met via reduction in management hours and non-staffing costs, a reduction in staffing costs to be co-ordinated so that it does not reduce the services identified above in Section 4 and direct support to children and families are protected – consultation process to be completed in February 2024 |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal’s impact score: | 3 |

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Directorate and Service Approval

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name and Job Title:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Responsible Lead Officer:** | Tom Stibbs, Principal Children and Families Social Worker and Head of Specialist Services | 17.01.24 |
| **Accountable Manager:** | Tom Stibbs, Principal Children and Families Social Worker and Head of Specialist Services | 17.01.24 |

**EDI Review and Approval:**

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service:** | Emma McDermott | 23-01-24 |

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2024/25 – Service Users**

Budget Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | Community Care Budget |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Steve Hook, Assistant Director of Operations |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Health and Adult Social Care, Operations |
| Budget proposal no. | 10 |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

|  |
| --- |
| The overall net budget for this service area is £68.387m and the proposed saving is £3.008m.  This is proposed to be done by continuing with the agreed direction of travel for Adult Social Care focusing upon reducing demand through several approaches:   * increase the reablement offer to those who require it * focus on preventative interventions and promoting independence in line with the target operating model, including advice, and signposting and increasing the use of technology enabled care * reduction of long-term care placements through improved care pathways. * supporting adults with learning disabilities to move on from high-cost placements into new living arrangements which promote independence * ensure reviews demonstrate support services are adequate to meet needs and represent efficiency and value for money * maximising income through financial assessment reviews in line with the annual state benefit increases by increasing the number of reviews undertaken * reviewing adult learning disabilities block contracts * reprovisioning Shared Lives to deliver greatest financial efficiencies * managing provider fee uplifts considering the current market fee position |
| Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionally negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable: |
| Older people, people with disabilities and carers are groups who are affected when changes are made in Adult Social Care, considering intersectional impacts. However, due to the nature of these changes being focused on prevention of admission into long term residential and nursing care, promoting independence in the community and ensuring value for money, there are no identified negative disproportionate impacts for these groups. |

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
| The results of the NHS Digital Adult Social Care User Survey 2022-23 have been reviewed to understand what is important to people who use adult social care services.  Continued engagement with partners, people with learning disabilities and their families through the Learning Disability Partnership Board.  Discussions with individuals and their families/carers, and with Grace Eyre, will take place prior to any alterations to the service provision of Shared Lives.  We regularly engage with care and support providers and will continue our ongoing engagement. We will continue to negotiate with providers throughout the year on fee uplift requests so that services can continue to meet the care and support needs of the individuals within their care. |

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

|  |
| --- |
| None |

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | YES |
| **Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not** | YES |
| **Ethnicity, ‘Race’, ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)** | YES |
| **Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism** | YES |
| **Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)** | YES |
| **Gender Reassignment** | NO |
| **Sexual Orientation** | YES |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | NO |
| **Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)** | Not applicable |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | NO |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** | NO |
| **Carers** | YES |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** | Not applicable |
| **Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)** | NO |
| **Socio-economic Disadvantage** | NO |
| **Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability** | YES |
| **Human Rights** | NO |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | NO |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Equalities data is gathered in line with statutory guidelines as indicated by DHSC and NHSE. Assessments and reviews of individuals gather further information to fully understand the strengths and needs of each person requiring care and support. Although this is not monitored currently for trends and analysis, each individual’s needs are considered throughout their care and support planning. Where we do not have data available, we will seek to improve this and continue to engage with people in the community to understand the impacts further. Further work is underway corporately to adopt new standards on data collection for protected characteristics which we will use as appropriate to our services. |

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| The Executive Director for Health and Adult Social Care retains the responsibility for professional leadership and operational delivery for meeting statutory need and will ensure governance arrangements support social work professional practice to ensure that statutory duties and responsibilities are appropriately met and best practice is followed.  We will continue to review the impacts of this proposal through annual service user surveys and bi-annual carer surveys, as well as monitoring compliments and complaints. We will also gather stakeholder feedback through existing partnership boards and forums. Any impacts to individuals are assessed through reviews and care and support planning. |

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assess impact for different population groups** | **Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?**  **State Yes or No** | **Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith**  **OR**  **If no impact is identified, briefly state why.** |
| **Age**  including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | No | Focus on prevention of admission into long term residential and nursing care and promoting independence in the community. |
| **Disability** includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities. | No | Focus on prevention of admission into long term residential and nursing care and promoting independence in the community. |
| **Ethnicity, ‘**Race’, ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers | No |  |
| **Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief** | No |  |
| **Gender and Sex** including non-binary and intersex people | No |  |
| **Gender Reassignment** | No |  |
| **Sexual Orientation** | No |  |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | No |  |
| **Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility** (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum) | No |  |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | No |  |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Carers** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors** | No |  |
| **Socio-economic disadvantage** considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Homeless and rough sleepers** considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Human Rights** | No |  |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | No |  |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

|  |
| --- |
| Any changes in Health Service provision in the city can impact particularly on those people impacted by this proposal. This will be closely monitored through the integrated health agenda and other joint planning mechanisms. |

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. No mitigation actions are available due to no disproportionate impacts identified |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal’s impact score: | 1 |

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Directorate and Service Approval

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name and Job Title:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Responsible Lead Officer:** | Steve Hook | 18/01/24 |
| **Accountable Manager:** | Rob Persey | 18/01/24 |

**EDI Review and Approval:**

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service:** | Emma McDermott | 23-01-24 |

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2024/25 – Service Users**

Budget Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | Health and Adult Social Care Provider Services |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Michelle Jenkins, Assistant Director of Resources, Safeguarding and Performance |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Health and Adult Social Care, Safeguarding and Performance |
| Budget proposal no. | 11 |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

|  |
| --- |
| The budget for this area is £14.358m and the proposed saving is £1.297m  This is proposed to be achieved through;   * ceasing the provision of the learning disability community support service (£182,000) * ceasing the provision of services at Cromwell Road (£327,000)   Additional to the above proposals, a saving of £577,000 is proposed through the following:   * ensuring Housing Benefit for residents living in Glenwood Lodge and New Steine Mews hostels is optimised (£344,000) * reduce service at Ireland Lodge Resource Centre from 34 to 24 bed (£211,000) * deleting vacant posts at Independence at Home Service (£100,000) * deleting vacant posts at Wellington House Day Service (£75,000) * reduced premises costs due to an office move (£30,000) * reduced costs from change of contract for staffing absence process (£28,000) |
| Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionally negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable: |
| Disabled people are disproportionately impacted by the closures proposals as these services are directly providing in response to the needs of disabled people.  Cromwell Road is a learning disability care home for two residents. As part of the closure these residents’ care will be reviewed and their future care plan to be agreed and actioned within the closure timescales. Future needs will be met through the private sector.  The learning disability community support service provides support to 78 people with learning disabilities living in the community. As part of the closure of this service, all service users will require their care to be reviewed and reprovisioned to alternative providers of community support in the private sector.  Ireland Lodge Resource Centre is a residential care home, currently providing 24 residential placements for people requiring 24-hour care due to living with dementia. The additional 10 beds are not required as there is alternative provision available.  Independence at Home is a home care service managed by Brighton & Hove City Council, delivering a service to those who are requiring care in their own homes, especially reablement. Deletion of vacancies in the Independence at Home service does not impact on immediate delivery of care as the service has not required recruitment to these posts for a significant amount of time in order to deliver the service. Deletion of these posts would mean future growth of the service, if required, is not possible, and would need to be met through the private sector.  Wellington House Day Service is a service providing day care for adults with a learning disability, managed by Brighton & Hove City Council. Deletion of vacancies in this service does not impact on immediate delivery of day care as the service has not required recruitment to these posts for a significant amount of time in order to deliver the demand for the service. Deletion of these posts would mean future growth of the service, if required, is not possible, and would need to be met through the private sector. |

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
| Consultation would be planned prior to the closure of Cromwell Road with residents and their families to ensure the best outcomes for their future care. We have reviewed the capacity of the private market to ensure there is enough provision available for those with services that will be ceasing.  Discussions are planned, prior to ceasing the provision of the Community Support service, with service users and their families to ensure the best outcomes for their future care. We have reviewed the capacity of the private market to ensure there is enough provision available for those with services that will be ceasing. |

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

|  |
| --- |
| None |

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | YES |
| **Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not** | YES |
| **Ethnicity, ‘Race’, ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)** | YES |
| **Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism** | YES |
| **Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)** | YES |
| **Gender Reassignment** | NO |
| **Sexual Orientation** | YES |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | NO |
| **Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)** | Not applicable |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | NO |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** | NO |
| **Carers** | YES |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** | Not applicable |
| **Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)** | NO |
| **Socio-economic Disadvantage** | NO |
| **Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability** | YES |
| **Human Rights** | NO |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | NO |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Equalities data is gathered in line with statutory guidelines as indicated by DHSC and NHSE. Assessments and reviews of individuals gather further information to fully understand the strengths and needs of each person requiring care and support. Although this is not monitored currently for trends and analysis, each individual’s needs are considered throughout their care and support planning. Where we do not have data available, we will seek to improve this and continue to engage with people in the community to understand the impacts further. Further work is underway corporately to adopt new standards on data collection for protected characteristics. |

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| The Executive Director for Health and Adult Social Care retains the responsibility for professional leadership and operational delivery for meeting statutory need and will ensure governance arrangements support social work professional practice to ensure that statutory duties and responsibilities are appropriately met and best practice is followed.  Through the commissioning strategy and cycle, we will continue to engage with providers, partners, service users and their families/carers to monitor the impact of this proposal. We will use data from our brokerage team to monitor demand and supply. Reviews will consider the impact to individuals and carers. The annual service user survey and biannual carers surveys, as well as customer feedback through compliments and complaints, will also feed into our monitoring and review of this proposal. |

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assess impact for different population groups** | **Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?**  **State Yes or No** | **Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith**  **OR**  **If no impact is identified, briefly state why.** |
| **Age**  including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | No | The services are for adults. Approximately 20% of people impacted by ceasing learning disability provision are over 65. |
| **Disability** includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities. | Yes | People with learning disabilities impacted by ceasing provision at Cromwell Road and Community Support. |
| **Ethnicity, ‘**Race’, ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers | Yes | The service users impacted by the ceasing of provision at Cromwell Road and the Community Support service are predominantly White British (over 90%). |
| **Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief** | No |  |
| **Gender and Sex** including non-binary and intersex people | No | Approximately 55% of people impacted by ceasing learning disability provision are male. |
| **Gender Reassignment** | No |  |
| **Sexual Orientation** | No |  |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | No |  |
| **Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility** (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum) | No |  |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | No |  |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Carers** considering for age, language, and various intersections | Yes | Changes in care arrangements for those accessing Community Support may impact carers. |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors** | No |  |
| **Socio-economic disadvantage** considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections | Yes | Cromwell Road and Community Support service provide support to people whose only source of income is welfare benefits. |
| **Homeless and rough sleepers** considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Human Rights** | No |  |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | No |  |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

|  |
| --- |
| Any changes in Health Service provision in the city can impact particularly on those people impacted by this proposal. This will be closely monitored through the integrated health agenda and other joint planning mechanisms. |

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

|  |
| --- |
| SMART action 1: Engagement with those impacted will happen through the individual reviews |
| SMART action 2: Full EIA for Learning Disability services due to cease and wider engagement with the Learning Disability community at the Learning Disability Partnership Board |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal’s impact score: | 2 |

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Directorate and Service Approval

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name and Job Title:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Responsible Lead Officer:** | Michelle Jenkins | 18/01/24 |
| **Accountable Manager:** | Rob Persey | 18/01/24 |

**EDI Review and Approval:**

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service:** | Emma McDermott | 23-01-24 |

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2024/25 – Service Users**

Budget Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | Grants |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Andy Witham, Assistant Director of Commissioning & Partnerships |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Health and Adult Social Care, Commissioning & Partnerships |
| Budget proposal no. | 12 |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

|  |
| --- |
| This proposal seeks to cease funding of the following grants with a total savings target of £87,060:   * Community Transport Easylink Shopping Service (£40,400) * Shopmobility (£26,100) * Disability Advice Centre (£20,560)   The Easylink Shopping service is a door-to-door transport service for people that find it difficult or not possible to use the city’s bus service Monday to Friday. This includes some wheelchair users and people who need to take a carer/companion. People pay a minimum £6 charge. Ceasing the funding grant to this service will impact running costs so the provider may need additional income to continue running the service as is.  Shopmobility is a low-cost mobility scooter and wheelchair hire service operating in 3 areas of the city, Monday to Friday 10 am to 4 pm. Residents and non-residents can hire a scooter. The service traditionally has high satisfaction rates – in 2018 the percentage of people who would use the service again and recommend the service to someone they know was 89% whilst 91% of customers rated their overall experience of accessing the service good or excellent. The sum is a contribution towards the costs of running the service. People pay £5-£10. Ceasing the funding grant to this service will impact running costs so the provider may need additional income to continue running the service as is.  The Disability Advice Centre offers support and advice to disabled people, their families and carers. The sum is a contribution towards the costs of running the Centre which deals with approximately 4,500 enquiries per year (2023 figures is comparable to 2017). Since the introduction of Personal Independence Payment the majority of enquiries have involved disability benefits. Support is provided to complete paperwork and challenge decisions. This grant contributes to a small proportion of the running costs so ceasing the funding to this service may mean the provider needs additional income to continue running the service as is. |
| Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionally negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable: |
| All three savings proposals will disproportionately impact on disabled people as they are services provided specifically to support the access requirements of disabled people.  The Easylink service will impact on older and female people. Data gathered for Budget EIA in 2017-18 revealed that all users of Easylink were over the age of 55, with 90% over the age of 70. 88% identified as female. At the current time it is not known if this still reflects the current user group as the service did not run during the pandemic (it delivered shopping instead).  Equality data is not requested in the grant agreements covering these saving proposals. |

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
| No consultation or engagement has been carried out to inform this assessment.  Discussions with current providers of these services prior to ceasing funding of these grants. |

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

|  |
| --- |
| 2017-18 EIA for Community Transport |

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | NO |
| **Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not** | NO |
| **Ethnicity, ‘Race’, ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)** | NO |
| **Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism** | NO |
| **Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)** | NO |
| **Gender Reassignment** | NO |
| **Sexual Orientation** | NO |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | NO |
| **Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)** | NO |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | NO |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** | NO |
| **Carers** | NO |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** | NO |
| **Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)** | NO |
| **Socio-economic Disadvantage** | NO |
| **Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability** | NO |
| **Human Rights** | NO |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | NO |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| None of this data is requested in the grant agreement. Data can be requested from the service providers. |

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Feedback will be requested from the service providers to understand the impact of the proposal. |

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assess impact for different population groups** | **Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?**  **State Yes or No** | **Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith**  **OR**  **If no impact is identified, briefly state why.** |
| **Age**  including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | Yes | Older people are a key demographic for the Community Transport services. |
| **Disability** includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities. | Yes | The Easylink Shopping service is set up as a door to door transport service for people that find it difficult or not possible to use the city’s bus service. Community Transport has a set of criteria for access to the service.  Shopmobility supports people who are less able to walk.  The Disability Advice Centre supports disabled people. |
| **Ethnicity, ‘**Race’, ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers | Unknow | Unknown |
| **Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief** | No |  |
| **Gender and Sex** including non-binary and intersex people | Yes | Women were traditionally the majority of users of the Easylink Shopping service so would be more impacted assuming that is the current situation. |
| **Gender Reassignment** | No |  |
| **Sexual Orientation** | No |  |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | No |  |
| **Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility** (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum) | No |  |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | Unknown | Unknown |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** considering for age, language, and various intersections | Unknown | Unknown |
| **Carers** considering for age, language, and various intersections | Yes | The Disability Advice Centre supports families and carers of disabled people. |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors** | No |  |
| **Socio-economic disadvantage** considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections | Unknown | Users must pay £6 (if booked) or £8 (on the day) to use the Easylink Shopping service.  Users must pay £5-10 to use Shopmobility scooters or wheelchairs.  The Disability Advice Centre provides advice on benefits and debt. |
| **Homeless and rough sleepers** considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Human Rights** | No |  |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | No |  |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

|  |
| --- |
| Budget savings across the council that impact disproportionately on disabled people are likely to worsen the impact of this proposal. |

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

|  |
| --- |
| SMART action 1: Further engagement with current providers of these services to understand the impact of this proposal and explore potential mitigating actions. |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal’s impact score: | 2 |

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Directorate and Service Approval

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name and Job Title:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Responsible Lead Officer:** | Andy Witham | 18/01/24 |
| **Accountable Manager:** | Rob Persey | 18/01/24 |

**EDI Review and Approval:**

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service:** | Emma McDermott | 23-01-24 |

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2024/25 – Service Users**

Budget Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | Commissioning – Support with Confidence funding |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Andy Witham, Assistant Director of Commissioning & Partnerships |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Health and Adult Social Care, Commissioning & Partnerships |
| Budget proposal no. | 13 |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

|  |
| --- |
| Ceasing Support with Confidence contract (£10,000)  Support with Confidence is a joint scheme between Health & Adult Social Care and Trading Standards to help people register to become approved Personal Assistants. Personal assistants (PAs) help people that need care and support. They can help with things like shopping, cleaning, food preparation, social activities, and personal care.  The scheme offers the following support:  • free training  • free background checks  • reference checks  Trading Standards no longer have the resource to administer non-statutory trader approved schemes on behalf of Adult Social Care. There is also a wider review of support for Personal Assistants and support for people using Direct Payments who employ Personal Assistants. |
| Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionally negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable: |
| No significant impacts on an equality groups as last personal assistant sign up to this scheme was in 2022. |

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
| There has been no consultation or engagement in relation to this assessment. |

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

|  |
| --- |
| n/a |

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | NO |
| **Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not** | NO |
| **Ethnicity, ‘Race’, ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)** | NO |
| **Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism** | NO |
| **Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)** | NO |
| **Gender Reassignment** | NO |
| **Sexual Orientation** | NO |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | NO |
| **Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)** | NO |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | NO |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** | NO |
| **Carers** | NO |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** | NO |
| **Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)** | NO |
| **Socio-economic Disadvantage** | NO |
| **Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability** | NO |
| **Human Rights** | NO |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | NO |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| As the scheme will be ending and hasn’t been active since 2022 there is no plan or feasible way to monitor the impact of the scheme. |

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| As the scheme will be ending and hasn’t been active since 2022 there is no plan or feasible way to monitor the impact of the scheme. |

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assess impact for different population groups** | **Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?**  **State Yes or No** | **Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith**  **OR**  **If no impact is identified, briefly state why.** |
| **Age**  including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | No |  |
| **Disability** includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities. | No |  |
| **Ethnicity, ‘**Race’, ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers | No |  |
| **Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief** | No |  |
| **Gender and Sex** including non-binary and intersex people | No |  |
| **Gender Reassignment** | No |  |
| **Sexual Orientation** | No |  |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | No |  |
| **Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility** (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum) | No |  |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | No |  |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Carers** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors** | No |  |
| **Socio-economic disadvantage** considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Homeless and rough sleepers** considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Human Rights** | No |  |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | No |  |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

|  |
| --- |
| None |

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

|  |
| --- |
| No mitigation actions are available due to: no disproportionate impacts identified |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal’s impact score: | 1 |

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Directorate and Service Approval

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name and Job Title:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Responsible Lead Officer:** | Andy Witham | 18/01/2024 |
| **Accountable Manager:** | Rob Persey | 18/01/2024 |

**EDI Review and Approval:**

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service:** | Emma McDermott | 23-01-24 |

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2024/25 – Service Users**

Budget Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | Sensory contracts |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Andy Witham, Assistant Director of Commissioning & Partnerships |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Health and Adult Social Care, Commissioning & Partnerships |
| Budget proposal no. | 14 |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

|  |
| --- |
| The overall budget for the sensory services is £67,785 with a savings target of **£41,000**. The sensory contracts provide preventative services to people with hearing or visual loss with the goal of providing support to prevent or delay the need for more costly statutory social care services.  The savings target will result in savings of:   1. 100% of the funding to the **Achieve Together Tuesday Group** (saving of **£6,842**) 2. 100% of the funding to the **Royal National Association of the Blind (RNIB) Eye Clinic Liaison Officer** (saving of **£19,590**) 3. 35% of the funding to the **East Sussex Vision Support** service (current funding is £41,353 = saving of **£14,568**) |
| Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionally negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable: |
| 1. Tuesday Group: Achieve Together hold a fortnightly group attended by approximately 10 D/deaf people who use British Sign Language (BSL) to meet to socialise, gain peer support and receive information and advice about any social care or health issues. It is run by staff trained in BSL. The loss of this service will negatively impact a small number of people who are D/deaf and have additional social care needs. We do not hold intersectional data for these participants. All of these people also receive HASC funded services from Achieve Together either from their community support service or their residential care home so the removal of the service should not put them at risk of harm but does remove an opportunity to reduce social isolation and promote wellbeing. 2. The RNIB Eye Clinic Liaison Officer (ECLO) service assisted over 1,000 people with information and practical and emotional support in 2022/23. The ECLO is based at the Sussex Eye Hospital in Brighton and supports people at the point of diagnosis or a deterioration of an eye condition. They provide information, support people to register for their Certificate of Visual Impairment and refer or signpost onto other organisations that can support people. The Council fund 50% of the service and RNIB fund the other 50%. In East & West Sussex, East Sussex Healthcare Trust and University Hospital Sussex Trust have arrangements with RNIB that they jointly fund the ECLO and it is recommended that this approach is taken in Brighton & Hove. If this is not achieved it may not be possible for RNIB to continue to provide the role and this would have an impact on people with sight loss as well as clinicians at the hospital (RNIB report that 76% of clinicians agreed that the ECLO Service reduces the amount of time clinic staff would otherwise need to spend with patients, and 87% agreed that the ECLO support for family and carers increases the capacity of the clinic team). 3. East Sussex Vision Support (ESVS) support people who are blind, partially sighted and deaf & blind. In 2022/23 they received 128 referrals for people needing support. They support people by recruiting and training volunteers who visit people at home and provide telephone contact. They also have social groups and activities to help alleviate social isolation and promote wellbeing, including blind tennis. ESVS also provide an important role in engaging with people with sight loss on behalf of the Council and contribute to needs assessments, falls prevention and promote public health initiatives. A 35% reduction in funding would have an impact on staffing within the service and affect their ability to recruit and manage volunteers and provide support, advice and the social groups. In addition to being blind or partially sighted, 71% of people using the service are over 65, 16% have a long standing illness, 9% a mental health condition and 12% a physical impairment. The reduction in provision of practical support, information and advice and social groups for older people with sight loss via ESVS may lead to an increase in social isolation, a reduction in wellbeing and in increase in falls. People who use ESVS report, amongst other outcomes, feeling more useful, more able to deal with problems, more relaxed and closer to people. |

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
| No consultation or engagement has yet taken place. Information has been taken from performance indicators and contract monitoring information.  If these savings recommendations are agreed engagement will take place with the 3 providers to discuss how to mitigate against any potential negative impacts set out in this report. |

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

|  |
| --- |
| N/A |

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | YES for 2 and 3 |
| **Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not** | YES for 3 |
| **Ethnicity, ‘Race’, ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)** | YES for 2 and 3 |
| **Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism** | YES for 3 |
| **Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)** | YES for 3 |
| **Gender Reassignment** | YES for 3 |
| **Sexual Orientation** | YES for 3 |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | Not applicable |
| **Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)** | Not applicable |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | YES for 3 |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** | YES for 3 |
| **Carers** | YES for 3 |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** | Not applicable |
| **Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)** | Not applicable |
| **Socio-economic Disadvantage** | Not applicable |
| **Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability** | Not applicable |
| **Human Rights** | Not applicable |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | NO |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| n/a |

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Meetings will take place with the 3 organisations to discuss the impact and actions set out below. |

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assess impact for different population groups** | **Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?**  **State Yes or No** | **Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith**  **OR**  **If no impact is identified, briefly state why.** |
| **Age**  including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | Yes | The majority of people using these services are over 65.  Brighton & Hove has an increasing population of older people with the largest increases in ages 65-69 (36%) and 80-84 (33%). The rates of age-related macular degeneration (preventable sight loss) will therefore increase locally and reflect the national average of 82 in every 100,000 65+ year olds.  The intersection of aging and hearing and sight loss can increase the risk of depression, falls and hip fractures, loss of independence and isolation. |
| **Disability** includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities. | Yes | All of the people in receipt of these services are deaf, hard of hearing, blind, partially sighted or deaf/blind. In addition, some of the people have a physical health and/or a mental health condition.  The numbers of people with sight loss are predicted to increase due to increasing levels of obesity, associated diabetes and related vision difficulties. Risk of sight loss is heavily influenced by health inequalities, including ethnicity, deprivation and age.  In Brighton and Hove, it is estimated that there were 124 people aged 18-64 with a serious visual impairment in 2014. This is expected to be 134 people in 2030. It is estimated that in 2020, there were 1,283 people aged 18-70 with severe hearing loss. This is predicted to be 1,494 in 2030. |
| **Ethnicity, ‘**Race’, ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers | No | People that use these services are predominantly White British (87% using the ECLO service and 91% White British or White Other using the ESVS service). |
| **Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief** | No |  |
| **Gender and Sex** including non-binary and intersex people | No | Within the ECLO service there is over representation, so slightly disproportionate, impact on men (61%) but this is the opposite within the ESVS service with a slightly disproportionate impact on women (63%). |
| **Gender Reassignment** | No |  |
| **Sexual Orientation** | No |  |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | No |  |
| **Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility** (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum) | No |  |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | No |  |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Carers** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors** | No |  |
| **Socio-economic disadvantage** considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Homeless and rough sleepers** considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Human Rights** | No |  |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | No |  |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

|  |
| --- |
| The removal of funding from the Disability Advice Centre could also impact on people with sensory impairments as they also provide information, advice and signposting.  Any changes in Health Service provision in the city can impact particularly on those people impacted by this proposal. This will be closely monitored through the integrated health agenda and other joint planning mechanisms. |

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

|  |
| --- |
| Work with Achieve Together to identify any people that attend the Tuesday Group that have no other support and identify whether they require an Adult Social Care assessment for support services or signposting to other support services such as Ageing Well. |
| Work with the ICB and University Hospitals Sussex Trust to ensure that there is alternative funding for the Eye Clinic Liaison Officer to reflect the arrangements across the rest of Sussex. |
| Work with East Sussex Vision Support to minimise the impact of a reduced service, for example charging for some services, linking them in with the Ageing Well service and applying to join the Community Support approved provider list. |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal’s impact score: | 3 |

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Directorate and Service Approval

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name and Job Title:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Responsible Lead Officer:** | Andy Witham | 18/01/24 |
| **Accountable Manager:** | Rob Persey | 18/01/24 |

**EDI Review and Approval:**

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service:** | Emma McDermott | 25-01-24 |

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2024/25 – Service Users**

Budget Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | Bus subsidy for services 77 & 79 (Breeze) |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Owen McElroy, National Bus Strategy Programme Manager |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Economy, Environment & Culture, City Transport |
| Budget proposal no. | *15* |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

|  |
| --- |
| Remove the subsidy that enhances the weekend and public holiday route 77 Devils Dyke bus route between Easter and mid-June.  Remove the subsidy to the 79 Ditchling Beacon bus route which runs at weekends and bank holidays all year round  The subsidy is £29,000 for each route, total £58,000 at current figures. Contract prices are subject to a 10% uplift on 24th September 2024.  The budget saving will remove the enhancement to the weekend and public holiday operation of the 77 Devils dyke bus between Easter and mid-June reducing it from two buses an hour to one bus an hour. The service does not run at all between September and Easter.  The budget saving will remove the entire subsidy to the route 79 Ditchling Beacon resulting in the complete withdrawal of the service.  The Breeze services 77& 79 provide access to the South Downs National Park in conjunction with the route 78 to Stanmer Village. The Department of Transport Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) funds the Monday to Friday operation of the 78 Stanmer village and the Council funds the weekend operation of the service 78. The summer services of the 77 & 79 are operated commercially by B&H buses. All supported operations from part of the same contract with B&H Buses.  They are an interlinked recreational access network where people travel to one destination and walk or cycle to another node. They also serve communities and facilities on their route. The service 78 is the only bus to serve Stanmer village and the Stanmer Park agricultural college (Plumpton extension).  Cuts to one route are therefore likely to weaken patronage on another route. |
| Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionally negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable: |
| Impacts identified on the following groups: Age (older and younger), Gender (women), Disability, Race, Religion/Belief.  Supported Bus routes are provided for geographically further out areas of the city where there are likely to be less services and higher car usage. These areas are poorly served by commercially funded bus services.  Reductions to services will affect those with fewer transport choices. Evidence for this EQIA (Equality Impact Assessment) is based on:  • 2014 Supported Bus route passenger survey  • Background research used to compile the latest Local Transport Plan (LTP5)  • The National Highways and Transportation Public Satisfaction Survey  Reductions to the supported bus route services will affect protected characteristic groups as follows, women, older and younger people and disabled people who place more importance and rely more on good local bus services than the general population. |

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
| Consultation with Lead Member for Transport prior to budget decision, consultation with Enhanced Partnership (statutory) in February 2024, consultation with BusWatch March 2024  The Enhanced Partnership is a forum of bus operators, stakeholders and the Local Authority set up under the Bus Services Act 2017 whose purpose is to ensure that the Bus Service Improvement Plans aims and schemes and measures are progressed, and a vote is required where any scheme such as enhancements to bus routes are varied. The Council has a veto power over decisions that commit money.  BusWatch is a charity that looks after the interests of bus passengers and is officially recognised as a statutory stakeholder by the Department of Transport |

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

|  |
| --- |
| None |

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | YES |
| **Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not** | YES |
| **Ethnicity, ‘Race****’, ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)** | YES |
| **Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism** | YES |
| **Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)** | YES |
| **Gender Reassignment** | Not applicable |
| **Sexual Orientation** | Not applicable |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | Not applicable |
| **Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)** | Not applicable |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | Not applicable |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** | Not applicable |
| **Carers** | Not applicable |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** | Not applicable |
| **Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)** | Not applicable |
| **Socio-economic Disadvantage** | YES |
| **Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability** | Not applicable |
| **Human Rights** | Not applicable |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | Not applicable |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Data on bus satisfaction levels is collected via regular surveys from Transport Focus “Our Bus Journey” funded through the council’s Bus Service Improvement Plan. Other sources are the National Highways & Transportation survey and customer surveys. Bus usage data is provided by bus operators. |

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assess impact for different population groups** | **Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?**  **State Yes or No** | **Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups for example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith**  **OR**  **If no impact is identified, briefly state why.** |
| **Age**  including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | Yes | There are 31,643 older persons bus pass holders in the city. These bus passes provide national travel for eligible holders between 9am and 4am weekdays and anytime at the weekend.  The Supported Bus Route Passenger Survey indicates a higher-than-average percentage of older people using supported services. Older people living in outlying areas of the city are at particular risk from social isolation when bus services are cut, and the supported network routes link some of the geographically remote parts of the city. They are less likely to be drivers as age increases, especially where there are associated health conditions/disabilities. Access to leisure activities (the countryside and in particular, to health walks at Stanmer Park may be curtailed by the loss of the Breeze up to the Downs services) in addition to retail and doctors/hospital appointments may be more difficult or costly for people to attend.  Younger people show the highest levels of importance for good local bus services. The Breeze services serve schools on their route and if cut, there may be barriers to education as well as social and leisure activities as young people are less likely to have access to any other form of transport. The council may provide pre-paid key cards for pupils with a long home-to-school distance but whether commercial services can fill the gaps in a lack of service needs further investigation. |
| **Disability** includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities. | Yes | Nearly one in five (51,797 people, 19%) are disabled in Brighton and Hove. Higher than seen in both the Southeast (16%) and England (17%) (Census 2021).  Residents with a disability under the Equalities Act are concentrated in city’s outer areas: central/eastern area of the city particularly in East Brighton, Queens Park, and Hollingbury & Stanmore wards. There are also higher proportions of disabled people in the east in Woodingdean and to the west in Hangleton & Portslade. (Census 2021).  There are approximately 6,500 disabled concessionary bus pass holders in the city. These bus passes provide free bus travel (24 hours) for eligible holders within Brighton and Hove and are available for use during statutory times 0930- 2300 in other areas.  Certain people may be more reliant on buses than the general population especially people on lower and fixed incomes. Disabled people spend more of their income on daily living expenses and may have less disposal income for leisure activities, this route with a concessionary bus provides access to the National Park on the city’s doorstep.  Levels of mental health illness in the wider region, are generally higher than national levels. Any reduction in bus services may reduce opportunities for getting out and about for disabled people specially access green open space, leading to social isolation. |
| **Ethnicity, ‘**Race’, ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers | Yes | The supported route bus passenger survey shows a higher percentage of people from ethnic minorities as users of the service (20%).  Census 2021 shows that resident who are BME live disproportionately in and around the city centre and in outer lying neighbourhoods. |
| **Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief** | Yes | 38% of the city’s population reported having a religion in the 2021 Census.  There are a limited number of faith schools and religious buildings in the city, and which may warrant longer travel distances to attend these. A reduction in bus services, particularly those that stop near faith schools or religious buildings, may have a disproportionate effect on faith groups. |
| **Gender and Sex** including non-binary and intersex people | Yes | The gender split of Brighton & Hove’s population is almost even (51%/49% female/male Census 2021)  Women tend to be the primary carer at home, and the head of single parent households and are less likely to be in full time employment.  In the city, 58% of carers are women rising to 62% of those providing care for 50 hours or more a week. The majority of caregivers, at home and in our communities, are also women. Women were over-represented as users in the Supported Bus route passenger survey; cuts to bus services will directly affect their means of travel. In the Supported Bus User Survey over 15% of women travellers responded as having care responsibilities and the supported route a key part of enabling them to manage these responsibilities |
| **Gender Reassignment** | No | No disproportionate impacts identified |
| **Sexual Orientation** | No | No disproportionate impacts identified. |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | No | No disproportionate impacts identified |
| **Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility** (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum) | Yes | 21% of households in the city have dependent children (Census 2021)  Women were over-represented as users in the Supported Bus route passenger survey; cuts to bus services will directly affect their means of travel to appointments and services. |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | No | No disproportionate impacts identified |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** considering for age, language, and various intersections | Yes | One in five residents (54,343 people, 20%) were born outside of the UK. Higher than seen in the Southeast (16%) and England (17%).  (Census 2021).  Despite the overall number of residents only increasing by 1%. The number of residents born outside of the UK has increased by 27% (11,456 people) since 2011, with the proportion increasing from 16% to 20%.  Just under one in six residents (15%) having lived in the UK for less than 2 years. Both figures are higher then found in the Southeast and England.  Some refugees and migrants are on low and fixed incomes. Therefore, like other population cohorts on low and fixed incomes are impacted by the reduction in public transport options making it more difficult to get to their places of work, education, leisure, social and worship. |
| **Carers** considering for age, language, and various intersections | Yes | Residents providing unpaid care live in all areas of the city but there are proportionally fewer in central areas of the city compared to outer areas. (census 2021). Carers and disabled people are more likely to have lower and/or fixed incomes. Reduction is bus services for carers may reduce their access to support for themselves and the person they care for and to carry out daily activities. |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No | No disproportionate impacts identified |
| **Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors** | No | No disproportionate impacts identified |
| **Socio-economic disadvantage** considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections | Yes | (Index of Multiple Deprivation 2019) Approximately 17.2% of Brighton and Hove residents live in one of the most deprived 20% of areas in England  18.7% of older people are income deprived.  68% of passengers using supported bus services said they would not have an alternative means of making their journey if the bus service did not exist.  Areas which don’t benefit from higher frequency services tend to be those served by the supported bus network.  Child poverty - The loss of the support network in particular areas of the city may disproportionately affect children from family units where the family is living on less than 60% of NMI.  Other groups - Changes in the ratio of car ownership levels and bus patronage: The Local Transport Plan 5 for the city lays out a number of strategies for improvements in transport and for mitigating the effects of transport on health and well-being and economic prosperity. The city has lower than average car ownership levels and a corresponding higher than average levels of bus patronage. Any cuts to bus services may result in increasing levels of car use.  Health and well-being: cuts to bus services may lead to reduced rates of physical activity and social isolation and in turn impact in additional pressure on NHS and public health services. |
| **Homeless and rough sleepers** considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | No | No disproportionate impacts identified |
| **Human Rights** | No | No disproportionate impacts identified |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | Schoolchildren and parents/ guardians of schoolchildren | If commercial services are to be used instead of the supported service, this may lead to longer journeys for some adding to length of the school day. Where parents then replace the bus journey by driving their children to school as a preferably option, there may be more congestion on roads and less independence for children |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

|  |
| --- |
| Other budget savings across the council that disproportionately impact on disabled people, older people, and residents on low and fixed incomes may worsen the impact of this proposal. |

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

|  |
| --- |
| SMART action 1: Approach local bus operators to see if they can step in to provide a full or partial commercial service to cover these routes |
| SMART action 2: Bid for funding from future Bus Support schemes grants from the Department of Transport. May be able to reinstate lost services but there could be a cliff edge when funding runs out |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal’s impact score: | 4 |

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Directorate and Service Approval

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name and Job Title:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Responsible Lead Officer:** | Owen McElroy National Bus Strategy Programme Manager | 22.01.24 |
| **Accountable Manager:** | Andrew Westwood Transport Projects and Engineering Manager | 22.01.24 |

**EDI (Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion) Review and Approval:**

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service:** | Emma McDermott | 22-01-24 |

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2024/25 – Service Users**

Budget Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | Parking fees and charges |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Charles Field, Head of Parking Services |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Economy, Environment & Culture, City Transport |
| Budget proposal no. | *16* |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

|  |
| --- |
| Parking service fees and charges proposals consisting of:   * Raising the price of resident, visitor and other permits * Increasing on-street tariffs * Increasing tariffs in off-street barrier and surface car parks * Reviewing localised parking to generate additional revenues. * Fees for unauthorised bay suspensions   The increases are to meet inflationary requirements of 3.5% taking into account demand loss, and also to contribute towards savings. They will further meet traffic management objectives including improving air quality, reducing demand and congestion, as well as achieving a higher turnover of spaces and supporting economic growth in the city.  Fee increases are targeted at areas where parking is at capacity to help provide drivers with better access to currently congested areas. There is also good coverage of the city centre/seafront by our public transport network, so there are alternatives for people wanting to access these areas where car park charges are increasing. |
| Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionally negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable: |
| Any increase in parking fees and charges is balanced against a decrease in demand from users. Members of the public may choose not to, or not be able to afford to, pay to park on or off-street due to price increases. This may disproportionately impact residents on lower incomes and cause an inclusion issue and could create additional barriers and disadvantage for some older and disabled people who rely on private vehicles / visitors to access facilities and services.  However, these proposals are in line with the council’s transport objectives of supporting sustainable transport options and reducing vehicle use in the city. It is recognised and understood that not all disabled people can use public transport to make the journeys they need to.    It may also mean carers have to pay more if they live in a different parking zone to the person they visit although there are carers’ permit or visitor permits available. |

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
| The service receives valuable feedback and intelligence about the experience of disabled car users and their carers via the Disabled Car Users Group, which is informing Parking proposals. |

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

|  |
| --- |
| 2022/2023 Budget EIA – Parking Services |

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | YES |
| **Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not** | YES |
| **Ethnicity, ‘Race’, ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)** | NO |
| **Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism** | NO |
| **Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)** | NO |
| **Gender Reassignment** | NO |
| **Sexual Orientation** | NO |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | NO |
| **Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)** | NO |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | NO |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** | NO |
| **Carers** | YES |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** | NO |
| **Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)** | NO |
| **Socio-economic Disadvantage** | NO |
| **Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability** | NO |
| **Human Rights** | NO |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | NO |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| No equality data for parking users at the point of use, however equality data for parking permit holders and consultations on the introduction of parking schemes will be collected and used to inform the service’s understanding of the impact of price increases. |

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Regular internal review meetings are held to analyse on-street and off-street parking usage and there are also regular meeting with the Disabled Car User group to get direct feedback on the experience of disabled car users and their carers.  Learning from customer complaints and feedback will also be used to monitor and review the impact of the changes.  Parking Services have applied for and been awarded People’s Parking accreditation in October 2023. This scheme was set up to provide independent feedback about the facilities and public car park experience from a disabled user perspective, with regular monitoring and reviews.    Parking Services have also received Park Mark accreditation in October 2023 from the police for our off-street car parks as safe car parks to use. It is nationally recognised and we receive significant feedback that we were chosen via the Park Mark website.  Parking Services produce an annual Parking Annual Report for Committee providing transparency and meaningful insight into the performance of the overall service including how and where funding is raised and distributed. |

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assess impact for different population groups** | **Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?**  **State Yes or No** | **Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith**  **OR**  **If no impact is identified, briefly state why.** |
| **Age**  including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | Yes | Age UK tell us that many older people face a difficult existence in retirement as a result of having a limited income combined with the extra costs of ageing. Increases in parking charges add to financial pressures. Link to research   [lr-6064-age-uk-financial-hardship-final\_v1.pdf (ageuk.org.uk)](https://www.ageuk.org.uk/globalassets/age-uk/documents/reports-and-publications/reports-and-briefings/money-matters/lr-6064-age-uk-financial-hardship-final_v1.pdf) |
| **Disability** includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities. | Yes | Research carried out by Scope found that the cost of living with a disability or families with disabled children is significantly higher than households with no disabled people. Transport was identified as one of the main drivers for this increase in costs. Increasing parking fees will add to financial pressures on these families.  Link to research.  [Disability Price Tag | Disability charity Scope UK](https://www.scope.org.uk/campaigns/extra-costs/disability-price-tag/)  The intersection of disability and faith is also a consideration for disabled people requiring the use of a vehicle to attend their place of worship. There are few non-Christian religious buildings in the city, meaning that disabled members of certain faith communities who need the use of their car are likely to have to travel across the city to worship. |
| **Ethnicity, ‘**Race’, ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers | No |  |
| **Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief** | Yes | See text above under Disability |
| **Gender and Sex** including non-binary and intersex people | Yes | The intersection of gender and disability and caring is a consideration. 90% of lone parent households with dependents in the city are headed up by women. The percentage of women providing unpaid care is 58% in comparison to men (42%).  Using a vehicle is important for them and those they their care for to carry out daily living activities, from shopping to doctor’s appointments to leisure activities. Increasing fees may reduce their choice and access as well as increase financial pressures especially for families on low and fixed incomes. |
| **Gender Reassignment** | No |  |
| **Sexual Orientation** | No |  |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | No |  |
| **Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility** (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum) | No |  |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | No |  |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Carers** considering for age, language, and various intersections | Yes | Research carried out by Carers UK found that many unpaid carers experience financial hardship because of their caring role. Increases in parking charges will add to the financial pressures. Link to research   [Research: Financial pressure of caring unpaid for a loved one intensifies over time - Carers UK](https://www.carersuk.org/news-and-campaigns/press-releases/research-financial-pressure-of-caring-unpaid-for-a-loved-one-intensifies-over-time) |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors** | No |  |
| **Socio-economic disadvantage** considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections | Yes | Households on low fixed incomes may experience increased financial pressures with increase parking fees. |
| **Homeless and rough sleepers** considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Human Rights** | No |  |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | No |  |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

|  |
| --- |
| In 22/23 we expanded Concessionary travel scheme for disabled passes for 24-hour use which will mitigate some of the impacts from increases to fees & charges by encouraging / improving access to public transport use.  There may be other budget saving proposals across the council that impact on disabled people that may worsen the impact of this budget proposal. |

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

|  |
| --- |
| Ongoing work to identify Blue Badge fraud will free up parking spaces for eligible blue badge holders and we will continue with Blue Badge fraud investigation work to protect disabled bays from misuse. |
| Surplus parking income is mainly spent on providing free concessionary bus passes for elderly and disabled people to encourage alternative sustainable transport choices. |
| Blue badges are issued to disabled people who are drivers or non-drivers allowing free parking for an unlimited amount of time in pay and display bays and parking in disabled bays. Where the blue badge can be used has been extended to include all permit bays in light touch schemes which cover a significant area of the controlled parking zones in Brighton & Hove. |
| The hours residents of Brighton and Hove can use an older person’s concessionary travel pass have been extended to between 9.30am – 4.30am on weekdays and 24hrs a day on weekends. Those unable to use the concessionary travel pass can swap the pass for an annual allocation of £70 worth of Taxi Vouchers. |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal’s impact score: | 2 |

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Directorate and Service Approval

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name and Job Title:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Responsible Lead Officer:** | Charles Field, Head of Parking | 24/01/2024 |
| **Accountable Manager:** | Mark Prior, Assistant Director City Transport |  |

**EDI Review and Approval:**

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service:** |  |  |

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2024/25 – Service Users**

Budget Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | Amend public toilets opening hours to end early opening and enable single, daytime staff shifts |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Lynsay Cook, Head of Strategy & Service Improvement |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Economy, Environment & Culture, City Environment |
| Budget proposal no. | *17* |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

|  |
| --- |
| The Council is responsible for 36 public toilet sites across the city.  Under the Public Health Act 1936, local authorities in England and Wales have a power, but not a duty, to provide toilets for use by the public. Public toilets are not a statutory service.  The 2024/25 budget proposal is to amend the opening hours of public toilet sites across the city to enable single, daytime staff shifts.  Existing opening hours are:  Summer:   * 8am-8pm - Shelter Hall, West Pier Arches, Kings Road Playpark, The Colonnade, Daltons * 8am-6pm - all other sites   Winter:   * 8am-6pm - Shelter Hall, West Pier Arches, Kings Road Playpark, The Colonnade, Daltons * 8am-4pm - all other sites   **The proposed opening hours are:**  Summer:   * 8am-8pm - Shelter Hall, West Pier Arches, Kings Road Playpark, The Colonnade, Daltons * **10am-6pm** - all other sites   Winter:   * 8am-6pm - Shelter Hall, West Pier Arches, Kings Road Playpark, The Colonnade, Daltons * **10am-4pm** - all other sites   The budget proposal assumes that public toilets at the Royal Pavilion Gardens continue to remain closed until a new facility is developed, and the toilets in the Velo Café at the Level remain closed. New public toilets (and an adjoining café) are to be created at The Level in The MacLaren Pavilion. The toilets at this location will be maintained by the tenant of the new café. |
| Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionally negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable: |
| Reducing the opening hours of public toilets may have a greater impact on people who need to use facilities more frequently, those with limited mobility, and those with limited alternative means for accessing facilities. This may include older people, small children and their carers, disabled people and individuals with some health issues, and rough sleepers. |

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
| Feedback from the public via the public toilet mailbox and Stage 1 complaints have been used to inform the EIA. |

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

|  |
| --- |
| Public Toilet closure EIA, [Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee, 17 January 2023](https://democracy.brighton-hove.gov.uk/documents/s185615/Public%20toilets%20APX.%20n%203.pdf) |

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | NO |
| **Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not** | NO |
| **Ethnicity, ‘Race’, ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)** | NO |
| **Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism** | NO |
| **Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)** | NO |
| **Gender Reassignment** | NO |
| **Sexual Orientation** | NO |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | NO |
| **Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)** | NO |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | NO |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** | NO |
| **Carers** | NO |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** | NO |
| **Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)** | NO |
| **Socio-economic Disadvantage** | NO |
| **Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability** | NO |
| **Human Rights** | NO |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | NO |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Public toilets are available for anyone who lives and works in, or visits, the city to use. As such, equality data is not held on service users. |

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| The impact of the proposal will be monitored through customer feedback and feedback from services who work with residents in vulnerable groups, e.g., rough sleepers. |

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assess impact for different population groups** | **Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?**  **State Yes or No** | **Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith**  **OR**  **If no impact is identified, briefly state why.** |
| **Age**  including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | Yes | Older people may have mobility issues which limit access to other toilets. They may need to use the toilet more often and will have less opportunity to.  Parents and carers may need more frequent access to public toilets for baby changing facilities. Small children have less control over their bladders and outings can be abruptly shortened if a child needs to use a toilet. |
| **Disability** includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities. | Yes | Some disabled people and people with long term and or fluctuating health conditions may need to use toilet facilities more frequently may be disproportionately impacted.  Some people with mobility issues may have limited access / opportunity to use other toilets. |
| **Ethnicity, ‘**Race’, ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers | No |  |
| **Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief** | No |  |
| **Gender and Sex** including non-binary and intersex people | Yes | Women and girls may need to use the toilet more often due to menstruation or experiencing the menopause but will have less opportunity to do so. |
| **Gender Reassignment** | No |  |
| **Sexual Orientation** | No |  |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | No |  |
| **Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility** (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum) | Yes | Pregnant people may need to use the toilet more often and will have less opportunity to. |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | No |  |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Carers** considering for age, language, and various intersections |  |  |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors** | No |  |
| **Socio-economic disadvantage** considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections | Yes | People on lower incomes may be disproportionately affected as businesses may expect their facilities to be used by only paying customers. |
| **Homeless and rough sleepers** considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | Yes | Rough sleepers may be disproportionately impacted as they have limited alternative access to toilet and handwashing facilities.  They may feel a greater stigma when using other facilities and may not feel welcome. |
| **Human Rights** | No |  |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | No |  |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

|  |
| --- |
| Other budget proposals that disproportionately impact on older and disabled people may worse the impact of this proposal. |

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

|  |
| --- |
| Continue publicising other toilets available, such as museums, shopping centres etc. |
| Place signage on the closed toilets, directing people to the nearest alternative and to the council website for more information. |
| Provide information on the facilities available to rough sleepers, including First Base, Antifreeze and the Clocktower Sanctuary. |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal’s impact score: | 2 |

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Directorate and Service Approval

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name and Job Title:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Responsible Lead Officer:** | Lynsay Cook, Head of Strategy & Service Improvement | 05-Jan-24 |
| **Accountable Manager:** | Rachel Chasseaud, Assistant Director City Environmental Management | 05-01-24 |

**EDI Review and Approval:**

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service:** | Emma McDermott | 18-01-24 |

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2024/25 – Service Users**

Budget Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | Transfer of Bowling Greens to clubs (or closure) to save maintenance costs |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Robert Walker, Head of City Parks |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Economy, Environment & Culture, City Parks |
| Budget proposal no. | *18* |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

|  |
| --- |
| The proposal is to transfer the management of council-run bowling greens to bowls clubs or close the greens to save on the cost of maintenance.  The council manages nine bowling greens across the city. The clubs have between 31 and 75 season ticket holders (an average of 46 per club) and an overall total of more than 410 members. Bowlers can also pay an hourly rate or by session to play casually and this includes a concessionary price for over 65s. |
| Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionally negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable: |
| The most significant impacts are likely to be on older and disabled people. The main group of people affected will be the existing 410+ club members.  If the management of a bowling green is not transferred as a community asset, bowls club members may be able to join another self-managed club, or one of the other private clubs in the city. |

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
| Consultation with bowls clubs and members will take place whilst exploring options to transfer council-managed greens as community assets. |

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

|  |
| --- |
| N/A |

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | YES |
| **Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not** | YES |
| **Ethnicity, ‘Race’, ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)** | NO |
| **Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism** | NO |
| **Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)** | NO |
| **Gender Reassignment** | NO |
| **Sexual Orientation** | NO |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | NO |
| **Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)** | NO |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | NO |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** | NO |
| **Carers** | NO |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** | NO |
| **Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)** | NO |
| **Socio-economic Disadvantage** | NO |
| **Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability** | NO |
| **Human Rights** | NO |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | NO |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| No equality data is collected on season ticket holders and the sale of concession tickets to non-members / casual players is managed directly by bowls clubs, so is not able to be monitored.  There is no plan to introduce equality monitoring as the bowling greens will no longer be in the management of the city council once the budget proposal is implemented. |

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Feedback from bowls clubs and customer enquiries/complaints. |

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assess impact for different population groups** | **Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?**  **State Yes or No** | **Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith**  **OR**  **If no impact is identified, briefly state why.** |
| **Age**  including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | Yes | Bowls is traditionally a sport enjoyed by older people as a social activity. It is a particular sport that can be continued into old age and offers many health and wellbeing benefits. If the number of bowling greens reduces due to closure this will have a potentially negative impact on older people in the city in terms of limiting access to sport and leisure facilities. |
| **Disability** includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities. | Yes | Bowls is considered an accessible ‘sport for all’ and people with a disability can play and compete with or against non-disabled bowlers. The potential closure of bowling greens could disproportionately impact disabled people by limiting accessible physical activities available to them, as well as opportunities for social interaction. |
| **Ethnicity, ‘**Race’, ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers | unknown | no data or insight available |
| **Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief** | unknown | no data or insight available |
| **Gender and Sex** including non-binary and intersex people | unknown | no data or insight available |
| **Gender Reassignment** | unknown | no data or insight available |
| **Sexual Orientation** | unknown | no data or insight available |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | unknown | no data or insight available |
| **Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility** (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum) | unknown | no data or insight available |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | unknown | no data or insight available |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** considering for age, language, and various intersections | unknown | no data or insight available |
| **Carers** considering for age, language, and various intersections | unknown | no data or insight available |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** considering for age, language, and various intersections | unknown | no data or insight available |
| **Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors** | unknown | no data or insight available |
| **Socio-economic disadvantage** considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections | unknown | no data or insight available |
| **Homeless and rough sleepers** considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | unknown | no data or insight available |
| **Human Rights** | unknown | no data or insight available |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | n/a |  |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

|  |
| --- |
| None know. |

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

|  |
| --- |
| SMART action 1: The facilities will be offered as an opportunity for asset transfer to the current bowls clubs. |
| SMART action 2: Alternative bowling green facilities will be shared with current club members. |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal’s impact score: | 2 |

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Directorate and Service Approval

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name and Job Title:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Responsible Lead Officer:** | Robert Walker, Head of City Parks | 24/01/2024 |
| **Accountable Manager:** | Chenine Bhathena, Assistant Director |  |

**EDI Review and Approval:**

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service:** | Emma McDermott | 26-01-24 |

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2024/25 – Service Users**

Budget Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | Increase of the Brighton Centre Facility Fee by £0.50 (from £1.50 to £2.00) per ticket sold from January 1st 2024 |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Howard Barden, Head of Tourism & Venues |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Economy, Environment & Culture – Culture, Tourism & Sport |
| Budget proposal no. | 19 |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

|  |
| --- |
| Increase of the Brighton Centre Facility Fee by £0.50 per ticket sold from £1.50 to £2.00 on all ticket sales at the Brighton Centre from January 1st, 2024. |
| Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionally negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable: |
| The increase of a £0.50 facility fee will impact on ticket buyers; ticket buying for events is a personal decision and the facility fee will form part of the overall cost to attend the event. Younger people, older people, working age people on benefits, disabled people, single parent households and those in socio-economic disadvantage are likely to be impacted by circa 33% fee increase. |

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
| None – this is a commercial decision and in line with industry standards and broadly in line with other venues of a similar scale in terms of what they are charging as a facility fee on ticket purchases. |

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

|  |
| --- |
| Budget Equality Impact Assessment Template 2023/24 – the introduction of a £1.50 facility fee on all tickets sold at the Brighton Centre. |

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | NO |
| **Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not** | NO |
| **Ethnicity, ‘Race’, ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)** | NO |
| **Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism** | NO |
| **Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)** | NO |
| **Gender Reassignment** | NO |
| **Sexual Orientation** | NO |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | NO |
| **Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)** | NO |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | NO |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** | NO |
| **Carers** | Carers receive a free ticket to attend events and will not be subject to the Facility Fee charge, this is in line with industry standards. |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** | NO |
| **Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)** | NO |
| **Socio-economic Disadvantage** | NO |
| **Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability** | NO |
| **Human Rights** | NO |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | NO |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Monitoring is based on ticket sales post the introduction of the £1.50 facility fee in 2023. Currently we are not seeing any reduction in the appetite for ticket purchases at the Brighton Centre. Our best gauge on this are the more marginal annual events that we host and currently there appears to be no reduction in ticket sales for these events and ticket sales remain consistent prior to the introduction of the £1.50 facility fee on tickets sold.  However, there is no evidence to say if there has not been an impact on the affordability of attending events at the Brighton Centre for customers who are on lower incomes.  In addition, we currently have not seen any evidence of a decrease in ticket sales by customers with access requirements for events with the introduction of Facility Fees at the Brighton Centre. |

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| None – other than above |

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assess impact for different population groups** | **Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?**  **State Yes or No** | **Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith**  **OR**  **If no impact is identified, briefly state why.** |
| **Age**  including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | Yes | By increasing the facility fee, this will increase the cost to attend events at the Brighton Centre. This may impact on the affordability of attending events at the Brighton Centre for customers who are on lower and fixed incomes. This would include older people on fixed incomes, working age people on benefits and young adults in low paid employment, all living in a city with high housing costs. |
| **Disability** includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities. | Yes | The increase of the facility fee may have an impact on the affordability of attending events at the Brighton Centre for customers who are on lower incomes. Disabled People are more likely to have lower incomes and spend a greater portion of their incomes on daily living expenses and therefore have less disposal income for leisure and social activities. We currently have not seen any evidence of a decrease in ticket sales for customers with access requirements for events at the Brighton Centre due to the introduction of a Facility Fee at the Brighton Centre. This is based on some of our annual repeat business shows where we have seen no impact on ticket sales from previous years when the facility fee was not in place. |
| **Ethnicity, ‘**Race’, ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers | No |  |
| **Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief** | No |  |
| **Gender and Sex** including non-binary and intersex people | Yes | 90% of single parent households in the city are female. Single parent households are often on low incomes/fixed incomes.  By increasing the facility fee, this will increase the cost to attend events at the Brighton Centre. This may impact on the affordability of attending events at the Brighton Centre for customers who are on lower and fixed incomes. |
| **Gender Reassignment** | No |  |
| **Sexual Orientation** | No |  |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | No |  |
| **Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility** (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum) | No |  |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | No |  |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Carers** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No | Carers receive a free ticket to attend events with a customer with access requirements paying a full price ticket, and the carer will not be subject to the Facility Fee charge, this is in line with industry standards. |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors** | No |  |
| **Socio-economic disadvantage** considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections | Yes | By increasing the facility fee, this will increase the cost to attend events at the Brighton Centre. This may impact on the affordability of attending events at the Brighton Centre for customers who are on lower and fixed incomes |
| **Homeless and rough sleepers** considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | Yes | By increasing the facility fee, this will increase the cost to attend events at the Brighton Centre. This may impact on the affordability of attending events at the Brighton Centre for customers who are on lower and fixed incomes including households in temporary and emergency accommodation. |
| **Human Rights** | No |  |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | N/A | N/A |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

|  |
| --- |
| Other services across the council are likely to be increasing charges and fees and therefore households/individuals on low/fixed incomes may be impacted by multiple proposals. |

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

|  |
| --- |
| No mitigation actions are available due to: commercial decision and in line with industry standards and broadly in line with other venues of a similar scale in terms of what they are charging as a facility fee on ticket purchases. |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal’s impact score: | 2 |

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

|  |
| --- |
| n/a |

Directorate and Service Approval

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name and Job Title:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Responsible Lead Officer:** | Howard Barden, Head of Tourism & Venues | 11/12/2023 |
| **Accountable Manager:** | Chenine Bhathena, Assistant Director Culture, Tourism & Sport | 22/01/2024 |

**EDI Review and Approval:**

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service:** | Emma McDermott | 22-01-24 |

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2024/25 – Service Users**

Budget Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | Introduction of Beach Hut Transfer Fee |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Toni Manuel, Seafront Development Manager |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Economy, Environment & Culture, Culture, Tourism & Sport |
| Budget proposal no. | 20 |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

|  |
| --- |
| **Introduction of Beach Hut Transfer Fee**  In November 2023 the CHSTE Committee agreed to change the beach hut administration fee from £82 to a transfer fee calculated at 10% of the sale price of the beach hut or four times the annual licence fee, whichever is greater. Beach huts are currently for sale with a guide price or have sold for between £23,000 - £38,000.  The beach huts are privately owned, and the owner pays an annual licence to place the hut on council land at Hove seafront. The annual licence fee payable to the council is currently £503.60 including VAT.  There was no mechanism in the previous licences for increasing the administration charge / transfer fee. To introduce the transfer fee, the only option available to the council is to terminate the licences and issue new licences to the beach hut owners on different terms. This requires the consent of the owners.  Following a consultation process with beach hut owners, a new licence containing modernised terms including the new transfer fee was agreed by the CHSTE Committee. The new licence is being sent to all hut owners in January 2024 to sign and return to the Seafront Office. If beach hut owners do not agree to the new terms, their hut will be unlicenced and the council will have grounds to enforce and remove the hut from the site. |
| Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionally negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable: |
| A beach hut can only be bought by residents of Brighton & Hove. The terms of the licence state the hut cannot be re-sold for a minimum of 3 years after purchase – except under extenuating circumstances.  All existing beach hut owners would be impacted by this proposal but only if/when they choose to sell their beach hut.  If a hut owner wishes to leave their beach hut in their will to a family member, who is a Brighton and Hove resident, the transfer fee will not be payable. This allows beach huts to be passed down through generations to local people without incurring additional costs. |

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
| Prior to the CHSTE Committee a consultation was undertaken to provide an opportunity for all beach hut owners to input into the proposed changes to the licence. Emails including a copy of the proposed licence were sent to all beach hut owners who have provided the council with an email address.  Letters were also sent to the home address (held on record by the council) of each beach hut owner to ensure that everyone received the information and had an opportunity to feedback on the proposals.  The consultation period ran initially for three weeks. The council extended the consultation by a further four days over a weekend to allow time for any additional responses following the Hove Beach Hut Association's Annual General Meeting. |

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

|  |
| --- |
| None |

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | NO |
| **Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not** | NO |
| **Ethnicity, ‘Race’, ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)** | NO |
| **Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism** | NO |
| **Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)** | NO |
| **Gender Reassignment** | NO |
| **Sexual Orientation** | NO |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | NO |
| **Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)** | NO |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | NO |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** | NO |
| **Carers** | NO |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** | NO |
| **Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)** | NO |
| **Socio-economic Disadvantage** | NO |
| **Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability** | NO |
| **Human Rights** | NO |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | NO |

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Equality monitoring of beach hut ownership is not currently in place. The proposal is to introduce an anonymous and voluntary equality monitoring form so that future changes can be considered for equality implications. |

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| The volumes of beach hut sales will be monitored compared with previous years. Direct feedback from owners will also be reviewed to highlight any further impacts that were not identified through the consultation period. |

Impacts

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assess impact for different population groups** | **Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?**  **State Yes or No** | **Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith**  **OR**  **If no impact is identified, briefly state why.** |
| **Age**  including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | Unknown | No data or insight available to determine impact |
| **Disability** includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities. | Unknown | No data or insight available to determine impact |
| **Ethnicity, ‘**Race’, ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers | Unknown | No data or insight available to determine impact |
| **Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief** | Unknown | No data or insight available to determine impact |
| **Gender and Sex** including non-binary and intersex people | Unknown | No data or insight available to determine impact |
| **Gender Reassignment** | Unknown | No data or insight available to determine impact |
| **Sexual Orientation** | Unknown | No data or insight available to determine impact |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | Unknown | No data or insight available to determine impact |
| **Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility** (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum) | Unknown | No data or insight available to determine impact |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | Unknown | No data or insight available to determine impact |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** considering for age, language, and various intersections | Unknown | No data or insight available to determine impact |
| **Carers** considering for age, language, and various intersections | Unknown | No data or insight available to determine impact |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** considering for age, language, and various intersections | Unknown | No data or insight available to determine impact |
| **Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors** | Unknown | No data or insight available to determine impact |
| **Socio-economic disadvantage** considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections | Unknown | No data or insight available to determine impact |
| **Homeless and rough sleepers** considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | Unknown | No data or insight available to determine impact |
| **Human Rights** | Unknown | No data or insight available to determine impact |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | None |  |

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

|  |
| --- |
| If the annual licence fee is also increased at the same time and by more than the corporate inflation rate Beach Hut owners might feel that they are being unfairly targeted. As the demographic of the owners is unknow it is not possible to know if there is a disproportionate impact based on protected characteristic However, it would apply to all owners equally. |

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

|  |
| --- |
| SMART Action 1: introduce an equality monitoring form for beach hut owners |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal’s impact score: | 1 |

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Directorate and Service Approval

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name and Job Title:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Responsible Lead Officer:** | Toni Manuel, Seafront Development Manager | 11/12/23 |
| **Accountable Manager:** | Mark Fisher, Head of Sport & Leisure | 23-01-24 |

**EDI Review and Approval:**

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service:** | Emma McDermott | 23-01-24 |

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2024/25 – Service Users**

Budget Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | Homelessness and Housing Needs Service Transformation Programme |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Paul Cooper, Assistant Director for Housing Needs and Supply |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Housing, Neighbourhoods and Communities, Homelessness Service |
| Budget proposal no. | 21 |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

|  |
| --- |
| The budget saving proposal is £285K for Homelessness and Temporary/ Supported Accommodation services. |
| Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionally negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable: |
| The proposed changes are not anticipated to have specific impact on any groups. The Homelessness Transformation Programme has been predicated around the customer journey, improving access to services and support and reducing the number of ‘hand-offs’ of a client between officers. Therefore, although the service redesign will generate savings, it has also been developed with the principle of an improved customer journey at its heart.  The savings outlined originate from streamlining the current structure with the aim of establishing a robust middle management tier to better support front line staff. The existing number of M9 management roles is considered unfit for purpose, contributing to a top heavy, flat structure that lacks the capacity to offer daily supervision and support required by front line staff. These changes are intended to empower staff to deliver services more effectively, enhancing support for clients. |

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
| The current phase (phase 2) of the redesign, has been informed by information, assessments and surveys undertaken during phase one.  The methodology has been driven by;   * Identify relevant data available for clients. * Review existing documentation. * Engagement of key stakeholders * User surveys and interviews with clients * Analysis of demographic data to understand the client base. * Review policies and procedures.   By gathering this data and insights, the recommendations proposed provide a solid foundation for understanding the impact on clients. |

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

|  |
| --- |
| None |

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | YES |
| **Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not** | YES |
| **Ethnicity, ‘Race’, ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)** | YES |
| **Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism** | NO |
| **Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)** | YES |
| **Gender Reassignment** | YES |
| **Sexual Orientation** | YES |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | NO |
| **Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)** | YES |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | YES |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** | YES |
| **Carers** | YES |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** | YES |
| **Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)** | YES |
| **Socio-economic Disadvantage** | YES |
| **Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability** | YES |
| **Human Rights** | Not applicable |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | Not applicable |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| The Transformation team has collaborated closely with the Performance Analyst to collect data, uncovering gaps in the current data collection process. This concern has been raised, and active engagement is in place to work in collaboration with the IT Project Management Team. The objective is to ensure that the procurement of the next IT platform has the capacity to furnish the necessary data. This enhancement aims to facilitate more effective monitoring of impacts and inform future changes.  As a crucial part of the proposal, a key suggestion is to create client tools aimed at capturing information more accurately. This initiative aims to enhance the service offer in a way that is inclusive and informed. |

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Key areas proposed.   * Define clear KPIs and objectives for the service. * Incorporate Diversity and inclusion from the start. Ensure diversity and inclusion considerations are integrated into the project from the planning phase. * Identify key stakeholders and representatives from the protected characteristic groups to participate in the transformation project. * Regular Data collection. Implement a robust data collection system that includes information specific to clients with protected characteristics. * Analyse trends and track progress. * Conduct focus groups, surveys, or interviews to understand experiences from the client perspective. * Diversity training – Provide all staff on diversity and inclusion. Ensure all staff members are aware of the potential impact on clients with various protected characteristics. * Compliance with Legal standards – Ensure the proposed changes are aligned to legal requirements related to protecting clients with specific characteristics. |

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

Data and analysis sources may include (not an exhaustive list):

* + **Consider a wide range (including but not limited to):**
    - [Census](https://www.ons.gov.uk/census/maps/choropleth?lad=E06000043) and [local intelligence data](http://www.bhconnected.org.uk/content/local-intelligence)
    - Service specific data
    - Community consultations
    - Insights from customer feedback including complaints and survey results
    - Lived experiences and qualitative data
    - [Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) data](https://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/BHconnected-needs-assessments)
    - [Health Inequalities data](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthinequalities)
    - Good practice research
    - National data and reports relevant to the service
    - Workforce, leaver, and recruitment data, surveys, insights
    - Feedback from internal ‘staff as residents’ consultations
    - Insights, gaps, and data analyses on intersectionality, accessibility, sustainability requirements, and impacts.
    - Insights, gaps, and data analyses on ‘who’ the most intersectionally marginalised and excluded under-represented people and communities are in the context of this EIA.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assess impact for different population groups** | **Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?**  **State Yes or No** | **Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith**  **OR**  **If no impact is identified, briefly state why.** |
| **Age**  including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | No | The proposed changes are not anticipated to impact the named groups. The target operating model is designed to optimise the customer journey, placing the customer at the forefront of our approach. This prioritisation is geared towards fostering positive outcomes and ensuring an improved experience for individuals accessing the service. |
| **Disability** includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities. | No | The proposed changes are not anticipated to impact the named groups. The target operating model is designed to optimise the customer journey, placing the customer at the forefront of our approach. This prioritisation is geared towards fostering positive outcomes and ensuring an improved experience for individuals accessing the service. |
| **Ethnicity, ‘**Race’, ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers | No | The proposed changes are not anticipated to impact the named groups. The target operating model is designed to optimise the customer journey, placing the customer at the forefront of our approach. This prioritisation is geared towards fostering positive outcomes and ensuring an improved experience for individuals accessing the service. |
| **Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief** | NA | Data not available |
| **Gender and Sex** including non-binary and intersex people | No | The proposed changes are not anticipated to impact the named groups. The target operating model is designed to optimise the customer journey, placing the customer at the forefront of our approach. This prioritisation is geared towards fostering positive outcomes and ensuring an improved experience for individuals accessing the service. |
| **Gender Reassignment** | No | The proposed changes are not anticipated to impact the named groups. The target operating model is designed to optimise the customer journey, placing the customer at the forefront of our approach. This prioritisation is geared towards fostering positive outcomes and ensuring an improved experience for individuals accessing the service. |
| **Sexual Orientation** | No | The proposed changes are not anticipated to impact the named groups. The target operating model is designed to optimise the customer journey, placing the customer at the forefront of our approach. This prioritisation is geared towards fostering positive outcomes and ensuring an improved experience for individuals accessing the service. |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | NA | Data not available |
| **Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility** (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum) | NO | The proposed changes are not anticipated to impact the named groups. The target operating model is designed to optimise the customer journey, placing the customer at the forefront of our approach. This prioritisation is geared towards fostering positive outcomes and ensuring an improved experience for individuals accessing the service. |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | No | The proposed changes are not anticipated to impact the named groups. The target operating model is designed to optimise the customer journey, placing the customer at the forefront of our approach. This prioritisation is geared towards fostering positive outcomes and ensuring an improved experience for individuals accessing the service. |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No | The proposed changes are not anticipated to impact the named groups. The target operating model is designed to optimise the customer journey, placing the customer at the forefront of our approach. This prioritisation is geared towards fostering positive outcomes and ensuring an improved experience for individuals accessing the service. |
| **Carers** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No | The proposed changes are not anticipated to impact the named groups. The target operating model is designed to optimise the customer journey, placing the customer at the forefront of our approach. This prioritisation is geared towards fostering positive outcomes and ensuring an improved experience for individuals accessing the service. |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No | The proposed changes are not anticipated to impact the named groups. The target operating model is designed to optimise the customer journey, placing the customer at the forefront of our approach. This prioritisation is geared towards fostering positive outcomes and ensuring an improved experience for individuals accessing the service. |
| **Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors** | No | The proposed changes are not anticipated to impact the named groups. The target operating model is designed to optimise the customer journey, placing the customer at the forefront of our approach. This prioritisation is geared towards fostering positive outcomes and ensuring an improved experience for individuals accessing the service. |
| **Socio-economic disadvantage** considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections | No | The proposed changes are not anticipated to impact the named groups. The target operating model is designed to optimise the customer journey, placing the customer at the forefront of our approach. This prioritisation is geared towards fostering positive outcomes and ensuring an improved experience for individuals accessing the service. |
| **Homeless and rough sleepers** considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | No | The proposed changes are not anticipated to impact the named groups. The target operating model is designed to optimise the customer journey, placing the customer at the forefront of our approach. This prioritisation is geared towards fostering positive outcomes and ensuring an improved experience for individuals accessing the service. |
| **Human Rights** | NA |  |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** |  |  |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

|  |
| --- |
| Not applicable |

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

|  |
| --- |
| No mitigation actions are available due to no disproportionate negative impacts on any one group or intersectionally. |
| SMART action 1:  Although no disproportionate negative impacts have been identified the following will be established to understand and respond to clients experience of the service:   * Define clear KPIs and objectives for the service. * Incorporate Diversity and inclusion from the start. Ensure diversity and inclusion considerations are integrated into the project from the planning phase. * Identify key stakeholders and representatives from the protected characteristic groups to participate in the transformation project. * Regular Data collection. Implement a robust data collection system that includes information specific to clients with protected characteristics. * Analyse trends and track progress. * Conduct focus groups, surveys, or interviews to understand experiences from the client perspective. * Diversity training – Provide all staff on diversity and inclusion. Ensure all staff members are aware of the potential impact on clients with various protected characteristics. * Compliance with Legal standards – Ensure the proposed changes are aligned to legal requirements related to protecting clients with specific characteristics. |
| SMART action 2: Additionally, the service has already established a task and finish group has been established to understand any inequalities based on households protected characteristics living in temporary accommodation, establish any events or actions which could have disproportionately impacted these groups resulting in them requiring temporary accommodation, and to work up any relevant mitigating actions to reduce this impact. The Task and Finish group, consisting of staff from all levels within the service, will commence in February and run for up to 4 months. |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal’s impact score: | 1 |

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

|  |
| --- |
| Confirmed for publication by Paul Cooper, Assistant Director Housing Needs & Supply |

Directorate and Service Approval

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name and Job Title:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Responsible Lead Officer:** | Paul Cooper, Assistant Director Housing Needs & Supply | 24 January 2024 |
| **Accountable Manager:** | Paul Cooper, Assistant Director Housing Needs & Supply | 24 January 2024 |

**EDI Review and Approval:**

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service:** | Emma McDermott | 25-01-24 |

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2024/25 – Service Users**

Budget Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | Review and reduce the range of services commissioned through Supported Accommodation to achieve a saving of £521K |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Adam Salmon – Rough Sleeping and Single Homeless Commissioning Lead |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Housing, Neighbourhoods and Communities - Housing Needs & Supply Commissioning Team |
| Budget proposal no. | 22 |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

|  |
| --- |
| The proposal is in three parts:   1. The £364K saving that has arisen from the closure of the St. Patricks High Support Rough Sleepers Hostel. This closure is as result of the current landlord seeking to dispose of the building because it’s economically unviable to maintain and repair. Realistically the building, a former church, requires a one-off expenditure of significant value and then an ongoing programme of maintenance of similar magnitude.   We did explore moving the service to another building but were originally unable to identify a potential replacement within the available budget envelope.   1. To decommission the Reconnection work we currently commission the First Base Rough Sleepers Day Centre to deliver on our behalf, saving £58K. This is a general contribution to the overall running costs of the day centre, rather than specific funding for specific posts. 2. To decommission the Young Person’s Housing Advice element of the Youth Advice Gateway, currently being provided through YMCA/Downslink (YAC). The pathway into accommodation, such as Nightstop, and also family mediation, will continue and will be put out to tender. The urgent need to find savings has meant commissioning priorities have focused on providers who are directly providing accommodation and/or contributing to reducing financial pressures on statutory services. The Young Person’s Housing Advice element does not significantly impact either of these priorities. Ceasing to commission this aspect of the service will generate a saving of £100k. (NB: Three month’s formal notice will be issued meaning the service will finish in July and a transition plan will be worked up with the provider. |
| Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionally negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable: |
| 1. The loss of St. Pats will reduce the number of high support hostel bedspaces we have for rough sleepers by 24 out of 76, a 32% reduction. This is a significant loss of provision that will, because of the nature of the service disproportionally negatively affect rough sleepers, and in particular older and more entrenched rough sleepers. This is largely driven by the lack of a suitable building within budget. However, discussions are ongoing with HASC to unlock other provision within the stock, (in particular ‘hospital discharge’) which will offer some mitigation. 2. First Base provide one part of the council’s reconnection offer. Because this operates from the Day Centre, it tends to pick-up the more rough sleepers who are new to the city and may not have yet engaged with street outreach services. Not being picked up and reconnected at First Base would risk extending the period of time they sleep rough, exacerbating their needs and vulnerability and increasing the risk that they establish a greater dependency on services. However, as reconnections capacity is covered by other commissioned services, this risk is mitigated. 3. Decommissioning a bespoke Young Person’s Housing Advice Service for single people under 26, will have an impact to this group. However, this is a non-statutory service. The Homelessness Transformation Programme, and subsequent redesign of Housing Needs, due to be implemented in July, has been predicated upon improving the customer journey, and additional capacity has been factored in to increase statutory duties around homelessness prevention and relief to this cohort. |

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
| A structured programme of consultation, with both internal and external stakeholders was undertaken at the beginning of the recommissioning process to inform the shape of the Rough Sleeper and Single Homeless services going forward and an element of redesign/transformation of the Rough Sleeper and Single Homeless Pathway. There has also been an ongoing consultation with existing and potential new providers as an integral component of the soft market testing exercise, the first stage of the formal tendering process. |

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

|  |
| --- |
| Homelessness Transformation Programme EIA (in relation to statutory advice and assistance being offered to U26 year olds). |

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | YES |
| **Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not** | YES |
| **Ethnicity, ‘Race’, ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)** | YES |
| **Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism** | NO |
| **Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)** | YES |
| **Gender Reassignment** | YES |
| **Sexual Orientation** | YES |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | NO |
| **Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)** | YES |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | YES |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** | YES |
| **Carers** | Not applicable |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** | YES |
| **Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)** | YES |
| **Socio-economic Disadvantage** | Not applicable |
| **Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability** | YES |
| **Human Rights** | YES |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** |  |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| While we don’t currently collect monitoring data on our rough sleepers’ Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism. We will explore how we might add this to our current data collection.  We don’t collect monitoring data on Marriage and Civil Partnership as our rough sleepers’ provision treats all service users as being essentially single homeless. If they have families, they access the statutory housing options service. We are reviewing our practice with respect to how we engage with couples and will as part and parcel of this review explore collecting monitoring data on our rough sleepers’ Marriage and Civil Partnership status.  None of our rough sleepers have carers or active caring responsibilities, even where a rough sleeper had had caring responsibilities prior to becoming a rough sleeper, it wouldn’t be practicable for them to maintain such a responsibility while rough sleeping, hence our identifying the collection of monitoring data for this characteristic as not applicable.  All of our rough sleepers are significantly socio-economically disadvantaged and marginalised by default hence our also identifying the collection of monitoring data for this characteristic as not applicable. |

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| We collect monitoring data through the BThink Client Data System we use for the collection and storage of all our rough sleeper services related data and Home Connections\* for our statutory homeless services. We will use data within these systems to monitor and review the impact of these proposals.  (\*The Home Connections system is currently under review, and a new system being commissioned. Through the tendering process, this may continue to be Home Connections, or could be something entirely different. If another system operates in future, this will become the data source.) |

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assess impact for different population groups** | **Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?**  **State Yes or No** | **Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith**  **OR**  **If no impact is identified, briefly state why.** |
| **Age**  including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | Yes | The closure of St. Pats will likely have a disproportionate negative impact on older, high need, rough sleepers, relative to their composition of the populations as they constitute a disproportionately high proportion of those needing the support of St. Pats, so referred there. However, in mitigation, there are ongoing discussions with HASC on a wider systematic offer to single people with Multiple Compound Needs (MCN)  There is no identifiable age-related disproportionate impact of the loss of the First Base Reconnection work, it will negatively impact equally across the equality groups.  The loss of the auxiliary housing advice and support service of YAC will, relative to the general population, disproportionately negatively affect young people as it’s a young peoples’ service. However, in mitigation, capacity within statutory services has been increased to better support this cohort. |
| **Disability** includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities. | Yes | In as much that the rough sleeping population experiences a proportionately greater level of disability and life limiting conditions relative to the general population, all three proposals will have a disability related disproportionate impact. However, it should also be noted that disability (as per this context) is a vulnerability which will be taken into consideration when determining ‘priority need’, and through this a duty to provide interim accommodation. |
| **Ethnicity, ‘**Race’, ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers | Yes | There is a higher proportion of Black and Black British people in our rough sleeping population compared to the local population (6% vs 2%) as such any proposal impacting rough sleepers will disproportionately negatively impact the Black and Black British demographic.  This will be impacted by national immigration policy and included individuals with no recourse to public funds.  Note this numbers are small 56 out of 644 individuals in 2023/4. |
| **Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief** | Unknown | No data or insight available to determined impact. |
| **Gender and Sex** including non-binary and intersex people | Yes | In as much that a disproportionately number of men sleep rough compared to their proportion of the general population, all three proposals will have a disproportionately negative impact on men. |
| **Gender Reassignment** | No | There is no identifiable gender reassignment related disproportionate impact of the loss of all three services. |
| **Sexual Orientation** | Yes | There is no identifiable sexual orientation related disproportionate impact of the loss of all three services. |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | No | There is no identifiable marriage or civil partnership related disproportionate impact of the loss of all three services. |
| **Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility** (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum) | No | There is no identifiable Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause or (In)fertility related disproportionate impact of the loss of any of the three services. |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | No | There is no identifiable Armed Forces Personnel, their families or Veterans related disproportionate impact of the loss of all three services,  However, it should also be noted that disability (as per this context) is a vulnerability which will be taken into consideration when determining ‘priority need’, and through this a duty to provide interim accommodation. |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** considering for age, language, and various intersections | Yes | There is no identifiable Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers or Refugees related disproportionate impact of the St. Pats or First Base Reconnection service losses.  The loss of the Young Person’s Housing Advice Service will disproportionately negatively affect migrants, asylum seekers and refugees as they contribute, relative to their composition of the local population, a greater proportion of the demographic utilising this service. |
| **Carers** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No | There is no identifiable carers related disproportionate impact of the loss of all three services, it will negatively impact equally across the cohort, in which carers are, relative to their composition of the local population, likely under-represented. |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** considering for age, language, and various intersections | Yes | There is no identifiable Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care or fostering experienced people related disproportionate impact of the St. Pats or First Base Reconnection service losses.  The council already offers additional provision to care experienced young people. As well as a statutory duty being owed (in some circumstances), former care leavers are a recognised priority group within the Allocations Policy, and under the TA Placements Policy, prioritised for transfer back into Brighton & Hove if (by exception) they are initially placed outside the city. Care experienced young people are also only offered non-contained TA, when self-contained is not available, and again prioritised for a transfer when a self-contained unit is identified. The ‘16/17 year old protocol’ (‘Southwark Judgement’) has been re-written in conjunction with Children’s Social Care, and a revised ‘Care Leavers Housing Protocol’ is due to be approved in the next month (again in conjunction with FCL) |
| **Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors** | No | There is no identifiable domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors related disproportionate impact of the loss of all three services. |
| **Socio-economic disadvantage** considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections | Yes | In as much as there is a far greater prevalence of socio-economic disadvantage among those using these services, compared to its prevalence in the local general population, the loss of all three services will have a disproportionately negative impact on people experiencing socio-economic disadvantage. |
| **Homeless and rough sleepers** considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | Yes | In as much as all three services specifically meet the needs of single homeless and rough sleepers, the loss of all three services will have a disproportionately negative impact on single homeless and rough sleepers. |
| **Human Rights** | No | There is no identifiable human rights related disproportionate impact of the loss of all three services, it will negatively impact equally across the cohort. |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** |  |  |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

|  |
| --- |
| None know |

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

|  |
| --- |
| SMART action 1: The council is actively pursuing the possibility of repurposing/bidding for future Rough Sleeper Initiative grant funding to grant fund the day centre activities of First Base. |
| No further mitigation actions are available due to: (1) We have no alternative building to which to move the St. Pats service, which is suitable and within resources. If a suitable building within resources were identified, this could be reviewed. |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal’s impact score: | 3 |

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Directorate and Service Approval

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name and Job Title:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Responsible Lead Officer:** | Adam Salmon Rough Sleeping and Single Homeless Commissioning Lead | 24-01-24 |
| **Accountable Manager:** | Paul Cooper Assistant Director Housing Needs and Supply | 24-01-24 |

**EDI Review and Approval:**

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service:** | Emma McDermott | 24-01-24 |

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2024/25 – Service Users**

Budget Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | Third Sector Commission (2020-2025) |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Emma McDermott, Head of Communities, Equality and Third Sector |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Housing, Neighbourhoods & Communities, Communities, Equality & Third Sector Service |
| Budget proposal no. | 23 |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

|  |
| --- |
| Reduction in the net budget of the Third Sector Commission (TSC) by 10% (£182,000)  The TSC invests strategically in the third sector to deliver against priority outcomes for the council as well infrastructure support to the community and voluntary sector, community development in priority neighbourhoods and citywide, and a community banking partnership to deliver the outcomes of the council’s financial inclusion ambitions and alleviate cost of living crisis. |
| Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionally negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable: |
| All equality groups will be impacted by the very nature of the Commission and there will intersectional impacts with many funded partnerships supporting beneficiaries facing multiple barriers, for example, LGBTQ+ young people, black and racially minoritized people in disadvantage neighbourhoods, young GRT people.  The Third Sector Commission is designed to target the council’s corporate priorities which focus on the most vulnerable individuals and communities, increasing fairness and promoting social capital and resilience. The organisations funded through the programme are groups/organisations that work with and support communities with legally protected characteristics, and those who are marginalised and vulnerable, including those experiencing poverty/financial exclusion.  The proposed reduction in the programme’s funding will directly result in:   * decreased capacity to meet some corporate priorities with specific impacts on characteristics protected in law * reduced capacity for CVS groups which support community resilience and reduce reliance on statutory services: reducing the budget could result in increased demand for council services especially relating to young people and older people * potential wider impact on ability to attract additional match funding |

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
| No consultation or engagement has been undertaken to inform this assessment. The partnerships in receipt of funding return, as part of their terms and condition, an annual and six-month performance report to council. As the current TSC is in its fourth year, there is sufficient information about the beneficiaries of the funded projects/organisations to provide information on those likely to be impacted by the saving. |

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

|  |
| --- |
| None |

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | Yes |
| **Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not** | Yes |
| **Ethnicity, ‘Race’, ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)** | Yes |
| **Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism** | Yes |
| **Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)** | Yes |
| **Gender Reassignment** | Yes |
| **Sexual Orientation** | Yes |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | Yes |
| **Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)** | Yes |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | Yes |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** | Yes |
| **Carers** | Yes |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** | Yes |
| **Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)** | Yes |
| **Socio-economic Disadvantage** | Yes |
| **Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability** | Yes |
| **Human Rights** | Yes |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | Yes |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Not applicable |

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Grant variations will need to be agreed with the funded partnerships. These will indicate the impact on numbers and types of beneficiaries, and provide funded partnership the opportunity to give feedback on the impact to the council.  The partnerships will also continue to return their 6 monthly and year-end monitoring return reports which will provide data and insight on impact.  Officers will also see feedback from third sector infrastructure organisations in the city, such as Community Works.  Feedback will be sought from commissioners across the council and other public bodies for example, Sussex NHS as the strategic investment underpins some organisations deliver of other contracts/work in the city. |

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assess impact for different population groups** | **Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?**  **State Yes or No** | **Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith**  **OR**  **If no impact is identified, briefly state why.** |
| **Age**  including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | No |  |
| **Disability** includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities. | No |  |
| **Ethnicity, ‘**Race’, ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers | No |  |
| **Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief** | No |  |
| **Gender and Sex** including non-binary and intersex people | No |  |
| **Gender Reassignment** | No |  |
| **Sexual Orientation** | No |  |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | No |  |
| **Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility** (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum) | No |  |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | No |  |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** considering for No age, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Carers** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors** | No |  |
| **Socio-economic disadvantage** considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Homeless and rough sleepers** considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Human Rights** | No |  |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | No |  |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

|  |
| --- |
| Reduction in the Third Sector Commission will likely impact on other budget proposals that may be looking to the VCS to help mitigate their impact. It may also jeopardise the delivery of other commissions, especially if those budgets are being reduced. |

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

|  |
| --- |
| SMART action 1: Officers will work with Community Works, within its reduced budget envelope to provide support to partnerships manage the impact of the reduction. |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal’s impact score: | 4 |

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Directorate and Service Approval

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name and Job Title:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Responsible Lead Officer:** | John Reading, Third Sector Manager | 26-01-24 |
| **Accountable Manager:** | Emma McDermott | 26-01-24 |

**EDI Review and Approval:**

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service:** | Emma McDermott | 26-01-24 |

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2024/25 – Service Users**

Budget Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | Reduction of Communities Fund |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Emma McDermott, Head of Communities, Equality and Third Sector |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Housing, Neighbourhoods & Communities, Communities, Equality & Third Sector Service. |
| Budget proposal no. | 24 |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

|  |
| --- |
| Removal of all the General Fund monies (£302,000) in Communities Fund (CF) budget except for £15,000 maintained for the BME Engagement Fund that sits within the CF.  As an annual grant programme to the community and voluntary sector there is opportunity to reduce the budget ahead of the start of the new financial year. The fund predominantly supports grass root volunteer lead organisations being both a starter fund for new/small groups and building resilience for medium sized groups supplementing their own fundraising and volunteer time and acting as a validation to other funders.    The objectives of the fund are to improve wellbeing, build cohesion and promote fairness. The fund is an open competitive process.  The £25,000 monies from the Hedgecock Bequest Fund that also make up the Communities Fund budget will continue as will the annually variable contribution from the Textile Recycling Fund. |
| Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionally negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable: |
| The reduction does not unfairly affect one protected characteristic more than another as it is not ringfenced to specific communities or residents except for the BME fund within the Communities Fund. However, the BME fund is continuing.    All the Communities Fund is unallocated at the start of the financial year.  The Communities Fund is designed to target the council’s corporate priorities which focus on the most vulnerable individuals and communities, increasing fairness and promoting social capital and resilience. The organisations funded through the programme are groups/organisations that work with and support communities with legally protected characteristics, and those who are marginalised and vulnerable, including those experiencing poverty/financial exclusion.    The proposed reduction in the programme’s funding will result in:   * decreased capacity to meet some corporate priorities with specific impacts on characteristics protected in law * reduced capacity for CVS groups which support community resilience and reduce reliance on statutory services * potential wider impact on ability to attract additional match funding |

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
| No consultations or engagement are being undertaken to inform this assessment. Annual evaluations are returned by recipients of the awards from the Communities Fund as part of their terms and conditions. These have been used to inform officers understanding of the nature of the groups and their beneficiaries who might likely be impacted by this budget saving proposal. |

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

|  |
| --- |
| None |

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | YES |
| **Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not** | YES |
| **Ethnicity, ‘Race’, ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)** | YES |
| **Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism** | YES |
| **Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)** | YES |
| **Gender Reassignment** | YES |
| **Sexual Orientation** | YES |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | YES |
| **Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)** | YES |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | YES |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** | YES |
| **Carers** | YES |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** | YES |
| **Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)** | YES |
| **Socio-economic Disadvantage** | YES |
| **Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability** | YES |
| **Human Rights** | YES |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | YES |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Not applicable |

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| As a small sum of monies will remain for the Communities Fund in 2024/45 for the BME Engagement Fund and the main rounds officers will monitor the number, nature and target beneficiaries for the groups/organisation that apply. Officers will also seek feedback from the community and voluntary sector via infrastructure organisations such as Community Works, Resource Centre. Officers will also monitor number of enquiries made in the year regarding potential council funds that small groups can apply to. |

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assess impact for different population groups** | **Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?**  **State Yes or No** | **Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith**  **OR**  **If no impact is identified, briefly state why.** |
| **Age**  including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | No |  |
| **Disability** includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities. | No |  |
| **Ethnicity, ‘**Race’, ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers | No |  |
| **Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief** | No |  |
| **Gender and Sex** including non-binary and intersex people | No |  |
| **Gender Reassignment** | No |  |
| **Sexual Orientation** | No |  |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | No |  |
| **Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility** (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum) | No |  |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | No |  |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Carers** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors** | No |  |
| **Socio-economic disadvantage** considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Homeless and rough sleepers** considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | No |  |
| **Human Rights** | No |  |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | No |  |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

|  |
| --- |
| Reduction in the budget will impact grass roots community provision in neighbourhoods and to city-wide equality groups. Many of the groups/projects securing funding through the Communities Fund provide preventative measures that may to stop or be scaled back. As statutory services increasing looking to ‘community’ services and ‘building social capital’ as preventative measures for their clients a reduction in Communities Funding will impact in council’s ability to facilitate these.  Other budget savings that reduce opportunities for funding for community and voluntary sector organisations may worse the impact of this proposal. For example, the cessation of the youth-led grants programme. |

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

|  |
| --- |
| No mitigation actions are available due to there being no disproportionate impact on one specific equality group. |
| SMART action 1: Community and voluntary sector groups making enquiries to the council about funding will be signed posted to other possible funders, for example Sussex Community Foundation |
| SMART action 2: In 204/25 officers will explore the most effective and efficient way to distribute the remaining monies in the Communities Fund. |
| SMART action 3: The BME engagement fund and one round of the Communities Fund will be held in 2024/25. |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal’s impact score: | 3 |

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Directorate and Service Approval

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name and Job Title:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Responsible Lead Officer:** | Donna Edmead | 26-01-24 |
| **Accountable Manager:** | Emma McDermott | 26-01-24 |

**EDI Review and Approval:**

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service:** | Emma McDermott | 26-01-24 |

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2024/25 – Service Users**

Budget Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | Fees and Charges |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Jo Player Head of Safer Communities |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Housing, Neighbourhoods and Communities, Safer Communities |
| Budget proposal no. | 25 |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

|  |
| --- |
| Increase regulatory and licensing fees and charges where it is statutorily allowable. It is estimated that these increases will generate a saving of £20,000.  Some licensing fees and charges have already been agreed by licensing committee October 2023.  Taxi fees increases between 6-323%  Animal licensing fees increased by an average of 5%  Sex Entertainment etc fees increased by an average of 5%  Gambling fees increased to the statutory maximum  Street Trading increased by an average of 5%  Body Piercing increased between 43-117% |
| Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionally negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable: |
| No significant impacts because this is a fee charging service to businesses. |

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
| None |

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

|  |
| --- |
| None applicable |

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | No |
| **Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not** | No |
| **Ethnicity, ‘Race’, ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)** | No |
| **Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism** | No |
| **Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)** | No |
| **Gender Reassignment** | No |
| **Sexual Orientation** | No |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | Not applicable |
| **Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)** | Not applicable |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | Not applicable |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** | No |
| **Carers** | Not applicable |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** | No |
| **Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)** | No |
| **Socio-economic Disadvantage** | Not applicable |
| **Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability** | Not applicable |
| **Human Rights** | Not applicable |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | Not applicable |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Customer enquiries/complaints |

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Budget monitoring regarding increase of income |

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assess impact for different population groups** | **Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?**  **State Yes or No** | **Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith**  **OR**  **If no impact is identified, briefly state why.** |
| **Age**  including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service to businesses |
| **Disability** includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities. | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service to businesses |
| **Ethnicity, ‘**Race’, ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service to businesses |
| **Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief** | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service to businesses |
| **Gender and Sex** including non-binary and intersex people | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service to businesses |
| **Gender Reassignment** | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service to businesses |
| **Sexual Orientation** | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service to businesses |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service to businesses |
| **Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility** (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum) | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service to businesses |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service to businesses |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service to businesses |
| **Carers** considering for age, language, and various intersections | no | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service to businesses |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** considering for age, language, and various intersections | no | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service to businesses |
| **Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors** | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service to businesses |
| **Socio-economic disadvantage** considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service to businesses |
| **Homeless and rough sleepers** considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service to businesses |
| **Human Rights** | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service to businesses |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | N/A | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service to businesses |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

|  |
| --- |
| N/a |

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

|  |
| --- |
| No mitigation actions are available due to: this is a fee charging service and will impact business rather than individuals |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal’s impact score: | 1 |

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Directorate and Service Approval

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name and Job Title:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Responsible Lead Officer:** | Jo Player | 17/01/2024 |
| **Accountable Manager:** | Rachel Sharpe | 25-01-24 |

**EDI Review and Approval:**

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service:** | Emma McDermott | 25-01-24 |

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2024/25 – Service Users**

Budget Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | Safer Communities |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Jo Player, Head of Safer Communities |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Housing, Neighbourhoods and Communities, Safer Communities |
| Budget proposal no. | 26 |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

|  |
| --- |
| Cessation of pest control service |
| Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionally negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable: |
| No significant impacts |

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
| None |

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

|  |
| --- |
| Nonapplicable |

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | No |
| **Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not** | No |
| **Ethnicity, ‘Race’, ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)** | No |
| **Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism** | No |
| **Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)** | No |
| **Gender Reassignment** | No |
| **Sexual Orientation** | No |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | Not applicable |
| **Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)** | Not applicable |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | Not applicable |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** | No |
| **Carers** | Not applicable |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** | No |
| **Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)** | No |
| **Socio-economic Disadvantage** | Not applicable |
| **Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability** | Not applicable |
| **Human Rights** | Not applicable |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | Not applicable |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Customer enquiries/complaints |

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Budget monitoring regarding loss of income |

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assess impact for different population groups** | **Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?**  **State Yes or No** | **Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith**  **OR**  **If no impact is identified, briefly state why.** |
| **Age**  including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service There are alternative providers available |
| **Disability** includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities. | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service There are alternative providers available |
| **Ethnicity, ‘**Race’, ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service There are alternative providers available |
| **Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief** | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service There are alternative providers available |
| **Gender and Sex** including non-binary and intersex people | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service There are alternative providers available |
| **Gender Reassignment** | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service There are alternative providers available |
| **Sexual Orientation** | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service There are alternative providers available |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service There are alternative providers available |
| **Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility** (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum) | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service There are alternative providers available |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service There are alternative providers available |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service There are alternative providers available |
| **Carers** considering for age, language, and various intersections | no | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service There are alternative providers available |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** considering for age, language, and various intersections | no | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service There are alternative providers available |
| **Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors** | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service There are alternative providers available |
| **Socio-economic disadvantage** considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service There are alternative providers available |
| **Homeless and rough sleepers** considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service There are alternative providers available |
| **Human Rights** | No | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service There are alternative providers available |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | N/A | No significant impacts this is a fee charging service There are alternative providers available |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

|  |
| --- |
| No |

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

|  |
| --- |
| No mitigation actions are available due to: this is a fee charging service alternative providers are available |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal’s impact score: | 1 |

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Directorate and Service Approval

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name and Job Title:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Responsible Lead Officer:** | Jo Player | 17/01/2024 |
| **Accountable Manager:** | Rachel Sharpe | 24-01-24 |

**EDI Review and Approval:**

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service:** | Emma McDermott | 24-01-24 |

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2024/25 – Service Users**

Budget Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) Services |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Jo Player, Head of Safer Communities |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Housing, Neighbourhoods and Communities, Safer Communities |
| Budget proposal no. | 27 |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

|  |
| --- |
| Review of commissioned DA/VAWG service provision.  Reduction in budget **£60k** saving initially identified as underspend plus unused interpretation & BSL services.  Further **£60k** saving from commissioned services:   * 50% funding of multiple compound needs specialist caseworker as part of Changing Futures programme due to end in 2024 * Current LGBTQ dispersed accommodation contract due to end in 2024, * Other funding unlikely to be required or where there is non-performance of contracts. |
| Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionally negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable: |
| The most significant impacts will be on women and girls affected by domestic violence/abuse. However, the budget reduction is from additional short term new burdens money and will not directly impact core budget for commissioned services. |

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
| There has been no specific consultation carried out to inform this EIA. However, detailed consultation has recently been completed to inform the council’s new Combatting Violence Against Women and Girls Strategy and data and insights from this will be used to inform the allocation of the remaining new burdens funding, which will be put to elected members for approval. |

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

|  |
| --- |
| None applicable |

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | Yes |
| **Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not** | Yes |
| **Ethnicity, ‘Race’, ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)** | Yes |
| **Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism** | Yes |
| **Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)** | Yes |
| **Gender Reassignment** | Yes |
| **Sexual Orientation** | Yes |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | Not applicable |
| **Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)** | Yes |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | Not applicable |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** | Yes |
| **Carers** | Not applicable |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** | Not applicable |
| **Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)** | Yes |
| **Socio-economic Disadvantage** | Not applicable |
| **Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability** | Not applicable |
| **Human Rights** | Not applicable |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | Not applicable |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| N/A |

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Monitoring data is collected from providers as part of quarterly contract monitoring arrangements. |

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assess impact for different population groups** | **Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?**  **State Yes or No** | **Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith**  **OR**  **If no impact is identified, briefly state why.** |
| **Age**  including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | No | Proposed reduction does not affect services provided to children who are victims/survivors of domestic violence.  Data unavailable on adult age cohorts. Impact unknown. |
| **Disability** includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities. | No | Proposed reduction may affect services provided to disabled people who are victims/survivors of domestic violence as a result of the offer from the specialist case worker supporting people with multiple complex need. |
| **Ethnicity, ‘**Race’, ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers | No | Proposed reduction does not affect services provided to victims/survivors of domestic violence from ethnic backgrounds.  Sufficient funding remains in place for translation and interpreting services. |
| **Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief** | No | Proposed reduction does not affect services provided to victims/survivors of domestic violence based on their religion or faith. |
| **Gender and Sex** including non-binary and intersex people | Yes | May disproportionately affect women at risk of domestic abuse/violence. However, core commissioned services remain in place. |
| **Gender Reassignment** | Yes | May disproportionately affect women at risk of domestic abuse/violence. However, core commissioned services remain in place. |
| **Sexual Orientation** | Yes | May disproportionately affected LGBT+ women at risk of domestic abuse/violence. However, core commissioned services remain in place. |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | No | Proposed reduction does not affect services provided to children who are victims/survivors of domestic violence |
| **Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility** (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum) | yes | May disproportionately affect women at risk of domestic abuse/violence. However, core commissioned services will still be in place. |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | No | Proposed reduction does not affect services provided to victims/survivors of domestic violence from the armed forces |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No | Proposed reduction does not affect services provided to victims/survivors of domestic violence who are refugees, migrants or asylum seekers.  Sufficient funding remains in place for translation and interpreting services |
| **Carers** considering for age, language, and various intersections | no | Proposed reduction does not affect services provided to victims/survivors of domestic violence who are carers. |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** considering for age, language, and various intersections | Yes | May disproportionately affect women and girls who are care experienced. However, core commissioned services will still be in place. |
| **Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors** | Yes | May disproportionately affect women at risk of domestic abuse/violence. However, core commissioned services will still be in place. |
| **Socio-economic disadvantage** considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections | No | Proposed reduction does not affect services provided to people who are victims/survivors of domestic violence who are at risk of socio disadvantage |
| **Homeless and rough sleepers** considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | No | Proposed reduction does not affect services provided to rough sleepers who are victims/survivors of domestic violence |
| **Human Rights** | N/A |  |
| **Another relevant group:**  **People with multiple complex need** | Yes | Proposed reduction will reduce the offer to individuals identified as having multiple complex need. |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

|  |
| --- |
| Other budget savings across the council that impact on women and disabled people may worsen this proposal. |

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

|  |
| --- |
| SMART action 1: Continued quarterly contract monitoring of those accessing core services to track impact of this proposal and explore further mitigating actions is needed. |
| SMART action 2: Core commissioned services will remain in place for the lifetime of the current contracts - until March 2026 as a minimum.  SMART action 3: Review of all grant funded and commissioned services by end March 2024 to ensure that they are delivering against contract specification. |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal’s impact score: | 3 |

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Directorate and Service Approval

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name and Job Title:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Responsible Lead Officer:** | Jo Player | 17/01/2024 |
| **Accountable Manager:** | Rachel Sharpe | 26-01-24 |

**EDI Review and Approval:**

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service:** | Emma McDermott | 26-01-24 |

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2024/25 – Service Users**

Budget Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | Third Party Reporting Centres |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Jo Player Head of Safer Communities |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Housing, Neighbourhoods & Communities, Safer Communities |
| Budget proposal no. | *28* |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

|  |
| --- |
| Cease all funding for third party reporting centres.  Currently there are three third party reporting centres for disabled, Black and racially minoritized residents and LGBTQ+ residents to report hate incidents if they do not feel wish/able to report to statutory services. |
| Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionally negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable: |
| These centres are provided by three voluntary organisations in the city that specifically support these cohorts of the city’s population. This proposal will therefore directly impact on disabled, Black and racially minoritized people and LGBTQ+ residents. Including the intersectional work that the centres were starting to do for people with experiencing marginalisation based on their multiple identities. For the first three quarters of the year 63 people contacted the centres for support with a hate incident. |

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

|  |
| --- |
| The setting up of the centres was a pilot based on best practice rather than a statutory requirement. Monitoring reports from the providers has been used to inform this EIA. |

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

|  |
| --- |
| None |

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | Not applicable |
| **Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not** | Yes |
| **Ethnicity, ‘Race’, ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)** | Yes |
| **Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism** | Yes |
| **Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)** | Yes |
| **Gender Reassignment** | Yes |
| **Sexual Orientation** | Yes |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | Not applicable |
| **Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)** | Not applicable |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | Not applicable |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** | Yes |
| **Carers** | Not applicable |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** | Not applicable |
| **Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)** | Not applicable |
| **Socio-economic Disadvantage** | Not applicable |
| **Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability** | Not applicable |
| **Human Rights** | Not applicable |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | Not applicable |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Hate crime reporting data will be collected from providers and from statutory agencies |

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assess impact for different population groups** | **Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?**  **State Yes or No** | **Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith**  **OR**  **If no impact is identified, briefly state why.** |
| **Age**  including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | No | No significant impacts funding not provided third party reporting centre for this group |
| **Disability** includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities. | Yes | Reduction of hate incidents reported |
| **Ethnicity, ‘**Race’, ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers | Yes | Reduction of hate incidents reported |
| **Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief** | Yes | Reduction of hate incidents reported |
| **Gender and Sex** including non-binary and intersex people | Yes | Reduction of hate incidents reported |
| **Gender Reassignment** | Yes | Reduction of hate incidents reported |
| **Sexual Orientation** | Yes | Reduction of hate incidents reported |
| **Marriage and Civil Partnership** | No | No significant impacts funding not provided third party reporting centre for this group |
| **Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility** (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum) | No | No significant impacts funding not provided third party reporting centre for this group |
| **Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans** | No | No significant impacts funding not provided third party reporting centre for this group |
| **Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees** considering for age, language, and various intersections | No | Reduction of hate incidents reported, based on the intersectional identities of ethnicity and immigration status. |
| **Carers** considering for age, language, and various intersections | no | No significant impacts funding not provided third party reporting centre for this group |
| **Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people** considering for age, language, and various intersections | no | No significant impacts funding not provided third party reporting centre for this group |
| **Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors** | No | No significant impacts funding not provided third party reporting centre for this group |
| **Socio-economic disadvantage** considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections | No | No significant impacts funding not provided third party reporting centre for this group |
| **Homeless and rough sleepers** considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | No | No significant impacts funding not provided third party reporting centre for this group |
| **Human Rights** | No | No significant impacts funding not provided third party reporting centre for this group |
| **Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)** | N/A | No significant impacts funding not provided third party reporting centre for this group |

**Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:**

* Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
* Lone parents
* People experiencing homelessness
* People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
* People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
* People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
* People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
* People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
* Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

|  |
| --- |
| The deletion of the Communities Fund may worsen the impact of the proposal as it will not be available as an alternative source of CVS funding. |

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

|  |
| --- |
| SMART action 1: Increased awareness campaign by statutory agencies to encourage reporting by those communities susceptible to hate incidents, to statutory services by March 2025 |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal’s impact score: | 3 |

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Directorate and Service Approval

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name and Job Title:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Responsible Lead Officer:** | Jo Player | 17/01/2024 |
| **Accountable Manager:** | Rachel Sharpe | 24-01-24 |

**EDI Review and Approval:**

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatory:** | **Name:** | **Date:** DD-MMM-YY |
| **Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service:** | Emma McDermott | 25-01-24 |

**Equality Act 2010: section 149 Public Sector Equality Duty**

(1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to —

(a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;

(b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;

(c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

(2) A person who is not a public authority but who exercises public functions must, in the exercise of those functions, have due regard to the matters mentioned in subsection (1).

(3) Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to —

(a) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;

(b) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;

(c) encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

(4 )The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.

(5) Having due regard to the need to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to—

(a) tackle prejudice, and

(b) promote understanding.

(6) Compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others; but that is not to be taken as permitting conduct that would otherwise be prohibited by or under this Act.

(7) The relevant protected characteristics are—

* age;
* disability;
* gender reassignment;
* pregnancy and maternity;
* race;
* religion or belief;
* sex;
* sexual orientation.

(8) A reference to conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act includes a reference to—

(a) a breach of an equality clause or rule;

(b) a breach of a non-discrimination rule.

(9) Schedule 18 (exceptions) has effect.

1. Non-Financial investments are investments in capital assets such as plant, property, equipment, hardware and software. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)