

CABINET	AGENDA ITEM No. 9
7th December 2015	PUBLIC REPORT

Cabinet Member(s) responsible:	Cllr David Seaton	
Contact Officer(s):	John Harrison, Corporate Director: Resources Steven Pilsworth, Service Director Financial Services	Tel. 452520 Tel. 384564

CABINET ADDENDUM – PHASE 1 BUDGET PROPOSALS

Background

- 1.1. This addendum has been produced in order that Members receive the most up to date position possible regarding the Budget Conversation.
- 1.2. This document contains:
 - An updated list of consultation responses received to date
 - Feedback from Joint Scrutiny on the Phase 1 Budget Conversation and resulting actions
 - Feedback from CMT members on the outcomes of the various Phase 1 engagement events that have taken place to date.

Consultation Response

- 1.3. This note contains all Phase 1 Consultation responses received as at 3/12/15 in full. A summary of the responses received to date is given in this section.
- 1.4. In total 15 responses have been received:

Survey Monkey online form	14
Handwritten response	1
Total	15

- 1.5. **Question 1** - 7 respondents answered question 1 which was *'Do you have any comments to make about the first round budget proposals?'*

Response	Number of Responses
Positive	3
Neutral	1
Negative	3
Total	7

- 1.6. **Question 2** – Respondents were asked, after having read the consultation document, how much they understood the Council’s proposals. Answers can be broken down as follows:

Response	Number of Responses
A great deal	3
A fair amount	6
Not very much	4
Nothing at all	0
Total	13

- 1.7. **Question 3** – Of the 15 responses received, 9 answered question 3 which was ‘*If you have any specific ideas about how the council can save money and protect services, please state these here:*’. A list of subjects raised is given below.

Response Theme	Respondents Citing Issue
Staff/Member pay & allowances	2
Business rates	1
Home-to-School transport	1
Energy	1
Business Parks	1
Community Projects/Grants	1
E-Services	1
Libraries	1
Vivacity	1
Serco	1
Asylum Seekers	1

Recommendations from Joint Meeting of the Scrutiny Committees and Commissions meeting held on 26th November 2015

1.8. The Joint Meeting of the Scrutiny Committees and Commissions have made the following recommendations to Cabinet with regard to Phase 1 of the Budget 2016/17 and Medium Term Financial Strategy to 2025/26.

Section of Budget	Scrutiny recommendation	Cabinet Response
People and Communities	a) That the Corporate Director: Resources provide the Committee with figures to show how much of the procurement pressure within Resources is due to the proposed changes in the Permanency Service in People and Communities	<p>Within the procurement pressure reported within Resources, approximately £110k is due to the decision to follow an alternative approach with the permanency service, based on the level of spend being £4m. The savings from the changes to the permanency service will be £650k in 2017/18, rising to £900k in 2018/19 and each year after that.</p> <p>The remainder is due to reductions in spend, or using alternative sources of funding to cover services such as grants, meaning it is not possible to bank savings in the same manner.</p>
	b) That the Corporate Director for People and Communities provide the relevant scrutiny committee with a regular report on the progress and implementation of the 'Front Door' project. The frequency of the report to be decided on presentation of the first report.	Agreed – a report will be brought to the Strong and Supportive Communities Scrutiny Committee meeting on 10 th March 2016.
	c) That Cabinet explore the use of SMS as a communications tool across council services and in particular as part of the Front Door project.	Agreed – this will be considered within the front door projects
Growth and Regeneration	d) That Cabinet provide the Sustainable Growth and Environment Capital Scrutiny Committee with a briefing note listing which council services are being sold to generate income and what income had been generated from the sale of these services.	Agreed – this will be brought forward after the work on the 2016/17 budget is finalised in march 2016

Section of Budget	Scrutiny recommendation	Cabinet Response
	<p>ACTION</p> <p>e) The Director of Governance to provide details of the policy for taxi licensing, particularly regarding the limits placed upon the number of licences being issued</p>	<p>Licencing: Best Practice Guidance March 2010 and legislation does not permit councils to limit taxi (hackney carriage) numbers unless there is no unmet demand.</p> <p>No unmet demand is a form of quantity control evaluated through an independent survey. The last survey was carried out in November 2011 and demonstrated that there was no basis for a restriction on the number of taxi licences issued. From April 2012 to date, 10 new taxi licences, in addition to the existing number, have been issued. This brings the number of taxi licences for Peterborough to 173</p>

Feedback from Conversation Events

1.9. A number of Phase 1 Consultation events have already been held:

- 20th November – Borderline & Peterborough Executive Partnership Board.
 - Wendi Ogle-Welbourn attended and the Phase 1 Conversation Document was noted.
- 26th November - Disability Forum
 - Kim Sawyer attended this event and the Phase 1 Conversation Document was noted.
- 2nd December - Schools Forum
 - Terry Reynolds and Steven Pilsworth attended and the Phase 1 Budget Conversation document was noted.
- 3rd December - Greater Peterborough Partnership City Leader's Forum
 - The Forum requested that the presentation and budget details were circulated to attendees for them to comment.
 -

1.10. Future events are scheduled as follows:

Forum	Date	Venue	Contact (<i>Finance rep</i>)
Peterborough Community Assistance Scheme	7 th December 10.30am	4.1 Bayard	Ian Phillips to lead <i>Steven Pilsworth</i>
Youth Council	8 th December 17.30 – 19.30	Council Chamber	Youth Style Scrutiny Event. All Cabinet Members and Directors invited. <i>Kirsty Nutton.</i>
Bondholder Breakfast	10 th December 07.30 – 09.00	Future Business Centre	Cllr Holdich to lead.
Peterborough Housing Partnership	10 th December 11.00 – 13.00	Forli Room	Simon Machen /Cllr Hiller to lead / attend
Connect Group	11 th December 10.00 – 11.00	Gillian's Office	Gillian / Adrian to lead.
Parish Council	16 th December 18.30	Bourges / Viersen	Adrian Chapman to lead.
Discussion with Trade Unions Joint Consultative Forum (JCF)	17 th December 09.30 – 12.30	Viersen Room	Kim to lead <i>Steven Pilsworth</i>

	Do you have any comments to make about the first round budget proposals?	Having read the first round proposals document, how much do you now feel you understand about why the council must make savings of £19.6million in 2016/17?	If you have any specific ideas about how the council can save money and protect services, please state these here:	Cabinet Response
1	Councils should only be expected to make efficiency savings to improve the way services are delivered, not provide a lesser service to local residents than exists.	Not very much	It seems residents are bearing the brunt of funding for 2015/16. Should grants be reducing it clearly seems business rate revenues need to increase. Why are we paying for school transport? It should be the responsibility of parents to get their child to school.	Given the scale of the grant reductions, the council must look at ways of providing services for less cost. None of the savings proposals in phase 1 are service reductions, they are all either efficiencies or increasing income, including increasing business rate income through the development of new business premises. The Council has a statutory responsibility to get children to school in certain circumstances.
2	Doing your best	A great deal	EndoTherm additive reduces energy consumption and carbon.	The Council has an energy performance contract in place with Honeywell. This enables works to be undertaken across council buildings, including leisure centres and swimming pools, to save energy and money. These savings have been built into the budget.
3	Not very much detail.	A fair amount	Cut Councillor's allowances to zero. Close Woodston Library as it is close enough to Central Library.	The level of Councillors allowances is recommended by an independent panel. In recent years the Panel has recommended a higher level of allowances than Councillors currently receive. Councillors have voted not to accept the increase. A major consultation on the library service was undertaken last year, showing how communities value their libraries. The council has become the first in the country to roll out innovative self-serve technology in all its libraries. This has enabled us to make savings of over £300,000 in the library service and to not only keep all libraries open but to actually extend opening hours.

4		Not very much	Business parks are being built yet the ones in existence are not fully occupied, therefore why build more when they are not generating income?	Business parks tend to be developed and owned by private developers and not the Council. The Council is keen to encourage such development as there is evidence of increasing demand for commercial space, leading to increased jobs in the city. The Council also receives business rates income from such developments
5		A fair amount		N/A
6		Not very much		N/A
7		A fair amount	Cut the waste that has gone on for years. Cut the vastly overmanned senior staff. Cut perks and expenses budgets drastically.	The Council has undertaken a number of significant senior management restructures in recent years. The most recent rounds saved £1.5m across the Council. In many cases staff are shared with neighbouring councils, including the Chief Executive.
8		Not very much		N/A
9	I think the Front Door project is a good idea - don't forget though about the elderly or those who need support to both understand and access e-services. Although I can see a range of proposals, they do seem very high level and as a resident I would be interested to see anticipated outcomes and risk.	A great deal	Shift services online where possible. Scrutinise the value of community projects and grants - are you getting value for money? They are a lifeline for some groups, but are not statutory.	The front door project will not replace existing methods for contacting the council or gaining access to services. We do believe that in many cases people will prefer the convenience of the alternative methods (including shifting services online as you suggest). The value of grants we provide to support projects is annually reviewed to ensure it is essential and provides value for money.
10	Very prudent	A fair amount	Ensure Vivacity become self-sufficient.	Since the council established Vivacity in 2010, savings have been made in the provision of these services, reducing the proportion of services funded by the Council. This has been partly due to joint initiatives, such as the library service, and also due to Vivacity being able to attract more income and grant funding as a charitable trust
11		A great deal		N/A

12	Why not save even more by promoting the current government deliberate policy of killing off the old, ill and disabled?			N/A
13	Clearly we need a commercially astute financial director / CEO. These are not savings but CUTS	Not very much	The whole SERCO proposition is based on greed, They source the service and pass back a discount...but there again the yardstick is one proposed by SERCO so what are the real figures? SERCO will never tell you. Cut them loose and regain control	None of the savings proposals in phase 1 are service reductions, they are all either efficiencies or increasing income
14		A fair amount		N/A
15		A fair amount	<p>The increase of £100,000 for asylum seekers should be cut to zero and any existing expenditure cut to zero. If the government insist they come here, the government should be told they must cover <u>all</u> costs including ongoing costs, ringfenced, if necessary.</p> <p>The Council wants to be self-sufficient. The government wants Councils to be self-sufficient – so we should only pay for existing residents. With far too many immigrants in the city we do not want any more – A sentiment held by the silent majority, whatever God-forsaken part of the world they come from.</p>	The Council has a statutory obligation to support these individuals. However we do continue to lobby Government for support in meeting these costs.