



**Brighton & Hove  
City Council**

# **COUNCIL ADDENDUM**

**4.30PM, THURSDAY, 3 MARCH 2011**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, BRIGHTON TOWN HALL**



## ADDENDUM

ITEM		Page
76.	<b>TO CONSIDER THE REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CABINET OF THE 17 FEBRUARY 2010 IN RESPECT OF:-</b>	<b>1 – 24</b>
(a)	<b>General Fund Revenue Budget and Council Tax 2011/12.</b>	
(b)	<b>Supplementary Financial Information for Budget Council.</b>	
(c)	<b>Capital Resources and Capital Investment Programme for 2011/12.</b>	
(d)	<b>Housing Revenue Account Budget 2011/12.</b>	
	(i) Extract from the Overview & Scrutiny Commission held on the 22 <sup>nd</sup> February 2011 (copy attached).	1 - 8
	(ii) Conservative Group amendment	9 -10
	(iii) Joint Labour & Green Groups' amendments 1 and 2	11 - 14
	(iv) Labour Group amendment	15 - 16
	(v) Green Group amendments 1 and 2	17 - 20
	(vi) Budget Protocol Annexe 2	21 - 24



**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL****OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMISSION****4.00PM 22 FEBRUARY 2011****COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL****DRAFT MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillors Mitchell (Chairman); Pidgeon (Deputy Chairman), Bennett, Cobb, Elgood, Morgan, Peltzer Dunn, Wakefield-Jarrett, Meadows, Randall and Kemble.

**PART ONE****68. BUDGET SCRUTINY; REPORTS TO 17 FEBRUARY CABINET**

Councillor Gill Mitchell the Chairman welcomed Councillors Jan Young and Trevor Alford, Cabinet Members to the meeting.

**Cabinet Agenda Items 164 and 165; General Fund Revenue Budget and Council Tax 2011-2012 and Capital resources and Capital Investment Programme 2011 – 2012**

- 68.1 Councillor Young the Cabinet Member for Finance said she was pleased to introduce the budget for 2011-2012 and asked the Director of Finance to clarify a number of key areas in the proposals that had recently been questioned, such as the use of reserves, inflation assumptions and impact on staffing.
- 68.2 Catherine Vaughan, Director of Finance said the Council was now looking for some £33.9million in budget reductions for 2011-2012. This change in the overall total budget gap, anticipated at around £20million in July 2010, had been largely affected by reductions in formula grant and changes in specific grants, all of which had been analysed in detail. The proposed 1% reduction in Council Tax added to the budget reduction requirement.
- 68.3 She explained the proposed allocations of useable reserves following a comprehensive review as set out in report paragraphs 3.26 – 3.32. The projected underspend for 2010/2011 would create new useable reserves. Examples of budget reductions included the pay award and pensions contributions had not been as high as expected so these areas contributed positively to the overall budget position.
- 68.4 Not all the anticipated £28 million savings were achievable from 1 April due to lead-in times for example for consultation with staff. Funding had been set aside for restructure and redundancy costs.

- 68.5 Regarding the 2% inflation level, all significant costs were being considered individually in the budget planning, especially for example social care costs and energy where prices created significant pressures. There was no general assumption that contracts would be uplifted by inflation and the situation would be kept under review.
- 68.6 Councillor Young noted that the Value for Money programme had over-achieved in the past two years. The third phase of VFM was getting under way; this, and Intelligent Commissioning would present a key advantage for the overall budget position including for future years. She preferred to delete vacant posts rather than make staff redundant, she said.
- 68.7 Councillor Alford was pleased that all aspects of the budget were being considered in full; that savings were being generated by doing things more efficiently and intelligently rather than traditional 'salami-slicing.' He gave an example of a review of procurement, especially in ICT.
- 68.8 The Cabinet Member and Director of Finance replied to questions on the validity of assumptions made, particularly at a time of budget cuts and uncertainty for instance in future energy supplies. There was still no information on some of the specific grants and assumptions and judgements had to be made on the best information available and experience. On-going and one-off risk provisions gave a level of flexibility.
- 68.9 The Council took advice from consultants on the 3 main energy contracts with different timeframes; for gas, electricity for small buildings and electricity for large buildings. More efficient procurement was producing savings but underlying prices were still rising. No assumptions on feed-in tariffs had been made at this stage, other than making the best use of housing stock.
- 68.10 Major works on Woodingdean Crossroads had been funded during 2010-2011 through additional coastal protection funds as the result of a successful legal claim. The risk regarding a land sale that had previously been linked with the project was reported to July 2010 Cabinet and no reduction in coastal protection or LTP funding for 2011-2012 was being proposed in relation to this scheme.
- 68.11 Some concerns were expressed about funding for community safety in future years. The Strategic Director Communities David Murray highlighted the importance of protecting frontline services that were fit for purpose. Officer support and funding for community safety for 2012-2013 would be challenging. Options were being looked at with partners.
- 68.12 Some Members were especially pleased that the Aids support grant and short breaks for disabled children were being protected.
- 68.13 The Strategic Director People Terry Parkin answered a question on the Ethnic Minority Achievement scheme which was now proposed to be funded via the Dedicated Schools Grant.
- 68.14 Several Members of OSC were disappointed at the low level of information given on Equalities Impact Assessments (EIAs) in the budget papers. There was a lot of expertise in this area and the Community Safety EIA did show how well these could be done,

though the budget reports gave only scant reference to crime and disorder implications. Greater consideration of disability alongside transport options was needed, it was felt.

- 68.15 Members pointed out that EIAs had been requested a number of times and more detailed individual equalities strands would represent a helpful and practical 'way in' to the key issues for individuals, in budget reports that otherwise could be seen as impenetrable in places.
- 68.16 The Strategic Director Communities told Members that the details provided in the EIAs via the web-link were not a 'tick-box' exercise but scanning documents. Thinking about the cumulative impact of the budget for example on youth services had in fact influenced the final proposals. The EIAs were proportionate at present but they could become more detailed where necessary and more of the wider cumulative impacts could be included and work would continue.
- 68.17 It was agreed that the EIAs would be included with the budget papers presented to OSC next time and presentation of budget reports and in particular the implications for people could be looked at for the future.
- 68.18 The Chairman was pleased that cumulative impacts were being considered; this had been one of the recommendations of the scrutiny panel on the societal impact of the in-year budget reductions.
- 68.19 Some Members felt there should be more focus on preventive measures rather than crisis services, and that the report needed to give a better overall picture especially of Youth Services, with reference to the loss of the Education Maintenance Allowance, and the high level of youth unemployment in the city.
- 68.20 The Strategic Director People reminded the Commission that comments from CYPOSC had been taken into account in the proposals. A wide range of support, statutory and non-statutory was provided for young people and this year there would be an increase of £2.9million in services to children, much of which could be described as 'early intervention.' Changes proposed for Youth Offending Services related to administrative support and would not affect staff available for supervision, he said.
- 68.21 Chris Todd referred to the CVSF written contribution to today's meeting that had been circulated to Members. He said a step towards EIAs was welcome though he did not find them informative in their current format. They did not compare well with the risk assessment methodology and needed to describe potential impacts more clearly, in his view.
- 68.22 Protection of frontline services was also welcomed, but the longer-term impact of some of the proposals – for example reducing council tax and removing cycle lanes - gave less room for manoeuvre. He later reiterated his concern that a 1% cut in the Council Tax in these proposals would more seriously affect the tax base in future years, especially during increased pressures on services and more uncertainty over future funding. He stressed the need to protect vulnerable people over the longer term.
- 68.23 Another concern was the assumption that providers would be able to manage inflation within existing budgets; there was a risk that higher inflation could affect the quality of

services. With regard to S106 interest funding he asked how community projects are agreed and whether communities could bid. In the context of the cash freed up through the waste disposal contract, he asked about incentives for increasing recycling, and was concerned that ideas for recycling elicited from the community by an innovative CityClean consultation should not be lost.

68.24 He urged the Council to ensure good on-going dialogue with the Community and Voluntary sector. It was hard to communicate and work together but there were difficult changes for all, that reinforced the need to do so.

68.25 The Strategic Director Communities reminded Members of the undertaking in the papers to minimise the impact on the Community and Voluntary sector. He said this commitment differed from some other local authorities that are cutting severely. The Council was keen to work together with the sector. It was widely recognised that intelligent commissioning was introducing major changes and avoiding duplication was key. So working with multiple agencies doing very similar work was not necessarily cost-effective or fruitful. What he called a 'reciprocal moment' in ways of working with and within the local third sector would help, in his view.

68.26 Answering questions the Director of Finance reassured the meeting that an increase in recycling would continue to be beneficial to the Council within the terms of the waste disposal contract, which was nationally recognised as good waste practice. Opportunities existed for recycling initiatives to be funded to generate savings in the longer term if there was a sound business case. She clarified the Community Assessment savings proposals set out in Appendix 10. The Council wanted to make better use of the interest on S106 money, for instance it had used some to replace Playbuilder funding in 2010/11. The interest was part of the council's resources rather than to be bid for. Councillor Young remarked that spending policies for S106 interest were being considered.

68.27 There was currently very little leeway in any public service budget; the main budget constraints included Council Tax parameters and on-going reductions in national grant funding. However the Council was in a position to create some flexibility for instance via Value For Money, with savings being reinvested in frontline services and Intelligent Commissioning providing better information on needs and improved delivery of the desired outcomes.

68.28 Councillor Anne Meadows, Chair of ASCHOSC had great concerns that significant savings on personalisation and reablement services could result in reduced levels of care in the future for those who were in most need of these services, especially those with learning disabilities. She later pressed her view that 'stretching' service providers could result in more expensive interventions later on for vulnerable people or reduced services as pressures grow. She felt that more investment in these areas in this budget would bring longer-term benefits.

68.29 Answering a question on a planned budget reduction for Examinations in Public the Strategic Director Place Geoff Raw said fewer major planning applications and public inquiries were anticipated and an EIP was thought unlikely at this stage. This would be kept under review. More generally, the need to make savings did open up new opportunities to do things more efficiently, he said.

- 68.30 The Strategic Director People referred to the VFM programme and was confident that significant cost reductions could be achieved at the same time as service improvements, as shown from past reorganisations. The budget showed a £2.1 million growth in children's services and an overall growth in Adult Social Care budget of nearly £5 ½ million including £3 million from the Primary Care Trust. Responding to a comment on taking the cheapest options, he said choice of services was not based on the lowest cost.
- 68.31 The Lead Commissioner People Denise D'Souza said Personalisation and VFM had been in operation for some years and had been shown to be successful. Adult Social Care commissioning was focussed not on the cheapest option but on the best outcomes for individuals. Outcomes would continue to be monitored, including across independent providers, which was the largest sector. Training packages and incentives were discussed in detail with service providers alongside inflationary pressures and she was mindful of the impacts of funding decisions by other local authorities. Some authorities were considering reducing levels of eligibility for services, she said which was not the case for Brighton & Hove.
- 68.32 In reply to a query on predicted savings on looked after children the Strategic Director People said that the Council had a disproportionate number of children in care and more work was needed to reduce this number including the number being looked after outside the City, which was more expensive.
- 68.33 The Director of Finance told the meeting that because of the considerable proportion of council spending on social care services for children and adults, it was essential to manage the budgets well. Brighton & Hove were in the top quartile of local authority spenders on all social care services but Month 9 TBM projected underspends had helped with regard to planning for future years.
- 68.34 The Chairman commented that children were taken into care for the right reasons, but in view of the large numbers involved, it would be beneficial for the subject of looked after children to be brought to scrutiny.
- 68.35 There were further questions on Legal Aid and advice services and the Disability Living Allowance, for which local authorities were awaiting the outcome of a recent government consultation
- 68.36 The Lead Commissioner Housing Jugal Sharma replied to queries on reviews of mental health and accommodation service areas where outcomes were deemed to have been very poor and being de-commissioned and re-commissioned with embedded outcomes. Senior officers gave further details and assured Members that there would be no gap in provision to service users.

### **Cabinet Agenda Item 166; Housing revenue account budget 2011 – 2012**

- 68.37 The Strategic Director Place Geoff Raw introduced the Housing Revenue Account Budget 2011/2012 and said a key aim in this area was on reducing management costs and improving value for money. Following removal of housing subsidy a new self-financing system would be introduced from April 2012 whereby the Council would be able to retain more of its rental income to reinvest in stock.

- 68.38 The Strategic Director outlined the main service pressures and the proposed savings as presented in the report. Members discussed potential changes to the housing subsidy system that may affect the proposals.
- 68.39 Chris Todd was disappointed that the implications sections of the reports did not reflect well the potential impacts of the proposals, not least because many of them eg the sustainability of investing in warmer homes, would be very positive and 'good news' stories.
- 68.40 The Strategic Director answered a question on reducing Housing Management and Maintenance costs which had been high compared with other local authorities. He said keeping costs down was especially important with regard to the Local Delivery Vehicle. The Commission heard that significant savings were planned in particular through the Customer Access Review which included co-location of services and better use of office space.
- 68.41 The Chairman of ASCHOSC Councillor Anne Meadows asked about the potential impact on tenants of the proposed changes to fees and service charges. The Strategic Director Place said that there were cost pressures but savings for tenants such as reduced gas costs had also been identified and the costs would be covered by Housing Benefits. Councillor Meadows was concerned for vulnerable tenants who were locked into charges that they could not meet.
- 68.42 The Director of Finance pointed out that the risks from changes to housing benefit regime were different for council tenants compared with the private rented sector, due to the lower levels of rent.

#### **Cabinet Agenda Item 167; Housing revenue account budget Capital Programme 2011 – 2014**

- 68.43 The Strategic Director Geoff Raw introduced the report on the 2011/2012 capital programme and provisional programme for the following two years. This provided for investment of around £30million, reducing to £23million and £18million in the following two years, on the priorities as set out in the report. The Year 1 programme relied on the Decent Homes target being met through capital receipts from leasing of properties to the Local Delivery Vehicle from 2011-2012.
- 68.44 In answer to a question on expenditure on lifts, the meeting heard that the proposed three year expenditure followed a survey of lifts identifying replacement and maintenance needs and was the start of a longer term capital programme currently being procured.

#### **Conclusion**

- 68.45 A number of Members were concerned at the lack of time available to scrutinise the proposals meaningfully. It was agreed that the Chairman would write on behalf of scrutiny to ask the Leader of the Council to make representations to Government on the lateness of certain funding announcements.
- 68.46 In summary, the Chairman said that the comments and concerns would be forwarded to budget Council. She thanked the Cabinet Members and the officers for speaking to OSC

68.47 **RESOLVED:**

1. That the draft minutes be forwarded to budget Council as the Overview and Scrutiny Commission's response to the budget proposals; and
2. That the Chairman write to the Leader of the Council on behalf of Scrutiny as minuted at paragraph 68.45 above.



## **GENERAL FUND REVENUE BUDGET & COUNCIL TAX 2011/12**

### **Conservative Group Amendment**

#### **Amendment**

To allocate the £0.205m unallocated reserves identified on page 14 of the agenda in paragraph 3.32 of the budget report to the following one-off proposals:

- £0.020m for new library books.
- £0.100m to provide transitional funding for city employment initiatives.
- £0.055m to provide one-off support for the Education Business Partnership.
- £0.010m for a bus study to consider city-wide gaps in service provision.
- £0.020m to provide additional one-off support for sports development work in the City's schools.



## **GENERAL FUND REVENUE BUDGET & COUNCIL TAX 2011/12**

### **Joint Labour and Green Groups' Amendments**

#### **Amendment 1**

The following proposals will generate £1.411m permanent resources in the general fund revenue budget for 2011/12 and add £0.096m to reserves:

- Reverse the proposed 1% reduction in council tax thereby freezing the council tax for 2011/12 and generating £1.198m in council tax revenue.
- Reduce the budget for mowing of grass verges by £0.1m. This will reduce the frequency of mowing verges and can be achieved by reducing the overtime budget for this service.
- Reverse the proposed 5% reduction in resident's parking permits thereby freezing the cost of permits and generating £0.113m income.

To allocate the £1.411m resources to the following:

- £0.149m for the Community Safety Team & Partnership and Drug and Alcohol Action Team to reverse part of the savings identified on page 86 of the agenda.
- £0.091m for the Youth Offending Service to reverse the saving identified on page 76 of the agenda.
- £0.232m for the Communities and Equalities Team to reverse the savings identified on page 81 of the agenda.
- £0.200m for the School and Community Teams to reverse part of the savings proposed in the Educational Psychology (allocation £0.120m) and Education Welfare Services (allocation £0.080m) identified on page 76 of the agenda.
- £0.014m for the Sustainable Transport Parking Service to reverse the proposal to charge for car club bays which is part of the saving identified on page 83 of the agenda.
- £0.100m for Community Care to reverse part of the saving identified on page 78 of the agenda.

- £0.250m for School Improvement Service to reverse the £0.070m saving identified on page 74 and provide an additional £0.180m investment in this service.
- £0.044m for Workforce Development within Schools, Skills and Learning to reverse the proposed saving in School Workforce Development and Governor Support identified on page 75 of the agenda.
- £0.025m for Advisory & Adult Learning to reverse the proposed saving in City Wide Attendance Strategy Support identified on page 74 of the agenda.
- £0.050m for Music & Arts Study Support to reverse part of the proposed savings in the Music Service identified on page 75 of the agenda.
- £0.156m for the Fostering & Adoption Service to reverse part of the saving identified on page 76 of the agenda.
- £0.100m for Day Services to reverse the saving proposed on page 80 of the agenda.

The reversal of savings identified above means that £0.096m of reserves allocated to fund the part year effect of these savings will no longer be needed and it is proposed that this money will be retained in reserves.

## Amendment 2

The following proposals will generate £1.175m in general fund revenue reserves for 2011/12:

- £1.100m by reversing the proposal set out in paragraph 3.11 on page 162 of the capital programme report to remove the cycle lanes in Grand Avenue and The Drive. Switch the capital grant funding to other schemes in the capital programme funded by either general fund revenue contributions or reserves thereby releasing the equivalent amount into general fund revenue reserves.
- £0.075m from the £0.205m unallocated reserves identified on page 14 of the agenda in paragraph 3.32 of the budget report.

To allocate the £1.175m to the following:

- £0.040m for City Clean to update the work already undertaken on a future food waste collection service and develop detailed financial and operational proposals for a trial.
- £0.200m for Early Intervention Services to provide transitional funding for the Connexions Service. The savings proposal is shown on page 77 of the agenda.
- £0.050m for Other Sustainable Transport to maintain certain supported bus routes for another year should alternative funding not be forthcoming. The savings proposal is shown on page 82 of the agenda.
- £0.030m for Schools, Skills & Learning to maintain the co-ordinator for school's equality and anti-bullying work for one year prior to the transfer of this responsibility to schools. The savings proposal is part of the full year effect of in-year grant cuts shown on page 75 of the agenda.
- £0.200m for a one-off risk provision in contingency to provide further protection for the shift to personalised care.
- £0.400m to provide funding to develop a Citywide Financial Inclusion Strategy including support for existing money and debt advice services and Credit Unions to be commissioned by the council via the Advice and Information Services Partnership of the LSP.
- £0.040m for Public Protection to provide transitional funding to support the changes outlined in the Public Protection saving proposals shown on page 85 of the agenda.
- £0.200m for a one-off risk provision in contingency to provide further cover for possible risks arising within Children's, Youth and Families.
- £0.015m for Grants to Voluntary Organisations to reverse the saving proposal as shown on page 81 of the agenda for one year only.



**GENERAL FUND REVENUE BUDGET & COUNCIL TAX  
2011/12****Labour Group Amendment****Amendment**

To allocate £0.130m from the £0.205m unallocated reserves identified on page 14 of the agenda in paragraph 3.32 of the budget report to the planned maintenance budget for seafront improvement works east of Brighton Pier.



## **GENERAL FUND REVENUE BUDGET & COUNCIL TAX 2011/12**

### **Green Group Amendments**

#### **Amendment 1**

The following proposals will generate £1.700m permanent resources in the general fund revenue budget for 2011/12 and release £0.137m back to reserves:

- Reverse the proposed 1% reduction in council tax thereby freezing the council tax for 2011/12 and generating £1.198m in council tax revenue.
- Reduce the budget for mowing of grass verges by £0.1m. This will reduce the frequency of mowing verges and can be achieved by reducing the overtime budget for this service.
- Delete the proposal to create a Local Homes Venture Fund saving £0.2m.
- Reverse the proposed 5% reduction in resident's parking permits and reinstating a 2% increase in the cost of permits and generating £0.158m income.
- Remove all catering including drinks at member meetings, pre-meetings and informal member meetings saving £0.026m.
- Adopt the members allowance scheme set out in the Review of Members Allowances report to Council on 21 October 2010 agenda item 28a saving £0.018m.

To allocate the £1.700m resources to the following:

- £0.247m for the Community Safety Team & Partnership and Drug and Alcohol Action Team to reverse part of the savings identified on page 86 of the agenda.
- £0.091m for the Youth Offending Team to reverse the saving identified on page 76 of the agenda.
- £0.200m for Early Intervention Services to reverse part of the Connexions Service saving identified on page 77 of the agenda, prioritising SEN support in mainstream schools.
- £0.232m for the Communities and Equalities Team to reverse the savings identified on page 81 of the agenda.

- £0.250m for the School and Community Teams to reverse part of the saving proposed in the Educational Psychology and Education Welfare Services identified on page 76 of the agenda.
- £0.014m for the Sustainable Transport Parking Service to reverse the proposal to charge for car club bays which is part of the saving identified on page 83 of the agenda.
- £0.025m to Public Protection to provide an additional noise patrol shift per week.
- £0.070m for School Improvement Service to reverse the saving identified on page 74 of the agenda.
- £0.044m for Workforce Development within Schools, Skills and Learning to reverse the proposed saving in School Workforce Development and Governor Support identified on page 75 of the agenda.
- £0.025m for Advisory & Adult Learning to reverse the proposed saving in City Wide Attendance Strategy Support identified on page 74 of the agenda.
- £0.059m for Music & Arts Study Support to reverse part of the proposed savings in the Music Service identified on page 75 of the agenda.
- £0.135m for the Fostering & Adoption Service to reverse part of the saving identified on page 76 of the agenda.
- £0.015m for Grants to Voluntary Organisations to reverse the saving proposal as shown on page 81 of the agenda.
- £0.047m for Sustainable Transport to reverse part of the saving identified on page 82 of the agenda relating to reducing the number of posts in Environment Initiatives, Traffic & Transport, Road Safety & Transport Planning.
- £0.100m for Day Services to reverse the saving proposed on page 80 of the agenda.
- £0.127m for Development Planning to reverse some of the savings from reductions in staff proposed on page 85 of the agenda.
- £0.019m for Public Protection to reverse part of the savings for environmental protection and licensing proposed on page 85 of the agenda.

The impact of new savings and the reversal of savings identified above means that £0.137m of reserves allocated to fund the part year effect of these savings will no longer be needed and it is proposed that this money will be retained in reserves.

## Amendment 2

The following proposal will generate £1.100m in general fund revenue reserves for 2011/12:

- £1.100m by reversing the proposal set out in paragraph 3.11 on page 162 of the capital programme report to remove the cycle lanes in Grand Avenue and The Drive. Switch the capital grant funding to other schemes in the capital programme funded by either general fund revenue contributions or reserves thereby releasing the equivalent amount into general fund revenue reserves.

To allocate £1.060m to the following:

- £0.040m for City Clean to update the work already undertaken on a future food waste collection service and develop detailed financial and operational proposals for a trial.
- £0.030m for Schools, Skills & Learning to maintain the co-ordinator for school's equality and anti-bullying work for one year prior to the transfer of this responsibility to schools. The savings proposal is part of the full year effect of in-year grant cuts shown on page 75 of the agenda.
- £0.500m to create a fund to support the installation of renewable energy generating technologies on council owned buildings in order to take advantage of the time limited feed in tariffs.
- £0.040m for Public Protection to provide transitional funding to support the changes outlined in the Public Protection saving proposals shown on page 85 of the agenda.
- £0.450m for a one-off risk provision in contingency to provide further cover for possible risks arising within Children's, Youth and Families and in the delivery units for Adult Assessment and Adult Provision.

The remaining £0.040m to be added to reserves.



3 March 2011

**Budget Council 3 March 2011:  
Setting a lawful budget for 2011/12**

**Introduction**

Under section 30 (6) of the Local Government Act 1992 the Council has a duty to set the **Council tax by 11 March 2011**. A failure to set the tax then does not in itself invalidate the tax demands but it has other adverse consequences including the potential loss of income to the Council.

The legal obligations for setting the budget mean in practical terms that:

- Members should not put forward proposals that would mean setting an unlawful budget and need to take officer advice in particular from legal and finance to ensure that proposals are in order;
- although the Council corporately sets the budget the Council acts through Members collectively, each and every Member is therefore jointly and severally responsible for the setting of the budget; and
- wherever possible Members are expected to facilitate rather than frustrate the setting of a lawful budget.

**Budget Council 3 March 2011**

To help Members at Council on 3 March 2011 the procedure to be followed in respect of the Budget debate is set out below:-

**74. Declarations of Interest.**

**75. Mayor's urgent communications, including the following:**

The Council will be asked to agree that the Procedural Rules be suspended to the extent that it is necessary to enable the business of the meeting to be dealt with as set out in agenda item 76 below.

**76. Revenue / Capital Budgets and Housing Revenue Account**

[Administration's Budget Proposal and amendment:](#)

- (a) The **Mayor** will invite Councillor Mears and Councillor Young to make their presentation to the Council and to move and second the Cabinet's budget, together with an amendment. Councillor Mears will have unlimited time and Councillor Young will have 5 minutes.

*[The Chief Finance Officer / Monitoring Officer shall have discretion at any stage to remind Members of the proposed substantive budget motion and its implications following acceptance of any amendments.]*

#### Joint Amendments Proposal:

- (b) The **Mayor** will invite Councillor Randall to move and Councillor Hamilton to second the Labour and Green Groups' joint amendment 1. Councillor Randall will have unlimited time to move the amendments and Councillor Hamilton will have 5 minutes within which to second the amendments.
- (c) The **Mayor** will invite Councillor Mitchell to move and Councillor Kitcat to second the Labour and Green Groups' joint amendment 2. Councillor Mitchell will have unlimited time to move the amendment and Councillor Kitcat will have 5 minutes within which to second the amendment.

#### Labour Group's Amendment Proposal:

- (d) The **Mayor** will invite Councillor Morgan, and Councillor Turton to respond and move their amendment. Councillor Morgan will have unlimited time to move the amendment and Councillor Turton will have 5 minutes within which to second the amendment and to refer to the prevailing financial conditions in relation to the budget.

*[The Chief Finance Officer / Monitoring Officer shall have discretion at any stage to remind Members of the proposed substantive budget motion and its implications following acceptance of any amendments.]*

#### Green Group's Amendments Proposal:

- (d) The **Mayor** will invite Councillor Kitcat and Councillor Randall to respond and move their amendments. Councillor Kitcat will have unlimited time to move the amendments and Councillor Randall will have 5 minutes within which to second the amendment and to refer to the prevailing financial conditions in relation to the budget.

*[The Chief Finance Officer / Monitoring Officer shall have discretion at any stage to remind Members of the proposed substantive budget motion and its implications following acceptance of any amendments.]*

#### Council Debate:

- (e) The **Mayor** will then allow Councillors to debate the proposed budget and the amendments.

**NOTE: Speakers are limited to five minutes each unless otherwise specified or extensions granted.**

#### Administration's Right of Reply:

- (f) At the conclusion of the debate the **Mayor** will invite Councillor Mears to give her final right of reply. Councillor Mears will have up to 5 minutes in which to give her reply.

## Voting on Amendments:

- (g) The Mayor will then put the amendments to the vote in the following order:
- (i) The Conservative Group amendment;
  - (ii) The Labour and Green Groups' Joint amendment 1
  - (iii) The Labour and Green Groups' Joint amendment 2;
  - (iv) The Labour Group amendment;
  - (v) The Green Group's amendment 1
  - (vi) The Green Group's amendment 2.

*The Chief Finance Officer / Monitoring Officer may advise the Mayor of the need for a short adjournment in order to adjust the budget model in light of amendments just agreed. The budget resolutions shall not be treated as concluded until any consequential adjustments are agreed.*

### *Additional guidance note regarding voting on amendments*

1. *Some of the proposed amendments use the same money for different purposes. Therefore if any amendment is voted through subsequent amendments may need to be changed.*
2. *The following amendments do not need to be changed regardless of the voting outcomes:*

*Conservative Amendment*

*Joint Labour / Green Amendment 1*

3. *The following amendments therefore may need to be changed:*
  - *Joint Labour / Green Amendment 2 if the Conservative Amendment is carried;*
  - *Labour Amendment if the Conservative Amendment is carried;*
  - *Green Amendment 1 if either the Joint Labour / Green Amendment 1 and/or the Joint Labour / Green Amendment 2 is carried;*
  - *Green Amendment 2 if Joint Labour / Green Amendment 2 is carried.*

*During the voting on the amendments if an amendment needs to be changed then there may need to be a short pause whilst further clarification is prepared by officers for Members.*

**Substantive Votes:**

(h) The **Mayor** will put the substantive motions (as amended) (if amended) to the meeting as follows:

Item 76(a) General Fund Revenue Budget & Council Tax 2011/12 recommendations 1-3 together with;

Item 76(b) Supplementary Financial Information for Budget Council recommendation 1;

Item 76(c) Capital Resources and Capital Investment Programme 2011/12 recommendation 1;

Item 76(d) Housing Revenue Account Budget 2011/12 recommendation 1.

*The Chief Finance Officer / Monitoring Officer may at any stage advise Members, especially if there is a need for consequential adjustment to parts of the budget resulting from the separate votes under 76(a), 76(b), 76(c) or 76(d).*

*Should Council fail to set the Council Tax on the 3rd March 2011 there is one significant practical implication; the contractor who prints and sends out the Council Tax bills has a slot booked to process the city council's bills on the 4 March and a delay in setting the Budget would significantly affect this process.*

Abraham Ghebre-Ghiorghis  
Head of Law  
(Monitoring Officer)

Catherine Vaughan  
Director of Finance  
(Chief Finance Officer)