



Brighton & Hove
City Council

Overview & Scrutiny

Title:	Scrutiny Panel on the Societal Impact of the In-Year Grant Reductions
Date:	29 October 2010
Time:	2.30pm
Venue	Committee Room 1, Hove Town Hall
Members:	Councillors: Watkins (Chairman), Mitchell and Wakefield-Jarrett
Contact:	Mary van Beinum Scrutiny Officer 01273 – 291062 e-mail mary.vanbeinum@brighton-hove.gov.uk

	The Town Hall has facilities for wheelchair users, including lifts and toilets
	An Induction loop operates to enhance sound for anyone wearing a hearing aid or using a transmitter and infra red hearing aids are available for use during the meeting. If you require any further information or assistance, please contact the receptionist on arrival.
	FIRE / EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE If the fire alarm sounds continuously, or if you are instructed to do so, you must leave the building by the nearest available exit. You will be directed to the nearest exit by council staff. It is vital that you follow their instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• You should proceed calmly; do not run and do not use the lifts;• Do not stop to collect personal belongings;• Once you are outside, please do not wait immediately next to the building, but move some distance away and await further instructions; and• Do not re-enter the building until told that it is safe to do so.

AGENDA

Part One	Page
1. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS	1 - 2
2. CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS	
3. TO NOTE INFORMATION PROVIDED TO PANEL SCOPING MEETING	3 - 20
4. FINANCIAL CONTEXT OF THE SCRUTINY REVIEW	
To follow	
5. REPORTS TO OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES AND EXTRACTS FROM THE DRAFT MINUTES	21 - 36
6. DISCUSSION WITH CHAIRMAN OF BRIGHTON & HOVE COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY SECTOR FORUM	
7. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT; SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT	37 - 40
8. UPDATE ON SUSSEX SAFER ROADS PARTNERSHIP (SSRP)	41 - 46
9. HOUSING AND PLANNING DELIVERY GRANT	47 - 48
10. PLAYBUILDER	49 - 50
11. DATE OF FUTURE MEETING	

The City Council actively welcomes members of the public and the press to attend its meetings and holds as many of its meetings as possible in public. Provision is also made on the agendas for public questions to committees and details of how questions can be raised can be found on the website and/or on agendas for the meetings.

The closing date for receipt of public questions and deputations for the next meeting is 12 noon on the fifth working day before the meeting.

Agendas and minutes are published on the council's website www.brighton-hove.gov.uk. Agendas are available to view five working days prior to the meeting date.

Meeting papers can be provided, on request, in large print, in Braille, on audio tape or on disc, or translated into any other language as requested.

For further details and general enquiries about this meeting contact Mary van Beinum,

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

(email mary.vanbeinum@brighton-hove.gov.uk) or email scrutiny@brighton-hove.gov.uk

Date of Publication – 26 October 2010

AGENDA ITEM 1

PROCEDURAL BUSINESS.

A. Declaration of Substitutes

Substitutes are not allowed on Scrutiny Select Committees or Scrutiny Panels.

B. Declarations of Interest

- (1) To seek declarations of any personal or personal & prejudicial interests under Part 2 of the Code of Conduct for Members in relation to matters on the Agenda. Members who do declare such interests are required to clearly describe the nature of the interest.
- (2) A Member of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission, an Overview and Scrutiny Committee or a Select Committee has a prejudicial interest in any business at meeting of that Committee where –
 - (a) that business relates to a decision made (whether implemented or not) or action taken by the Executive or another of the Council's committees, sub-committees, joint committees or joint sub-committees; and
 - (b) at the time the decision was made or action was taken the Member was
 - (i) a Member of the Executive or that committee, sub-committee, joint committee or joint sub-committee and
 - (ii) was present when the decision was made or action taken.
- (3) If the interest is a prejudicial interest, the Code requires the Member concerned:-
 - (a) to leave the room or chamber where the meeting takes place while the item in respect of which the declaration is made is under consideration. [There are three exceptions to this rule which are set out at paragraph (4) below].
 - (b) not to exercise executive functions in relation to that business and
 - (c) not to seek improperly to influence a decision about that business.
- (4) The circumstances in which a Member who has declared a prejudicial interest is permitted to remain while the item in respect of which the interest has been declared is under consideration are:-

(a) for the purpose of making representations, answering questions or giving evidence relating to the item, provided that the public are also allowed to attend the meeting for the same purpose, whether under a statutory right or otherwise, BUT the Member must leave immediately after he/she has made the representations, answered the questions, or given the evidence,

(b) if the Member has obtained a dispensation from the Standards Committee, or

(c) if the Member is the Leader or a Cabinet Member and has been required to attend before an Overview and Scrutiny Committee or Sub-Committee to answer questions.

C. Declaration of party whip

To seek declarations of the existence and nature of any party whip in relation to any matter on the Agenda as set out at paragraph 8 of the Overview and Scrutiny Ways of Working.

D. Exclusion of press and public

To consider whether, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted, or the nature of the proceedings, the press and public should be excluded from the meeting when any of the following items are under consideration.

NOTE: Any item appearing in Part 2 of the Agenda states in its heading the category under which the information disclosed in the report is confidential and therefore not available to the public.

A list and description of the exempt categories is available for public inspection at Brighton and Hove Town Halls.

AGENDA ITEM 3A

SCRUTINY PANEL ON THE SOCIETAL IMPACT OF 2010-2011 IN-YEAR BUDGET REDUCTIONS

**Panel Members: Councillors Janio, Mitchell,
Wakefield-Jarrett and Watkins**

Informal Scoping Meeting to be held on

Tuesday 12 October at 4pm in Kings House Room G7

DRAFT AGENDA

- 1) To elect Panel Chairman
- 2) To discuss the approach to the scrutiny review (outline attached)
- 3) Financial context: finance officers
- 4) Societal perspective
- 5) Further information/witnesses required
- 6) Arrangements for future meetings; dates and venues

Scrutiny Panel on Societal Impact of the In-Year Budget Reductions

Aim of the scrutiny review

Following agreement for scrutiny investigation at 15 July full council, a Scrutiny Panel was then approved by Overview and Scrutiny Commission on 20 July to investigate the Societal Impact of the In-Year Budget Reductions.

The Panel's recommendations will be used to help inform the 2011-2012 and future budget decisions in light of significant further anticipated cuts.

Chronology

Date	
10 June	Announcement of details of in-year grant reductions by Secretary of State for Communities & Local Government. Briefing note sent to all Councillors
14 June	All Party Budget Review Group discussion on government proposals
17 June	Cabinet receives report on in-year grant reductions and decides on the principles for dealing with the reductions
21 June	Leaders Group to receive an update on the implications for the council
22 June	Emergency National Budget
w/b 28 June	All Party Budget Review Group further discussion on the implications for the council and papers for full Council meeting
15 July	Full Council debates government proposals and the implications for the council
19 July	Leaders Group Circulation of final July Cabinet decision-making report on budget changes needed to match in-year grant reductions reflecting where appropriate the debate at full Council on 15 th July
22 July	Cabinet - Decisions on the in-year budget savings package (report extracts, attached)

Scope of the Review

To consider:

- 1) Background - financial context for the City
Scale, timeframe for the in-year reductions
- 2) Individual service areas affected by in-year grant reductions
- 3) Main areas of questioning:
Background to the services - aims and objectives of the funding
Current situation; how and when reductions are being actioned
Issues in implementing the changes?
- 4) Assessing the potential societal impacts of the reductions including EIAs
- 5) Panel recommendations to be endorsed by Overview and Scrutiny Commission and passed to Cabinet

Information from:

- e-mail all City Councillors for information/invitation
 - Invitation to Cabinet Member for Finance
 - Senior budget holders for the services
 - Third Sector representative organisations in relevant areas
-
- Education
 - Transport
 - Supporting People Administration
 - Home Office funding and Prevent
 - LABGI
 - Playbuilder
 - Housing & Planning Delivery
 - Free Swimming

Desired outcomes

Overview of implementing the 2010-2011 in-year savings

Assessing the societal impacts of budget changes

Findings to inform the future budget process

Timetable

--Public meeting dates in late October/during November; to be confirmed.

Possibly Tues 4th Nov 2pm; Tues 9 Nov 10am or 4pm Hove Town Hall

--To report to Overview and Scrutiny Commission on 14 December 2010

**EXTRACT FROM 22 JULY CABINET REPORT:
'2010/2011 IN-YEAR GOVERNMENT GRANT REDUCTIONS**

£1.580m reduction (24%) in Area Based Grant (ABG) funding received from the Department of Education (DoE).

3.14 There are a number of areas of work funded by ABG where the government is signalling changes in policy direction and long term reductions in funding which the council needs to anticipate and respond to. There are summarised below:

- **Connexions service - £500,000 reduction**
There are strong indications that the government will move from a Connexions service in its current form and shift responsibility for statutory information advice and guidance (formerly known as Careers guidance) directly to schools. It is likely that the rest of the grant will be vulnerable in the longer term. The reduction anticipates this change while protecting that element of the service that we assume will continue. This will mean de-commissioning some of the targeted services provided and this will impact on both council and community and voluntary sector provision. This reduction is in addition to the £200,000 reduction in spend on the Connexions service agreed as part of the budget setting process for 2010/11.
- **School improvement £435,000 reduction**
A fundamental shift in the local authority's relationship with schools is expected which will be matched by long term funding reductions particularly for the local authority's school improvement function. The local authority's role will become more strategic and its operational service will be focused on schools with the greatest need (ie low levels of attainment or in an Ofsted category). The proposed reduction in ABG will therefore be managed as part of an overall review of the CYPT's school improvement function to ensure a core offer is available to schools in need and will involve consulting with schools about the viability of offering a buy back service. This review will include the management of the reduction of central support for the National Strategies which are due to end in March 2011 anyway.
- **Extended schools £48,000 reduction**
We anticipate that in the future the government will only fund the childcare element of extended schools funding through local authorities and it will be up to schools to determine what their extended offer should be. The proposed reduction of 15% in this area is considered to be a reasonable interim step.

Further savings have been identified as follows;

- Children's Fund grant allocation has £167,000 uncommitted
- A review of 14-19 provision following the council taking on responsibility from the Learning & Skills Council in April this year has resulted in £30,000 efficiency savings.

- £115,000 can be achieved through releasing projected underspends against the grant funding, not recruiting to existing vacancies and smaller efficiencies savings.

In addition £195,000 of Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) will be used to protect all of the funding currently in ABG for the Autistic Spectrum Condition support service, speech therapy services and a learning mentor in the Behaviour & Attendance team. A further £90,000 of DSG has been earmarked to support ABG reductions as a whole.

£105,000 reduction (26.5%) in Road Safety Grant Revenue plus £88,000 in Road Safety Grant Capital (100%)

- 3.15 This overall 40% reduction in grant will be passed on to the Road Safety Partnership who will need to reprioritise within the reduced funding available. Given the severity of the reduction, discussions are now underway with West and East Sussex County Councils, Sussex Police Authority and Her Majesty's Court Service and Sussex Safer Roads Partnership, to determine the future viability of the Partnership and implications of the pan Sussex road safety programme. Proposals will be developed by the end of July.

£30,000 reduction (7.8%) in Home Office funding and £56,000 reduction (29%) in Prevent Grant

- 3.16 These savings will be achieved through a combination of additional income, efficiency savings and a reduction in specific projects to be agreed in consultation with the community.

£164,000 reduction (100%) in Supporting People Administration

- 3.17 The government's expectation is that Supporting People Administration could be incorporated into the administration of other related activities. In the short term this will be funded from an underspend that is created through low utilisation/voids in some services, re-charging and also an additional saving that was created due to decommissioning a service earlier than planned. £119,000 of the reduction will be funded from underspends in the Supporting People welfare grant and the remaining £45,000 from the Housing Strategy revenue budget. There is no reduction in any current funding levels for any of our Supporting People services in this financial year so there will be no impact on existing services. As part of the planning for the 2011/12 budget consideration will be given to how the administration of Supporting People could be delivered alongside other services to achieve this saving on a recurrent basis.

£120,000 reduction (100%) in Housing & Planning Delivery Grant

- 3.18 The original intention of Housing and Planning Delivery Grant was to act as an incentive to local authorities to bring forward housing and prepare the ground for increased delivery but is now considered by the Government to be an ineffective and excessively complex incentive. Therefore on value for

money grounds the council will reduce its related staffing expenditure accordingly and consider alternative models for meeting its aspirations in respect of housing numbers.

£125,000 reduction (65%) in Free Swimming Grant

- 3.19 This reduction assumes free swimming for Under 16s and Over 60s stops at the end of July. One off funding of £25,000 will be drawn from the risk provision to take this to the beginning of September in order to ensure that free swimming for both age groups can take place throughout the school holidays as this has already been publicised to families and carers. In addition the PCT has committed to provide £38,500 funding to enable free swimming for Under 11s to continue until the end of March 2011 as part of their work on reducing obesity in this age group. A further £8,000 will need to be provided by the Council to put this in place.

£171,000 reduction (100%) in LABGI funding

- 3.20 This funding had not yet been committed so there is no impact on services of this reduction.

£1.240m reduction (76% of Integrated Transport capital grant funding) for Local Transport Plan (LTP)

- 3.21 This has been a particularly difficult area to make the required funding reductions due to earlier reductions in the LTP programme, contractual commitments, match funding requirements particularly for the projects with Civitas and Cycle England, essential highway maintenance and the need to prioritise road safety.

£431,000 will be saved by deferring projects that have not yet commenced with a view to re-profiling them into future year's programmes should they still remain a priority.

- Final minor works at the North Street Scheme (£42,000)
- New Road/Church Street Scheme (£55,000)
- A 50% reduction in funding set aside for the Queen's Park Safer Routes to Schools Scheme, which is currently out for consultation (£55,000)
- East Street Walking Scheme (£250,000)
- Walking Facilities – Dropped Kerbs (£29,000)

The following capital budgets totalling £115,000 will be removed or reduced:

- Design of future schemes (£35,000)
- Contingency for residual spend on completed schemes (£79,000)
- Other public transport information will be reduced by £4,000 with £2,000 transferred to pedestrian signing and £1,000 accessible bus stops (£1,000)

As this is somewhat short of the funding reduction required alternative funding sources have been identified to safeguard other important pieces of work:

- the Woodingdean Crossroads scheme which is considered essential to maintain effective traffic flows once the Community Stadium is operational through capital receipts funding connected to the sale of land at Park Wall Farm, Falmer (£410,000)
- ensure no cuts to the street lighting budget through use of a windfall capital receipt in relation to successful legal challenge on the coast protection scheme (£150,000)
- a further contribution from the coast protection monies to support the Bridges/Structures budget (14,000)
- fund the statutory Highways Asset Management Plan from revenue resources through reprioritising some minor highways works (£120,000)

The revised LTP programme is shown at APPENDIX 2. [See below MvB]

Impact of the further announcements in from the Department for Education made on the 14th July

3.22 Further announcements have been made by the Department for Education (DfE), Those in respect of capital have been particularly complex and have been gradually clarified but are not yet necessarily fully understood at the time of writing this report. They have been summarised at APPENDIX 3. [See below MvB] The government is making reductions in co location projects but the Whitehawk Co-location project is sufficiently well progressed that it will not be one of the projects to be cut. The project is on target to meet its aims and will therefore be one of 98 projects to receive continued funding. Most other funding reductions are still being analysed at the time of writing this report. Any further updates will be provided to Cabinet orally at the meeting. In many cases the DfE is withdrawing funding for specific schemes and this will mean they are unable to go ahead. The only area where it is proposed for the Council to provide additional funding to offset the lost grant is the £61,000 reduction in the Youth Capital Fund. It is proposed that the council replaces this grant reduction from its one off risk provision in order to minimise the impact on the community and voluntary sector of the 28 one-off projects funded from this source. If this was not done there is a risk that a significant number of those projects would be unable to go ahead. It is proposed that the relevant Cabinet Member Meetings take any necessary decisions on reductions in expenditure that may be required as a result of this.

Removal of ringfences

3.23 It is not proposed to make use of the additional flexibility provided by the removal of ringfences on certain grants because these remain priority areas for expenditure. This means for example that there will be no reduction in planned expenditure on HIV/AIDS support grant.

APPENDIX 2

LTP CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2010/11

SCHEME	Original Allocation (£000s)	Revised LTP funding (£000s)	Other funding (£000s)
MAINTENANCE			
Completed Works	Footway Maintenance	50	50
Committed Spend	Essential Road Maintenance	200	200
	Highway Asset Management Plan	120	0
Rolling Programmes	Highway Maintenance (carriageway)	160	160
	Street Lighting	150	0
	Bridges/Structures	50	36
MAINTENANCE SUB-TOTAL		£730	£446
INTEGRATED TRANSPORT			
Completed Works/Spend	Cycling Routes A23 ATC	150	150
	Other Public Transport Information	20	16
Commitments to ongoing projects from 2009/10	North Street	450	408
	New Road/Church Street junction and crossing	60	5
	Pedestrian Signing	0	2
	Accessible Bus Stops	0	1
Commitments to Casualty Reduction including LAA target	Road Safety Engineering	272	272
	Safer Routes to School	110	55
Committed Match Funding and Partnership Projects	Travel info - cycle counters (Civitas)	13	13
	Bike off (Civitas)	11	11
	Cyclist Signing	0	0
	Cycling Facilities - Cycle parking	110	110
	Travel Awareness	80	80
	Individualised Travel Choices	80	80
	Business Travel Plan Funding	35	35
	Emissions VMS (Civitas)	28	28
	School Travel Plan	25	25
	Walking Network East St	267	17
	Missing Links Funding (ROWIP)	10	10
Rolling Programme of	Walking Facilities - Dropped Kerbs	29	0

Works			
	Easy Access Route (ROWIP)	0	0
	Access to Rail	0	0
	Scoping/design of future schemes (including BSG)	50	15
	Completion of committed 2009/10 schemes	79	0
	Journey Time Analysis	0	0
New Construction Works	Woodingdean Crossroads	410	0
	INTEGRATED TRANSPORT SUB-TOTAL	£2,289	£1,333
	INTEGRATED TRANSPORT & MAINTENANCE SUB-TOTAL	£3,019	£1,779

REDUCTION IN GRANT FUNDING

£1,240

REVISED BUDGET

£1,779 £1,779

APPENDIX 3

Latest Department for Education Grant announcements

Government Department and name of grant	2010/11 Original Grant £'000	2010/11 Revised Grant £'000	Change in grant allocation £'000	% Change
Revenue Grants				
Department for Education				
Local Delivery Support Grant (Note 1)	194	136	-58	-30%
Youth Capital Fund (Note 2)	122	61	-61	-50%
Extended Schools Capital (Note 3)	183	83	-100	-55%
Harnessing Technology Grant (Note 4)	660	332	-328	-50%
Targeted Capital Fund (funded over 2 years) (Note 4)	8,000	7340	-660	-8%
Sure Start (Note 5)	3,801	3,501	-300	-8%
Playbuilder (Note 6)	598	?	?	?
Total Additional Estimated Reduction				

Note 1: Delivery Support Grant

The Local Delivery Support Grant is provided to local authorities to help with preparation for the delivery of 14 to 19 Education Reforms. Allocations are based on the number of young people in each authority area and the number of new Diploma lines offered for the first time in each authority. The allocation has been reduced as part of the DfE's scaling back of support for delivery of Diplomas. The providers have been informed of the revised allocation and are confident that the Diplomas can still be provided within this reduced budget.

Note 2: Youth Capital Funding

This fund has been used to allocate funding to small groups for one-off capital projects. The government announcement anticipated that local authorities would honour all existing commitments in this area.

Note 3: Extended Schools Capital

The impact of this is still being analysed.

Note 4: Harnessing Technology Grant

This grant is mainly delegated to schools. The impact of this is still being analysed.

Note 5: Targeted Capital Fund (TCF)

TCF funding paid to local authorities not in BSF is to be cut by roughly £660k per LA. This will affect Brighton & Hove as we did receive this funding (£8 million over 2 years). The impact of this is still being analysed.

Note 6: Sure Start

The Department for Education has announced its intention to manage down the capital expenditure from the Sure Start Early Years & Childcare Grant. The proposal is to identify any projects not yet fully contracted. In Brighton & Hove, all Children's Centres projects are contracted and the budget is fully allocated. The latest advice is that 3 Early Years projects have been allowed to proceed. However the Bevendean Children's association project can only partially proceed saving £0.14m. A further unallocated contingency of £0.16m has been removed giving an estimated total reduction of £0.3m. All of this is still subject to final confirmation.

Note 7: Playbuilder

The original CLG announcement on 10th June included the un-ringfencing of the Playbuilder grant but at that time the funding level was unchanged. Originally the intention was that this flexibility would not be used to protect the current schemes under consultation. This was set out at Council on 15th July. However, in recent days the Department for Education has instructed local authorities not to incur any future contractual liabilities in relation to Playbuilder. The Council has £0.598m allocated in 2010/11. However the funding is now being cut and this will change the position. The amount of the reduction is not yet known.

**SCRUTINY PANEL ON THE SOCIETAL IMPACT
OF 2010-2011 IN-YEAR BUDGET REDUCTIONS**

Notes of Informal Scoping Meeting

Tuesday 12 October at 4pm in Kings House Room G7

- 1) Panel Members are Councillors Janio, Mitchell, Wakefield-Jarrett and Watkins (Chairman)
- 2) Approach to the scrutiny review

The 2011/2012 budget proposals will be scrutinised from December 2010 as in previous years by the Overview and Scrutiny Committees and the Overview and Scrutiny Commission, whose recommendations will pass to Cabinet.

Therefore this Panel is to focus only on the specific grants affected by the 2010-2011 in-year reductions and the potential impact of these; in the context of future cuts to be announced imminently in the General Spending Review.

Investigate the aims and objectives of these particular grants; and support received from other sources plus the potential impact of in-year reductions.

Outcomes from this review will be a wider understanding of size, aims and objectives of the specific grant funding streams and how to deal with specific grant cuts and the role of partners. Together with views on how different groups receiving these services are affected by a reduction or withdrawal of the service.

Recommendations will help inform future budget process and intelligent commissioning.

Members requested detailed information on all the affected budgets to be sent prior to the next Panel meeting including Equalities Impact Assessments.

Main areas of questioning for officers/ third sector:

What was the preparation process before and after the Cabinet decision of 22nd July?

To what extent can the impact be judged prior to taking a decision? And afterwards? In the short term and longer term.

What are the aims and objective of the budgets that were affected by the in-year grant reductions?

What was the in-year reduction in monetary terms and as % of original grant?

How are funding streams affected by the removal of ring-fencing and how does that affect decisions made?

How to deal with joint programmes with partnership organisations including eg matched funding?

What has been done in implementing the changes so far? What is happening now?

What have been the key issues in making the cuts? (challenges eg contractual; plus opportunities)

To help understand potential impacts - how can the effects of the reductions be mitigated?

How has EqIA work been considered? What groups or categories of groups were, or could be, affected? Views on how these in-year budget cuts could potentially impact on groups? Short-term and longer term.

How to ensure groups in receipt of grants via different Council services and/or partner organisations are not disproportionately affected. i.e. linking cuts decisions within the Council and with partner organisations?

3) Financial context:

This situation was very unusual as the reductions announcements were made mid-year. There will be issues common to all grant reductions and some issues that are specific to particular circumstances of a grant.

There are potentially many at risk grant funding streams that may not be known until near the end of the financial year. The Council is in receipt of around 200 central government grant streams; some of these are not well known. Total assumed grant loss for 2011/2012 is more than £10 million, based on a 20% reduction in Area Based Grant.

A great deal of work was done in the weeks prior to the decision on in-year reductions but it is impossible to assess every single funding combination. The societal outcome from an investment can't be proven. But a good understanding is the bigger part of budget planning.

Officers analyse all the grant funding streams but the decisions on options are political decisions.

The principle is to protect front-line services as a priority. We have the benefit of the CVSF who were able to give their areas of concern and more than 90% of these areas were protected.

Local authorities generally are likely to be struggling with complicated choices; what process do they use when services may be withdrawn at short notice?

What examples of good practice are there, in terms of assessing options and societal impact?

There will always be alternatives and where there are multiple options it can be unnecessarily destructive to consult too early. For the future, analysis of needs and societal impacts will be key in the new commissioning model. But in the interim up to 2012/2013 we have to deal with a degree of lack of synchronisation between funding and allocation and still produce as fair and as robust decisions as possible.

Best financial advice is that if national grant funding is reduced then, unless shown otherwise, the activity or service ends or reduces accordingly.

There has been much focus on Connexions, involving a private sector partner which has been particularly complex and where there have been difficulties in terms of contracts. Removal or reduction of funding produces different strains on different service areas depending on the specific grant.

4) Societal perspective

The Panel can focus on what worked well. Also can consider the potential impact now and look at factors to mitigate against the reduction of grant.

The CVSF would be well-placed in a coordinating role to send information to providers about the Panel and also give information to the Panel on how the reductions have been implemented and views on the impacts.

5) Further information/witnesses required

Finance Officers – written detail of the grants

CVSF

Cabinet Members and lead officers

Other Local authorities

6) Arrangements for future meetings; dates and venues

October 29th 2.30pm HTH CC

Potential dates

4 November 2pm HTH CR3

23 November 2pm HTH CC

Grant Reductions 2010/11 as Reported to 22 July Cabinet

REVENUE	Grant Allocation £000	Grant Reduction £000	Percentage Reduction %
Area Based Grant			
Department for Education	6,583	1,580	24%
Department for Transport	396	105	27%
Home Office	385	30	8%
Communities & Local Government	357	220	62%
Other Grants			
Local Delivery Support Grant	194	58	30%
Housing & Planning Delivery Grant	120	120	100%
Local Authority Business Growth Incentive Scheme	172	172	100%
Free Swimming	192	125	65%
sub-total revenue	8,399	2,410	
CAPITAL			
Road Safety	88	88	100%
Integrated Transport Block	1,632	1,240	76%
Extended Schools Capital	183	100	55%
Harnessing Technology Grant	660	328	50%
Targeted Capital Fund (14-19 diploma & SEN)	6,000 ¹	660	11%
Sure Start Capital Allocation	3,801	140 ²	4%
Playbuilder	598	527 ³	88%
Youth Capital Fund	122	61	50%
sub-total capital	13,084	3,144	
Total	21,483	5,554	

¹ Cabinet report stated £8M as the budget over two years, the 2010/11 allocation was £6M.

² Original reduction reported was £300k, this was reduced by £160K to allow a contingency sum to be retained within the programme

³ At the time of the Cabinet report the exact reduction was not known. This has since been confirmed and reported to Cabinet as part of TBM 4 in September

SCRUTINY PANEL

Agenda Item 5A

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject: In –year Grant Reductions 2010-11

Date of Meeting: ASCHOSC 9 September 2010 (Item 22)
Scrutiny Panel 29 October 2010

Report of: The Acting Director of Housing, Culture & Enterprise

Contact Officer: Name: Narinder Sundar Tel: (29)3887
E-mail: narinder.sundar@brighton-hove.gov.uk

Wards Affected: All

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 The Secretary of State for Communities & Local Government announced details of 2010/11 in-year grant reductions for all local authorities on 10 June. These totalled £3.55m for Brighton & Hove City Council covering both revenue and capital grants. There was a further announcement of a reduction in grant received from the Department for Culture, Olympics, Media and Sport on 17 June. On the 5 July the Secretary of State for Education announced reductions to the Education Capital programme relating to the Building Schools for the Future and Academies programme as well as high level reductions in the End Year Flexibility (EYF) allocations. Further details of the EYF allocations were announced on 14 July.
- 1.2 The in-year budget reductions have been considered by Full Council and the Cabinet.
- 1.3 The Overview and Scrutiny Commission (OSC) has considered all of the planned in-year grant reductions as a whole. The OSC has asked each Overview and Scrutiny Committee to individually consider the in-year grant reductions for their departments.
- 1.4 A Scrutiny Review Panel is being set up to consider all of the in-year budget cuts and their effects on Brighton & Hove City Council services.
- 1.5 For the Adult Social Care and Housing Overview and Scrutiny Committee, the only relevant in-year grant reduction is in terms of the Supporting People Administration Grant. This is being reduced by £164,000, which is 100% of the grant.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

2.1 That members:

- (1) Note the report;
- (2) and consider whether to refer any issues to the Scrutiny Review panel that will be considering the reductions in detail.

3. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 3.1 There will be a £164,000 reduction (100%) in the Supporting People Administration Grant from central Government.
- 3.2 The government's expectation is that Supporting People Administration could be incorporated into the administration of other related activities. The in-year cut to the Supporting People Administration Grant will be funded from an underspend that is created through low utilisation/voids in some services, re-charging, subsidy payments and a saving generated as a result of one service closing earlier than planned. There is no reduction in any current funding levels for any of our Supporting People services in this financial year and therefore there will be no impact on existing services.
- 3.3 As part of the planning for the 2011/12 budget consideration will be given to how the administration of Supporting People could be delivered alongside other services across the Housing Strategy Division to achieve this saving on a recurrent basis.
- 3.4 The Supporting People Commissioning Body is the key decision making body that governs and oversees implementation of the Supporting People Strategy. Its key role is to direct the administering authority on the use and application of the Supporting People grant, ensuring expenditure profile is prudent and taking into account existing and proposed commitment to fund services. The Commissioning Body's role is also to identify opportunities for joint commissioning of services and collaborative working with key partners in Health and Probation to commission services. Membership includes representation of Chief Officers from Primary Care Trust, Probation, Housing Strategy and it is chaired by the Cabinet Member for Housing.
- 3.5 Communities and Local Government commissioned a report into the financial benefits of the Supporting People Programme in 2007. This research indicated that for every £1.61 spent on Supporting People services there was a £3.41 benefit for this

investment. The methodology developed is based on the projected costs of alternative, appropriate support if Supporting People services were not available. The projected costs take into account costs for housing departments, Department of Work & Pensions, Health and other social costs such as crime and homelessness. This methodology has been applied to the local Supporting People Programme in Brighton and Hove and identified a benefit of £3.24 for every £1.00 spent on Supporting People services locally.

- 3.6 Local Authorities will receive an announcement on future allocation of the Supporting People Welfare Grant from April 2011 onwards after the Spending Review in October 2010. In previous years, allocations have been made on a 3-year basis and for 2008-11 we received an 11% cut over 3 years.
- 3.7 At a national level, National Housing Federation, SITRA and Homeless Link (all member organisations for supported housing) have published a joint submission to Communities and Local Government that presents a business case for ongoing investment in housing-related support. It also includes a number of recommendations to the Spending Review to maintain the same levels of investment in housing-related support and homelessness services that meet the support needs of vulnerable people that offer good outcomes, prevention through early intervention and value for money.

4. CONSULTATION

- 4.1 There has been early consultation with the Trades Unions on the in-year grant reductions. Statutory consultation will be required with staff affected and the Trades Unions once the detailed proposals are agreed. Preliminary discussions have taken place with Sussex Police, the Community & Voluntary Sector Forum and the Primary Care Trust on the potential implications for services that are jointly funded. These will need to be continued as more detailed information on implementation is developed,

5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

- 5.1 These are contained in the main body of the report.

Finance Officer Consulted: James Hengeveld Date: 19 July 2010

Legal Implications:

- 5.2 The respective powers of Council and Cabinet in the decision-making process are set out in the body of the report. The details of how the in year reductions announced by the government are implemented in Brighton & Hove is a matter for the City

council's discretion. In exercising its discretion, the council is required to act reasonably. This includes a requirement not to fetter its discretion by adopting rigid/inflexible rules or policies, the need to consider the particular circumstances of each service affected, the need to undertake any necessary consultation with those affected where relevant and proportionate given the practical limitation imposed by time. Above all, the council needs to show that it considered all available options with an open mind. The council should also avoid taking any action that involves a breach of its statutory duty or failure to provide services that are mandatory.

Lawyer Consulted: Abraham Ghebre-Ghiorghis
2010

Date: 19 July

Equalities Implications:

5.3 Equalities implications have been taken into account when prioritising the areas for grant reductions.

Sustainability Implications:

5.4 None have been identified.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

5.5 None have been identified.

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

5.6 5.6 As part of the process of drawing up the proposed expenditure reductions risk implications have been taken into account for example:

- Considering any legal and contractual implications
- Considering the implications on wider schemes particularly provided by the community and voluntary sector
- The lead in times required for delivery of savings

The one off risk provision of £0.5m has been set aside to deal with any residual risks that may arise during the detailed implementation of the proposals and any unforeseen delays.

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

5.7 Covered in the body of the report.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

1.

Documents in Members' Rooms:

Background Documents:

1.

EXTRACT FROM DRAFT MINUTES OF 9 SEPTEMBER ASCHOSC

22 IN-YEAR GRANT REDUCTIONS - ADULT SOCIAL CARE & HOUSING

22.1 Jugal Sharma, Assistant Director of Housing, presented the report and answered questions from the Committee. Mr Sharma said that the £164.000 reduction represented 1-2% of the total supporting people grant for the city. Members heard that an equality impact assessment had been undertaken before making the reductions.

22.2 Members asked whether the council could add its voice to the calls asking for the Supporting People grant to remain ringfenced. Any loss of funding would impact on the most vulnerable residents in the city. The committee was told that Councillor Maria Caulfield was very keen to see the Supporting People programme stay intact; representations had been made to central Government.

22.3 Members asked where the underspend had come from? They heard that a service closure had taken place as a third sector hostel had had a serious fire and so the council funding was returned. Another third sector provider had returned funding as they had been unable to fill accommodation places that had been funded by the council.

Central Government expected the service to be mainstreamed in the long-term and the department was making provision for how to meet the underspend in future years.

22.4 There seemed to be a contradiction between points 3.2 and 3.3; were posts at risk? Mr Sharma said that 'consultation' was a formal process that had to be followed but it had found that there would be no impact on jobs or on front line services.

22.5 **RESOLVED** - to refer the report to the Scrutiny Review Panel, noting the Committee's concerns as to how the funding will be met next year. It was agreed that the relevant minutes from this committee would be forwarded to the Panel.

Subject: Free Swimming Initiative
Date of Meeting: CTEOSC 30 September 2010 (Item 23)
Scrutiny panel 29 October 2010
Report of: The Acting Director of Environment
Contact Officer: Name: Toby Kingsbury Tel: 29-2701
E-mail: toby.kingsbury@brighton-hove.gov.uk
Wards Affected: All

FOR GENERAL RELEASE**1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:**

- 1.1 The Culture, Tourism and Enterprise Overview and Scrutiny Committee have requested an update following the end of the Free Swimming Initiative for over 60s and children aged 16 and under.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 Members are requested to note the success of the Free Swimming Initiative and are advised of the extended version of the scheme as detailed below.

3. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 3.1 The Council opted into the Free Swimming Initiative for over 60s and children 16 and under and were one of only two local authorities in Sussex to offer the full scheme to both age groups. The initiative was funded by central government through the Department for Culture, Media and Sport and was supported further in Brighton and Hove through funding from NHS Brighton and Hove.
- 3.2 The Free Swimming Initiative was initially planned to be funded for two years from 1st April 2009 to 31st March 2011 but in June 2010 the government announced that funding would cease on 31st July 2010.
- 3.3 Before the end of the initiative, the Council announced that with continued funding from NHS Brighton and Hove, the initiative would

continue for the remainder of the school summer holidays and would be extended for children aged 11 and under until 31st March 2011.

- 3.4 The reason for retaining the initiative for children aged 11 and under is that this age group are a key target group for NHS Brighton and Hove in their strategy to tackle childhood obesity in the city.
- 3.5 Officers have undertaken some research into extended initiatives offered by other local authorities across the South East. Of the 18 local authorities researched, 6 extended their existing initiative through the school summer holidays. Brighton & Hove is the only authority to have extended an initiative to the end of the current financial year.

Participation levels in Brighton and Hove

- 3.6 A total of 14,418 children aged 16 and under and 4,778 over 60s were registered for free swimming up until 31st July 2010.
- 3.7 There were a total of 79,675 individual swims from children 16 and under and 56,059 from over 60s. When compared to before the initiative started, these figures represent an increase in the number of swims of approximately 24% for those aged 16 and under and 17% for those over 60.

Impact of the scheme's withdrawal

- 3.8 The initiative being prematurely ceased will obviously impact most upon those who enjoyed its benefits i.e over 60s and children aged 16 and under, particularly those on low income. The extent of the impact is difficult to predict and will only become apparent when we see the participation figures over the coming months and are able to make an accurate comparison.
- 3.9 The Council has been able to reduce this impact by extending the initiative until the end of the school summer holidays and also by retaining free swimming for children aged 11 and under until 31st March 2011.
- 3.10 Although there will inevitably be a drop-off in the number of swimmers as a result of the initiative being withdrawn, it is hoped that many of those who have enjoyed free swimming will have developed a swimming habit and will be more likely to continue despite having to pay for it.

Plans for the future

- 3.11 The extended initiative (free swimming for those aged 11 and under) is planned to cease on 31st March 2011. Before this date the Council will

consult with NHS Brighton and Hove to explore what future funding might be available and assess the possibility of continuing the initiative in some form.

- 3.12 Regardless of any free swimming initiatives, the King Alfred, Prince Regent and St Luke's continue to operate a concessionary pricing structure designed to help minimise the cost of swimming for people over 60 and children 16 and under.
- 3.13 The Council are also looking to develop a leisure card scheme designed to allow access to facilities at a discounted rate for those residents in receipt of certain state benefits. This should help to improve participation levels and reduce inequality of access to the facilities.

4. CONSULTATION

- 4.1 Consultation was undertaken with NHS Brighton and Hove and DC Leisure when considering options to extend the scheme.

5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Financial Implications

Residual funding for the 2010/11 financial year totals £133,486, from the remaining DCMS Grant (£67,486) and Brighton & Hove PCT ((£66,000)). The Council has committed £70,581 in payments to DC Leisure for the provision of free swimming, of which £11,323 is for under 11's for the period of September 2010 to March 2011.

The remaining funds of £62,905 will be allocated to the King Alfred Leisure Centre to recompense loss revenue through the provision of free swimming for the year April 2010 to March 2011.

There were 39,268 free swims for under 16s at the King Alfred in 2009/10 and records show that the majority of these were under 11 (97%). If (using the data in section 3.6) it is assumed that 76% of this group would pay to swim, this would equate to a loss of income through free swimming of £71,228. The number of free swims for the over 60 age group in the current financial year was 10,552, if 83% would have paid for the swim this would equate to lost income of £16,378.

Therefore the shortfall in recompense for loss of income to the King Alfred LC would equate to £24,701 which will be met from existing budgets within the department.

Finance Officer Consulted Name: Derek Mansfield Date 14/9/10

5.2 Legal Implications

The actions referred to in this report are considered to be reasonable given the circumstances of the funding situation.

Lawyer Consulted

Name Bob Bruce

Date 13/9/10

5.3 Equalities Implications

The cessation of the Free Swimming Initiative has reduced the accessibility of residents to access swimming facilities in Brighton and Hove. However, the extended scheme has minimised this by allowing children aged 11 and under to continue to swim for free until 31st March 2011.

5.4 Sustainability Implications

None.

5.5 Crime & Disorder Implications

Projects have shown that providing physical activity opportunities can help reduce crime within geographical areas. Therefore the withdrawal of free swimming could have a negative impact on the reduction of crime in the city.

5.6 Risk & Opportunity Management Implications

None

5.7 Corporate/Citywide Implications

The withdrawal of free swimming will make the facilities less accessible, particularly to those on low income and will not help towards the Council's objective of providing opportunities for healthy living.

EXTRACT FROM DRAFT MINUTES OF 30 SEPTEMBER CTEOSC

23. FREE SWIMMING INITIATIVE

23.1 Mr Toby Kingsbury, Sports Facilities Manager, told members that the BHCC was one of only two local authorities in Sussex to offer the full scheme to both over 60s and children aged 16 and under. The funding for this initiative had ceased in July 2010, but the Council had decided to continue the scheme for the remainder of the school summer holiday. This would be extended for children aged 11 and under until 31st March 2011, because reducing childhood obesity was a key target. The extension of free swimming had been made possible by the continued support funding of the PCT. Of the 18 authorities researched, BHCC was the only one who had extended this initiative to the end of the financial year.

23.2 Figures showed that there had been an increase in number of swims since the initiative started. It would be hard to measure the impact of ceasing the scheme, except for those aged 11 and under, until later in the year. The future of the scheme was uncertain, but the Council would talk to the PCT about it towards the close of the year. Mr Kingsbury also reminded the Committee of the intention to develop a leisure card scheme offering discounted rates for residents in receipt of certain benefits.

23.3 A question was asked about whether the abolition of PCTs, to be replaced by GPs consortia, would have an impact on sports provision. Ms Murray told members that talks needed to continue with those who would hold the finance. A member of CTEOSC suggested that the Council looked at the example of Tower Hamlets who offer swimming and gym use on prescription. Mr Kingsbury agreed to provide information about the funding and pricing of the GP referral scheme in the city. This currently operated for gyms but could be explored in relation to swimming. A letter had been received from the Older People's Council expressing its concern about the withdrawal of free swimming for the over 60s.

23.4 According to a member, a white paper was expected in the next 3 months which would give local authorities greater power in relation to public health. However, it was not clear whether this would attract additional funding.

23.5 RESOLVED – The Committee noted the success of the Free Swimming and were advised of the extended version of the scheme.

AGENDA ITEM 5E

EXTRACT FROM THE DRAFT MINUTES OF 15 SEPTEMBER CYPOSC

20.6 RESOLVED

- (1) The Committee agreed to have a short report summarising the main points of the Connexions savings and its impact on services before the next CYPOSC meeting, 10 November.

Equalities Impact Assessment – of proposed changes to the advisory service 2010

Aim of policy/Scope of current service:

Overall aims and purpose of current teams:

Purpose of the Advisory and Consultant Team for Secondary, Primary and Special Schools

All the team objectives fall within the **Schools, Learning and Skills Business Plan service improvement objectives**

1. Improve resources and the curriculum offered to provide better access to an appropriate education for all children and young people
2. To improve the overall effectiveness of schools, sixth forms and early years settings
3. To raise the achievement of children and young people and to narrow the gap between the achievement of those with disadvantage and the others
4. Improve **school climate and pupil well-being, leading to improved** attendance at school and reduced **exclusions**

In addition, they meet the priorities in the **CYPT School Improvement Strategy 2008-2013** to work with school staff, individually and in groups to:

- Develop and support the workforce;
- Develop better tracking and monitoring of pupil progress and teachers' understanding of appropriate interventions;
- Improve the quality of teaching and learning;
- Support schools in transforming their curriculum;
- Support the development of a good climate for learning and emotional intelligence in the whole school community;
- Further develop school inclusion.

The team objectives also match with **National Strategy Expected Outcomes** linked to: Improving teachers' understanding and use of progression and assessment; Developing pedagogy for personalisation - teaching and learning; Targeting intervention to tackle underachievement and Strengthening Leadership of Improvement and Practice Transfer.

Rationale for all teams

We believe that all children are entitled to an educational experience that ensures they achieve their full potential and build the foundations for life-long learning. We work to ensure teachers throughout all Phases are confident to plan learning experiences for the pupils that will motivate and engage, acknowledging their strengths and needs, and move their learning forward.

The core work of the team is to support schools in developing high quality teaching and learning, and work with all stakeholders to improve progress and attainment for all learners.

Key Changes	<p>The National Strategies is a government funded, time limited project, funded until March 31 2011. This proposal brings forward the end of the contracts to March 2011 to meet the in year savings due to the withdrawal of funding by the government. These proposals affect members of the Primary Strategy Team (six out of ten members), the Secondary Strategy Team (two out of three members), the Healthy Schools Team (three out of eight members), the Behaviour and Attendance Team (six out of 14 members) and the 14 – 19 team (three out of six members). Teams also include some secondees.</p>	
Different groups included in scope	<p>This assessment has considered the impact of vulnerable groups in the city. The proposals do not affect the teams that specifically work with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • children with English as an Additional Language, • children in care, • traveller children and young people • children and young people with special educational needs and • the two projects Every Child a Reader and Every Child counts which tackle underachievement at KS1. • One to one tuition coordination remains to support underachieving pupils. <p>Support and challenge on behalf of vulnerable groups remains in the form of schools' advisers and SIPs.</p>	
Potential impact	<p><u>Benefits of current service for the different groups</u></p> <p>Training and support for ensuring equalities forms part of all core work and development.</p> <p>Training and support for narrowing attainment gaps for vulnerable groups</p>	<p><u>Risks if provision is not provided as within the proposals</u></p> <p>The risk to vulnerable groups with this proposal is that headteachers may not be able source good quality</p>

	<p>(e.g. FSM, BME, gender, CiC)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - data analysis used to target interventions at appropriate pupils, including strategic implementation of 1-1 tuition and pedagogies; - schools supported to review curriculum and ensure vulnerable learners have appropriate learning opportunities and support planned; - personalised learning results from intelligent use of teacher assessment (AfL and APP) and progress is maximised for all learners; <p>Published reports such as The Standards Report, CYPT Performance Report and CYPT Board report provide specific performance figures and trends. They show that the various gaps in attainment are narrowing and overall achievement is improving. This is due to improved monitoring in schools, better quality first teaching and targeted challenge. These developments have been supported by the Service but the quality issues are the responsibility of headteachers and governors.</p>	<p>support where quality of teaching needs improvement</p> <p>These reports show that standards and achievement of vulnerable groups are rising. There is a risk that the quality of teaching may fall. However, schools are responsible for school improvement.</p>
<p>Mitigation of negative impact of the proposed changes</p>	<p>Staff in the learning school and skills branch of CYPT will be working with headteachers to develop processes, structures and training to enable schools to support schools with professional development. This strategy has already begun in acknowledgement that National Strategies funding was to cease in April. Good practice has been identified in schools and through use of secondments and leading teacher work training for school to school support has been undertaken.</p>	

	<p>The LA will retain the capacity to collect and interpret data to identify inequalities across the city and also within individual schools. Schools will continue to receive challenge and support in identifying improvement strategies.</p>
<p>Equalities issues within the proposals</p>	<p>The Advisory service has had an under-representation of men for many years. The ratio is approximately 4:1 women to men in the teams affected. Within these proposals the ratio is approximately 5:1. There is no gender inequality within these proposals.</p> <p>There is also underrepresentation of staff identifying as from BME groups or as having disabilities. There is no overrepresentation of these groups in the proposals.</p> <p>The age profile of those affected by the proposals is wide there is not a significant over representation of older people or those new in their career.</p>

Update on Sussex Safer Roads Partnership (SSRP)

A meeting with the Asst Chief Constable Sussex Police, LHA directors and HMCS on the 13th July confirmed the 58% reduction in funding for SSRP from the Specific Road Safety Grant made available to partnerships through the LHAS. This level of reduction was the result of the Government withdrawal of the capital grant, reduction of the revenue element by 27% (representing an average total grant reduction of 40%) and the previously agreed 18% grant withheld by the 3 Local Authorities.

As a result, the SSRP Strategy Sub-Group met to identify areas to negate the £400k gap between the latest business plan and the funding available. The plan was revised and a new conclusion on the budget requirements reached. A meeting of the SSRP staff at Shoreham identified further reductions and a new realignment of the budget.

Please see Activity Matrix Appendix 'A' that identifies the original business plan of £3.315m and the result of various cuts to reach the present business plan costs of £1.87m. It also shows the activities in priority order according to the 'points awarded' structure in respect of strategic priority value of each activity

The methodology employed to bridge the £400k gap, with Police support, was to utilise the anticipated Speed Awareness course surplus from this year. This figure is based upon the surplus from 2009/10 and is estimated at approximately £200k. Additionally, the Strategy Sub-Group agreed to widen the scope of the courses, raising the potential for another 8,000 clients per annum. When the normal ratio of accepted offers is applied, it is estimated that will translate into an additional £70k surplus.

Other adjustments have been made to the business plan, which include current vacant establishment posts not being filled in the Central Ticket Office, a reduction in consultancy hours and provision of cover for maternity leave. There is still a shortfall of approximately £45k in this year's expenditure forecast, but it is anticipated that there will be fluctuations in expenditure that may have a 'smoothing effect'.

CONSEQUENCE AND IMPACT OF CUTS

The savings of the latest round of cuts will compound the already significant impact on road safety being promoted by the Partnership.

For instance, since 1994 the introduction of cameras has contributed to the reduction of casualties across Sussex. On a rolling 12 month period, KSI casualties have been reduced at camera sites by 90 per annum, which is a 67% reduction from the 3 year baseline data. At fixed cameras this reduction is 72%. The former saving at all sites equates to a cost saving to society of £42m annually, using the DfT Highway Economic Notes (HEN) as a guide. It should be noted that any reduction in camera activity, including the long term effect of maintenance cuts, could lead to an increase in vehicle speeds, which in turn could lead to more serious injuries to road casualties. There is also

some jeopardy to the great opportunity, through referral, to educate drivers, via the Speed Awareness courses. These courses are an alternative method of case disposal and last year 7000 people benefitted from this form of driver education in Sussex. This is vital in trying to educate drivers and changing the culture regarding speeding to make it socially unacceptable viz a viz 'drink driving'.

Education is as important as enforcement and any further reduction in the current budget would mean a severe impact on delivery of schemes which are targeting key priority groups, regarded as the most vulnerable through data intelligence. Such Education projects delivered through the SSRP are those which were considered to have benefit across the whole Sussex area, as well as having the potential to be cost effectively delivered across Sussex, as opposed to on a local basis.

Specific projects for Brighton & Hove (non- pan Sussex or shared) that have been affected by the reduction in funding are:

- Child Pedestrian Trainer wages (no further funding from SSRP for the remainder of this financial year original support £22.5k – reduced by approx £14k)
- Biekeability Coordinator salary (funding reduced from £24k to £20k)
- Biekability Trainer mandatory assessments (funding withdrawn £1520)
- Speed Indicator Device (SID) Operator (salary for p/t operator funding withdrawn £11500) – vacancy now being held.
- White Nights event (funding withdrawn £8k)
- Warning Lights in Vicinity of Schools (funding withdrawn £7.7k)

NB.Brighton & Hove participate in several of the projects shown on Appendix A and the list above is purely those that are unique to B&H.

Early bookings and commitments were made by the SSRP Communications Manager to save money over the year, but there is now no funding available, which restricts the ability to support projects and events with additional marketing material once the current crop expires.

OPPORTUNITIES

There are potential revenue streams available through promotions such as the internationally award winning 'Embrace Life' video, which has potential customers world- wide, currently being primed.

Another is the development of the 'Routes' educational programme, with sales already agreed with Michelin and interest from as far afield as Australia. There is also an opportunity for international linkage on road safety research and evaluation due to this particular project.

The potential for centralising certain projects from an administrative perspective has already been outlined in Appendix 'A'. Speed awareness is

making significant progress in this field and will be looking to integrate by October.

There are opportunities to adopt a different style of marketing by utilising the internet in different forms, which has already proved its power by the success of 'Embrace Life'.

FURTHER WORK

The Strategy Group is identifying options for 2011/12, based on the Directors' meeting recommendations that funding scenarios of 0%, 25% and 50% be considered, with the aim of circulating a discussion document prior to the Leaders Group meeting, provisionally set for the 5th October. Although these levels of funding are purely hypothetical at this time, pending the Government's Autumn public spending review, it was felt that we should explore the options and have some provisional models for SSRP structure/function and to identify the risks and opportunities of each of these levels, ahead of any formal announcements or decisions regarding funding.

Phil Clarke

Road Safety Manager

18th August 2010

Sussex Safer Roads Partnership

2010/11 Activity Priority Matrix

APPENDIX A

Activity	Assessment	Original Planned Spend	Revised Planned Spend	Agreed Budget Reduction	Actual Spend 1st Qtr	Projected Spend to end of F/yr	Mimumum Required Budget	
Group								
Camera	21000	New camera equipment	£438,000	£38,000	£38,000	£0	£0	
Camera	21001	Camera & Data core busines	£1,887,900	£1,827,570	£391,744	£306,751	£1,129,075	£1,435,826
E&E	42001	Op Ride	£30,000	£25,000	£21,384	£1,866	£1,750	£3,616
ETP	52207	ROUTES	£25,000	£25,000	£4,983	£5,817	£14,200	£20,017
E&E	42003	Enforcement Equipment	£15,000	£15,000	£10,000	£0	£5,000	£5,000
Comms	31003	Comms cumulative activity	£265,000	£100,000	-£20,047	£112,047	£8,000	£120,047
ETP	52002	2 PCSO	£60,000	£60,000	£49,663	£6,837	£3,500	£10,337
E&E	41002	Casualty Reduction Initiatives	£20,000	£20,000	£19,988	-£4,988	£5,000	£12
E&E	41003	KSI Remedial Fund	£5,000	£5,000	-£8,192	£22,192	-£9,000	£13,192
ETP	52003	Ped Trainers Part Time	£78,013	£78,050	£60,432	£14,618	£3,000	£17,618
ETP	51006	FRS RS Coordinator	£26,000	£26,000	£5,000	£0	£21,000	£21,000
ETP	51008	Coaching for safer Sussex	£30,000	£30,000	£5,000	£0	£25,000	£25,000
ETP	52004	COSTS	£30,000	£30,000	£23,190	£2,810	£4,000	£6,810
E&E	42005	Bikesafe	£30,000	£30,000	£15,000	£0	£15,000	£15,000
E&E	42006	Make the commitment 'Kill You	£20,000	£20,000	-£7	£6,807	£13,200	£20,007
PP	71002	Operation Crackdown	£90,000	£90,000	£14,810	£18,690	£56,500	£75,190
ETP	52001	Instructors Training / Assessme	£32,111	£32,111	£12,127	-£16	£20,000	£19,984
ETP	52005	Pass Plus	£40,800	£40,800	£31,381	£8,419	£1,000	£9,419
ETP	51003	APE Theatre	£23,000	£23,000	£5,000	£0	£18,000	£18,000
ETP	51005	Review of Road Safety Educ.	£10,000	£10,000	£10,000	£0	£0	£0
ETP	53005	Firebike	£10,000	£10,000	£9,000	£0	£1,000	£1,000
ETP	51001	SID	£107,800	£107,800	£74,635	£23,165	£10,000	£33,165
ETP	51007	Moped Focus Group	£10,000	£10,000	£10,000	£0	£0	£0
ETP	53007	White Knights Event	£8,000	£8,000	£8,000	£0	£0	£0
E&E	41007	VAS in vicinity of Schools	£16,220	£16,220	£16,220	£0	£0	£0
E&E	41010	School Crossing Flashing Light	£7,777	£8,000	£8,000	£0	£0	£0
			£3,315,621	£2,685,551	£815,311	£525,015	£1,345,225	£1,870,240

45

AGENDA ITEM 9

The Housing and Planning Delivery Grant supported Planning in providing a policy framework for the delivery of our affordable housing targets and to incentivise speedy planning decisions to further enable delivery of housing. The withdrawal of this grant will impact upon the ability to purchase IT that would make the planning service more efficient and on the commissioning of essential supporting evidence for the Core Strategy and any subsequent planning policy documents.

Rob Fraser
Head of Planning Strategy

AGENDA ITEM 10

Playbuilder Update – Societal Impacts of In Year Cuts – Scrutiny Panel 29th October 2010

In July 2010 the Playbuilder Project was put on hold by Central Government pending the budget review.

On the 20th of October the council was informed that it would receive a revised grant settlement. The original Playbuilder budget, and the revised allocation, is shown below.

Summary of Capital Budget	
Playbuilder Capital Grant 2010/11	£597,537
Revised Allocation (As per 20/10/10)	<u>£373,460</u>
Capital Shortfall	£224,077

There is a capital shortfall of £224,077 and a revenue shortfall of £21,960 to complete the work on all 11 sites.

Options on how to progress the project are currently being considered. EqIA screening in line with the budget process has not yet been completed as the decision on grant funding was unknown until last week.

