

## Item 12

### **Strategy & Resources 7 February 2022 - Finance and Resources Portfolio: Liberal Democrat Group Amendment to Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2022/23**

**To:**

Councillor Mike Davey, Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources Portfolio

**Report by:**

Caroline Ryba, Head of Finance

Tel: 01223 - 458134 Email: [caroline.ryba@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:caroline.ryba@cambridge.gov.uk)

**Wards affected:**

(All) Abbey, Arbury, Castle, Cherry Hinton, Coleridge, East Chesterton, King's Hedges, Market, Newnham, Petersfield, Queen Edith's, Romsey, Trumpington, West Chesterton

## **Key Decision**

### **Foreword to the Liberal Democrat Group Amendment**

The city council budget does need to respond to the realities of declining government funding and uncertainty of other income sources. But its finances are not so problematic as to prevent it at the same time from playing a confident and outward-looking role to enrich and support our city as we move through the pandemic and towards the challenges of post-covid recovery. Our proposals seek to bring together strategies to ensure this happens: strategies that at present are missing.

#### **Climate Change**

Liberal Democrats originally initiated climate change strategies at the council and much of the continuing work is bipartisan. However, recent experience shows it clearly benefits from debate and challenge to ensure both urgency and ambition. We have identified three critical areas where, despite other achievements and the potential for influence and partnership, Cambridge is sadly in danger of falling behind:

- EV Charging  
Enabling the charging of electrical vehicles for residents with no private off-road space has barely moved forward at all, and the woeful charging infrastructure in

Cambridge is a major obstacle to the switch to electric vehicles. The city council has built up commercial expertise in this through its car parks and should use this knowledge in partnership with the GCP (which is looking at parking implications) and the County Council (the highways authority which is keen to collaborate on a district by district basis) and galvanise action.

- Recycling

A zero-waste strategy also seems lacking. Nowhere is this more important than in food waste. Unlike many other City Councils and despite pilots in the city, we still do not have a citywide segregated food waste collection. Experience shows that food-waste collection reduces waste, landfill and carbon emissions. A major drive on home composting could also help move us towards being a zero-waste city.

- Insulation

Insulation of privately-owned homes remains a major national challenge, though vital in reducing carbon emissions. In addition to channelling selective central government grant funding support, the council could have a trusted and authoritative role in promoting owner investment, increasing awareness of payback potential and helping owners assess opportunities, navigate the market for suppliers, and access third party funding. Developing such a strategy is badly needed.

### **City Centre Car Parks**

If the city council is to play a positive role in the Greater Cambridge Partnership for a less polluted, low-traffic city, it must reduce its city centre car parking provision. It needs a long-term strategy to re-purpose the car park sites to meet other needs of the city, whilst securing replacement income to support council services. Leaving this any longer risks frustrating wider transport plans whilst failing to ensure the long-term financial security of the Council.

### **Key Worker Housing**

We also continue to argue for expansion of key worker housing, targeted towards those who fall between the housing needs register and market housing such as our valued carers, NHS staff and teachers. Cambridge housing costs have sky-rocketed and we must recognize that it is not only those who qualify for social housing that struggle to afford to live here. We need an ambitious strategy to address this urgent issue.

### **Recovery from the Pandemic**

The pandemic has deprived older and younger people alike of opportunities. Younger people have missed out on the opportunity to make friends and socialize, whereas our older residents have been isolated from the 'lifeline' that comes from the company of others. It is important this does not permanently scar the generations. We are proposing to boost funding to help both groups.

We are also offering a hand of support to Cambridge's market traders. These independent businesses faced 2 years of restrictions and uncertainty, with closures imposed by both the national government and then separately by the Council. Even now, they are largely without the boost which comes from tourism. We will hold back from the proposed increase in their fees, in order to help speed-up their recovery. We will also provide an electricity supply to Hobson's Square in Trumpington to support stallholders and local events which will help to make it a more vibrant centre to the new community there.

## **Planning Enforcement**

The city's continuing success as a place to live and work makes for ongoing development pressure which the council is responsible for regulating. It is important that respect for approvals and conditions is maintained; yet the hard-working planning enforcement team is clearly stretched and operates entirely reactively. We therefore propose an additional Planning Enforcement officer to ensure developers obey the rules and that public trust in the planning authority is maintained.

## **Acoustic Monitoring Cameras**

Last October, we were pleased that the council supported our case to throw its weight behind an effort to reduce the nuisance and danger of noisy vehicles racing around the city. There has subsequently been much national interest in new acoustic monitoring cameras which several authorities are adopting. Recognising the challenges faced by the police in tackling this problem and the opportunity for partnership, we propose to fund two such cameras for deployment in the city.

## **Public Scrutiny of decisionmaking**

The council's leadership has embarked on a lengthy and expensive corporate transformation programme, which remains a 'black box', destination unknown, to both the public and to opposition councillors, but smothered in meaningless branding. When something emerges we will press for full discussion before decisions are made on cutbacks; we will fight negative impacts on those already suffering disadvantage, on services necessary to civilized city life or on the quality of the democratic forum which the council provides to the city community.

In the meantime, as a result of the length of the transformation process, the current budget resorts to a large stealth cut – the largest cutback in the whole package - by failing to recognise the current high level of inflation. This completely removes from public sight and accountability the decisions that officers will now need to take to make their budgets balance. We are proposing that elected members monitor this process as the year progresses, allowing them to ensure consistency with the council's values, including equalities impacts.

## **Councillor Tim Bick, Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group**

## **Councillor Jamie Dalzell, Liberal Democrat Group Spokesperson on Finance and Resources**

### **1. Executive Summary**

The Liberal Democrat proposals will:

- bring forward strategies on key areas related to climate change, including electric vehicle charging, progression towards a zero waste city, and the provision of support for insulation of private homes;
- consider opportunities to reduce car park spaces in the city centre, and to re-purpose existing car park sites;
- explore options for expanding the provision of key worker housing through the Cambridge City Housing Company;

- deepen post pandemic initiatives supporting some of the most affected, including children in poverty and older and vulnerable individuals;
- defer the annual increase in fees for market traders by 3 months, in order to support their post-Covid recovery;
- fund the installation of an electricity supply at Hobson Square, enabling markets and other events to increase vibrancy in the new community;
- fund the installation of two acoustic monitoring cameras to tackle anti-social driving and noisy vehicles;
- strengthen planning enforcement in the city through a new Senior Planning Enforcement Officer post, funded through a reduction in the Corporate Communications team; and
- require regular scrutiny by Members, in public, of the impact of the Council's approach to inflation in 2022/23 (namely that general inflation is required to be absorbed by Council services).

## 2. Recommendations

Changes to recommendations highlighted in italics refer to the recommendations contained within the Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2022/23, as presented to the meeting of the Strategy & Resources Scrutiny Committee held on 7 February 2022, subject to any other amendment agreed by the Executive Councillor at this committee meeting.

The Executive Councillor is recommended to:

### **General Fund Revenue Budgets: [Section 5, page 26 refers]**

2.1 Under recommendation 2(a), add:

- ***Together with the changes in Appendix 2 to the Liberal Democrat Group Amendment to Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2022/23.***

2.2 Incorporate and replace the table shown in Appendix 5 into the Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2022/23 at the page so annotated.

### **Capital: [Section 6, page 29 refers]**

2.3 At recommendation 2(e), after "Capital Plan", add "***together with the changes in Appendix 3 to the Liberal Democrat Group Amendment to Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2022/23***".

2.4 At recommendation 2(g), after "Appendix C(c)", add "***(as amended by the changes in Appendix 3 to the Liberal Democrat Group Amendment to Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2022/23)***".

2.5 Incorporate and replace the tables shown in Appendix 5 into the Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2022/23 at the pages so annotated.

**General Fund: Expenditure and Funding 2021/22 to 2031/32: [Section 7, page 35 refers]**

- 2.6 Incorporate and replace the tables shown in Appendix 5 into the Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2022/23 at the pages so annotated.

**General Fund Reserves: [Section 8, page 44 refers]**

- 2.7 Incorporate and replace the table shown in Appendix 5 into the Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2022/23 at the page so annotated.

**General Fund Future Strategy: [Section 9, page 63 refers]**

- 2.8 Incorporate and replace the table shown in Appendix 5 into the Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2022/23 at the page so annotated.

**Section 25 Report: [Section 10, page 65 refers]**

- 2.9 Note the Section 151 Officer's assessment, at Appendix 6, of the impact of these proposed amendments on the Section 25 report presented at Section 10 of the Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2022/23.

**Equality Impact Assessment: [Appendix E, page 106 refers]**

- 2.10 Append Appendix 4 to the existing Equality Impact Assessment at Appendix E to the Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2022/23.

**Other Recommendations:**

- 2.11 Accept the non-financial proposals set out at Appendix 1.
- 2.12 Recommend to Council formally confirming delegation to the Chief Financial Officer (Head of Finance) of authority to make any other consequential changes to the Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2022/23 as a result of these amendments.

### **3. Council Tax**

No changes to council tax are being proposed by the Liberal Democrat Group.

### **4. Implications**

All budget proposals have a number of implications. A decision not to approve a revenue bid will impact on managers' ability to deliver the service or scheme in question and could have financial, staffing, equality and poverty, environmental, procurement or community safety implications. A decision not to approve a capital or external bid will impact on managers' ability to deliver the developments desired in the service areas.

## **(a) Financial Implications**

Financial implications of budget proposals are summarised in the Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2022/23, as amended by the recommendations above.

## **(b) Staffing Implications**

Staffing implications of budget proposals are also summarised in the Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2022/23, as amended by the recommendations above.

## **(c) Equality and Poverty Implications**

A consolidated Equality Impact Assessment for the budget proposals is included at Appendix E to the Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2022/23, as amended by Appendix 4. Individual Equality Impact Assessments have been conducted to support this.

A local poverty rating (using the classifications outlined at Appendix B(a) to the Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2022/23) has been included for each budget proposal to assist with assessment.

## **(d) Net Zero Carbon, Climate Change and Environmental Implications**

Where relevant, officers have considered the climate change impact of budget proposals which are annotated as follows and as detailed in the Climate Change Rating Tool in Appendix B(a) to the Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2022/23:

- Positive High / Positive Medium / Positive Low: to indicate that the proposal has a high, medium or low positive impact on climate change.
- Nil: to indicate that the proposal has no climate change impact.
- Negative High / Negative Medium / Negative Low: to indicate that the proposal has a high, medium or low negative impact on climate change.

## **(e) Procurement Implications**

Any procurement implications are outlined in the Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2022/23, as amended by the recommendations above.

## **(f) Community Safety Implications**

Any community safety implications are outlined in the Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2022/23, as amended by the recommendations above.

## **7. Background papers**

These background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2022/23
- Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) October 2021
- Individual Equality Impact Assessments

## **8. Appendices**

**Appendix 1: Liberal Democrat Group Budget Amendment – Non-Financial Proposals**

**Appendix 2: Liberal Democrat Group Budget Amendment – Revenue Budget Proposals**

**Appendix 3: Liberal Democrat Group Budget Amendment – Capital Budget Proposals**

**Appendix 4: Liberal Democrat Group Budget Amendment – Equality Impact Assessment**

**Appendix 5: Liberal Democrat Group Budget Amendment – Revised Tables for BSR**

**Appendix 6: Liberal Democrat Group Budget Amendment – Section 25 Report**

## **9. Inspection of papers**

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact Caroline Ryba, Head of Finance, tel: 01223 - 458134, email: [caroline.ryba@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:caroline.ryba@cambridge.gov.uk).

This page is intentionally left blank



1) Failure to provide for inflation

To request a quarterly in-year, service-by-service commentary for scrutiny by councillors of the impact of requesting 2022/23 inflation to be absorbed, which at current levels amounts to a cutback of £1.5m. The report to note of actual experience of inflation and to identify management decisions taken to meet budget targets through changes to the extent of service provision, standard of provision, timing of delivery or gains in efficiency, including equalities impact assessments.

2) City Centre Car Parks

Request a report to the Leader, to be discussed at the July meeting of Strategy & Resources Scrutiny Committee, proposing a strategic plan to reduce car park spaces in the city centre to make for a less car-based, carbon-rich transport system in line with the GCP's recent 'Making Connections' initiative; to further re-purpose existing car park sites to fulfil other key needs of the city including housing; and to secure replacement financial return to the council, with necessary budgetary impact to be reflected through in-year revisions to the current budget and the next MTFS.

3) Housing Opportunities in Cambridge

Request a report to the Executive Councillor for Finance & Resources, to be discussed at the July meeting of Strategy & Resources Scrutiny Committee, recommending financial and site options for the expansion of the Cambridge City Housing Company, in order to supply more sub-market rental housing for key workers in Cambridge whose circumstances leave them unable to access other housing via the housing needs register or via the market, with necessary budgetary impact to be reflected through in-year revisions to the current budget and the next MTFS.

4) Climate Change

Request a report to the Executive Councillor for Climate Change, to be discussed at the July meeting of Environment & Community Scrutiny Committee, recommending strategies to speed up important council initiatives, where the council has a role of influence, in particular:

- (i) Advancing a long-awaited, co-ordinated approach to on-street Electrical Vehicle charging in collaboration with the highways authority and GCP;
- (ii) Progression towards a zero waste city, including moving from localized pilot food waste collection schemes to a citywide service, bringing us up to many other urban areas; and stronger promotion of home composting;
- (iii) Provision of co-ordinated support and encouragement for insulation of existing private homes in the city;

With necessary budgetary impact to be reflected through in-year revisions to the current budget and the next MTFS.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Liberal Democrat Group Budget Amendment – Revenue Budget Proposals

## Appendix 2

Proposal Type	2022/23 Budget £	2023/24 Budget £	2024/25 Budget £	2025/26 Budget £	2026/27 Budget £	Total
<b>Total Impact of Liberal Democrat Group budget proposals</b>						
Reduced Income	5,000	-	-	-	-	5,000
Bids	110,000	60,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	320,000
Savings	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(250,000)
<b>Change to use of General Fund reserves</b>	<b>65,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>65,000</b>
<b>Change to net savings requirement</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>(10,000)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>

# Liberal Democrat Group Budget Amendment – Revenue Appendix 2

## Budget Proposals

### Amendments to Appendices B(b) and B(c)

#### 2022/23 Budget – GF Revenue Bids and Savings

Reference	Item Description	2022/23 Budget £	2023/24 Budget £	2024/25 Budget £	2025/26 Budget £	2026/27 Budget £	Climate Rating	Poverty Ratings & Contact
-----------	------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	-------------------	---------------------------------

#### Appendix B(b) [2022/23 Budget – GF Proposals – Pressures & Bids]

##### Reduced Income

<b>RI0003</b>	<b>Postpone 2022-23 increase in market stall trader fees</b>	5,000	0	0	0	0	Nil	No Impact
---------------	--	-------	---	---	---	---	-----	-----------

Deferral by 3 months of the implementation of the annual increase in fees charged in 2022 to market traders for their stalls to support their recovery from the pandemic.

Tim Jones

Climate Change, Environment and City Centre Portfolio

Amendment to Total Reduced Income	5,000	0	0	0	0
-----------------------------------	-------	---	---	---	---

##### Revenue Bids

<b>B0001</b>	<b>Strengthen planning enforcement within the city</b>	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	Nil	No Impact
--------------	--	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	-----	-----------

Addition of a Senior Planning Enforcement Officer within the Shared Planning Service to supplement planning enforcement within the city. To recognise the development pressures in Cambridge and put the planning authority in a better position to ensure conformance with its approvals and conditions and protect the city's character and amenity. The position will initially enable the backlog of a year's worth of cases to be actioned and thereafter a proactive programme to be established, not reliant solely on complaints.

Stephen  
Kelly

Executive Councillor for Planning Policy & Transport

<b>B0004</b>	<b>Contribution to County Council Children's Pandemic Education Catch-up Fund</b>	50,000	0	0	0	0	Nil	High Positive Impact
--------------	---	--------	---	---	---	---	-----	----------------------

Contribution to the County Council's fund for access to out-of-school activities for children qualifying for free school meals or from families receiving Universal Credit in order to remove barriers and encourage full participation, addressing the impoverishment of learning and growth opportunities during the pandemic.

Jane Wilson

Communities Portfolio

# Liberal Democrat Group Budget Amendment – Revenue Budget Proposals

## Appendix 2

### Amendments to Appendices B(b) and B(c)

#### 2022/23 Budget – GF Revenue Bids and Savings

Reference	Item Description	2022/23 Budget £	2023/24 Budget £	2024/25 Budget £	2025/26 Budget £	2026/27 Budget £	Climate Rating	Poverty Ratings & Contact
<b>B0005</b>	<b>Post-Covid community inclusion initiative for older and vulnerable people</b>	10,000	10,000	0	0	0	Nil	No Impact

Increase the community grant to the Care Network to enhance their project under development to support the wellbeing of older and vulnerable people in Cambridge through the Covid recovery as they become able to re-integrate into the wider community. Debbie Kaye

Communities Portfolio

Amendment to Total Revenue Bids	110,000	60,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
<b>Amendment to Pressures &amp; Bids Total:</b>	<b>115,000</b>	<b>60,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>

#### Appendix B(c) [2022/23 Budget – GF Proposals – Savings]

##### Savings

<b>S0002</b>	<b>Reduction of Communications team expansion</b>	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	Nil	No Impact
--------------	---	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----	-----------

A reduction of the additional £125,000 annual budgetary provision made in the MTFS in order to expand the work of the Corporate Communications team “to the level of other councils”. Remaining provision will confine expansion to one additional Communications Officer, the licensing of a new online digital community engagement and consultation platform and a slightly reduced extra provision for visual/graphic products and campaigns in support of major projects and policy initiatives.

Andrew  
Limb

Strategy and External Partnerships Portfolio

Amendment to Total Savings	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)
<b>Amendment to Savings Total:</b>	<b>(50,000)</b>	<b>(50,000)</b>	<b>(50,000)</b>	<b>(50,000)</b>	<b>(50,000)</b>
<b>All portfolios – Net Impact of Lib Dem Amendments Total</b>	<b>65,000</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

This page is intentionally left blank

# Liberal Democrat Group Budget Amendment – Capital Budget Proposals

## Appendix 3

### Amendments to Appendix C(a)

#### 2022/23 Budget – GF Proposals – Capital Proposals

Reference	Item Description	2022/23 Budget £	2023/24 Budget £	2024/25 Budget £	2025/26 Budget £	2026/27 Budget £	Climate Rating	Poverty Ratings & Contact
-----------	------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	-------------------	---------------------------------

#### Capital Bids

<b>CAP0006</b>	<b>Capital grant for acquisition of acoustic monitoring cameras</b>	49,000	0	0	0	0	Nil	No Impact
----------------	---	--------	---	---	---	---	-----	-----------

Funding of two acoustic monitoring cameras to enable joint working with the Police, Highways Authority and the Vision Zero partnership to deter and penalise those breaching the peace on Cambridge roads with anti-social driving and noisy vehicles. This takes forward the motion passed by the city council in November to take further action with partners on the nuisance which is widely experienced in the city. It is anticipated that the equipment would be operated by the Highways Authority and that penalty income would cover the cost of data management and penalty administration.

Lynda  
Kilkelly

Executive Councillor for Planning Policy & Transport

<b>CAP0007</b>	<b>Electricity supply for Hobsons Square</b>	20,000	0	0	0	0	Negative/ Low Impact	No Impact
----------------	--	--------	---	---	---	---	-------------------------	-----------

Installation of an electricity supply to Hobson's Square, Trumpington, enabling markets and other events to increase vibrancy in the heart of the new community.

Alistair  
Wilson

Open Spaces, Sustainable Food & Community Wellbeing

Amendment to Total Capital Bids	69,000	0	0	0	0
---------------------------------	--------	---	---	---	---

<b>Amendment to Capital Total:</b>	<b>69,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------------------------	---------------	----------	----------	----------	----------

<b>All portfolios – Net Impact of Lib Dem Amendments Total</b>	<b>69,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
--	---------------	----------	----------	----------	----------

This page is intentionally left blank



# Liberal Democrat Group Budget Amendment – Appendix 4 Equality Impact Assessment

## Cambridge City Council Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)

This tool helps the Council ensure that we fulfil legal obligations of the [Public Sector Equality Duty](#) to have due regard to the need to –

- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act 2010;
- (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Guidance on how to complete this tool can be found on the Cambridge City Council intranet. For specific questions on the tool email Helen Crowther, Equality and Anti-Poverty Officer at [equalities@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:equalities@cambridge.gov.uk) or phone 01223 457046.

Once you have drafted the EqIA please send this to [equalities@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:equalities@cambridge.gov.uk) for checking. For advice on consulting on equality impacts, please contact Graham Saint, Strategy Officer, ([graham.saint@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:graham.saint@cambridge.gov.uk) or 01223 457044).

<b>1. Title of strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service</b>
Liberal Democrat budget proposals 2022/23

<b>2. Webpage link to full details of the strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service (if available)</b>
Click here to enter text.

<b>3. What is the objective or purpose of your strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service?</b>
The Liberal Democrat's budget amendment makes a number of alternative budget proposals to those set out by the ruling group in the Budget Setting Report. This EqIA has been carried out by Council officers to provide Councillors with an assessment of the potential equality impacts of the Liberal Democrat budget proposals at the point when they are being asked to make a decision, as required by the Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act 2010.

Some proposals in the Liberal Democrat budget amendment will have very small or neutral impacts on equality and therefore have not been included in this EqlA. For other proposals there is not enough information at this stage on the proposal to be able to assess equality impacts.

The proposals that could have more significant impacts related to equality include:

- Contribution to County Council Children's Pandemic Education Catch-up Fund
- Post-Covid Community Inclusion Initiative for older and vulnerable people

#### 4. Responsible service

The Finance service manages the budget process and the two bids in this EqlA sit within the Council's communities portfolio

#### 5. Who will be affected by this strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service?

(Please tick all that apply)

- ☒ Residents  
☐ Visitors  
☐ Staff

Please state any specific client group or groups (e.g. City Council tenants, tourists, people who work in the city but do not live here):

[Click here to enter text.](#)

#### 6. What type of strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service is this?

- ☒ New  
☐ Major change  
☐ Minor change

#### 7. Are other departments or partners involved in delivering this strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service? (Please tick)

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

If 'Yes' please provide details below:


The budget bids in this EqlA relate to the Council's partnership working with the third sector and Cambridgeshire County Council.

#### 8. Has the report on your strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service gone to Committee? If so, which one?

The Liberal Democrat budget proposals will go to Council on 24<sup>th</sup> February 2022

**9. What research methods/ evidence have you used in order to identify equality impacts of your strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service?**

Sources of data used to inform this EqlA include:

- <https://cambridgeshireinsight.org.uk/>
- <https://www.campaigntoendloneliness.org/>
- <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-report-of-the-commission-on-race-and-ethnic-disparities/education-and-training>
- Strand, S, (2021), 'Effects of Ethnicity and Socio-economic Status on Attainment', University of Oxford. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-report-of-the-commission-on-race-and-ethnic-disparities-supporting-research/ethnic-socio-economic-and-sex-inequalities-in-educational-achievement-at-age-16-by-professor-steve-strand> 
- <https://www.jrf.org.uk/data>
- [Disability and education, UK - Office for National Statistics \(ons.gov.uk\)](https://ons.gov.uk)

**10. Potential impacts**

For each category below, please explain if the strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service could have a positive/ negative impact or no impact. Where an impact has been identified, please explain what it is. Consider impacts on service users, visitors and staff members separately.

**(a) Age - Please also consider any safeguarding issues for children and adults at risk**

**Contribution to County Council Children's Pandemic Education Catch-up Fund**

According to the latest data before the pandemic, in 2019 only 43% of pupils receiving Free School Meals achieved the Key Stage 4 benchmark (Grades 9 to 4 in GCSE English and Maths), compared to three quarters (75.3%) of children not eligible for free school meals in the city. As a result of the Covid-19 pandemic, the government closed schools for most pupils for several months. Concerns have been raised that during this time the educational attainment gap would increase. The proposal would have a positive impact on children's educational attainment by contributing funding to the County Council's fund for access to out-of-school activities for children qualifying for free school meals or from families receiving Universal Credit.

**Post-Covid Community Inclusion Initiative for older and vulnerable people**

Before Covid 19, older people were more likely to experience loneliness and older people are more

likely to live alone. Older people are at greater risk if they get coronavirus, so many have avoided contact with other people and continue to do so, which can exacerbate loneliness.

This proposal could have a positive impact on older people in preventing isolation and loneliness by increasing the Community Grant to the Care Network for their project, which will support older and vulnerable people re-integrating into the wider community. At the same time, as older people are at greater risk if they get coronavirus, the programme of support would need to be carefully planned to protect their safety from the virus and take into account data on transmission rates/vaccination.

## **(b) Disability**

### **Post-Covid Community Inclusion Initiative for older and vulnerable people**

Loneliness is considered to be a public health issue as it is associated with a range of health risks – for instance, loneliness and social isolation put individuals at greater risk of cognitive decline and dementia. Before Covid19, older people were more likely to experience loneliness and older people are more likely to live alone. Older people are at greater risk if they get coronavirus so many have especially avoided contact with other people and continue to do so, which can exacerbate loneliness. Many people with pre-existing health conditions were required to ‘shield’ during the pandemic, which may also have led them to experience loneliness and isolation.

As noted above, this proposal could have a positive impact on older and vulnerable people in preventing isolation and loneliness and reduce associated health risks. The project will increase the Community Grant to the Care Network for their project, which will help older and vulnerable people re-integrating into the wider community. At the same time, as older and vulnerable people are at greater risk where they get coronavirus, the programme of support would need to be carefully planned to protect their safety from the virus and take into account data on transmission rates/vaccination.

### **Contribution to County Council Children’s Pandemic Education Catch-up Fund**

Households with disabled individuals (adults or children) are more likely to experience poverty and therefore qualify for free school meals or be claiming Universal Credit, meaning this proposal could have a positive impact on them. Moreover, there is a disparity in educational attainment between disabled and non-disabled people.

## **(c) Gender reassignment**

No impacts have been identified specific to this protected characteristic group.

**(d) Marriage and civil partnership**

No impacts have been identified specific to this protected characteristic group.

**(e) Pregnancy and maternity**

No impacts have been identified specific to this protected characteristic group.

**(f) Race – Note that the protected characteristic ‘race’ refers to a group of people defined by their race, colour, and nationality (including citizenship) ethnic or national origins.****Contribution to County Council Children’s Pandemic Education Catch-up Fund**

This proposal would have a positive impact for children in low-income households or experiencing poverty as it is aimed at improving educational outcomes of children on qualifying for free school meals or from families receiving Universal Credit.

Some minority ethnic groups are more likely to experience poverty than others, but all ethnic minority groups are more likely than White British people to experience poverty. 2021 research indicates that educational attainment of different ethnic groups is closely related to socio-economic status. People from low-income backgrounds or who experience poverty perform less well. Once this is controlled for, all major ethnic groups perform better than White British pupils except for Black Caribbean pupils (with the Pakistani ethnic group at about the same level).

**(g) Religion or belief**

No impacts have been identified specific to this protected characteristic group.

**(h) Sex**

No impacts have been identified specific to this protected characteristic group.

**(i) Sexual orientation**

No impacts have been identified specific to this protected characteristic group.

**(j) Other factors that may lead to inequality – in particular, please consider the impact of any changes on:**

- Low-income groups or those experiencing the impacts of poverty
- Groups who have more than one protected characteristic that taken together create overlapping and interdependent systems of discrimination or disadvantage. (Here you are being asked to consider intersectionality, and for more information see: <https://media.ed.ac.uk/media/1159kt25q>).

**Contribution to County Council Children's Pandemic Education Catch-up Fund**

This proposal would have a positive impact for children in low-income households or experiencing poverty as it is aimed at improving educational outcomes of children on qualifying for free school meals or from families receiving Universal Credit.

**11. Action plan – New equality impacts will be identified in different stages throughout the planning and implementation stages of changes to your strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service. How will you monitor these going forward? Also, how will you ensure that any potential negative impacts of the changes will be mitigated? (Please include dates where possible for when you will update this EqlA accordingly.)**

No actions have been identified

**12. Do you have any additional comments?**

None

**13. Sign off**

Name and job title of lead officer for this equality impact assessment: Helen Crowther, Equality and Anti-Poverty Officer

Names and job titles of other assessment team members and people consulted: David Kidston, Strategy and Partnerships Manager

Date of EqlA sign off: 28th January 2022

Date of next review of the equalities impact assessment: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Date to be published on Cambridge City Council website: [Click here to enter text.](#)

# Liberal Democrat Group Budget Amendment – Revised Tables for BSR

## Appendix 5

### Section 5 – General Fund revenue budgets

#### Savings requirements (BSR, page 27)

Savings requirements	2022/23 £000	2023/24 £000	2024/25 £000	2025/26 £000	2026/27 £000	Total £000
<b>MTFS 2021 Current Savings Target (new savings each year)</b>	<b>3,103</b>	<b>2,390</b>	<b>510</b>	<b>873</b>	<b>623</b>	<b>7,499</b>
Adjust savings requirement for indicative items now coming forward as proposals:						
Remove indicative pressures per MTFS	(1,565)	(2,813)	(3,426)	(3,960)	(4,513)	
Remove technical adjustment for NI increase (now a proposal)	(220)	(220)	(220)	(220)	(220)	
<b>Add back indicative pressures in later years where no budget proposal has come forward:</b>						
Car parking income		1,695	2,208	2,717	3,220	
Commercial and administrative property income		460	460	460	460	
Waste service cost pressures			100	100	200	
<b>MTFS 2021 adjusted savings requirement in year</b>	<b>1,318</b>	<b>3,297</b>	<b>510</b>	<b>848</b>	<b>673</b>	
Unavoidable revenue pressures	568	568	568	568	568	
Reduced income	1,118	855	817	555	505	
Bids	1,106	578	421	354	354	
Savings	(869)	(830)	(832)	(780)	(782)	
Increased income	(523)	(228)	(230)	(195)	(159)	
<b>Impact of Liberal Democrat Group budget proposals</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>10</b>				
<b>Net bids and savings</b>	<b>1,465</b>	<b>953</b>	<b>744</b>	<b>502</b>	<b>486</b>	
Revised council tax base - impact on council tax income	(24)	7	(75)	(77)	(79)	
Changes to business rates assumptions	85					
Collection Fund surplus	(89)					
Uncommitted NHB used to fund in-year spend	(415)					
Lower Tier Services Grant	(1,765)					
2022/23 Services Grant	(294)					
Use of reserves to support revenue spending on services	(216)					
<b>Impact of Liberal Democrat Group budget proposals – increased use of reserves to support revenue spending</b>	<b>(65)</b>					
<b>Total funding changes</b>	<b>(2,783)</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>(75)</b>	<b>(77)</b>	<b>(79)</b>	
<b>Total changes to savings requirements</b>	<b>(1,318)</b>	<b>960</b>	<b>669</b>	<b>425</b>	<b>407</b>	
<b>Revised savings target / savings (new savings each year)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5,575</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>604</b>	<b>655</b>	<b>7,053</b>

### Section 6 – General Fund capital budgets

#### Capital receipts and development surpluses available (BSR, page 33)

Capital receipts and development surpluses available	2021/22 £000	2022/23 £000	2023/24 £000	2024/25 £000	2025/26 £000	2026/27 £000
<b>Brought forward at 1 April</b>	<b>14,182</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>4,185</b>	<b>7,620</b>	<b>6,389</b>	<b>5,689</b>
Forecast capital receipts and development surpluses	8,754	7,139	8,486	0	0	2,000
Used for financing of in-year capital plan expenditure	(22,712)	(2,668)	(939)	(1,231)	(700)	(700)
Used for financing of historic capital plan expenditure (to reduce internal or external borrowing)	0	(441)	(4,112)	0	0	0
<b>Impact of Liberal Democrat Group budget proposals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(69)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Carried forward at 31 March</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>4,185</b>	<b>7,620</b>	<b>6,389</b>	<b>5,689</b>	<b>6,989</b>

#### Capital plan spending (BSR, page 33)

Capital plan spending	2021/22 £000	2022/23 £000	2023/24 £000	2024/25 £000	2025/26 £000	2026/27 £000	Total £000
<b>Spend MTFS October 2021</b>	<b>94,473</b>	<b>28,082</b>	<b>30,345</b>	<b>8,362</b>	<b>710</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>162,672</b>
Approved since MTFS October 2021	5,828	0	0	60	0	0	5,888
<b>Capital plan before new proposals</b>	<b>100,301</b>	<b>28,082</b>	<b>30,345</b>	<b>8,422</b>	<b>710</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>168,560</b>
New proposals see Appendix C(a) and narrative above for 2021/22	(249)	7,752	0	0	0	0	7,503
<b>Impact of Liberal Democrat Group budget proposals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Revised capital plan</b>	<b>100,052</b>	<b>35,903</b>	<b>30,345</b>	<b>8,422</b>	<b>710</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>176,132</b>



# Liberal Democrat Group Budget Amendment – Revised Tables for BSR

## Appendix 5

### Capital plan funding (BSR, page 34)

Capital plan funding	2021/22 £000	2022/23 £000	2023/24 £000	2024/25 £000	2025/26 £000	2026/27 £000
<b>External support</b>						
Developer contributions	(2,511)	(41)	(10)	(18)	(10)	0
Other sources	(3,299)	(5,945)	0	0	0	0
<b>Total – External support</b>	<b>(5,810)</b>	<b>(5,986)</b>	<b>(10)</b>	<b>(18)</b>	<b>(10)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>City Council</b>						
Direct Revenue Financing (DRF) – GF services	(8)	0	0	0	0	0
Direct Revenue Financing (DRF) – in-year allocation of revenue funding	(2,082)	0	0	0	0	0
Earmarked Reserve – Repairs and renewals fund - vehicles	(1,221)	0	0	0	0	0
Earmarked Reserves – Other	(1,777)	(120)	0	0	0	0
Capital receipts and development surpluses	(22,712)	(2,668)	(939)	(1,231)	(700)	(700)
External borrowing - Park Street redevelopment	(35,700)	(18,534)	(29,396)	(7,173)	0	0
Internal and external borrowing - on-lending for capital purposes	(29,015)	(5,700)	0	0	0	0
Internal and external borrowing - other schemes	(1,727)	(2,826)	0	0	0	0
<b>Impact of Liberal Democrat Group budget proposals – Capital receipts and development surpluses</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(69)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total – City Council</b>	<b>(94,242)</b>	<b>(29,917)</b>	<b>(30,335)</b>	<b>(8,404)</b>	<b>(700)</b>	<b>(700)</b>
<b>Total Funding</b>	<b>(100,052)</b>	<b>(35,903)</b>	<b>(30,345)</b>	<b>(8,422)</b>	<b>(710)</b>	<b>(700)</b>
<b>Capital Plan</b>	<b>100,052</b>	<b>35,903</b>	<b>30,345</b>	<b>8,422</b>	<b>710</b>	<b>700</b>

# Liberal Democrat Group Budget Amendment – Revised Tables for BSR

## Appendix 5

### Section 7 – General Fund: Expenditure and funding 2021/22 to 2031/32 (BSR, pages 35-36)

Description / £'000s	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32
<b>Expenditure</b>											
Strategy and External Partnerships	6,918	6,530	6,450	6,841	6,891	6,905	7,252	7,614	7,984	8,364	8,755
Finance and Resources	(4,945)	(5,153)	(4,305)	(4,801)	(4,800)	(4,765)	(4,704)	(4,642)	(4,577)	(4,511)	(4,442)
General Fund Housing	4,556	3,542	3,674	3,764	3,857	3,933	4,028	4,126	4,226	4,329	4,435
Climate Change, Environment and City Centre	5,280	5,316	5,307	5,426	5,583	5,673	5,792	5,915	6,041	6,171	6,304
Communities	8,446	7,443	7,414	7,466	7,551	7,640	7,780	7,923	8,072	8,225	8,383
Open Spaces, Sustainable Food and Community Wellbeing	2,814	2,607	2,553	2,529	2,564	2,617	2,691	2,764	2,839	2,916	2,996
Planning policy and transport	3,438	4,063	4,267	4,611	4,910	5,374	5,393	5,413	5,436	5,462	5,490
<b>Impact of Liberal Democrat Group Budget proposals (before allocation to portfolios)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Revised net savings requirement	0	0	(5,575)	(5,794)	(6,398)	(7,053)	(7,703)	(8,354)	(9,047)	(9,758)	(10,515)
<b>Net service budgets</b>	<b>26,507</b>	<b>24,413</b>	<b>19,795</b>	<b>20,042</b>	<b>20,158</b>	<b>20,324</b>	<b>20,529</b>	<b>20,759</b>	<b>20,974</b>	<b>21,198</b>	<b>21,406</b>
Capital accounting adjustments	(6,336)	(6,336)	(6,337)	(6,336)	(6,336)	(6,336)	(6,336)	(6,336)	(6,336)	(6,336)	(6,336)
Capital expenditure financed from revenue	1,458	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cost of revised capital financing strategy	0	40	180	320	460	600	740	880	1,020	1,160	1,300
Collection fund deficit	25,335	2,481	3,247	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contributions to earmarked funds	5,522	627	395	395	395	395	395	395	395	395	395
<b>Net spending requirement</b>	<b>52,486</b>	<b>21,225</b>	<b>17,280</b>	<b>14,421</b>	<b>14,677</b>	<b>14,983</b>	<b>15,328</b>	<b>15,698</b>	<b>16,053</b>	<b>16,417</b>	<b>16,765</b>

Description / £'000s	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32
Funded by:											
Settlement Funding Assessment (SFA)	(4,272)	(4,272)	(4,118)	(4,118)	(4,118)	(4,118)	(4,118)	(4,118)	(4,118)	(4,118)	(4,118)
Locally Retained Business Rates – Growth Element/additional income	(9,747)	(4,301)	(883)	(1,138)	(1,405)	(1,405)	(1,405)	(1,405)	(1,405)	(1,405)	(1,405)
Core Funding Grants	(988)	(2,059)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Homes Bonus (NHB)	(3,458)	(1,957)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Covid grant and furloughing income	(652)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Appropriations from earmarked funds	(27,790)	(3,225)	(3,247)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Council Tax	(9,033)	(9,371)	(9,855)	(10,243)	(10,559)	(10,865)	(11,210)	(11,580)	(11,935)	(12,299)	(12,647)
Contributions to / (from) reserves	3,454	4,025	823	1,078	1,405	1,405	1,405	1,405	1,405	1,405	1,405
Impact of Liberal Democrat Group budget proposals – increased use of reserves to support revenue spending	0	(65)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total funding	(52,486)	(21,225)	(17,280)	(14,421)	(14,677)	(14,983)	(15,328)	(15,698)	(16,053)	(16,417)	(16,765)

### Section 8 – Risks and reserves

#### General Fund Reserves (BSR, page 53)

£000	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27
<b>Balance as at 1 April b/fwd</b>	<b>(16,594)</b>	<b>(20,048)</b>	<b>(24,008)</b>	<b>(24,831)</b>	<b>(25,909)</b>	<b>(27,314)</b>
Contribution from reserves to support delivery of services	1,534	216				
Carry forwards	659					
Projected business rates surplus	(9,747)	(4,301)	(883)	(1,138)	(1,405)	(1,405)
Contribution to the Climate Change Fund (NCL4667 and NCL 4722)	200					
Funding and contingency for Our Cambridge transformation programme	3,900					
Contingency funding for adults with 'multiple disadvantage' programme		60	60	60		
<b>Impact of Liberal Democrat Group budget proposals – increased use of reserves to support revenue spending</b>		<b>65</b>				
<b>Balance as at 31 March (c/fwd)</b>	<b>(20,048)</b>	<b>(24,008)</b>	<b>(24,831)</b>	<b>(25,909)</b>	<b>(27,314)</b>	<b>(28,719)</b>

### Section 9 – Future strategy and recommendations

#### Unmet savings requirement (BSR, page 63)

£'000s	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30
<b>Balance at 1 April (b/fwd)</b>	<b>(16,594)</b>	<b>(20,048)</b>	<b>(19,588)</b>	<b>(15,546)</b>	<b>(13,229)</b>	<b>(10,999)</b>	<b>(8,114)</b>	<b>(5,229)</b>	<b>(2,344)</b>
Contributions and carry forwards	2,393	216							
Business rates growth – indicative increase in growth element	(9,747)								
Funding for Our Cambridge transformation and recovery programme	3,900								
<b>Impact of Liberal Democrat Group budget proposals – increased use of reserves to support revenue spending</b>		<b>65</b>							
	<b>(20,048)</b>	<b>(19,767)</b>	<b>(19,588)</b>	<b>(15,546)</b>	<b>(13,229)</b>	<b>(10,999)</b>	<b>(8,114)</b>	<b>(5,229)</b>	<b>(2,344)</b>
Savings requirement - cumulative		0	5,575	5,794	6,398	7,053	7,053	7,053	7,053
Indicative net savings delivered by Our Cambridge Programme - cumulative		179	(1,533)	(3,477)	(4,168)	(4,168)	(4,168)	(4,168)	(4,168)
<b>Call on reserves to balance budget</b>		<b>179</b>	<b>4,042</b>	<b>2,317</b>	<b>2,230</b>	<b>2,885</b>	<b>2,885</b>	<b>2,885</b>	<b>2,885</b>
<b>Balance at 31 March (c/fwd)</b>	<b>(20,048)</b>	<b>(19,588)</b>	<b>(15,546)</b>	<b>(13,229)</b>	<b>(10,999)</b>	<b>(8,114)</b>	<b>(5,229)</b>	<b>(2,344)</b>	<b>541</b>

This page is intentionally left blank

These budget amendments would not require any substantive changes to the existing Section 10 – Section 25 Report. **[Section 10, Page 65 refers]**

There are two types of amendment:

- General Fund (GF) revenue amendments – spending proposals or reductions in savings and income are matched by a reduction in spending and a small (£65k) use of reserves. There is no impact on the five-year net savings requirement.
- Capital bids – an increase in capital expenditure of £69k is proposed, funded from capitals receipts and development surpluses. Once capital receipts and surpluses are fully used, additional borrowing of £69k will be needed to finance future capital bids, giving rise to an indicative annual revenue cost of approximately £5k p.a. based on average rates used to calculate the indicative revenue cost of capital expenditure within the BSR.

**I therefore consider, in relation to the budget resulting from the application of these amendments, the estimates for the financial year 2022/23 to be sufficiently robust and the financial reserves up to 31 March 2023 to be adequate.**

**Caroline Ryba  
Head of Finance and S151 Officer**

This page is intentionally left blank



Green and Independent Group

Foreword

General Fund

26 January 2022

Introduction to the Green and Independent Budget Comments

### **Our role**

As the smallest group in the council we consider that our role in the budget process is primarily scrutiny and evaluation.

### **Alternative Reporting**

The reason for this proposal is that the council's work is of great importance to a wide variety of people.

Lengthy accounting reports can be daunting particularly when you are short of time and using alternative reporting techniques can help people to access the main reports and understand the council's work.

As a working accountant, I know that many people are very uncomfortable with purely numerical information and find that other reporting forms, such as graphs, key performance indicators, frequently asked question lists and benchmark reports can help them get to grips with the main report.

Some councillors will be aware that we have put forward a proposal to look at how to make the Housing Revenue Account main report more accessible.

This proposal has been accepted and will go forward under the transformation programme.

At this stage, we are not putting forward a similar proposal for the general fund. This is because it will be more efficient to start with just one account and apply the lessons learned to the second one.

To be clear, our objective is not to replace the main report but to show how simple things such as an FAQ can help us navigate round the main reports and help us find the bits we want easily.

To be equally clear I also want to recognise the high quality of the budget reports and the detailed and meticulous work behind them. I also want to express my appreciation of the steps already taken to make these reports more accessible

A short extract from the FAQ prepared for internal Green and Independent Councillor Use is attached.

### **Treasury management**

Councillors will recall that we raised the issue of evaluating and hopefully reducing the level of treasury funds held with banks with heavy fossil fuel investments.

We understand that Ms Ryba has commenced work on this review and has selected an appropriate independent research source.

The review is not straightforward because treasury funds must also satisfy prudent investment practices. This is not optional but prescribed by law. These rules are known as the CIPFA Treasury Management Code.

This progress is in line with our expectations and we look forward to seeing the first results at the next treasury review.

### **The city's grant income**

Cllr Davey has mentioned the difficulties caused for the city by central government's current grant system and rightly so. Cities need to plan ahead. That requires stable and dependable funding, not the present tangle of stop-start grants.

Grants which are constantly changing, which are so hedged with conditions so that they are at best expensive to administer and at worst

may make them unworkable not only fail to meet our financial needs but they burn up expensive staff time on applications and administration which is wasteful of public funds.

We will continue to press for reform in this area.

### **Grants to community groups and charities**

The council's support for charities and community groups is something that is close to all our hearts.

Many councillors will know from experience how demoralising and exhausting the grant process can be for smaller charities and community groups.

One of the questions that we asked as part of our budget scrutiny was what could we do to streamline our grants process for these groups and avoid perpetrating the problems that the council faces itself with the grant system.

The problem is particularly acute now because many charities face increased demands following lockdown with depleted resources.

Our 2022/23 proposal is for a structural review, whether as part of the transformation programme or otherwise

Although we are aware that cost reduction is a goal of the transformation programme, we argue that in the case of community grants, a better objective would be to consider instead how the service could be improved at the same cost.

We would anticipate that such a review would cover:

A shared smart portal with South Cambs and Cambridgeshire for all grants they administer.

Closer co-operation between local authorities and working towards a shared service approach .

Moving away from annual grants to three year grants

Replacing small grant pots with individual rules with a single community pot (subject to legacy limitations which may restrict this)

Making more use of matched funding arrangements with the private sector. This would be attractive to mid tier businesses which wish to demonstrate good corporate citizenship without carrying the overheads of in house administration.

We submit that these changes would reduce the time spent on administration of the grant system for both community groups and officers alike and would increase the effectiveness of both

We had expected that the outcome of this process would be a proposal for more grants to be provided by the city council and for more advisory support to help local community groups target grants provided by other organisations.

### **Note of thanks**

We have also had discussions with many council officers and will feed back any comments on policies that don't require inclusion in the budget process at this stage and share our thanks for their help individually.

We also want to thank leaders of several voluntary groups who also gave us much useful feedback.

ENDS