



To: Executive Councillor for Strategy / Leader:  
Councillor Tim Bick  
Report by: Director of Resources  
Relevant scrutiny Strategy & Resources 7 February 2014  
committee:  
Wards affected: All Wards

## **LABOUR GROUP AMENDMENT TO:**

### **Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2014/15**

#### **Key Decision**

#### **1. Executive summary**

- 1.1 This report sets out amendments proposed by the Labour Group to the overall set of budget proposals which were agreed by the Executive at its meeting on 23 January 2014, for recommendation to Council on 27 February 2014, subject to any Executive Amendment agreed by The Leader at this committee.
- 1.2 The papers included here reflect the appropriate updates to the Budget-Setting Report, Version 1 as updated at Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee on 20 January 2014 and the Executive meeting on 23 January 2014. This amendment also refers to the Section 25 Report (Appendix N) included in the Budget Setting Report by Executive Amendment at this meeting.
- 1.3 The appendices to this report present the Labour Group budget proposals in relation to specific budget items for both General Fund (GF), Revenue and Capital as follows:
  - (i) to add new budget proposals
  - (ii) to amend or delete specific existing proposals
  - (iii) to add and amend existing items on the Capital & Revenue projects Plan
  - (iv) to create new Earmarked Funds with accompanying Remits
  - (v) to add certain items of text to the Budget Setting Report 2014/15

## **2. Recommendations**

2.1 Changes to recommendations are highlighted in italics.

Recommendations of the Executive to this Council, as agreed at their meeting on 23 January 2014, subject to any Executive Amendment agreed by The Leader at this committee following the publication of the Final Settlement are further amended as follows:

**For the existing recommendation “2: Recommendations”, add:**

**- Budget Setting Report February 2014, add:**

- Text as detailed in “Labour Budget Amendment – Changes to Budget Setting Report 2014-15”
- The changes in the attached Labour Budget Amendment, namely “Add Supplement to Appendices C( b), C(d), C(e), C(g) and add new appendices C(h) – Bids, and C( i) Bids to Fixed T erm Priority Policy Fund” Supplement to Appendices C(b), C(d), C(e), C(g)
- Supplement to Appendix [ H ] - Earmarked & Specific Funds
- Supplement to Appendix [ N ] - Section 25 Report

**- Equalities Impact Assessment**

- Replace Appendix I – Equalities Impact Assessment with Appendix I [Labour Amendment] - Equalities Impact Assessment

## **3. Council Tax**

3.1 No changes are being proposed by the Labour Group.

## **4. Capital**

4.1 The Labour Group are proposing items identified “ Labour Budget Amendment – Supplement to Appendix G(a)”.

## **5. 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 staffing, equal opportunities, environmental and/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**

The financial implications are outlined in the Budget Setting Report 2014/15, **as amended by [Labour Amendment]**

(b) **Staffing Implications**

See text above

(c) **Equal Opportunities Implications**

An Equality Impact Assessment is included at **Appendix I [Labour Amendment]** in the attached Budget Setting Report 2014/15

(d) **Consultation**

As outlined in 5 above, budget proposals are based on the requirements of statutory and discretionary service provision. Public consultations relating to Council services are undertaken throughout the year, and details can be found on the Council's website - details of the results of the 2013 survey can be found on the internet at: <http://alturl.com/h9jgw>

(e) **Community Safety**

See text above.

(f) **Section 25 Report**

The proposals contained within this budget amendment would change the Section 25 report as outlined in the Supplement to Appendix N

(g) **Environmental Implications**

Where relevant, officers have considered the environmental impact of budget proposals.

## **6. Background papers**

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

- Mid-Year Financial Review (MFR) 2013
- Budget files: Revised 2013/14 and Original 2014/15.
- Budget-setting Report Version 1, January 2014 (covering 2013/14 to 2017/18) as updated at Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee on 20 January 2014, the Executive meeting on 23 January 2014, the Executive Amendment at this meeting and for the [Labour Amendment].

## **7. Appendices**

In this Report:

### **Labour Amendment:**

- Supplement to Appendices C(b), C(d), C(e), C(g)
- New appendices C(h) – Bids, and C( i) Bids to Fixed Term Priority Policy Fund
- Supplement to Appendix [ H ] - Earmarked & Specific Funds
- BSR replacement of Appendix [ I ] - Equality Impact Assessment
- Supplement to Appendix [ N ] - Section 25 Report
- Labour Budget Amendment – Changes to Budget Setting Report 2014-15 (incorporating new fund remits)

## **8. Inspection of papers**

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact:

Author's Name:	David Horspool
Author's Phone Number:	01223 - 457007
Author's Email:	david.horspool@cambridge.gov.uk

# Foreword by the Leader of the Labour Group

## A New Vision for Cambridge

This amended Budget Setting Report gives a clear initial indication of Labour's agenda for Cambridge. Firstly, we back a responsible financial approach, underpinned by sensible savings, to give the council a secure base. This will enable the council to protect vital services that residents need, despite the Coalition's swingeing local government cuts. Secondly, we will ensure a more active and imaginative use of existing resources to invest in the city's future. Thirdly, and most importantly, we want this prudence to be used as the financial basis for a new set of priorities, which will include:

- Sharing Cambridge's prosperity in order to help struggling households and individuals with the cost-of-living crisis
- Tackling youth unemployment
- Providing a more accessible city centre
- Taking a more robust approach to public realm enforcement, and issues such as cleanliness, dog mess, and anti-social behaviour.

Our proposals contain a series of practical savings that will help make the best of the council's stretched resources. In addition to some smaller items, we have particularly been concerned to identify back-room savings and cuts to the non-essentials, such as:

- Changing officer professional subscriptions to require employees to cover half the cost
- Cuts to unnecessary organisational subscriptions
- Cuts to the training, seminars and conferences budget, which is routinely underspent.

In terms of opportunities to increase Council income, our plans include a proposal to use a measured proportion of the Repair and Renewal capital balance – which currently contains £14m, and is not projected to fall below £10m in the near future – to make a major investment of £2m in commercial property to obtain a far higher rate of return than are currently received. Even if R & R costs are unexpectedly three times higher than projected, this still retains a multi-million pound buffer, and in place of minimal bank interest will generate a potential future return of about £90,000 per annum, plus the potential for additional capital income.

At the centre of this budget amendment is our proposal to redirect part of the current balance of 2014/15 New Homes Bonus money away from the 'Keep Cambridge Moving Fund' to a new 'Sharing Prosperity Fund'. This will provide funding for anti-poverty projects and other schemes to tackle inequality and show Cambridge residents that the council is on their side in tough times, including:

- An external Living Wage Promotion Officer to help Cambridge's businesses, colleges and other organisations become Living Wage employers
- Schemes to help low-income residents with water and energy bills
- A programme of Youth Apprenticeships, in partnership with local colleges, which will improve our frontline services as well as help reduce youth unemployment in Cambridge
- An expanded series of Environment Community Days to help residents with bulky waste disposal.

We will retain a large sum in the 'Keep Cambridge Moving Fund', with a view to considering further investment as and when sufficient resources become available, but we reject the idea that it is necessary to put all the council's eggs in this one basket all in one go. Detailed plans for the 'Keep Cambridge Moving Fund' are still to be defined, and the fund is supposed to be a long-term 25 year commitment, not a short-term splurge at a time when possible City Deal and other far larger funding sources are still unclear.

In addition, our proposals will reverse the administration's plans to shut down the Pest Control Service. Closing this service is ill-advised and represents a false economy, particularly considering the council's statutory duty to control disease and pests on its own property and public spaces. We will ensure that this service continues to give all who need it a free Pest Control service as it does currently, preventing those on low incomes risking rat infestation to pay the rent.

We will also:

- Provide funding for initial measures to make Cambridge's city centre more accessible to the disabled, elderly and infirm
- Build on the impact of the Mill Road Co-ordinator by expanding the concept with a new 'Chesterton Co-ordinator', and:
- Increase promotion funding for both home insulation schemes and the County Council's 'Collective Energy Switching Scheme' as the best immediate local option to help people obtain lower energy prices.

These measures are a taste of the pragmatic, intelligent social democratic approach that residents can expect from a future Labour administration, an approach that will improve essential council services and target scarce resources to some of the most disadvantaged sections of our community, while being fiscally responsible and imaginatively forward thinking in our strategic financial approach.

In the longer-term, Labour's strategy for the city will be to continue to look for the savings and efficiency gains necessary to protect core services, while using the 'Sharing Prosperity Fund' to tackle inequality in Cambridge. Our approach will be to continue to drive forward service reviews, opportunities for shared services and innovative delivery, to review Council central support and overheads and discretionary areas of spending, while also looking more carefully at areas that generate surplus income and offer further opportunities. No stone should be left unturned in the search for efficiencies and increased income (so long as they do not compromise our wider objectives), which can help us do the same as we do now, or more, more intelligently and economically. Revenue-generating areas like car-parks need careful examination to make sure that we could not make greater efficiencies, or even dispose of underperforming assets. In statutory areas, we would be scrupulous not to endanger the level of service, but to look carefully for efficiencies and savings, underpinned by a more systematic approach to service transformation and review.

Cambridge City Council may become smaller in the sense that it has less money, but under Labour it will continue to have big ambitions for the city, and squeeze out the maximum in service quality and value for every pound spent.

Yours sincerely,

*Councillor Lewis Herbert*

# Labour Budget Amendment – Changes to Budget Setting Report 2014-15

## **All page references are to Budget Setting Report Version 1 (Strategy & Resources)**

[On p. 31, after “and it is recommended”, delete until and including “uncommitted funding” on p. 32 and insert instead]:

“that £700,000 of the balance of unapplied New Homes Bonus funding for 2014/15 is used as a contribution to this fund.”

1. [On p. 32, after the section entitled ‘Keep Cambridge Moving’, insert]:

### **“Sharing Prosperity Fund**

Cambridge is overall a wealthy city. However, some areas and sections of the community do not share in this general prosperity. Many Cambridge residents have had their income reduced in recent years. Many workers have lost the value of their wages through receiving limited or no increase over the last three years. House prices and rents are increasing at far higher rates than wages. Cuts in benefits and the introduction of the Bedroom Tax are hitting many of the least well off. At the same time the cost of living in the city has risen, especially the cost of housing and energy, but food and bus fares are other examples.

Various areas in the city have households who are not able to share in the City’s prosperity. Although the most obvious examples, are King’s Hedges, Abbey and East Chesterton, and to a lesser extent Arbury, other wards contain pockets of people having to live very low incomes. This is shown by the Lower Super Output Area data (data on sub-areas of wards grouped together by similar demographics, each covering around 1500 residents). For example, Trumpington, Queen Edith’s, Coleridge, Petersfield and Romsey all contain areas of households struggling to make ends meet. 2450 people used Cambridge Food Bank in 2012, which implies a level of hidden poverty that may not immediately be apparent.

Though admirable as a stop-gap, simply providing charity for those who reach crisis-point is not enough. It is imperative that the City Council pro-actively leads and supports further initiatives to help people who most need support to maximise their income, minimise their costs and prevent that crisis point from ever being reached.

That is why it is recommended that £500,000 of the balance of unapplied New Homes Bonus Funding for 2014/15 is used to create a ‘Sharing Prosperity Fund’. It will provide resources to fund fixed-term and one-off projects and proposals that fulfil the following criteria. It will underpin an Anti-Poverty Strategy that Labour proposes to develop in 2014.

Proposals to the fund (which can be made through the budget process by members or officers, subject to committee consideration) must contribute towards one of the following objectives:



- A. Assisting (solely or predominantly) low income households or persons in:
  - maximising their income
  - minimising their costs
  - dealing with debt and personal finances
  - improving their skills, education or chance of employment
- B. Reducing economic inequality in Cambridge
- C. Ameliorate deprivation or assist low-income households in any other way"

***Sharing Prosperity Fund Formal Remit:***

*To provide resources to fund fixed-term and one-off projects and proposals that fulfil the following criteria and underpin an Anti-Poverty Strategy that Labour proposes to develop in 2014.*

*Proposals to the fund (which can be made through the budget process by members or officers, subject to committee consideration) must contribute towards one of the following objectives:*

- 1) *Assisting (solely or predominantly) low income households or persons in:*
  - *maximising their income*
  - *minimising their costs*
  - *dealing with debt and personal finances*
  - *improving their skills, education or chance of employment*
- 2) *Reducing economic inequality in Cambridge*
- 3) *Ameliorate deprivation or assist low-income households in any other way*

2. [On p. 46, after "in those years", insert:]

"It is also recommended that in future years the Policy Priority Fund (PPF) is used solely to fund ongoing revenue costs, not fixed term or one-off projects. This is because it is also recommended that to allow non-ongoing sources of funding, such as New Homes Bonus (NHB), to be used responsibly for priority projects, a new fund, similar to the PPF but only available for funding non-ongoing, fixed-term projects, be set up, called the Fixed-Term Priority Project Fund (FPPF).

**Fixed-Term Priority Project Fund**

As it stands, it is not responsible to use non-ongoing, potentially short-term or uncertain sources of income, most obviously NHB, to fund the PPF, because the PPF can be used, as it stands, for both fixed-term or ongoing costs. The creation of this fund will allow such sources of income to be used for priority projects without building in unsustainable ongoing revenue commitments. It is recommended that £300,000 of the balance of unapplied New Homes Bonus Funding for 2014/15 is used to create this fund."

3. [On p. 42, between the sentence ending 'commercial property portfolio' and the one starting 'This will effectively', insert the following:]

"Further investment of £2m in commercial property is also recommended, from the balance of capital in the Repair and Renewal Fund. This is financially responsible, since the balance of that fund is not projected to dip below £10m in future years. This sum will not seriously

increase future risk to the council but will enable additional income to be generated from investments.”

4. [On p. 42, on the end of the sentence ending ‘future years’ net savings requirements’, insert:]  
“, or towards extra funding for contributions to the ‘Sharing Prosperity Fund’ .”

***Fixed-Term Priority Project Fund Formal Remit:***

*To use non-ongoing, potentially short-term or uncertain sources of income, most obviously New Homes Bonus, for both fixed-term or ongoing costs. The creation of this fund will allow such sources of income to be used for priority projects without building in unsustainable ongoing revenue commitments.*

## Labour Budget Amendment - Supplement to Appendix [ C (b) ]

### 2014/15 - Non-Cash Limit Items - GF

Reference	Item Description	2013/14 Budget £	2014/15 Budget £	2015/16 Budget £	2016/17 Budget £	2017/18 Budget £	Contact
-----------	------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	---------

#### Strategy & Resources - Strategy

LNCL1	Decrease contribution to Keep Cambridge Moving Fund	0	(688,860)	0	0	0	Simon Payne
-------	---	---	-----------	---	---	---	-------------

No clear case has been made for putting £1.2m extra into this fund, which is supposed to represent a '25 year commitment', in one go, at this time. Additional funding for the fund, if required, can be identified in future years along with clear priorities. We will retain £700,000 in the Keep Cambridge Moving Fund with the option of additional contributions being added from, for example, the New Homes Bonus funding in future years. The remaining £800,000 is better invested from 2014/15 for new purposes, such as helping those struggling on low incomes and in tackling inequality, and in the main will form the basis for Labour's new 'Sharing Prosperity Fund' instead.

0	(688,860)	0	0	0
---	-----------	---	---	---

LNCL2	Contribution to create 'Sharing Prosperity Fund	0	500,000	0	0	0	Andrew Limb
-------	---	---	---------	---	---	---	-------------

This fund is a new earmarked fund that is intended to provide funding for projects aimed at maximising the incomes of those on low incomes, tackling poverty and addressing economic inequality created in the context of the cost-of-living crisis and welfare cuts faced by some Cambridge residents. A full set of criteria and a description of the fund is appended. This will be funded by diversion of some of the funds currently apportioned to the 'Keep Cambridge Moving' fund.  
[Funded from New Homes Bonus]

LNCL3	Contribution to create a Fixed-Term Priority Project Fund (FPPF)	0	300,000	0	0	0	Ray Ward
-------	--	---	---------	---	---	---	----------

This will be available to fund fixed-term policy priority projects only, freeing up the existing Policy Priority Fund to continue to fund ongoing revenue items. This will be funded by diversion of some of the funds currently apportioned to the 'Keep Cambridge Moving' fund.  
[Funded from New Homes Bonus]

0	800,000	0	0	0
---	---------	---	---	---

Portfolio Total		0	111,140	0	0	0
-----------------	--	---	---------	---	---	---

# Labour Budget Amendment - Supplement to Appendix [ C (d) ]

## 2014/15 Budget - Savings - GF

Reference	Item Description	2013/14 Budget £	2014/15 Budget £	2015/16 Budget £	2016/17 Budget £	2017/18 Budget £	Contact
-----------	------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	---------

### Environment - Environmental & Waste Services

LS6	<b>Increase charges at public toilets that require payment</b>	0	(5,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	Bob Carter
-----	--	---	---------	----------	----------	----------	------------

Increase charges at public toilets that require payment by 10p (from 20 to 30p) - This is a small increase, still keeping public toilet charges at a modest level to yield increased income for the council. The alterations to the toilets can be funded from existing R & R budgets.

<b>Portfolio Total</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>(5,000)</b>	<b>(10,000)</b>	<b>(10,000)</b>	<b>(10,000)</b>	
------------------------	--	----------	----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	--

### Environment - Planning & Climate Change

LS7	<b>Introduction of pre-application charging on listed building planning applications</b>	0	(2,000)	(2,000)	(2,000)	(2,000)	Patsy Dell
-----	--	---	---------	---------	---------	---------	------------

National legislation does not allow for charging for planning applications related to listed buildings as happens commonly on many other applications, but, especially in the context of an historic University city, many such applications come forward at considerable cost to the council. Introducing a modest pre-application charge will ensure that the costs to the council of administering listed-buildings related planning applications and associated pre-application advice process is minimised. This is a conservative estimate which can be revised following implementation.

<b>Portfolio Total</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>(2,000)</b>	<b>(2,000)</b>	<b>(2,000)</b>	<b>(2,000)</b>	
------------------------	--	----------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	--

### Environment - Public Places

LS1	<b>Increase roundabout sponsorship</b>	0	(2,500)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	Alistair Wilson
-----	--	---	---------	---------	---------	---------	-----------------

Increased income through more sponsorship signs on Cambridge roundabouts

<b>Portfolio Total</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>(2,500)</b>	<b>(5,000)</b>	<b>(5,000)</b>	<b>(5,000)</b>	
------------------------	--	----------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	--

### Strategy & Resources - Customer Services & Resources

LS2	<b>Top slice cut of 25% of overall Training, Seminar and Conference budge</b>	0	(75,460)	(75,460)	(75,460)	(75,460)	Deborah Simpson
-----	---	---	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------

Cambridge City Council has a base budget of £301,860 on training, seminars and conferences for its staff. This is very high for a council of its size and budget. In the current financial year, by December only £138,000 had been spent, and it is unlikely that the whole budget will be spent. It is important to maintain high levels of training and ensure that staff can attend appropriate conferences and seminars, but it is clear from these figures that it can be done on a considerably reduced resource. The saving will be delivered by a top-slice to the overall budget. Remaining budget will be re-distributed according to need by officer review.

## 2014/15 Budget - Savings - GF

Reference	Item Description	2013/14 Budget £	2014/15 Budget £	2015/16 Budget £	2016/17 Budget £	2017/18 Budget £	Contact
-----------	------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	---------

LS3	<b>Change policy to pay only 50% of the cost of professional subscriptions for staff</b>	0	(11,500)	(23,000)	(23,000)	(23,000)	Deborah Simpson
-----	--	---	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------

Currently, Cambridge City Council pays one whole professional subscription per relevant staff member, which costs £46,000 p.a. Many councils have ceased this altogether and require staff members to pay for their whole subscription. Reflecting the fact that both the individual staff member and the organisation as a whole benefit from the membership of such organisations, this item will make a saving by requiring relevant staff to pay for half of their own personal professional subscriptions, with the council continuing to pay the other half, thereby striking a fair balance.

LS8	<b>Commercial Property Portfolio Extra Income from Further Additional Investments</b>	0	(43,500)	(87,000)	(87,000)	(87,000)	Dave Prinsep
-----	---	---	----------	----------	----------	----------	--------------

Funded by investing £2,000,000 of the R & R balance in commercial property - a responsible amount given that the balance is not projected over the years ahead to ever go below £10,000,000, and therefore liquidity problems are very unlikely to pose a significant risk to the council's financial position - and assuming a modest 5% return, but still greater than alternative returns from bank deposits, etc.

LS5	<b>Returning planning from area committees to central planning committee</b>	0	(3,400)	(3,400)	(3,400)	(3,400)	Gary Clift
-----	--	---	---------	---------	---------	---------	------------

This amount defines the minimum saving in managing planning through a single planning committee pending a fuller review on the effective handling of all applications. This will enable area committees to focus on their prime job of community engagement on issues in their area and that arise through public forums and other agenda items, rather than being dominated by planning items. It also frees up ward members to be available as advocates for their residents on planning issues rather than risking pre-determination.

<b>Portfolio Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(133,860)</b>	<b>(188,860)</b>	<b>(188,860)</b>	<b>(188,860)</b>
------------------------	----------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------

### Strategy & Resources - Strategy

LS4	<b>Top slice cut of 25% budget for organisational subscriptions</b>	0	(10,620)	(21,250)	(21,250)	(21,250)	Andrew Limb
-----	---	---	----------	----------	----------	----------	-------------

In tough times, all avenues need to be explored for savings before jobs are cut and services reduced. The council spends £85,000 on organisational subscriptions, many of which are not crucial and could be cancelled. This will be a top slice cut, with the remaining budget re-distributed according to need.

<b>Portfolio Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(10,620)</b>	<b>(21,250)</b>	<b>(21,250)</b>	<b>(21,250)</b>
------------------------	----------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

<b>All Portfolios - Net Impact of Labour Amendment</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(153,980)</b>	<b>(227,110)</b>	<b>(227,110)</b>	<b>(227,110)</b>
--	----------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------

## Labour Budget Amendment - Supplement to Appendix [ C (e) ]

### 2014/15 Budget -Service Reviews - GF

Reference	Item Description	2013/14 Budget £	2014/15 Budget £	2015/16 Budget £	2016/17 Budget £	2017/18 Budget £	Contact
-----------	------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	---------

#### Environment - Environmental & Waste Services

LSR1	Reverse Service Review SR3299 – Cessation of the Pest Control Service	0	13,800	54,500	54,500	54,500	Jas Lally
------	---	---	--------	--------	--------	--------	-----------

Pest control is an important public service. The council needs to continue to help residential households control vermin and pests free of charge, for the good of public health and to prevent the general spread of problems such as rats and bed bugs. The savings in SR 3299 are not completely realisable anyway due to the necessity of calling in private contractors to carry out pest control work that the council is legally obliged to carry out on its own council homes, commercial properties, parks and play areas if the in-house team is abolished. This item will reverse this cut and save the Pest Control Service. With the proposed savings in the PPF in addition to remaining funding, from year 2, in the 2014/15 allocation of £100,000, this can be achieved.

<b>Portfolio Total</b>	0	13,800	54,500	54,500	54,500
<b>Portfolio Total</b>	0	13,800	54,500	54,500	54,500
<b>All Portfolios - Net Impact of Labour Amendment</b>	0	13,800	54,500	54,500	54,500

# Labour Budget Amendment - Supplement to Appendix [ C (g) ]

## 2014/15 Budget - External Bids

Reference	Item Description	2013/14 Budget £	2014/15 Budget £	2015/16 Budget £	2016/17 Budget £	2017/18 Budget £	Contact
-----------	------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	---------

### Community Services - Housing

LX1	Expanded programme of 'Community Clear-Out Days'	0	9,000	0	0	0	Liz Bisset
-----	--	---	-------	---	---	---	------------

Currently, these events are very successful, but many areas in need of help with bulky-waste and a general 'clear up' do not get the benefit of these days very often or at all. An expanded programme would allow 6 such events per year in both the North and South of the city. This will help low-income households to clear any local dumping and to save money on disposing bulky waste etc. If successful, could be considered for funding in future years.  
(Funded from Sharing Prosperity Fund)

<b>Portfolio Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------------	----------	--------------	----------	----------	----------

### Strategy & Resources - Strategy

LX2	Living Wage External Campaign Officer	0	9,820	19,630	9,820	0	Deborah Simpson
-----	---------------------------------------	---	-------	--------	-------	---	-----------------

Cambridge City Council is implementing the living wage and is seeking its own accreditation. The council now needs to focus on promoting living wage accreditation externally to make Cambridge a 'Living Wage City'. This two-year fixed term trial post would involve working with the Living Wage Foundation and local Living Wage campaigners to promote accreditation among businesses and other organisations in Cambridge, such as Colleges and the Universities, making the argument in favour of the benefits to workers and businesses from paying the living wage. The work will involve co-ordinating action, researching existing practices, communicating with external organisations and groups, and promotion.  
(Funded from Sharing Prosperity Fund)

LX3	Promotion budget to accompany Living Wage campaign	0	3,500	7,000	3,500	0	Deborah Simpson
-----	--	---	-------	-------	-------	---	-----------------

This would accompany the Living Wage External Campaign Officer, and is a budget for events, publicity, meetings and other promotion/project costs associated with that post.  
(Funded from Sharing Prosperity Fund)

LX4	Water Meter Anti-Poverty Scheme	0	25,000	50,000	25,000	0	Jas Lally
-----	---------------------------------	---	--------	--------	--------	---	-----------

There are many households in Cambridge still paying for their water and sewerage based on rateable values last reviewed over 25 years ago. Although rateable values are no longer used for payment of council taxes, they are still used to charge for water and sewerage where no meter has been fitted. This scheme would pay for a two year fixed-post officer and small project budget with a remit to assist residents review their water and sewerage bill and establish if they would benefit from changing to a meter, or moving to the assessed charge basis, together with information and help to make any changes identified. It would focus on wards and LSOAs high on the deprivation indices, and could be considered for extension in future years.  
(Funded from Sharing Prosperity Fund)

## 2014/15 Budget - External Bids

Reference	Item Description	2013/14 Budget £	2014/15 Budget £	2015/16 Budget £	2016/17 Budget £	2017/18 Budget £	Contact
LX5	<b>Extra project budget for Private Sector Energy Officer</b>	0	7,000	0	0	0	Jas Lally

This would constitute an extra project budget for the existing officer aimed at enhancing information, publicity and uptake of existing/new energy efficiency and other insulation schemes, such as e.g. the ECO, targeted particularly at low-incomes areas of Cambridge.  
(Funded from Sharing Prosperity Fund)

LX6	<b>Youth Apprenticeship Programme</b>	0	31,500	63,000	94,500	126,000	Deborah Simpson
-----	---------------------------------------	---	--------	--------	--------	---------	-----------------

Initially a 4 year programme. Although unemployment in general continues to come down, under-25 unemployment remains a stubborn problem, especially in some of the city's poorer areas. This scheme would help to address this by providing funding for apprenticeships for local young people, apportioned according to a review of capacity in the whole council. Every head of service will be required to examine the potential for apprenticeships in their area, and then the funding will be apportioned appropriately. It will build up as capacity is identified, from 5 in the first year to 20 by the 4th. This will cost £6,300 per apprenticeship p.a.  
(Funded from Sharing Prosperity Fund)

<b>Portfolio Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>76,820</b>	<b>139,630</b>	<b>132,820</b>	<b>126,000</b>
<b>All Portfolios - Impact of Labour Amendment</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>85,820</b>	<b>139,630</b>	<b>132,820</b>	<b>126,000</b>



## Labour Budget Amendment - New Appendix [ C (h) ]

### 2014/15 Budget - Bids - GF

Reference	Item Description	2013/14 Budget £	2014/15 Budget £	2015/16 Budget £	2016/17 Budget £	2017/18 Budget £	Contact
-----------	------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	---------

#### Environment - Environmental & Waste Services

##### Bid

LB1	'Clean it Up' anti-dog-fouling campaign	0	13,350	16,700	16,700	16,700	Adrian Ash
-----	---	---	--------	--------	--------	--------	------------

'Clean it Up' anti-dog-fouling campaign - £16,700 to make the current part-time dog warden post into a full time post (including on-costs) from October 2014. In the first year advertising and poster campaign costing £5,000, including poster competition in schools, to educate and warn public about new, tougher approach to dog fouling.

LB2	Bolstering Public Realm Enforcement	0	51,000	102,000	102,000	102,000	Adrian Ash
-----	-------------------------------------	---	--------	---------	---------	---------	------------

Public realm enforcement in Cambridge is inadequate. An irresponsible few damage our parks and public spaces, do not pick up dog mess, drop litter and create an untidy environment for the majority, and they currently do so with almost total impunity, due to the lack of resources devoted to enforcement. A more pro-active and effective approach across the City is needed. This will be facilitated by the radical move of doubling the public realm enforcement team, from 3 officers to 6.

Portfolio Total	<b>0</b>	<b>64,350</b>	<b>118,700</b>	<b>118,700</b>	<b>118,700</b>
-----------------	----------	---------------	----------------	----------------	----------------

#### Strategy & Resources - Strategy

LB3	Contributions from core funding to 'Sharing Prosperity Fund'	0	75,830	53,910	53,910	53,910	Ray Ward
-----	--	---	--------	--------	--------	--------	----------

Ongoing contributions from Savings to the 'Sharing Prosperity Fund'

Portfolio Total	<b>0</b>	<b>75,830</b>	<b>53,910</b>	<b>53,910</b>	<b>53,910</b>
-----------------	----------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

All Portfolios - Net Impact of Labour Amendment	<b>0</b>	<b>140,180</b>	<b>172,610</b>	<b>172,610</b>	<b>172,610</b>
---	----------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------

## Labour Budget Amendment - New Appendix [ C (i) ]

### 2014/15 Budget - Fixed-Term Priority Project Fund - GF

Reference	Item Description	2013/14 Budget £	2014/15 Budget £	2015/16 Budget £	2016/17 Budget £	2017/18 Budget £	Contact
-----------	------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	---------

#### Environment - Planning & Climate Change

FPPF1	City Centre Accessibility Review	0	15,000	0	0	0	Emma Thornton
-------	----------------------------------	---	--------	---	---	---	---------------

The City Centre is becoming increasingly difficult to access and navigate, particularly for the elderly, the infirm and the disabled. This review would consider issues such as advertising boards and street cafes blocking pavements, poor and uneven pavements, location and availability of disabled parking bay, and particular issues faced by some groups such as the deaf and blind. This project would involve increasing the accessibility officer post to a FTE post for 1 year and a small projects budget. It will require partnership working with the planning department, the county council, the Cambridge BID, the city centre management team and local business to identify the problems and suggest solutions/negotiate solutions where possible. This project would complement Labour County Group's 'Investing in Town Centres' budget proposal, which would provide capital funds to implement recommendations.

FPPF3	Extra Cambridge promotion of the Cambridgeshire Collective Energy Switching Scheme	0	10,000	0	0	0	Jas Lally
-------	--	---	--------	---	---	---	-----------

This scheme has the potential to save residents money on their energy bills, but only if proper work is done on promoting it in the City. Otherwise, it will fail due to lack of take-up and obscurity, as the Green Deal is in danger of doing. This item would involve a poster campaign, an advert on local radio, and a booklet distributed to every household.

<b>Portfolio Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>25,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------------	----------	---------------	----------	----------	----------

#### Environment - Public Places

FPPF2	Chesterton Co-ordinator	0	11,250	22,500	11,250	0	Emma Thornton
-------	-------------------------	---	--------	--------	--------	---	---------------

Some areas of the City with a lot of shops, traders and other businesses are not covered by the BID area, but also need help in the current climate - such as Chesterton. This bid is for a fixed term 2-year trial post for a part-time small business/community group/trader co-ordinator post on the model of the current successful Mill Road Co-ordinator, but for shops and businesses, especially independent ones, in the Chesterton area. This would include Chesterton High Street, the area around Mitcham's Corner/Chesterton Road (up to Elizabeth Way Roundabout), Milton Road, Victoria Road and other businesses (final area subject to consultation). This is particularly pertinent given that in the Local Plan East Chesterton is designated as an area of major change, and Mitcham's Corner as an opportunity area. The co-ordinator would work with local traders, the council and community groups to identify and capitalise on opportunities.

<b>Portfolio Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11,250</b>	<b>22,500</b>	<b>11,250</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------------	----------	---------------	---------------	---------------	----------

<b>All Portfolios</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>36,250</b>	<b>22,500</b>	<b>11,250</b>	<b>0</b>
-----------------------	----------	---------------	---------------	---------------	----------

# Labour Budget Amendment - Supplement to Appendix [ G (a) ]

## 2014/15 Budget - Capital Bids - GF

Reference	Item Description	2013/14 Budget £	2014/15 Budget £	2015/16 Budget £	2016/17 Budget £	2017/18 Budget £	Contact
-----------	------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	---------

### All GF Portfolios

#### Capital

<b>LC1</b>	Delete C3448 'Capital contribution to the 'Keep Cambridge Moving Fund' and delete from Capital Plan SC593 [Linked to LNCL1]	0	(111,140)	0	0	0	
------------	--	---	-----------	---	---	---	--

Requirement for Capital Funding (included above)						
0		(111,140)		0		0

<b>LC2</b>	Extra additional investment in Commercial Property Portfolio [Funded from all Repairs & Renewals balances] [Linked to LS8]	0	2,000,000	0	0	0	
------------	--	---	-----------	---	---	---	--

Requirement for Capital Funding (included above)						
0		0		0		0

<b>All Portfolios Total</b>	0	(111,140)	0	0	0	
-----------------------------	---	-----------	---	---	---	--

Requirement for Capital Funding (included above)						
0		(111,140)		0		0

# Labour Budget Amendment - add to Appendix H

## Earmarked & Specific Funds (all figures in £'000s)

### Sharing Prosperity Fund

	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
<b>(Surplus) / Deficit Balance b/f</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>(490.0)</b>	<b>(404.3)</b>	<b>(325.4)</b>
Contributions	0.0	(500.0)	0.0	0.0	0.0
Contributions	0.0	(75.8)	(53.9)	(53.9)	(53.9)
<b>Total surplus available</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>(575.8)</b>	<b>(543.9)</b>	<b>(458.2)</b>	<b>(379.3)</b>
Expenditure approvals	0.0	85.8	139.6	132.8	126.0
Pending approvals	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>(Surplus) / Deficit Balance c/f</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>(490.0)</b>	<b>(404.3)</b>	<b>(325.4)</b>	<b>(253.3)</b>

### Fixed-Term Priority Project Fund

	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
<b>(Surplus) / Deficit Balance b/f</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>(263.7)</b>	<b>(241.2)</b>	<b>(230.0)</b>
Contributions	0.0	(300.0)	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Total surplus available</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>(300.0)</b>	<b>(263.7)</b>	<b>(241.2)</b>	<b>(230.0)</b>
Expenditure approvals	0.0	36.3	22.5	11.2	0.0
<b>(Surplus) / Deficit Balance c/f</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>(263.7)</b>	<b>(241.2)</b>	<b>(230.0)</b>	<b>(230.0)</b>

### Keep Cambridge Moving Fund [*Labour Amendment*]

	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
<b>(Surplus) / Deficit Balance b/f</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>(436.1)</b>	<b>(700.0)</b>	<b>(700.0)</b>	<b>(700.0)</b>
Contributions	(436.1)	(263.9)	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Total surplus available</b>	<b>(436.1)</b>	<b>(700.0)</b>	<b>(700.0)</b>	<b>(700.0)</b>	<b>(700.0)</b>
Expenditure approvals	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>(Surplus) / Deficit Balance c/f</b>	<b>(436.1)</b>	<b>(700.0)</b>	<b>(700.0)</b>	<b>(700.0)</b>	<b>(700.0)</b>

## Cambridge City Council Equality Impact Assessment



Completing an Equality Impact Assessment will help you to think about what impact your strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service may have on people that live in, work in or visit Cambridge, as well as on City Council staff.

The template is easy to use. You do not need to have specialist equalities knowledge to complete it. It asks you to make judgements based on evidence and experience. There are guidance notes on the intranet to help you. You can also get advice from David Kidston, Strategy and Partnerships Manager on 01223 457043 or email [david.kidston@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:david.kidston@cambridge.gov.uk) or from any member of the Joint Equalities Group.

### 1. Title of strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service:

Labour Budget Amendment 2014

### 2. What is the objective or purpose of your strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service?

The objective of the Liberal Democrat Group's proposed budget for 2014/15 is to set a balanced budget for 2014/15 that reflects the Council's eight vision statements and takes into account councillor's priorities in its proposals for achieving the savings required. This EQIA is an initial assessment of the equality impacts of the amendments proposed by the Labour Group to the General Fund element of the City Council's budget, based on the limited information available about each project in the Labour Budget Amendment Appendix. It should be noted that a fuller assessment of the equality impact of these proposed amendments based on more detailed information than is currently available will need to be carried out before any decisions are taken regarding the City Council's budget for 2014/15 at the full Council meeting on 27 February 2014. This includes consideration of any steps that could be taken to mitigate any of the negative impacts identified in section 7 of this assessment.

### 3. Who will be affected by this strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service? (Please tick those that apply)

- Residents
- Visitors
- Staff

A specific client group or groups (please state):

This is an assessment of proposed amendments to the Council's budget. The amendments relate to a number of different City Council service areas. Some of the proposals will have a universal impact, while others may have a differential impact on particular client groups. Further information on these impacts is set out in section 7 of this assessment.

**4. What type of strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service is this? (Please tick)**

- New
- Revised
- Existing

**5. Responsible directorate and service**

Directorate: Resources

Service: Accounting Services

**6. Are other departments or partners involved in delivering this strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service?**

- No
- Yes (please give details):

The proposed amendments would require action by a number of City Council services, including City Homes, Corporate Strategy, Human Resources, Planning, Property Services, Refuse and Environment, Streets and Open Spaces, and Tourism and City Centre Management

## 7. Potential impact

Please list and explain how this strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service could **positively** or **negatively** affect individuals from the following equalities groups.

When answering this question, please think about:

- The results of relevant consultation that you or others have completed (for example with residents, people that work in or visit Cambridge, service users, staff or partner organisations).
- Complaints information.
- Performance information.
- Information about people using your service (for example whether people from certain equalities groups use the service more or less than others).
- Inspection results.
- Comparisons with other organisations.
- The implementation of your piece of work (don't just assess what you think the impact will be after you have completed your work, but also think about what steps you might have to take to make sure that the implementation of your work does not negatively impact on people from a particular equality group).
- The relevant premises involved.
- Your communications.
- National research (local information is not always available, particularly for some equalities groups, so use national research to provide evidence for your conclusions).

**(a) Age** (any group of people of a particular age, including younger and older people – in particular, please consider any safeguarding issues for children and vulnerable adults)

LS6 - Increased charges at public toilets that require payment - The proposed amendment to increase charges from 20p to 30p at those public toilets which require payment may have a small negative impact on those people who need to use toilets more frequently, which could include some older people.

LS5 - Returning planning from area committees to central planning committee - There could be a potential negative impact from this proposal on those who have mobility issues, including some older people, or those who might find it more difficult to travel from the area in which they live into the centre of the City to attend meetings.

FPPF1 - City Centre Accessibility Review - The proposed review is likely to have a positive impact on older residents and visitors to the City Centre, because it will review existing access issues (advertising boards, street cafes blocking pavements, pavement conditions, and the location and availability of disabled parking bays) and suggest potential solutions which could be supported by the Labour group's 'Investing in Town Centres' budget proposal.

LX6 - Youth Apprenticeship Programme - If the proposed additional funding enables Heads of Service to identify and support more youth apprenticeships than are currently available in City Council services, this could have a positive impact on the skills and employability of those young people that benefit from the apprenticeships created.

**(b) Disability** (including people with a physical impairment, sensory impairment, learning disability, mental health problem or other condition which has an impact on their daily life)

LS6 - Increased charges at public toilets that require payment - The proposed amendment to increase charges from 20p to 30p at those public toilets which require payment may have a small negative impact on those people who need to use toilets more frequently, which could include some people with disabilities or medical conditions.

LS2 - Top slice training budget by 25% - During 2012/13, 5.11% of attendees at training courses declared themselves as disabled. This is higher than the workforce profile for disability which is 4.74%. This suggests that reducing the training budget could fall disproportionately on disabled staff, as they are over-represented on training courses. However, if the 30% reduction in the budget comes mainly from the annual underspend on the corporate training budget, it may be that there is actually no tangible impact on particular groups of staff.

LS5 - Returning planning from are committees to central planning committee - There could be a potential negative impact from this proposal on those who have mobility issues, including those with physical disabilities or visual impairments, or those who might find it more difficult to travel from the area in which they live into the centre of the City to attend meetings.

FPPF1 - City Centre Accessibility Review - The proposed review is likely to have a positive impact on disabled residents and visitors to the City Centre, because it will review existing access issues (advertising boards, street cafes blocking pavements, pavement conditions, and the location and availability of disabled parking bays) and suggest potential solutions which could be supported by the Labour group's 'Investing in Town Centres' budget proposal



**(c) Gender**

LS2 - Top slice training budget by 25% - The gender profile of the workforce currently sits at 48% Female and 52% Male. The numbers of staff attending training in 2012/13 are 49.55% Female and 50.45% Male. This suggests that there would not be a disproportionate impact on either female or male employees from reducing the corporate training budget by this amount.

**(d) Pregnancy and maternity**

LS6 - Increased charges at public toilets that require payment - The proposed amendment to increase charges from 20p to 30p at those public toilets which require payment may have a small negative impact on those people who need to use toilets more frequently, including those who are pregnant or those with young children.

FPPF1 - City Centre Accessibility Review - The proposed review is likely to have a positive impact on pregnant women and parents with young children, because it will review existing access issues (advertising boards, street cafes blocking pavements and pavement conditions) and suggest potential solutions which could be supported by the Labour group's 'Investing in Town Centres' budget proposal.

**(e) Transgender (including gender re-assignment)**

No differential impact on transgender people has been identified through this assessment of the proposed budget amendments

**(f) Marriage and Civil Partnership**

No differential impact on marriage and civil partnership has been identified through this assessment of the proposed budget amendments

**(g) Race or Ethnicity**

LS2 - Top slice training budget by 25% - In 2012/13 9.23% of staff who attended declared themselves as BAME, which is higher than the workforce profile of 7.75%. This suggests that reducing the training budget could fall disproportionately on BAME staff, as they are over-represented on training courses. It may also be that there is a greater training need amongst any staff who speak English as a second language, although the City Council does not monitor attendance at training by staff who speak English as a second language. However, if the 25% reduction in the budget comes mainly from the annual underspend on the corporate training budget, it may be that there is actually no tangible impact on particular groups of staff.

**(h) Religion or Belief**

No differential impact on religion or belief has been identified through this assessment of the proposed budget amendments

### **(i) Sexual Orientation**

No differential impact on sexual orientation has been identified through this assessment of the proposed budget amendments

### **(j) Other factor that may lead to inequality (please state):**

LNCL1 - Decreasing the contribution to the Keep Cambridge Moving Fund and LNCL2 - Contribution to Sharing Prosperity Fund. - The amendment proposes to retain £700,000 in the Keep Cambridge Moving Fund, and use the remaining £800,000 to invest for new purposes from 2014/15 onwards. This would include helping those on living on low incomes and in tackling inequality and in the main will form the basis of Labour's proposed 'Sharing Prosperity Fund'. The 'Sharing Prosperity Fund' would be an earmarked fund which would support projects that aim to maximise the incomes of those on low incomes, tackle poverty and address economic inequality. This amendment has the potential to have a positive impact on residents on low incomes. However, without further information on the types of initiatives that this would support and a more detailed assessment of the impact of reducing the level of investment in the Keep Cambridge Moving Fund, it is difficult to assess the overall equality impact of the proposed amendment. Further consideration of the full set of criteria and description of the fund will be undertaken in the final EqIA of the Labour budget amendments.

FPPF3 - Extra Cambridge promotion of the Cambridgeshire Collective Energy Switching Scheme - This proposed amendment could have a positive impact on those on low incomes and those suffering from fuel poverty if it leads to greater awareness and take-up of the collective energy switching scheme amongst Cambridge residents.

LX1 - Expanded programme of 'Community Clear Out Days' - The proposal to increase the number of events held in the North and South of the City could have a positive impact on those residents living on low incomes and others who may find it difficult to access existing locations. It would increase access to free disposal of bulky waste rather than paying for these services.

LX2 - Living Wage External Campaign Officer and LX3 - Promotion Budget to accompany Living Wage Campaign - If the employment of an officer to promote the living wage within the City results in more businesses and other organisation within the City, including the Universities, paying a Living Wage to their staff, this will have a positive impact on those residents who are currently not paid the Living Wage. There may be a disproportionate representation of some of the protected characteristics amongst those who are currently receive less than the Living Wage in the City, but further research would be needed to demonstrate the impact on particular groups.

LX4 - Water Meter Anti-Poverty Scheme - The proposal to provide officer capacity to assist residents to review their water usage and assess whether they would achieve savings through having a water meter installed could potentially have a positive impact on residents living on low incomes. However, a fuller assessment of the impact of this proposal would need to consider the relationship between the proposed services and any existing support offered to residents by water companies on this issue.

LX5 - Extra project budget for Private Sector Energy Officer - The proposal to increase the budget for promotion of energy efficiency and insulation schemes could have a positive impact on those living on low incomes if the proposed targeting of low income areas of the City results in greater take-up in these areas.

## 8. If you have any additional comments please add them here

There could potentially be equality impacts, both negative and positive, of some of the proposed amendments but there is not enough evidence available to make a full assessment. These include:

LS4 - Top slice 25% of budget for organisational subscriptions - Depending on which subscriptions were discontinued in order to achieve this saving, it could potentially have a disproportionate impact on different groups of staff. However, the Council does not monitor the usage of corporate subscriptions by equality group so it is not possible to make this assessment.

LSR1 - Cessation of the Pest Control Service - Without further information on which groups currently access the free pest control service, it is not possible to assess whether reinstating this service would have a positive impact on particular groups.

## 9. Conclusions and Next Steps

- If you have not identified any negative impacts, please sign off this form.
- If you have identified potential negative actions, you must complete the action plan at the end of this document to set out how you propose to mitigate the impact. If you do not feel that the potential negative impact can be mitigated, you must complete question 8 to explain why that is the case.
- If there is insufficient evidence to say whether or not there is likely to be a negative impact, please complete the action plan setting out what additional information you need to gather to complete the assessment.

All completed Equality Impact Assessments must be emailed to David Kidston, Strategy and Partnerships Manager, who will arrange for it to be published on the City Council's website. Email [david.kidston@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:david.kidston@cambridge.gov.uk)

## 10. Sign off

Name and job title of assessment lead officer: David Kidston, Strategy and Partnerships Manager

Names and job titles of other assessment team members and people consulted:

Chris Humphris, Principal Accountant

Date of completion: 31 January 2014

Date of next review of the assessment: Before the Council meeting on 27 February 2014

## Action Plan

**Equality Impact Assessment title:**

**Date of completion:**

<b>Equality Group</b>	<b>Age</b>
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

<b>Equality Group</b>	<b>Disability</b>
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

<b>Equality Group</b>	<b>Gender</b>
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

<b>Equality Group</b>	<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

<b>Equality Group</b>	<b>Transgender</b>
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

<b>Equality Group</b>	<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

<b>Equality Group</b>	<b>Race or Ethnicity</b>
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

<b>Equality Group</b>	<b>Religion or Belief</b>
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

<b>Equality Group</b>	<b>Sexual Orientation</b>
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

<b>Other factors that may lead to inequality</b>	
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

# Supplement to Appendix N

## [Labour Amendment]

### Section 25 Report (2014/15 Budget Process)

### Robustness of Estimates and Adequacy of Reserves

#### Section 25 Report

This budget amendment would not require any substantive changes to the existing Appendix N - Section 25 Report.

The amendment has no impact on the Net Savings Requirements in the forecast period, and does not propose any changes to the levels of Reserves.

However, it should be noted that the proposed use of £2m of funding held as balances in Repair & Renewals Funds is being made in advance of the completion of the scheduled exercise to identify the actual spending requirements associated with the 20-year plans that have been developed for each fund, so that the overall cashflow can be reviewed in the context of funding available; and appropriate decisions made on how balances are held most appropriately held. This is due to be reported back as part of the September 2014 MFR. However, in proposing the amendment it is recognised that there may be need to sell assets at a point in the future to meet R&R expenditure requirements.