



To: Executive Councillor for Finance & Resources:
Councillor George Owers

Report by: Head of Finance

Relevant scrutiny
committee: Strategy & Resources 13 February 2015

Wards affected: All Wards

LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP AMENDMENT TO:

Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2015/16

Key Decision

Foreword to the Liberal Democrat Group Amendment

Our major proposition seeks to provide an alternative investment strategy for the Council. Deriving from the review initiated by the last Council of the Repairs and Renewals provision, a significant onetime sum has been released. We would like to see the priority for investment to be the provision of additional housing at below market rent, an area of considerable community need where there are insufficient investors, rather than commercial property where there are many - and where there is little or no intrinsic community value. Based on work carried out so far we believe that our proposal can generate a good financial return to the council. It will naturally be subject to detailed public scrutiny and input as it is developed further by officers.

The city's housing shortage is the single largest structural factor in cost of living challenges in Cambridge. We believe that the Council should be applying its role to address it as a top priority including through the way it invests its funds. It should consider the issue not only as a question of social housing, but of the whole range of housing including intermediate housing, to avoid the city slipping further towards a polarised housing economy.

This scheme would have the benefit of reducing what we consider a financially risky over-concentration of overall investment in commercial property which is inherent in Labour plans.

Our budget amendment slightly reduces the council's requirement to make savings over the next 5 years. But hard decisions for this will still be required, in the main pursuing the directions set by the previous administration. In the meantime we believe that our revisions to the budget accord with what matters to the people of Cambridge.

Councillor Tim Bick
Leader of Liberal Democrat Group

1. Executive summary

- 1.1 This report sets out amendments proposed by the Lib Dem Group to the overall set of budget proposals which were agreed by the Executive at its meeting on 22 January 2015, for recommendation to Council on 26 February 2015, subject to any Executive Amendment agreed by The Leader at this committee following the publication of the Final Settlement.
- 1.2 The appendices to this report present the Lib Dem Group budget proposals in relation to specific budget items for both General Fund (GF), Revenue and Capital as follows:
- (i) to add new items
 - (ii) to delete specific existing proposals
 - (iii) to amend specific existing proposals
 - (iv) to amend and delete existing items on the Capital Plan
- 1.3 The Lib Dem Group budget amendment:
- Marries up financial investment of the council's resources with the community need for housing;
 - Listens to the voice of the public by continuing our partnership with the Police and focusing it on recurrent neighbourhood concerns about traffic enforcement;
 - Moves the Council closer to its aim of securing the Living Wage for the employees of firms who deliver contracted services to the council;
 - Restores much of the cutback to the funding of voluntary organisations which contribute to the council's social objectives;
 - Maintains strong Area Committees with planning responsibilities re-instated and without a cutback to the funding for small environmental improvements;
 - Upholds a completely fair equalities policy inside the council by removing underlying organisational pressure on maternity and parental leave;
 - Keeps real people answering callers to the Council, rather than diverting them to a conversation with an automated voice;
 - Drops proposals to increase the subsidy for trade union activities and also to increase council PR staffing;
 - Reinstates into the capital programme some of the schemes that the public expects, which the Labour administration has dropped.

2. Recommendations

2.1 Changes to recommendations are highlighted in italics.

Recommendations of the Executive to this Council, as agreed at their meeting on 22 January 2015, 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:

General Fund Revenue Budgets: [Section 5, Page 28 refers] add:

- Together with the changes in the attached Lib Dem Budget Amendment to Appendix [B...]

Capital: [Section 7, page 35 refers]

- For the existing recommendation 2 f) After “Agree any recommendations to the Executive add “***together with the changes in the attached Lib Dem Budget Budget Amendment to Appendix [D(a)]***”.
- For the existing recommendation 2 g) After “Agree the revised Capital Plan add “***together with the changes in the attached Lib Dem Budget Amendment to Appendix [D(a)]***”.

Equality Impact Assessment

- Replace Appendix F – Equality Impact Assessment with ***Lib Dem Amendment Appendix F Equality Impact Assessment***

3. Council Tax

3.1 No changes are being proposed by the Lib Dem Group.

4. Capital

4.1 The Lib Dem Group are proposing items identified “***Lib Dem Budget Amendment to [D(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, equality and poverty, procurement, environmental, consultation and communication 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 2015/16, ***as amended by [Lib Dem Budget Amendment]***

(b) **Staffing Implications**

See text above

(c) **Equality and Poverty Implications**

A consolidated Equality Impact Assessment is included at Appendix F in the attached Budget Setting Report 2015/16. ***as amended by [Lib Dem Budget Amendment]***

(d) **Procurement Implications**

Any procurement implications will be outlined in the Budget Setting Report 2015/16, ***as amended by [Lib Dem Budget Amendment]***

(e) **Environmental Implications**

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

(f) **Consultation and Communication Implications**

As outlined in 3 above, budget proposals are based on the requirements of statutory and discretionary service provision. Public consultations are undertaken throughout the year and can be seen at:

<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/current-consultations>

(g) **Community Safety Implications**

Any community safety implications will be outlined in the Budget Setting Report 2015/16, ***as amended by [Lib Dem Budget Amendment]***

6. Background papers

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

- Mid-Year Financial Review (MFR) 2014
- Individual Equality Impact Assessments
- Budget-setting Report Version 1, January 2015 (covering 2014/15 to 2019/20) ***as updated at Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee on 19 January 2015, the Executive meeting on 22 January 2015, the Executive Amendment at this meeting and for the [Lib Dem Amendment].***

7. Appendices

In this Report:

Lib Dem Budget Amendment:

- ***Amendment to Appendix [B...] Revenue Budget proposals***
- ***Amendment to Appendix [D(a)] Capital Budget proposals***
- ***Appendix [F] Equality Impact Assessment (Supplement)***
- ***Replacement of relevant tables in the BSR***

8. Inspection of papers

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

Author's Name:	Caroline Ryba
Author's Phone Number:	01223 - 458134
Author's Email:	caroline.ryba@cambridge.gov.uk

Lib Dem Budget Amendment to Appendix [B...]

2015/16 Budget - Bids & Savings - GF

Reference	Item Description	2015/16 Budget £	2016/17 Budget £	2017/18 Budget £	2018/19 Budget £	2019/20 Budget £	Contact	Portfolio
Appendix [B(b) Savings]								
Increased Income								
OPP-II 1	Reduce income from Commercial Property Acquisition Programme. The proposed additional £8m funding will be halved in order to part fund a new Intermediate Housing programme. Links to OPP- CAP 8 [Executive budget item II3665]	0	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	Dave Prinsep	Finance & Resources
OPP-II 2	Income from investment in Intermediate Housing programme of £12m. Links to OPP-CAP 1	0	0	(450,000)	(450,000)	(450,000)	Dave Prinsep	Finance & Resources
Total Increased Income		0	200,000	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)		
Programme								
OPP-PROG 1	Abandon introduction of self-service telephony and electronic enquiry services. Delete savings that have been envisaged from this proposal. [Executive budget item PROG3558]	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	Clarissa Norman	Strategy & Transformation
OPP-PROG 2	Abandon introduction of a self-service voice activated switchboard. Delete savings resulting from this. [Executive budget item PROG-3561]	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	Clarissa Norman	Strategy & Transformation
Total Programme		65,000	65,000	65,000	65,000	65,000		
Savings								
OPP-S 1	Maintenance of Partnership Funding with Cambridgeshire Constabulary. Delete the proposed ending of financial contribution to Cambridgeshire Constabulary and provide for new negotiation with the Constabulary for the provision of 1 FTE Police Officer dedicated to enforcement against traffic offences (speeding, weight restrictions, dangerous parking around schools) within the city area. [Executive budget item S3528]	51,000	51,000	51,000	51,000	51,000	Lynda Kilkelly	Strategy & Transformation
OPP-S 2	Maternity Funding. Deletion of proposed cutback in Maternity Fund funding [Executive budget item S3614]	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	Caroline Ryba	Non-Committee Items
OPP-S 3	Corporate Information Assistant. Delete the new proposed position of Corporate Information Assistant which is proposed to be funded from a saving in the Corporate Marketing Budget in order to promote the Council in the media.	(17,400)	(17,400)	(17,400)	(17,400)	(17,400)	Andrew Limb	Strategy & Transformation
Total Savings		133,600	133,600	133,600	133,600	133,600		
Appendix [B(c) PPF]								
OPP-PPF 1	Payment of the Living Wage to external staff operating Council contracts To incentivise payment of the Living Wage to those employees of external contractors who provide services within or on behalf of the Council; seeking a contributory approach with the aim of achieving this during the forthcoming financial year by negotiation as appropriate	30,000	20,000	10,000	0	0	Debbie Kaye	Community, Arts & Recreation
OPP-PPF 2	Restore local planning to area committees Restore local planning to area committees so that decisions can be taken by local members and residents are more easily able to attend.	3,400	3,400	3,400	3,400	3,400	Patsy Dell	Planning Policy & Transport
OPP-PPF 3	Restore funding for grants to voluntary organisations. This provision reduces the proposed cutback from 25% to 10% from 16/17, based on the recent consultation exercise and the experience of the 2015/16 bidding round. In 2015/16 the budgeted "Transition Funding" of £75,000 will be supplemented to enable a further interim bidding round.	25,000	180,000	180,000	180,000	180,000	Debbie Kaye	Community, Arts & Recreation
OPP-PPF 4	Project Delivery Officer. Appointment of an additional fixed term Project Delivery Officer to increase capacity in implementation of capital projects; to focus on removal of the backlog in Environmental Improvement schemes. Links to OPP-CAP 6	45,000	45,000	0	0	0	Joel Carré	City Centre & Public Places
OPP-PPF 5	Increase in paid time-off for Trade Union Branch Secretaries. Delete proposed additional publicly paid time-off for Trade Union branch secretaries, which would be significantly more generous than other local authorities relative to the size of our organisation. [Executive budget item PPF3706]	(34,500)	(34,500)	(34,500)	(34,500)	(34,500)	Deborah Simpson	Finance & Resources
Total PPF		68,900	213,900	158,900	148,900	148,900		
Appendix [B(e) Non-Cash Limit]								
OPP-NCL 1	Invest for Income Fund. Delete Creation of an Invest for Income Fund. Links to OPP-NCL 2 [Executive budget item NCL3696]	(6,500,000)	(1,000,000)	(500,000)	0	0	Caroline Ryba	Finance & Resources
OPP-NCL 2	Increase DRF to Capital to part-fund Intermediate Housing programme. Links to OPP-CAP 1	6,500,000	1,000,000	500,000	0	0	Caroline Ryba	Finance & Resources
Total PPF		0	0	0	0	0		
All Portfolios - Net Impact of Lib Dem Amendment		267,500	612,500	107,500	97,500	97,500		

Lib Dem Budget Amendment to Appendix [D(a) Capital proposals]

2015/16 Budget - Capital Bids - GF

Reference	Item Description	2015/16 Budget £	2016/17 Budget £	2017/18 Budget £	2018/19 Budget £	2019/20 Budget £	Contact	Portfolio
All GF Portfolios								
Capital								
	Intermediate Housing Programme.							
	To invest £12m from the General Fund in building Intermediate Housing at 80% of market rent, providing an estimated return over the first 10 years of 3.75% and average 5.5% over 30 years, based on use of land already in the ownership of the city council's general fund. Preparation of the programme to include evaluation of the potential to carry this out through an arms length vehicle jointly with the University of Cambridge and other local councils and investment institutions.							
OPP-CAP 1	Links to OPP-II 2, OPP-NCL 2 and OPP-CAP 8	10,500,000	1,000,000	500,000	0	0	Alan Carter	Finance & Resources
	Nightingale Recreation Ground Pavilion refurbishment.							
	Re-instate scheme in the Capital Plan. Business case and project plan to be developed and to be in place for approval at BSR ahead of year of implementation. Funding to exploit relevant available developer contributions for outdoor sports and community facilities.							
OPP-CAP 2		0	400,000	0	0	0	Debbie Kaye	Community, Arts & Recreation
	Jesus Green Pavilion. Re-instate scheme in the Capital Plan.							
	To improve the facilities provided by the current Rouse Ball Pavilion, including upgraded public conveniences for users of the Green and do so in combination with enhancement of facilities at the Jesus Green Pool. Business case and project plan to be developed and in place for approval at BSR ahead of year of implementation. Funding to exploit relevant and available developer contributions for outdoor sports and community facilities and any external sources, including British Swimming.							
OPP-CAP 3		0	500,000	250,000	0	0	Debbie Kaye	Community, Arts & Recreation
	Public Conveniences.							
	Re-instate scheme in the Capital Plan. Business case and project plan to be developed and in place for approval at BSR ahead of year of implementation. [Executive budget item C3736]							
OPP-CAP 4		0	437,000	0	0	0	Simon Payne	Environment, Waste & Public Health
	Local Centres Improvement Programme.							
	Re-instate programme in the Capital Plan. To include Cherry Hinton High Street, Arbury Court and Mitcham's Corner. Business cases and project plans to be in place for approval at BSR ahead of year of implementation. [Executive budget item C3700]							
OPP-CAP 5		0	195,000	195,000	195,000	195,000	Joel Carré	City Centre & Public Places
	Extension of Environmental Improvement Programme.							
	Re-instate proposed removal of provision in 2015/16 and restore £30,000 removed for Minor Highway Improvement Programme which would be funded at the discretion of Area Committees from their total EIP programme budget. Scheme backlog to be addressed through proposal OPP-PPF 4 in addition to ongoing organization and process redesign. [Executive budget item C3621]							
OPP-CAP 6		200,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	Joel Carré	City Centre & Public Places
	Minor Highways Improvement Programme.							
	Avoid centralisation of decisions away from area committees and re-incorporate with Environmental Improvement Programme funding under Area Committee discretion. Links to OPP-CAP 6. [Executive budget item C3623]							
OPP-CAP 7		(30,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)	Andy Preston	Planning Policy & Transport
	Commercial Property Acquisition Programme.							
	Reduction in proposed additional investment in commercial property by 50%. [Executive budget item C3664]							
OPP-CAP 8		(4,000,000)	0	0	0	0	Dave Prinsep	Finance & Resources
All Portfolios Total		6,670,000	2,532,000	945,000	195,000	195,000		



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 Suzanne Goff, Strategy Officer on 01223 457174 or email suzanne.goff@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:

Budget Setting Report 2015/16 (General Fund) – Opposition Amendments

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

The General Fund Budget Setting Report enables the City Council to set a balanced budget for 2015/16 that reflects the Council's vision statements and takes into account councillor's priorities in its proposals for achieving the savings required.

This EQIA assesses the equality impacts of the amendments proposed by the Liberal Democrat Group in relation to the budget.

It should be noted that a fuller assessment for each of the proposed amendments should be carried out with more detailed information when it becomes available.

This Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) is a composite assessment of the budget proposals which are likely to have a significant impact. Some of the proposals have a full EqIA already and where these have been available, they have been considered as part of this assessment.

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

Here is the list of Liberal Democrat budget amendment proposals that may have significant equality impacts.

Revenue Amendments:

- **OPP-PPF 1: Payment of the Living Wage to external staff operating Council contracts.** To incentivise payment of the Living Wage to those employees of external contractors who provide services within or on behalf of the Council; seeking a contributory approach with the aim of achieving this during the forthcoming financial year by negotiation as appropriate
- **OPP-PPF 2: Restore local planning to area committees.** Restore local planning to area committees so that decisions can be taken by local members and residents are more easily able to attend.
- **OPP-PPF 3: Restore funding for grants to voluntary organisations.** This provision reduces the proposed cutback from 25% to 10% from 16/17, based on the recent consultation exercise and the experience of the 2015/16 bidding round. In 2015/16 the budgeted "Transition Funding" of £75,000 will be supplemented to enable a further interim bidding round.
- **OPP-PROG 1: Abandon introduction of self-service telephony and electronic enquiry services.** Delete savings that have been envisaged from this proposal.[Executive budget item PROG3558]
- **OPP-PROG 2: Abandon introduction of a self-service voice activated switchboard.** Delete savings resulting from this.[Executive budget item PROG-3561]
- **OPP-S 2: Maternity Funding. Deletion of proposed cutback in Maternity Fund funding** [Executive budget item S3614]
- **Capital Amendments:**
- **OPP-CAP 1: Intermediate Housing Programme.** To invest £12m from the General Fund in building Intermediate Housing at 80% of market rent, providing an estimated return over the first 10 years of 3.75% and average 5.5% over 30 years, based on use of land already in the ownership of the city council's general fund. Links to OPP-II 2, OPP-NCL 2 and OPP-CAP 8
- **OPP-CAP 5: Local Centres Improvement Programme.** Re-instate programme in the Capital Plan. To include Cherry Hinton High Street, Arbury Court and Mitcham's Corner.
- **OPP-CAP 2: Nightingale Recreation Ground Pavilion refurbishment.** Re-instate scheme in the Capital Plan. Funding to make best use of relevant available developer contributions for outdoor sports and community facilities.

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

- **OPP-CAP 4: Public Conveniences.** Re-instate scheme in the Capital Plan. Business case and project plan to be developed and in place for approval at BSR ahead of year of implementation.[Executive budget item C3736]
- **OPP-CAP 3: Jesus Green Pavilion.** Re-instate scheme in the Capital Plan. To improve the facilities provided by the current Rouse Ball Pavilion, including upgraded public conveniences for users of the Green and do so in combination with enhancement of facilities at the Jesus Green Pool. Business case and project plan to be developed and in place for approval at BSR ahead of year of implementation. Funding to exploit relevant and available developer contributions for outdoor sports and community facilities and any external sources, including British Swimming.
- **OPP-CAP 6: Extension of Environmental Improvement Programme.** Re-instate proposed removal of provision in 2015/16 and restore £30,000 removed for Minor Highway Improvement Programme which would be funded at the discretion of Area Committees from their total EIP programme budget. Scheme backlog to be addressed through proposal OPP-PPF 4 in addition to ongoing organization and process redesign.[Executive budget item C3621]

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

- X Residents
- X Visitors
- X Staff

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

- X New
- Revised
- Existing

5. Responsible directorate and service?

Directorate: Resources

Service: Accounting Services

This EqIA report involves cross organisation responsibility and is managed by a team from different departments in the Council – Corporate Strategy and Accounting Services in particular.

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

No

X Yes (please give details):

This is an assessment of the Council's budget and therefore covers all our services. In particular the EqlA considers the equalities impacts of proposals submitted by Community Development, Corporate Strategy, Customer Services, Human Resources, Refuse and Environment, Specialist Services, Strategic Housing, Streets and Open Spaces, and Tourism and City Centre Management. The budget also affects some of our partnership working, notably with Cambridgeshire County Council, and it has an impact on the voluntary and community sector.

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.

- This EqlA is a working document and as such, gives a snap shot of the potential impacts at the time of writing. EqlAs should be regularly reviewed to understand whether the assessment of the impacts anticipated is still relevant and to address any new issues that have arisen in the interim.

(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)

Revenue Amendments

OPP-PPF 1: Payment of the Living Wage to external staff operating Council contracts.

There are likely to be a significant number of young and older people in part-time, low-paid employment.

Younger and older workers are significantly more likely to fall below low pay and living wage thresholds than are those aged between 31 and 55.

(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)

OPP-PPF 1: Payment of the Living Wage to external staff operating Council contracts cont...

According to the Resolution Foundation report *Low Pay Britain 2014*, (based on analysis of the Office for National Statistics (ONS) *2013 New Earnings Survey Data Panel Data* combined with the ONS *2013 Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings*):

- 81% of employees aged 20 and under (0.9 million young people) were low paid
- 40% of employees aged 21-25 (another 0.9 million young people) were low paid
- 35% of employees aged 16-20 were in extreme low pay jobs, accounting for 84% of the total number of people in extreme low pay
- 21% of workers aged 61-55 were low paid (0.2 million people)
- 33% of employees aged 66 and above were low paid (0.1 million people).

So this proposal is likely to have a positive impact on young people.

OPP-PPF 2: Restore local planning to area committees: Moving planning decisions back to area committee meetings held in community venues from central planning committees held in the Guildhall could have both positive and negative impacts for different age groups. There could be a potential positive impact from this proposal for some people with mobility issues, including some older people, who might find it more difficult to travel from the area in which they live into the centre of the City to attend meetings.

However, there could also be negative impacts for some people who have mobility issues, including some older people, as the Guildhall is located in the centre of Cambridge, which is arguably the most accessible part of Cambridge by public transport. The Guildhall is also an accessible public building, set up and fully equipped for meetings to take place.

OPP-PPF 3: Restore funding for grants to voluntary organisations. This provision reduces the proposed cutback from 25% to 10% from 16/17, based on the recent consultation exercise and the experience of the 2015/16 bidding round.

In trying to establish what the potential impacts might be on older or younger people, the data for 2014/2015 applications for grants round helps to give some context as to who might be most affected by this proposal.

- In this grants round, 153 applications were received from 101 different groups / organisations.
- This compares with 196 applications from 125 different groups / organisations from 2013

There were 25 bids received in the age category and 19 were funded - so this might suggest any increase in funding would have a positive impact for older and younger people.

(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) cont..

Equality strand	No of Bids	Recommended for full / some funding	Not recommended for any funding
Age	25	19	6
BAME	32	30	2
Disability	27	21	6
Gender	6	4	2
Pregnancy & Maternity	0	0	0
Transgender	0	0	0
Marriage & Civil Partnership	0	0	0
Race & Ethnicity	0	0	0
Religion & Belief	0	0	0
Sexual Orientation	5	4	1
Low Income / Poverty	10	10	0
Umbrella / Cross-Cutting	30	29	1
Non-Specific	18	0	18
Total	153	117	36

Table of grants allocations for 2014/2015 – see [EqIA for the Grants Review December 2014](#)

OPP-PROG 1: Abandon introduction of self-service telephony and electronic enquiry services. [Executive budget item PROG3558] and OPP-PROG 2: Abandon introduction of a self-service voice activated switchboard. [Executive budget item PROG-3561] Delete savings resulting from this.

Customer Services looked at case studies from two other local authorities implementing similar systems. From the anecdotal evidence, some older people might experience a negative impact by the introduction of this service. Automated options can be difficult for older people to use, if they are hard of hearing they are not able to adjust the volume to hear what the messages are saying or if they feel they are unable to ask clarification questions. So the abandonment of both of these proposals may have positive impact for some older people.

However, subsequent EqIA assessments could be strengthened by looking at customer feedback, complaints and performance to establish the benefits of the current system versus the new system.

Capital Amendments

OPP-CAP 5: Local Centres Improvement Programme. Improvements in local areas might provide improvements in the appearance and usability of particular spaces in the City. This could have a positive impact for young people and for older people in terms of accessibility and community safety – for example improving paving and making the area more attractive.

(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)

OPP-CAP 2: Nightingale Recreation Ground Pavilion refurbishment. OPP-CAP 3: Jesus Green Pavilion and Re-instate scheme in the Capital Plan. Reinstating these bids could provide improvements to facilities and public provision and therefore might provide some positive impact for young and older people. Further details would need to be considered to fully understand the impact.

OPP-CAP 3: Jesus Green Pavilion. Re-instate scheme in the Capital Plan. Reinstating these bids could provide improvements to facilities and public provision and therefore might provide some positive impact for young and older people. Further details would need to be considered to fully understand the impact.

OPP-CAP 4: Public Conveniences. The Silver Street toilets are built into the bridge over the River Cam. Male and female toilets are below ground and are accessed via set of steps. The large disabled toilet is positioned above ground. The toilets were originally constructed in 1985 and have only had minor improvements since and their standard is far below what is expected.

The proposal is to build a bespoke, lightweight, standalone structure above ground. This would provide an easy access for disabled and ambulant disabled users, as well as parents with toddlers and reduce congestion on the access steps. The existing disabled toilet would need to be demolished to provide a space for a new standalone unit.

This would have a positive impact for older people and very young people.

OPP-CAP 6: Extension of Environmental Improvement Programme. Re-instate proposed removal of provision in 2015/16 and restore £30,000 removed for Minor Highway Improvement.

Reinstating these bids could provide improvements to facilities and public provision and therefore might provide some positive impact for young and older people. Further details would need to be considered to fully understand the impact.

(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)

Revenue Amendments

OPP-PPF 1: Payment of the Living Wage to external staff operating Council contracts.

There is likely to be positive implications for people with disabilities who are employed in low-paid jobs.

(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)

Revenue Amendments continued..

OPP-PPF 1: Payment of the Living Wage to external staff operating Council contracts continued...

There is likely to be positive implications for people with disabilities who are employed in low-paid jobs.

In August 2013, Nottinghamshire County Council carried out a study of employees paid below the living wage rate (2,211 workers in total). 3.22% of these employees declared they had a disability, which was slightly higher than the workforce overall (2.88%). Therefore it seems that the proportion of employees with a disability is slightly higher among workers paid below the living wage rate. It will depend on the profile of people with disabilities in the given services workforce.

It is anticipated that a proportion of people with disabilities should benefit from this proposal.

OPP- PPF 2: Restore local planning to area committees: Moving planning decisions back to area committee meetings held in community venues from a central planning committee held in the Guildhall could have both positive and negative impacts for different people with different types of disabilities. There could be a potential positive impact from this proposal for some people with mobility issues, including some less mobile people or those who find it difficult to come into the City for social reason such as some people with mental health issues , who might find it more difficult to travel from the area in which they live into the centre of the City to attend meetings.

However, there could also be negative impacts for some people who have mobility issues, including some older people, as the Guildhall is located in the centre of Cambridge, which is arguably the most accessible part of Cambridge by public transport. The Guildhall is also an accessible public building, set up and fully equipped for meetings to take place.

OPP-PPF 3: Restore funding for grants to voluntary organisations. This provision reduces the proposed cutback from 25% to 10% from 16/17, based on the recent consultation exercise and the experience of the 2015/16 bidding round.

- In this grants round, 153 applications were received from 101 different groups / organisations.
- This compares with 196 applications from 125 different groups / organisations from 2013

There were 27 bids received in the age category and 21 were funded - so this might suggest any increase in funding would have a positive impact people with disabilities.

Equality strand	No of Bids	Recommended for full / some funding	Not recommended for any funding
Age	25	19	6
BAME	32	30	2
Disability	27	21	6
Gender	6	4	2
Pregnancy & Maternity	0	0	0
Transgender	0	0	0
Marriage & Civil Partnership	0	0	0
Race & Ethnicity	0	0	0
Religion & Belief	0	0	0
Sexual Orientation	5	4	1
Low Income / Poverty	10	10	0
Umbrella / Cross-Cutting	30	29	1
Non-Specific	18	0	18
Total	153	117	36

Table of grants allocations for 2014/2015 – see [EqIA for the Grants Review December 2014](#)

OPP-PROG 1: Abandon introduction of self-service telephony and electronic enquiry services. [Executive budget item PROG3558] and OPP-PROG 2: Abandon introduction of a self-service voice activated switchboard. [Executive budget item PROG-3561] Delete savings resulting from this.

Customer Services looked at case studies from two other local authorities implementing similar systems. From the anecdotal evidence, some people with disabilities might experience a negative impact by the introduction of this service. Automated options can be difficult for some people with disabilities to use, for example some people with a learning difficulty or if they are hard of hearing – may not be able to adjust the volume to hear what the messages are saying or if they feel they are unable to ask clarification questions. Therefore dropping this proposal would have a positive for some people.

Some people with disabilities may also experience a negative impact by the removal of this service. Customers who struggle to converse, or have a physical impairment but need to access information or provide change in circumstances details may prefer to use the self-service option. Some people mental health problems could be negatively affected by the removal of this service if they prefer to limit speaking to a person. So there are both potential positive and negative impacts for both of these proposals.

Capital Amendments

OPP-CAP 2: Nightingale Recreation Ground Pavilion refurbishment. OPP-CAP 3: Jesus Green Pavilion and Re-instate scheme in the Capital Plan. The reinstating these bids could provide improvements to facilities and public provision and therefore might provide some positive impacts for people with disabilities in terms of improving accessibility.

(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)

OPP-CAP 3: Jesus Green Pavilion. Re-instate scheme in the Capital Plan.

Improved facilities including upgraded public conveniences for users of the Green and the enhancement of facilities at the Jesus Green Pool could provide a positive impact for people with disabilities by improving access within these facilities..

OPP-CAP 4: Public Conveniences. The Silver Street toilets are built into the bridge over the River Cam. Male and female toilets are below ground and are accessed via set of steps. The large disabled toilet is positioned above ground. The toilets were originally constructed in 1985 and have only had minor improvements since and their standard is far below what is expected.

The proposal is to build a bespoke, lightweight, standalone structure above ground. This would provide an easy access for disabled and ambulant disabled users, as well as parents with toddlers and reduce congestion on the access steps. The existing disabled toilet would need to be demolished to provide a space for a new standalone unit.

This could have a positive impact for people with disabilities. More details would be needed for the capital proposals if they progress in order to assess the full impact.

OPP-CAP 5: Local Centres Improvement Programme. Improvements in local areas might provide improvements in the appearance and usability of particular spaces in the City. This bid could provide improvements in the appearance and usability of particular spaces in the City. This could have a positive impact for people with disabilities in terms of accessibility and community safety – for example improving paving.

OPP-CAP 6: Extension of Environmental Improvement Programme. This bid could provide improvements in the appearance and usability of particular spaces in the City. This could have a positive impact for people with disabilities in terms of accessibility and community safety – for example improving paving.

(c) Gender

Revenue Amendments

OPP-PPF 1: Payment of the Living Wage to external staff operating Council contracts.

If this proposal is successful, it should benefit women more than men as proportionately more women have low-paid part-time jobs.

(c) Gender

Revenue Amendments:

OPP-PPF 1: Payment of the Living Wage to external staff operating Council contracts continued..

In addition, in Cambridge the percentage of female employees in the lowest 4 occupations (32.4%) is higher than the percentage of male employees (26.1%) - Source: Nomis Official labour market statistics, report DC6601EW – Residents in Cambridge Occupation by sex.

According to the Resolution Foundation report *Low Pay Britain 2014*,

- 3.2 million women were low paid in 2013
- 27% of female workers earned below the low pay threshold, compared with 17% of male workers
- Extreme low pay was relatively low in both instances (at 2%), but female workers were slightly more likely to find themselves in this position.
- The level of impact will depend on the female profile in the workforce.

OPP-PPF 2: Restore local planning to area committees: There are no specific gender implications from this proposed change. Attending may be more difficult if individuals who have primary childcare or caring responsibilities and have to travel into Cambridge to attend meetings.

OPP-PPF 3: Restore funding for grants to voluntary organisations. This provision reduces the proposed cutback from 25% to 10% from 16/17, based on the recent consultation exercise and the experience of the 2015/16 bidding round. There might be a positive impact from a greater amount of funding being available but the grant data is broken into a number of headings, including one titled 'gender'. However, without further clarification, it is unclear how many of the 'gender' applications, of which there were 6, relate to which genders. 4 were funded in total. Gender applications were less well represented in the overall grants scheme.

Equality strand	No of Bids	Recommended for full / some funding	Not recommended for any funding
Age	25	19	6
BAME	32	30	2
Disability	27	21	6
Gender	6	4	2
Pregnancy & Maternity	0	0	0
Transgender	0	0	0
Marriage & Civil Partnership	0	0	0
Race & Ethnicity	0	0	0
Religion & Belief	0	0	0
Sexual Orientation	5	4	1
Low Income / Poverty	10	10	0
Umbrella / Cross-Cutting	30	29	1
Non-Specific	18	0	18
Total	153	117	36

Table of grants allocations for 2014/2015 – see [EgIA for the Grants Review December 2014](#)

(c) Gender

Revenue Amendments continued:

OPP-S 2: Maternity Funding. Deletion of proposed cutback in Maternity Fund funding
[Executive budget item S3614]

Impact on services: The reduction in maternity funding may impact staffing levels within services if there are insufficient funds to manage maternity cover arrangements within existing budgets or the contingency fund, and therefore it may have an indirect impact on service provision.

Impacts on staff: The reduction may have a higher impact on services with females who take maternity leave. These services may find it more difficult to manage within their overall budgets. However, a contingency budget will be available to assist where there is an unmanageable financial impact on the service.

Impact on job applicants: Recruiting managers may be reluctant to interview candidates and/or offer jobs to candidates who they believe may take maternity / parental leave in the future. However, there are strong HR policies in place to ensure that this does not occur.

To better understand the intentional and unintended impact of this bid, regular reviews will need to be undertaken but there may be an overall positive impact from this proposal.

Capital Amendments

OPP-CAP 4: Public Conveniences. The Silver Street toilets are built into the bridge over the River Cam. Male and female toilets are below ground and are accessed via set of steps. The large disabled toilet is positioned above ground. The toilets were originally constructed in 1985 and have only had minor improvements since and their standard is far below what is expected.

The proposal is to build a bespoke, lightweight, standalone structure above ground. This would provide an easy access parents with toddlers and make passage on the access steps safer and therefore could have a positive impact.(This would also apply to other people with caring responsibilities)

(d) Pregnancy and maternity

Revenue Amendments:

OPP-S 2: Maternity Funding. Deletion of proposed cutback in Maternity Fund funding
[Executive budget item S3614]

Impact on services: The reduction in maternity funding may impact staffing levels within services if there are insufficient funds to manage maternity cover arrangements within existing budgets or the contingency fund, and therefore it may have an indirect impact on service provision.

Revenue Amendments continued:

OPP-S 2: Maternity Funding. Deletion of proposed cutback in Maternity Fund funding [Executive budget item S3614] continued..

Impacts on staff: The reduction may have a higher impact on services with females who take maternity leave. These services may find it more difficult to manage within their overall budgets. However, a contingency budget will be available to assist where there is an unmanageable financial impact on the service.

Impact on job applicants: Recruiting managers may be reluctant to interview candidates and/or offer jobs to candidates who they believe may take maternity / parental leave in the future. However, there are strong HR policies in place to ensure that this does not occur.

Impact on services: This change will initially impact services with female staff who have maternity leave as it relates to the maternity fund. However, with the introduction of shared parental leave from December 2014 partners and fathers will have rights to shared parental leave and pay. The change could then potentially impact on all services regardless of the gender profile of their staff.

There may be an overall positive impact from this proposal.

(e) Transgender (including gender re-assignment)

Capital Amendments

OPP-CAP 4: Public Conveniences. The Silver Street toilets are built into the bridge over the River Cam. Male and female toilets are below ground and are accessed via set of steps. The large disabled toilet is positioned above ground. The toilets were originally constructed in 1985 and have only had minor improvements since and their standard is far below what is expected. The proposal is to build a bespoke, lightweight, standalone structure above ground.

In recent research looking into the needs of the LGBT&Q communities, it was identified that some transgender or people identifying as non binary do not feel safe or comfortable in the City and that toilet facilities are often gendered. This might provide an opportunity to look at how to create public conveniences that help transgender residents and visitors to feel more comfortable. The research is available here: [Cambridge LGBTQ-Needs-Assessment 2014](#)

So this proposal and any other proposals relating to toilets or to community safety may have a positive impact if the opportunity is taken to consider the needs of the Transgender communities..

(f) Marriage and Civil Partnership

No disproportionate impacts have been identified.

(g) Race or Ethnicity

Revenue Amendments:

OPP-PPF 1: Payment of the Living Wage to external staff operating Council contracts.

People from black or minority ethnic backgrounds are heavily represented in some low paid employment sectors. Many agency workers in unskilled and low paid work are from minority racial groups. In Cambridge City, Census data 2011 shows that in the lowest 4 occupations, the percentages of Black; Bangladeshi; Traveller groups were significantly higher (42.9%; 58.2%; 52.3% respectively); and Pakistani, other Asian, and Arab were moderately higher (29.7%; 34.9%; 31.6%).

In the lowest occupation (elementary occupations), the Black and Bangladeshi, Traveller groups were significantly higher (14%; 13.9% 52.3%); and “other white” (probably from eastern Europe) were moderately higher (14.3%). (source: Nomis)

There is likely to be a positive impact as more employees in BME groups and East European people could benefit from an increase in income as they are more significantly represented in the low paid professions. It will depend on the workforce profile to establish the extent to which there will be positive or negative impacts.

OPP-PPF 3: Restore funding for grants to voluntary organisations. This provision reduces the proposed cutback from 25% to 10% from 16/17, based on the recent consultation exercise and the experience of the 2015/16 bidding round There were 32 bids received in the race and ethnicity category (BAME) and 30 were funded This could suggest any increase in funding would have a positive impact for people. Consideration should also be given to some of the conclusions in the main EqIA. *‘It appears that some BAME groups have found the transition period (or meeting the new priorities and outcomes) particularly challenging but further work is needed with individual groups to understand fully whether this is due to a lack of appreciation of the changes or because the activities of the group do not meet the Council’s new priorities and outcomes’* Grants Review December 2014 update – from the [EqIA for the Grants Review December 2014](#) This could also be affecting the overall percentage of funding/ take up figures.

Equality strand	No of Bids	Recommended for full / some funding	Not recommended for any funding
Age	25	19	6
BAME	32	30	2
Disability	27	21	6
Gender	6	4	2
Pregnancy & Maternity	0	0	0
Transgender	0	0	0
Marriage & Civil Partnership	0	0	0
Race & Ethnicity	0	0	0
Religion & Belief	0	0	0
Sexual Orientation	5	4	1
Low Income / Poverty	10	10	0
Umbrella / Cross-Cutting	30	29	1
Non-Specific	18	0	18
Total	153	117	36

(g) Race or Ethnicity

OPP-PROG 1: Abandon introduction of self-service telephony and electronic enquiry services. [Executive budget item PROG3558] and OPP-PROG 2: Abandon introduction of a self-service voice activated switchboard. [Executive budget item PROG-3561] Delete savings resulting from this.

Some people within the race or ethnicity equalities group could be affected by this initiative. Customers whose first language is not English might feel a negative impact by the introduction of this service, however there are options for customers to exit the system and speak to an advisor.

From anecdotal evidence, there is a very small percentage of customers that contact the Council by telephone who are unable to speak English; people generally prefer to seek advice face to face where an interpreter is more easily facilitated. So a traditional method of customer contact might have positive impacts in contrast to a self service system but more evidence is needed to assess the overall impact.

(h) Religion or Belief

No disproportionate impact has been identified.

(i) Sexual Orientation

No disproportionate has been identified.

(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 (please state):

Revenue Amendments:

OPP-PPF 1: Payment of the Living Wage to external staff operating Council contracts. Positive impact – the payment of the living wage to external staff operating Council contracts could benefit working adults experiencing poverty rather than families wholly dependent on benefits.

It is a recent phenomenon that working adults outnumber workless adults in poverty - see the Joseph Rowntree Foundation blog - <http://www.jrf.org.uk/blog/2012/11/work-poverty-outstrips-poverty-workless-households>

In their recent *2014 Annual Report Monitoring Poverty and Social Exclusion* which stated “*Half of all people in poverty live in a family with someone in paid work; ie half of all those in poverty live with a working adult.*” <http://www.jrf.org.uk/publications/monitoring-poverty-and-social-exclusion-2014>

OPP-PPF 1: Payment of the Living Wage to external staff operating Council contracts continued..

A potential unintended consequence relates to the complex relationship between low pay and 'in-work' benefits. Depending on circumstances, employees in receipt of benefits may have their benefits reduced as their wages rise. There are no known cases of employees being worse off as a result of receiving the Living Wage for benefits and allowances where there is a 'taper' in place. However it is important for employees to inform their benefits providers and the Tax Credit Office when their circumstances change, otherwise they may face a penalty or have to pay back overpayments with short notice which could be a negative impact for some people.

Furthermore, employees receiving Carers Allowance, which does not taper, have the potential to be negatively impacted as a result of pay increases. Therefore it is important for enterprises who become accredited Living Wage employers to signpost employees to relevant support services and agencies so that they can get advice on the implications for their benefits and tax credits.

A positive benefit might be how it could affect lone parents. Proportionately more lone-parent families headed by women. As shown in section 7(c), low pay affects significantly more women than men. Because most lone-parent, low-income households are headed by women, the prevalence of low pay amongst the female workforce is a major factor in child poverty. Payment of the living wage to contracted external staff could contribute as part of a wider strategy toward alleviating child poverty.

Individuals who have no, or low, levels of educational qualification are heavily represented in low paid employment sectors. If the adoption of a Living Wage is also tied to training and progression, the skills level of such employees should be improved.

Capital Amendments:

OPP-CAP 1: Intermediate Housing Programme.

This proposal plans to invest £12 million in new affordable homes by building 70 homes set at 80 per cent of market rent, with a further 30 social housing units taking the total development up to 100 properties. More work needs to be done to look at data on demand for housing, in particular for ethnicity, gender and age but this could have a positive impact on a wide range of people who couldn't afford their own property.

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

Many of the bids had no disproportionate impact for the following reasons:

- No or little impact on people – e.g. capital bids
- It was too early to assess the impacts or they had been previously assessed last year and had been to Committee and then were delayed in being implemented – the EqIAs for these bids have been looked at as part of this process and are available [here](#).

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

The greatest impacts were on age, pregnancy, maternity, disability, ethnicity, transgender and socio economic factors. Positive impacts generally outweighed the negative and were already being mitigated .

The EqlAs that were used in this assessment are available for viewing and can be found here: [here](#).

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 Suzanne Goff, Strategy Officer, who will arrange for it to be published on the City Council's website.

Email suzanne.goff@cambridge.gov.uk

Sign off

Name and job title of assessment lead officer: Suzanne Goff – Corporate Strategy

Date of completion: 30th January 2015

Action Plan

Equality Impact Assessment title: Liberal Democrat Amendments.

Date of completion: 30th January 2015

Equality Group	Age
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	The projects mainly have a positive impact. A few of the projects may have elements that could cause an adverse impact on older people.
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	Regular reviews as projects come forward and individual actions are detailed in the bid EqIA.
Officer responsible for progressing the action	Individual officers responsible for the projects will review their EqIAs to monitor the impacts
Date action to be completed by	December 2015

Equality Group	Disability
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	The projects mainly have a positive impact. A few of the projects may have elements that could cause an adverse impact on people with disabilities.
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	Regular reviews as projects come forward and individual actions are detailed in the bid EqIA.
Officer responsible for progressing the action	Individual officers responsible for the projects will review their EqIAs to monitor the impacts
Date action to be completed by	December 2015

Equality Group	Gender
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	The projects mainly have a positive impact. A few of the projects may have elements that could cause an adverse impact on women or carers.
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	Regular reviews as projects come forward and individual actions are detailed in the bid EqIA.
Officer responsible for progressing the action	Individual officers responsible for the projects will review their EqIAs to monitor the impacts
Date action to be completed by	December 2015

Equality Group	Pregnancy and Maternity
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	The projects mainly have a positive impact. A few of the projects may have elements that could cause an adverse impact on pregnant women.
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	Regular reviews as projects come forward and individual actions are detailed in the bid EqIA.
Officer responsible for progressing the action	Individual officers responsible for the projects will review their EqIAs to monitor the impacts
Date action to be completed by	December 2015

Equality Group	Transgender
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	The projects mainly have a positive impact. A few of the projects may have elements that could cause an adverse impact on transgender communities.
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	Regular reviews as projects come forward and individual actions are detailed in the bid EqIA.
Officer responsible for progressing the action	Individual officers responsible for the projects will review their EqIAs to monitor the impacts
Date action to be completed by	December 2015

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

Equality Group	Race or Ethnicity
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	The projects mainly have a positive impact. A few of the projects may have elements that could cause an adverse impact on ethnic communities.
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	Regular reviews as projects come forward and individual actions are detailed in the bid EqIA.
Officer responsible for progressing the action	Individual officers responsible for the projects will review their EqIAs to monitor the impacts
Date action to be completed by	December 2015

Equality Group	Religion or Belief
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	N/A
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	
Equality Group	Sexual Orientation
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	N/A
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	
Other factors that may lead to inequality – <u>in particular</u> – please consider the impact of any changes on low income groups or those experiencing the impacts of poverty (please state):	
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	The projects mainly have a positive impact. A few of the projects may have elements that could cause an adverse impact on low income groups..
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	Regular reviews as projects come forward and individual actions are detailed in the bid EqIA.
Officer responsible for progressing the action	Individual officers responsible for the projects will review their EqIAs to monitor the impacts
Date action to be completed by	December 2015

Lib Dem Budget Amendment – BSR 2015/16 replacement tables

Performance against savings targets [Section 5, page 29]

Savings Targets	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
MFR 2014 - Current Savings Target (new savings each year)	-	1,225	1,323	798	1,073	1,547
<i>Previous year savings not achieved / (over achieved)</i>	-		(334)	-	(459)	-
Revised savings target	-	1,225	989	798	614	1,547
Impact on savings target - pressures - excluding additional PPF provision	-	1,680	270	305	383	511
<i>Impact on savings target - pressures - additional PPF provision</i>	-	107	161	(55)	(10)	-
Revised savings target including pressures	-	3,012	1,420	1,048	987	2,058
<i>Impact on savings target - New deliverable savings found in year</i>	-	(3,346)	(584)	(1,507)	(465)	(245)
Savings still to be found	-	(334)	836	(459)	522	1,813
Savings found as a % of revised savings target	-	111.09%	41.13%	143.80%	47.11%	11.90%

New table: Savings targets changes summary

Savings Targets – Lib Dem Amendment	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	Total £000
<i>Savings still to be found per BSR</i>	(602)	223	46	991	1,813	2,471
<i>Savings still to be found resulting from Lib Dem Amendment</i>	(334)	836	(459)	522	1,813	2,378
<i>Net increase / (decrease) in annual savings target</i>	268	613	(505)	(469)	0	(93)

Priority Policy Fund [Section5, page 33]

Priority Policy Fund 2015/16	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
PPF funding available (MFR 2014)	-	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)
Additional funding provided	-	(38)	(54)	(54)	(54)	(54)
Total funding available	-	(138)	(154)	(154)	(154)	(154)
<i>Lib Dem Amendment: additional PPF funding</i>	-	(69)	(214)	(159)	(149)	(149)
Total funding available	-	(208)	(369)	(314)	(304)	(304)
Bids into the PPF	-	138	154	154	154	154
<i>Lib Dem Amendment: additional PPF bids</i>	-	69	214	159	149	149
Shortfall / (Unused) Funding	-	-	-	-	-	-

General Fund Projection: Expenditure and funding [Section 6, page 34]

Description	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
Expenditure						
<i>Net service budgets – Lib Dem Amendment</i>	<i>19,813</i>	<i>18,488</i>	<i>18,988</i>	<i>18,714</i>	<i>19,558</i>	<i>19,878</i>
Revenue Budget Proposals - MFR	125	(90)	(75)	(75)	(75)	(75)
Revenue Budget Proposals - BSR	-	(2,827)	(3,325)	(4,077)	(4,159)	(3,893)
<i>Revenue Budget Proposals – Lib Dem Amendment</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>268</i>	<i>613</i>	<i>108</i>	<i>98</i>	<i>98</i>
Future years PPF provision	-	100	100	100	100	100
Capital accounting adjustments	(4,656)	(4,656)	(4,656)	(4,656)	(4,656)	(4,656)
<i>Capital expenditure financed from revenue – Lib Dem Amendment</i>	<i>2,230</i>	<i>16,291</i>	<i>2,562</i>	<i>2,380</i>	<i>1,880</i>	<i>1,880</i>
<i>Contributions to earmarked funds – Lib Dem Amendment</i>	<i>2,678</i>	<i>3,284</i>	<i>3,263</i>	<i>3,357</i>	<i>2,622</i>	<i>3,869</i>
<i>Revised net savings requirement – Lib Dem Amendment</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>334</i>	<i>(836)</i>	<i>459</i>	<i>(522)</i>	<i>(1,813)</i>
Contribution to reserves	-	-	255	40	824	1,078
Net spending requirement	20,190	31,192	16,889	16,350	15,670	16,466
Funded by:						
Settlement Funding Assessment (SFA)	(8,115)	(6,889)	(6,004)	(5,224)	(4,545)	(3,954)
Locally Retained Business Rates – Growth Element	(670)	(800)	(800)	(800)	(800)	(800)
Other grants from central government	(93)	-	-	-	-	-
New Homes Bonus (NHB)	(3,376)	(2,519)	(2,423)	(2,423)	(2,423)	(3,612)
Appropriations from earmarked funds	522	(13,499)	(254)	(194)	-	-
Council Tax	(6,706)	(7,058)	(7,408)	(7,709)	(7,902)	(8,100)
Contributions from reserves	(1,752)	(427)	-	-	-	-
Total funding	(20,190)	(31,192)	(16,889)	(16,350)	(15,670)	(16,466)

Capital Funding Available [Section 7, page 38]

Capital Funding Available	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
Funding available and unapplied (MFR Oct 2014)	(149)	(44)	(562)	(880)	(880)	(880)
Reduce DRF	-	-	-	-	-	-
R&R additional DRF	-	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)
Fund New Bid	-	(8,000)	-	-	-	-
<i>Lib Dem Amendment: additional funding - delete creation of an Invest for Income Fund and increase DRF to Capital to fund Intermediate Housing programme.</i>		(6,500)	(1,000)	(500)		
Total funding available	(149)	(15,544)	(2,562)	(2,380)	(1,880)	(1,880)
New Bids using funding	-	8,332	250	250	250	-
<i>Lib Dem Amendment: net use of DRF including Intermediate Housing programme.</i>	-	6,670	2,532	945	195	195
Net Funding Available	(149)	(542)	220	(1,185)	(1,435)	(1,685)
Cumulative Funding Available	(149)	(691)	(471)	(1,656)	(3,091)	(4,776)

New table: Direct Revenue Funding summary

Direct Revenue Funding	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
Funding for Approved Plan	(2,081)	(15,749)	(2,782)	(1,195)	(445)	(195)
Available	(149)	(542)	220	(1,185)	(1,435)	(1,685)
Total in General Fund Projection	(2,230)	(16,291)	(2,562)	(2,380)	(1,880)	(1,880)

Capital Plan Spending and Funding [Section 7, page 41]

Capital Plan Spending	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
Programmes	4,283	16,977	3,065	1,465	895	195
Projects	2,451	1,161	36	31	36	-
Sub-total	6,734	18,138	3,101	1,496	931	195
Provisions	12,909	10,041	472	989	100	-
Total Spend	19,643	28,179	3,573	2,485	1,031	195

Capital Plan Funding	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
External Support						
Developer Contributions	(6,334)	(2,745)	(146)	(123)	(121)	-
Other Sources	(7,081)	(3,138)	(50)	(50)	(50)	-
Prudential Borrowing	-	(2,804)	-	-	-	-
Supplementary Credit Approvals (SCA)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total - External Support	(13,415)	(8,687)	(196)	(173)	(171)	-
City Council						
Developer Contributions	-	-	-	-	-	-
Direct Revenue Financing (DRF) - GF Services	(18)	-	-	-	-	-
Direct Revenue Financing (DRF) - Use of Reserves	(2,081)	(15,749)	(2,782)	(1,195)	(445)	(195)
Earmarked Reserve - Capital Contributions	(115)	(220)	(208)	(208)	(400)	-
Earmarked Reserve - Repair & Renewals Fund	(2,512)	(1,421)	(15)	(20)	(15)	-
Earmarked Reserves - Technology Investment Fund	(11)	-	-	-	-	-
HRA Capital Balances	-	-	-	-	-	-
Internal Borrowing - Temporary Use of Balances	(1,202)	(739)	(327)	(889)	-	-
Usable Capital Receipts	(289)	(1,363)	(45)	-	-	-
Total - City Council	(6,228)	(19,492)	(3,377)	(2,312)	(860)	(195)
Total Funding	(19,643)	(28,179)	(3,573)	(2,485)	(1,031)	(195)