

Item

## **LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP AMENDMENT TO: Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2018/19**

**To:**

Councillor Richard Robertson, Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources Portfolio

**Report by:**

Caroline Ryba, Head of Finance

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

**Wards affected:**

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

## **Key Decision**

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

Our Budget amendment reflects what Cambridge residents tell us is concerning them, such as the cost of housing, the level of congestion and air pollution, and the standard of basic council services. These are themes we have pursued in our budget proposals for a number of years.

We therefore welcome the inclusion in the administration's budget of some items we have argued for previously: serious engagement with housing development at the city's North-East fringe; acceptance that improvements to the waste collection service are necessary after its poor performance in 2017; a plan to refurbish the Market Square; ending the price-cutting approach to city centre car parks, which is so contradictory to attempts to reduce congestion and air pollution; incentives for switching taxis to electric vehicles; the strengthening of Planning Enforcement; and the provision of advisory support to refugees and asylum seekers. In view of the rejection of these proposals when Liberal Democrat members made them over the past two years, the change of heart is recognised. We are pleased that residents will now benefit.

In other respects, proposals in the BSR still run behind a clear need in a growing and ever-more hard-pressed city. This amendment advances proposals to change that.

Our proposals provide a series of improvements in outcomes from universal basic services which should be at the core of the council's purpose: for cleanliness, care and maintenance in the public realm, the management of waste and the provision of decent public conveniences. The importance of service reviews and efficiency savings should not obscure the need for some services to improve without others getting correspondingly worse.

Facilitating the provision of housing should be shaping a lot of what the council does. This leads us to propose increasing the penal level of council tax on empty homes to the new maximum that is possible from next year: this allows an attempt to agree with partner authorities, who will also gain small shares of income, that this should be pooled for a combined contribution to efforts to reduce rough sleeping and manage street life issues. We will also apply un-invested council funds to the provision of key public sector worker homes at rents related to salary, in order to mitigate the enormous problems of recruiting and retaining employees, who are critical for the running of the city but are unlikely to qualify for other council housing.

Woodland is all too scarce inside the city and so we are particularly keen to propose opening up five small council-owned sites for public and educational use, with the necessary ecological mitigation and management that will be necessary to properly conserve them.

We also propose immediate community action for cleaner air in the city, which will play a valuable role while other welcome changes in the pipeline are going to take longer to impact. To further realise the council's commitment to mitigating climate change, we bring forward a scheme to work on energy efficiency and renewable generation opportunities in the council's considerable commercial property ownership in the city: a much bigger estate than the buildings which the council itself operates from.

Equalities have always been an agreed value in the City Council. We were therefore shocked to see that the same energy applied to the Living Wage campaign with outside bodies has not been applied to prevent an imposition of charges to disabled and elderly customers of Shopmobility, risking a 20% reduction in usage. Our amendment suspends that plan for really thorough attempts to be made to avoid it.

Our proposals are funded by reallocating priorities to customer-facing needs and utilising unallocated resources. They enable the risk-related target for general fund reserves to be met and they do not require any adjustment to the proposed general council tax proposal.

**Tim Bick – Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group**

**Rod Cantrill – Liberal Democrat Group Spokesperson on Finance and Resources**

## 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 25 January 2018, for recommendation to Council on 22 February 2018, subject to any Executive Amendment agreed by The Leader at this committee.

### **The Liberal Democrat Group Budget amendment:**

- Ploughs back the savings achieved through the service review of Streets & Open Spaces to improve service standards, better reflecting our growing 24/7 city with: environmental patrols and public toilet hours; better, faster maintenance of facilities; the seasonal pressures of litter in the city centre and on open spaces; public litter bins needing better routine cleaning; the potential damage to open spaces if event organisers are not supervised; focus on litter in residential areas adjacent to shopping centres.
- Reduces the time taken to provide waste collection services to newly built homes, after problems were exposed during last year's route reorganisation
- Develops plans to improve the city's neighbourhood recycling sites, exploring the potential to introduce underground storage;
- Delivers much-needed emergency maintenance to the public toilets on Jesus Green, enabling them to stay in service, while a longer-term scheme is developed to improve the quality and scope of facilities provided on the green;
- Increases the premium council tax rate on empty homes and, with the proceeds, provides a fund for further improving efforts to reduce rough sleeping and street life issues
- Reallocates £8m un-invested council funds to the provision of key public sector worker homes at rents related to salary rather than at market rents
- Defers the council's plan to charge for the Shopmobility service, which risks a decline in usage among the elderly and disabled, to allow the Executive Councillor to campaign for third party funding;
- Introduces an education campaign to discourage drivers from leaving engines idling in stationary vehicles that are out of traffic
- Pilots a self-funding approach to energy efficiency improvements and solar energy generation in buildings in the council's commercial property portfolio
- Develops 5 small publicly-owned woodland sites across the city into community woodland resources, to support environmental education in schools and the wider community (Bramblefields, Walpole Road, Highfields, Cherry Hinton Hall and The Spinney).

## 2. Recommendations

Changes to recommendations are highlighted *in italics*.

Recommendations of the Executive to this Council, as agreed at their meeting on 25 January 2018, subject to any Executive Amendment agreed by The Leader at this committee are further amended as follows:

The Leader is recommended to:

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

General Fund Revenue Budgets: [Section 5, Page 31 refers] add:

- *Together with the changes in the attached Appendix 1 - Lib Dem Budget Amendment to Appendices [C (a), (b)]*
- Incorporate and replace the tables shown in *Appendix 4 - Lib Dem Budget Amendment at the pages so annotated*

Earmarked Reserves [Section 5, Page 31 refers]:

- *New recommendation: to close the “Invest for Income Fund” to release the funds for the purposes outlined below.*

Capital: [Section 7, page 37 refers]

- For the existing recommendation 2 f) After *“Agree any recommendations to the Executive add “together with the changes in the attached Appendix 2 - Lib Dem Budget - Budget Amendment to Appendix [E(a)]”, specifically to recommend that Executive Councillor for Finance & Resources Invests in housing by utilising the £8m resources released from closing the “Invest for income Fund” (Proposal C0001 refers).*

Equality Impact Assessment [Appendix G, Page 94 refers]

- Append *Appendix 3 - Lib Dem Budget Amendment Appendix G Equality Impact Assessment to the existing Equality Impact Assessment*

Section 25 Report [Section 10, Page 51 refers]

- Replace in Section 10 *Appendix 5 - Lib Dem Budget Amendment*

### 3. Council Tax

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

### 4. Capital Plan

4.1 The Lib Dem Group are proposing items identified “**Lib Dem Budget Amendment to [E(a) Capital proposals]**”.

### 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 financial, staffing, equality and poverty, environmental, procurement or community safety implications. A decision not to approve a capital or external bid will impact on managers’ ability to deliver the developments desired in the service areas.

#### (a) Financial Implications

Financial implications of budget proposals are summarised in the General Fund Budget Setting Report 2018/19, **as amended by [Lib Dem Budget Amendment]**.

#### (b) Staffing Implications

Staffing implications of budget proposals are also summarised in the General Fund Budget Setting Report 2018/19.

#### (c) Equality and Poverty Implications

A consolidated Equality Impact Assessment for the budget proposals is included in the BSR, **as amended by [Appendix 3 - Lib Dem Budget Amendment]**. Individual Equality Impact Assessments have been conducted to support this and will be available on the Council’s website.

A local poverty rating (using the classifications outlined in the BSR (Appendix B) has been included in each budget proposal to assist with assessment.

#### (d) Environmental Implications

Where relevant, officers have considered the environmental impact of budget proposals which are annotated as follows:

- +H / +M / +L: to indicate that the proposal has a high, medium or low positive impact.

- Nil: to indicate that the proposal has no climate change impact.
- -H / -M / -L: to indicate that the proposal has a high, medium or low negative impact.

## **(e) Procurement Implications**

Any procurement implications will be outlined in the BSR 2018/19, **as amended by [Lib Dem Budget Amendment]**

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

Any Community Safety Implications will be outlined in the BSR 2018/19, **as amended by [Lib Dem Budget Amendment]**.

## **6. Background papers**

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

- Budget Setting Report 2018/19, **updated (as appropriate) for at Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee on 22 January 2018, the Executive meeting on 25 January 2018 and for the [Lib Dem Amendment]**.
- Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) October 2017
- Individual Equality Impact Assessments

## **7. Appendices**

***Lib Dem Budget Amendment:***

***Appendix 1 - Amendment to Appendix [C (a), (b)] Revenue Budget proposals***

***Appendix 2 - Amendment to Appendix [E (a)] Capital Budget proposals***

***Appendix 3 - Appendix [G] Equality Impact Assessment (Supplement)***

***Appendix 4 - Replacement of relevant tables in the BSR***

***Appendix 5 - Section 25 Report***

## **8. Inspection of papers**

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

Authors' Names:

Caroline Ryba

Authors' Phone Numbers:

01223 - 458134

Authors' Emails:

[caroline.ryba@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:caroline.ryba@cambridge.gov.uk)

## Appendix 1: Lib Dem Budget Amendment to Appendix [C (a), (b)]

### 2018/19 Budget - GF - Bids and Savings

Reference	Item Description	2018/19 Budget £	2019/20 Budget £	2020/21 Budget £	2021/22 Budget £	2022/23 Budget £	Contact / Climate rating / Poverty rating	Portfolio
-----------	------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---	-----------

#### Appendix [C (a) - GF - Pressures]

##### Bids

<b>B0001</b>	<p><b>Development of a scheme to improve support for recreational activity on Jesus Green</b></p> <p>Development of a plan to take forward the replacement of the Rouse Ball Pavilion with a new multi-purpose building capable of supporting recreational needs on Jesus Green, potentially integrated with the Lido complex. Needs expected to be considered include public toilets, changing facilities, equipment storage and refreshments. Feasibility work will be undertaken to prepare a business case for a new Rouse Ball Pavilion, including topographic and ground surveys and working drawings. The work will include identification of funding sources such as available s106 funds, grant awards and contributions from partner organisations to the full build costs.</p>	35,000	-	-	-	-	A Wilson  Nil  None	Streets & Open Spaces
<b>B0002</b>	<p><b>Improvements to City Neighbourhood Recycling 'Bring' Sites</b></p> <p>There are over 24 bring sites within the City Council area. The facilities are important enablers for recycling in the city, especially where homes have insufficient space to accumulate for fortnightly collections. However many of these sites are poorly located, of a poor design, attract fly tipping and cause a blight for local residents. This project would be a scoping exercise to undertake a full review of the 'bring' site service, considering the long-term needs for residents. The scoping exercise would look at location of 'bring' sites, the demand from residents, the range of materials required at each location and the infrastructure provided, examining the potential for underground bins, which have proved successful at Eddington in North West Cambridge. The final part of this exercise would be to develop a costed capital proposal for the 'bring' sites. This bid provides for 6 months' resourcing of this review and scoping with SC P Band 4 or external support at equivalent cost and would constitute a City Council commission to the Shared Waste service.</p>	15,000	-	-	-	-	T Nicholl  Nil  None	Environmental Services & City Centre
<b>B0003</b>	<p><b>Education Campaign on Engine Idling in Cambridge</b></p> <p>Cambridge comprises a number of known air quality hotspots and it is already established that the major contributor to these is motor traffic, especially diesel-powered vehicles. The relationship of poor air quality to early deaths, particularly among the young and elderly, is understood and is agreed to be the basis for intervention on public health grounds. A number of welcome local strategies is already in hand or under consideration to encourage conversion of vehicles to electric engines and to promote more sustainable transport choices, but these will take a number of years to impact the everyday situation in the city. This budget item is for the development and delivery of an immediate 3-year public education campaign to curtail current, controllable driver behaviour of allowing engines to idle while stationary and out of traffic in the city, which needlessly adds to air pollution. It will also have the benefit of creating a wider public understanding for the impact of subsequent measures. The campaign will take learnings from other local authorities who have embarked on similar schemes, such as Westminster City Council's "#Don't Be Idle" and 16 other London authorities' support for "I'm no Idler". It will involve members of the public on a voluntary basis. In addition to the general public, its particular potential audiences will include: the taxi trade, bus companies and drivers, the employees of major city organisations, users of council car parks and schools. The final year of the project would include evaluation of a follow-on to this with an enforcement element. The costs provided are for an Air Quality Projects Officer at (City Band 6) £42,500pa (including on costs) and £7,500pa for promotional media.</p>	50,000	50,000	50,000	-	-	J Dicks  +L  None	Environmental Services & City Centre
<b>B0004</b>	<p><b>Development of Energy Packages for Buildings in the Council's Commercial Property Portfolio</b></p> <p>A pilot scheme to secure energy improvements for commercial properties in the Council's portfolio, on a case by case basis drawing on the potential for energy conservation measures, solar power generation or a mix of both. The aim of the pilot is to prove a model (or models) for a self-funded approach to greening the council's commercial estate. During the two year project, customised proposals will be developed for a sample of both void and tenanted properties, seeking to offer sufficiently attractive reductions in tenant running cost to be viably balanced by an uplift in rent. Sources of initial capital outlay will be evaluated and determined as part of the pilot, with options likely to feature internal borrowing and the council's own capital programme. Opportunities for grant funding will be explored and utilised where applicable. The revenue provided under this item will meet costs of either surveying resource or consultancy advice to design, cost and procure energy improvement works and management of project implementation. The potential of this approach based on experience will be evaluated before the 2020/21 BSR.</p>	25,000	25,000	-	-	-	D Prinsep  +L  None	Finance & Resources





## 2018/19 Budget - GF - Bids and Savings

Reference	Item Description	2018/19 Budget £	2019/20 Budget £	2020/21 Budget £	2021/22 Budget £	2022/23 Budget £	Contact / Climate rating / Poverty rating	Portfolio
<b>S0001</b>	<b>Inflation Provision</b>	(40,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)	C Ryba	Finance & Resources
	Bank of England forecasts from the November 2017 inflation report would suggest an over-provision of inflation in the MTFs of approximately 0.2% in 2018/19 (~£40k) increasing marginally over time. No adjustment to budgets was proposed in the BSR, as these amounts are minor in relation to overall expenditure, however the proposal here is to reflect the more recent forecast. (Ref p.10 BSR 2018/19)						Nil	Finance & Resources
							None	
<b>S0002</b>	<b>Mill Road Depot Redevelopment Equity Interest</b>	(14,000)	(30,000)	(48,000)	(168,000)	-	F Bryant	
	Delete NCL4147. This allows interest on the Council's loan of equity to the CIP to remain in the General Fund, along with the return on other investments; development loan interest from the scheme would remain in an earmarked reserve as a contingency and risk mitigation for the project (see NCL4149).						Nil	Finance & Resources
							None	
<b>S0003</b>	<b>Increase Council tax premium on empty homes to new higher level to fund enhancements to rough sleeping strategy (see B0008)</b>	-	(4,500)	(4,500)	(4,500)	(4,500)	A Cole	
	See B0008.						Nil	
							Low	
<b>S0004</b>	<b>Public Information Films</b>	(9,000)	(9,000)	(9,000)	(9,000)	(9,000)	A Limb	Finance & Resources
	Delete B4006.						Nil	
							None	
<b>S0005</b>	<b>Reduction in paid time off for TU Officials</b>	(34,000)	(34,000)	(34,000)	(34,000)	(34,000)	D Simpson	Finance & Resources
	Revoke the doubling of paid time-off for Trade Union officials provided in 2015, reducing it again to 1 full-time equivalent post from 2. This recognises that the last time the council considered evidence of practice by other councils, 1 FTE position was a generous level of provision. Between 2015 and 1 April 2018, the council's staff will have declined by 25%, further underlining a disproportionate provision.						Nil	
							None	
<b>S0006</b>	<b>Data Scientist</b>	(60,000)	(60,000)	(60,000)	(60,000)	(60,000)	A Limb	Strategy & Transformation
	Remove from base budget provision funding for a new position of Data Scientist within the Corporate Strategy team and charge as 2 year limited duration commitment to unallocated funds within Business Transformation Programme (PROG4067). This initiative, which may contribute positively to the future operation of the council should be reviewed in 2019/20 and, if appropriate, a bid brought forward to support it from 2020/21, potentially as a shared role with other councils.						Nil	Finance & Resources
							None	
<b>S0007</b>	<b>Reduce GF reserves to target balance</b>	(183,000)	(66,000)	(4,000)	166,000	(2,000)	C Ryba	
	Reduce GF reserves to target balance						None	
<b>Total Savings &amp; Increased Income</b>		<b>(340,000)</b>	<b>(243,500)</b>	<b>(199,500)</b>	<b>(149,500)</b>	<b>(149,500)</b>		
<b>All Portfolios - Net Impact of Lib Dem Amendment</b>		<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>		

## Appendix 2: Lib Dem Budget Amendment to Appendix [E (a) Capital proposals]

### 2018/19 Budget - GF - Capital Bids

Reference	Item Description	2018/19 Budget £	2019/20 Budget £	2020/21 Budget £	2021/22 Budget £	2022/23 Budget £	Contact / Climate rating / Poverty rating	Portfolio
-----------	------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---	-----------

#### Capital

<b>C0001</b>	<b>Investment of Invest-for-income fund - housing</b>	8,000,000	-	-	-	-	C Ryba	Finance & Resources
--------------	---	-----------	---	---	---	---	--------	---------------------

Cambridge continues to be a difficult market for people seeking to buy and rent residential property. Rents have increased by approximately 16% over the last three years in the city. In particular, it is increasingly difficult for key workers, many of whom are not eligible for council support to be able to live in the city. The City Council, as a key stakeholder in the city is in a position to assist in addressing this issue. The proposal reallocates the £8.0m Invest to Save fund and with it provides a 50% equity investment and 50% loan to the wholly owned housing company for the purchase of 29 one and two bedroom properties across the city for rental on a living rent basis (i.e. approximately one third of a household income in the bracket £15,000 - £31,500 - this is approximately 30% of the households in Cambridge). The properties would be available to rent to public sector workers such as teachers and nurses. The scope of income band will mean that properties could be rented to key workers with household income higher than the average of £23,250 as well as below the average. An adjustment of rent based on an adjustment of household income would only occur if household income moved by 10% over a 12 month period. In addition, all rents would increase annually on an inflation basis. The scheme would have similar characteristics to the current rental scheme in the housing company, but critically would be based on household income rather than market rents. **The net revenue impact on interest receipts will be nil.**

Nil

Low

<b>C0002</b>	<b>Rouse Ball Pavilion (Jesus Green toilets and changing) urgent maintenance</b>	25,000	-	-	-	-	A Wilson	Streets & Open Spaces
--------------	--	--------	---	---	---	---	----------	-----------------------

An immediate maintenance overhaul of the current Rouse Ball Pavilion on Jesus Green to bring its facilities up to an acceptable and usable standard, pending the development of a longer-term and more complex scheme which officers believe may take 3-5 years to deliver (see B001). Public feedback has underlined the unsustainable condition of the existing facilities in one of the city's premier open spaces where demand is considerable. See B0009 funding.

Nil

None

<b>C0003</b>	<b>Community Woodland Scheme</b>	-	30,000	-	-	-	A Wilson	Streets & Open Spaces
--------------	----------------------------------	---	--------	---	---	---	----------	-----------------------

The development of 5 small council-owned woodland sites into community woodland resources that can be used by local community groups and schools to provide environmental education and natural open spaces, including the potential for a Forest School approach. The sites, totalling 1.7 hectares, currently have no or limited public access and are located: in the Triangle area at the Bramblefields Local Nature Reserve, Walpole Road, Highfields Avenue, Cherry Hinton Hall and the Spinney. Making these scarce sites available will reduce and share some of the pressures experienced by the Local Nature Reserves. They vary in their current condition in relation to security, tree management and accessibility. Subject to consultation and ecological mitigation, it is proposed to make them accessible to all and to promote a booking system for groups. Scheme costs are for initial tree inspection and remedial works (£20k) and fencing, gating and surfacing (£10k). Officers believe that any minor ongoing revenue costs could be defrayed by small charges for group usage and the remainder absorbed within existing budgets.

+L

Nil

<b>All Portfolios - Net Impact of Lib Dem Amendment</b>	<b>8,025,000</b>	<b>30,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
---	------------------	---------------	----------	----------	----------

## Appendix 3 - Lib Dem Amendment 2018/19 [BSR App G]



### Cambridge City Council Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)

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

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

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

Liberal Democrat Budget proposals 2018/19

#### 2. Webpage link to full details of the strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service (if available)

<https://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=116&MIId=3256&Ver=4>

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

The Liberal Democrats budget amendment makes a number of alternative budget proposals to those set out by the ruling group in the Budget Setting Report. This EqIA has been carried out by Council officers to provide Councillors with an assessment of the potential equality impacts of the Liberal Democrat budget proposals at the point when they are being asked to make a decision, as required by the Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act 2010.

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

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

- Education campaign on engine idling in Cambridge

## Appendix 3 - Lib Dem Amendment 2018/19 [BSR App G]

- Future funding for Shopmobility
- Service standard improvements for Streets and Open Spaces
- Enhancements to rough sleeping strategy funded from increased empty homes tax
- Development of a scheme to improve support for recreational activity on Jesus Green
- Community Woodland Scheme

### 4. Responsible Service

The Finance service manages the budget process, but a range of Council services would be responsible for the individual proposals included in this EqlA, if they were implemented.

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

- Residents of Cambridge City
- Visitors to Cambridge City
- Staff

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

N/a

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

- New
- Major change
- Minor change

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

No

Yes (Please provide details): This is an assessment of proposed amendments to the

## Appendix 3 - Lib Dem Amendment 2018/19 [BSR App G]

Budget Setting Report and therefore covers many Council services. The budget also affects some of the Councils partnership working: For instance, related to the running of the shared waste service with South Cambridgeshire District Council, and proposals to work with the County Council and Police and Crime Commissioner to tackle rough sleeping.

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

This will go to Council on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2018

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

- Disability Facts and Figures report (2016) by The Papworth Trust:  
<http://www.papworthtrust.org.uk/node/2206>
- Department for Work and Pensions (2016), Family Resources Survey: financial year 2014/15 <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/family-resources-survey-financial-year-201415>
- Royal College of Physicians (2016), 'Every Breath we Take: The Lifelong impact of air pollution' (report of a working party)

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

## Appendix 3 - Lib Dem Amendment 2018/19 [BSR App G]

**(a) Age - Any group of people of a particular age (e.g. 32 year-olds) , or within a particular age range (e.g. 16-24 year-olds) – in particular, please consider any safeguarding issues for children and vulnerable adults**

**Education Campaign for Engine Idling in Cambridge:** This proposal is expected to have a positive impact in preventing early deaths caused by poor air quality, especially for the young and elderly<sup>1</sup> who research shows are likely to be most affected by poor air quality. Amongst the project's particular audiences included schools, which could mean the impact is felt amongst young people.

**Future funding for Shopmobility:** The budget proposal, states that introducing a charging scheme will lead to a reduction in demand of the service by 20% amongst the elderly and/ or disabled people who use this service today. The charging scheme could contribute to social isolation amongst these groups, if older people with significant mobility issues are not able to access the city centre because they cannot afford to use the service. Therefore, the proposal to find third party funding for the service could have a positive impact related to age for older people with low incomes.

**Service standard improvements in streets and open spaces:** Amongst the priorities for re-investing savings of the current Streets and Open Spaces review is to intensify routine maintenance inspections of installations and equipment on open spaces. This includes reference to play equipment, which will be of benefit to children.

**Community Woodland Scheme:** It is envisaged that the 5 community woodland resources will be used by schools to provide environmental education and natural open spaces, including the potential for a Forest School approach that could benefit children and young people. Forest School is a process that offers all learners regular opportunities to achieve and develop confidence and self-esteem through hands-on learning experiences in a woodland or natural environment with trees.

**(b) Disability - A person has a disability if she or he has a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on that person's ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities. (In this section please also include impacts of policies on carers.)**

**Education Campaign for Engine Idling in Cambridge:** This proposal is expected to have a positive impact in potentially helping to prevent ill-health, disability and early deaths that can be caused by poor air quality<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Royal College of Physicians (2016), 'Every Breath we Take: The Lifelong impact of air pollution' (report of a working party)

<sup>2</sup> Royal College of Physicians (2016), 'Every Breath we Take: The Lifelong impact of air pollution' (report of a working party)

## Appendix 3 - Lib Dem Amendment 2018/19 [BSR App G]

**Future funding for Shopmobility:** The budget proposal states that introducing a charging scheme will lead to a reduction in demand of the service by 20% amongst elderly and/ or disabled people who use this service today. The charging scheme could contribute to social isolation amongst these groups, if people with mobility issues are not able to access the city centre because they cannot afford to use the service. Therefore, the proposal to find third party funding for the service could have a positive impact related to disability.

**Service standard improvements in streets and open spaces:** Amongst the priorities for re-investing savings of the current Streets and Open Spaces review is to have wider hours or opening for public toilets to support usage of open spaces. This may benefit disabled people who have disabilities that require them to need greater access to toilets.

**Enhancements to rough sleeping strategy funded from increased empty homes tax:** The project would aim to improve the capacity to reduce rough sleeping and associated street life issues in Cambridge, and a significant proportion of people within the streetlife community have disabilities. Therefore, the project could have a positive impact related to disability.

**Community Woodland Scheme:** Subject to consultation and ecological mitigation, it is proposed to make the 5 woodland sites accessible to all, which would have a positive impact related to disability.

### (c) Sex – A man or a woman.

**Future funding for Shopmobility:** There are more disabled women in the UK than men<sup>3</sup> so the proposal to find third party funding for Shopmobility so that charges are not applied to service users will benefit women more than men.

### (d) Transgender – A person who does not identify with the gender they were assigned to at birth (includes gender reassignment that is the process of transitioning from one gender to another)

No impacts have been identified for this equality group.

### (e) Pregnancy and maternity

**Service standard improvements in streets and open spaces:** Amongst the priorities for re-investing savings of the current Streets and Open Spaces review is to intensify routine

<sup>3</sup> Department for Work and Pensions (2016), Family Resources Survey: financial year 2014/15  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/family-resources-survey-financial-year-201415>

## Appendix 3 - Lib Dem Amendment 2018/19 [BSR App G]

maintenance inspections of installations and equipment on open spaces. This includes reference to play equipment, which will be of benefit to those with children.

### **Development of a scheme to improve support for recreational activity on Jesus Green:**

Amongst the needs to be considered that relate to this proposal is around changing facilities. Taking account of these needs could have a positive impact related to maternity if the developed plans were to go ahead.

#### **(f) Marriage and civil partnership**

No impacts have been identified for this equality group.

#### **(g) Race - The protected characteristic 'race' refers to a group of people defined by their race, colour, and nationality (including citizenship) ethnic or national origins.**

No impacts have been identified for this equality group.

#### **(h) Religion or belief**

No impacts have been identified for this equality group.

#### **(i) Sexual orientation**

No impacts have been identified for this equality group.

#### **(j) Other factors that may lead to inequality – in particular – please consider the impact of any changes on low income groups or those experiencing the impacts of poverty**

See separate poverty ratings attached to Liberal Democrat budget proposals



## Appendix 3 - Lib Dem Amendment 2018/19 [BSR App G]

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

This will go to Council on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2018

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

No negative impacts have been identified for the protected characteristics related to these budget proposals. Positive impacts have been identified related to age, disability, sex and pregnancy/ maternity.

The Community Woodland Scheme might have a positive impact for all equality groups, as it may be used by local community groups as well as schools.

**13. Sign off**

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

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

David Kidston, Strategy and Partnerships Manager

Graham Saint, Corporate Strategy Officer

Date of EqlA sign off: 02/02/2018

Date of next review of the equalities impact assessment: For next Opposition Budget proposals for 2019/20

Sent to Helen Crowther, Equality and Anti-Poverty Officer?

Yes

No

Date to be published on Cambridge City Council website (if known): 05/02/2018

## Appendix 4 - Lib Dem Budget Amendment – Replacement Tables

### General Fund Projection (BSR, page 36)

Description	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	2020/21 £000	2021/22 £000	2022/23 £000
<b>Expenditure</b>						
Net service budgets	21,894	19,325	18,891	20,866	21,549	21,290
<b>Revenue Budget Proposals - BSR - updated for Lib Dem Budget proposals</b>	-	<b>826</b>	<b>(433)</b>	<b>(567)</b>	<b>(751)</b>	<b>(583)</b>
Capital accounting adjustments	(6,155)	(6,155)	(6,155)	(6,155)	(6,155)	(6,155)
Capital expenditure financed from revenue	4,279	1,458	1,786	1,786	1,786	1,786
Contributions to earmarked funds	5,868	4,470	3,425	2,747	2,617	2,408
Revised net savings requirement	-	-	(85)	(85)	(85)	(85)
<b>Net spending requirement</b>	<b>25,886</b>	<b>19,924</b>	<b>17,429</b>	<b>18,592</b>	<b>18,961</b>	<b>18,661</b>
<b>Funded by:</b>						
Settlement Funding Assessment (SFA)	(5,093)	(4,689)	(4,240)	(4,240)	(4,240)	(4,240)
Locally Retained Business Rates – Growth Element	(800)	(800)	(800)	(800)	(800)	(800)
Other grants from central government	-	-	-	-	-	-
New Homes Bonus (NHB)	(5,962)	(5,595)	(4,449)	(3,905)	(3,894)	(3,604)
Appropriations from earmarked funds	-	-	-	-	-	-
Council Tax	(7,807)	(8,227)	(8,483)	(8,767)	(9,094)	(9,132)
<b>Contributions to / (from) reserves - updated for Lib Dem Budget proposals</b>	<b>(6,224)</b>	<b>(613)</b>	<b>543</b>	<b>(880)</b>	<b>(933)</b>	<b>(885)</b>
<b>Total funding</b>	<b>(25,886)</b>	<b>(19,924)</b>	<b>(17,429)</b>	<b>(18,592)</b>	<b>(18,961)</b>	<b>(18,661)</b>

### General Fund Reserves (BSR, page 46)

Description	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	2020/21 £000	2021/22 £000	2022/23 £000
<b>Balance as at 1 April (b/fwd)</b>	<b>(15,412)</b>	<b>(9,188)</b>	<b>(8,575)</b>	<b>(9,118)</b>	<b>(8,238)</b>	<b>(7,305)</b>
Contribution (to) / from reserves	6,224	479	(576)	867	1,061	883
Non-Cash Limit items (Appendix C(d) )	-	(49)	(33)	9	38	-
<b>Impact of Lib Dem Budget proposal</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>(166)</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Balance as at 31 March (c/fwd)</b>	<b>(9,188)</b>	<b>(8,575)</b>	<b>(9,118)</b>	<b>(8,238)</b>	<b>(7,305)</b>	<b>(6,420)</b>

## General Fund Capital Funding and Spend (BSR, pages 41 & 42)

Capital funding Available	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	2020/21 £000	2021/22 £000	2022/23 £000
<b>Funding available and unapplied (MTFS Oct 2017)</b>	-	(1,042)	(1,761)	(1,761)	(1,786)	(1,786)
Additional funding (Warkworth Lodge capital receipt)	(251)	(1,273)	(76)	-	-	-
Urgent approval since MTFS Oct 2017 (Park Street equipment)	145	-	-	-	-	-
Schemes removed from capital plan (see above) and rephased into 2018/19	-	-	-	-	-	-
Capital bids requiring funding (Appendix E(b) )	106	2,315	455	-	-	-
<b>Impact of Lib Dem Budget proposals</b>			11			
<b>Net Funding Available</b>	-	-	(1,371)	(1,761)	(1,786)	(1,786)

Capital plan spending	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	2020/21 £000	2021/22 £000	2022/23 £000
<b>Spend MTFS Oct 2017</b>	38,334	1,845	272	866	61	-
Approvals since MTFS Oct 2017 see Appendix E (c):						
Pre-planning development costs for Silver Street toilets capitalised	48	-	-	-	-	-
Under urgency	145	-	-	-	-	-
Section 106 (with funding)	315	50	-	-	-	-
<b>Capital Plan total before new proposals</b>	38,842	1,895	272	866	61	-
New proposals see Appendix E (d)	1,056	11,966	10,655	2,500	-	-
<b>Total Spend</b>	39,898	13,861	10,927	3,366	61	-
<b>Impact of Lib Dem Budget proposals</b>	-	8,025	30	-	-	-
<b>Total Spend</b>	39,898	21,886	10,957	3,366	61	-

<b>Capital plan funding</b>	<b>2017/18 £000</b>	<b>2018/19 £000</b>	<b>2019/20 £000</b>	<b>2020/21 £000</b>	<b>2021/22 £000</b>	<b>2022/23 £000</b>
<b>External support</b>						
Developer Contributions	(4,792)	(185)	-	-	-	-
Other Sources	(1,969)	(25)	(25)	(25)	-	-
Prudential Borrowing	-	-	-	-	-	-
Specified Capital Grants (SCG)	(180)	(120)	(126)	-	-	-
<b>Total External support</b>	<b>(6,941)</b>	<b>(330)</b>	<b>(151)</b>	<b>(25)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>City Council</b>						
Direct Revenue Financing (DRF) - GF Services	(336)	-	-	-	-	-
Direct Revenue Financing (DRF) - Use of Reserves	(4,279)	<b>(1,483)</b>	<b>(1,805)</b>	(1,786)	(1,786)	(1,786)
Earmarked Reserve - Capital Contributions	(3,214)	<b>(8,922)</b>	-	-	-	-
Earmarked Reserve - Climate Change Fund	(333)	-	-	-	-	-
Earmarked Reserve – Asset Replacement Reserve	(2,991)	(1,106)	-	-	-	-
HRA Capital Balances	-	-	-	-	-	-
Internal Borrowing - Temporary Use of Balances	(21,421)	(8,772)	(10,296)	(3,316)	-	-
Other Sources	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prudential Borrowing	-	-	-	-	-	-
Usable Capital Receipts	(383)	(1,273)	(76)	-	(61)	-
<b>Total City Council</b>	<b>(32,957)</b>	<b>(21,556)</b>	<b>(12,177)</b>	<b>(5,102)</b>	<b>(1,847)</b>	<b>(1,786)</b>
<b>Total funding</b>	<b>(39,898)</b>	<b>(21,886)</b>	<b>(12,328)</b>	<b>(5,127)</b>	<b>(1,847)</b>	<b>(1,786)</b>
<b>Net Funding Available</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>(1,371)</b>	<b>(1,761)</b>	<b>(1,786)</b>	<b>(1,786)</b>

## Appendix 5 – Lib Dem Budget Amendment - Section 25 Report

These budget amendments would not require any substantive changes to the existing Section 10 – Section 25 Report. **[Section 10, Page 51 refers]**

There are two types of amendment:-

- General Fund (GF) revenue amendments – spending proposals are matched by funding generated from a variety of sources including:
  - Reducing GF reserves to the recommended target balance
  - Reallocating funding from the deletion of three budget bids
  - Reducing the earmarked reserve (GF Development Fund) created from interest income earned from loans provided to fund development at the former Mill Road depot by approximately 30%, thereby reducing the level of contingency funding available for this and other Cambridge Investment Partnership (CIP) projects.

These proposals represent a reprioritisation of existing funding and the use of other available resources, and as such do not compromise the deliverability of the council's overall budget. It should be noted that some of the proposals support feasibility and development work that may give rise to future bids for funding.

The GF Development Fund is created in the BSR from interest receipts that are considered to be uncertain in timing and quantum. By limiting the use of this source of funding to receipts related to the equity loan and representing about 30% of the total income, risks related to the receipt of this income are considered to be reduced, although not eliminated entirely.

- Capital bids – proposals are matched by revenue funding identified above (£44k), available capital funding from 2019/20 (£11k) and the redirection of £8m from the Invest for Income Fund towards the provision of affordable housing.

The investment in affordable housing at Living Rent uses funding set aside for investment in proposals generating at least 5% return for the council. As the proposal projects a return of 1%, use of the Invest for Income Fund for this purpose will require a policy decision to forego at least 4% return, equivalent to £320k.

The expected 1% return on the housing proposal is in line with current returns on the council's cash investments, but will fall below this benchmark if interest rates rise, as expected in the short to medium term. Therefore, the proposed investment does not achieve the aim of 'Using cash balances and earmarked reserves to generate additional income' identified above as a principle way of addressing the council's savings requirement.

The proposal is to lend £8m to the council's housing company to buy and manage 29 houses. The company is currently being run as a three-year pilot, with a limited portfolio of 23 new build properties on two sites. The company has the following objective stated in its articles of association:

*“.....providing and managing housing that is affordable for those in housing need and any other property related activity in Cambridge and neighbouring districts that also generates a financial return for the Council.”*

As the scheme is only projected to return amounts equivalent to those achievable by the council through cash investments, it is questionable whether this scheme would enable the company to achieve its stated objective. Therefore, to deliver this proposal, the following actions are required:

- Review and assessment of the pilot, followed by approval for the operations of the company to be extended;
- Amendment of the company's objective.

The affordable housing scheme has been financially assessed in line with the council's established methods, and estimates have been made in line with those used for the 23 properties already owned and managed by the company. However, it is noted that existing properties of various ages and locations around Cambridge will be purchased, rather than new build properties located on one or a small number of developments. There is therefore a risk that management, maintenance and capital costs will be higher than estimated. Rent income has been calculated assuming that across the 29 properties an average rent will be achieved, based on the incomes of tenants. However, a mix of tenants with incomes at the lower end of the range would reduce the rental income of the scheme.

Overall, delivery of this proposal will require changes in policy. The scheme is considered to be of marginal viability, with a low level of return that cannot be guaranteed due to the risks noted above. Furthermore, the level of return leaves little scope to cover normal operational risks.

**I therefore consider, in relation to the budget resulting from the application of these amendments, that the estimates for the financial year 2018/19 to be sufficiently robust and the financial reserves up to 31 March 2019 to be adequate. I draw attention to the financial risks associated with the low level of projected return from the proposed housing scheme.**

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