



BROMLEY CIVIC CENTRE, STOCKWELL CLOSE, BROMLEY BRI 3UH

TELEPHONE: 020 8464 3333

CONTACT: Keith Pringle
keith.pringle@bromley.gov.uk

DIRECT LINE: 020 8313 4508

FAX: 020 8290 0608

DATE: 3 July 2015

To: Members of the
EXECUTIVE

Councillor Stephen Carr (Chairman)

Councillors Graham Arthur, Robert Evans, Peter Fortune, Kate Lymer, Peter Morgan and Colin Smith

A meeting of the Executive will be held at Bromley Civic Centre on **WEDNESDAY 15 JULY 2015 AT 7.00 PM**

MARK BOWEN
Director of Corporate Services

Copies of the documents referred to below can be obtained from
<http://cde.bromley.gov.uk/>

A G E N D A

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3 VISIT BY THE RIGHT HON. GREG CLARK MP, SECRETARY OF STATE FOR COMMUNITIES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

4 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, questions must be received in writing four working days before the date of the meeting. Therefore please ensure that questions are received by the Democratic Services Team by 5pm on Thursday 9th July 2015.

5 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 10TH JUNE 2015
(Pages 5 - 20)

6 PETITION - BULL LANE ALLOTMENTS, CHISLEHURST
(Pages 21 - 24)
Chislehurst Ward

- 7 **BUDGET MONITORING 2015/16**
(Pages 25 - 60)
- 8 **CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - 1ST QUARTER 2015/16**
(Pages 61 - 74)
- 9 **COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT - 2016/17**
(Pages 75 - 90)
- 10 **REORGANISATION OF BROMLEY ADULT EDUCATION COLLEGE**
(Pages 91 - 100)
- 11 **SOCIAL CARE INNOVATION GRANT - DRAWDOWN OF FUNDING**
(Pages 101 - 112)
- 12 **DIRECT CARE (LEARNING DISABILITIES) - CONTRACT AWARD**
(Pages 113 - 134)
- 13 **GATEWAY REPORT FOR LEARNING DISABILITY SUPPORTED LIVING SCHEMES**
(Pages 135 - 140)
- 14 **DEVELOPING BROMLEY'S LOCAL PLAN - DRAFT ALLOCATIONS FOR CONSULTATION**
(Pages 141 - 158) (Appendix 1 to follow)
- 15 **BROMLEY NORTH VILLAGE IMPROVEMENTS - CONTINGENCY OPTIONS**
(Pages 159 - 164)
Bromley Town Ward
- 16 **LEAD LOCAL FLOOD AUTHORITY UPDATE AND GRANT DRAW-DOWN**
(Pages 165 - 170) (Appendix 1 to follow)
- 17 **CONSIDERATION OF ANY OTHER ISSUES REFERRED FROM THE EXECUTIVE AND RESOURCES POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**
- 18 **LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 AS AMENDED BY THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) (VARIATION) ORDER 2006 AND THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000**

The Chairman to move that the Press and public be excluded during consideration of the items of business listed below as it is likely in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings that if members of the Press and public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information.

Items of Business

Schedule 12A Description

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>19 EXEMPT MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 10TH JUNE
(Pages 171 - 172)</p> | <p>Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)</p> |
| <p>20 DIRECT CARE - CONTRACT AWARD
(Pages 173 - 178)</p> | <p>Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)</p> |
| <p>21 CHISLEHURST LIBRARY , RED HILL, CHISLEHURST
(Pages 179 - 222)
Chislehurst Ward</p> | <p>Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)</p> |
| <p>22 BROMLEY BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT (BID) PROPOSAL
(Pages 223 - 278)
Bromley Town Ward</p> | <p>Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)</p> |
| <p>23 CONTRACT FOR STREET ENVIRONMENT - CONTRACT EXTENSION OPTION
(Pages 279 - 286)</p> | <p>Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)</p> |
| <p>24 STREET WORKS INSPECTION CONTRACT EXTENSION
(Pages 287 - 292)</p> | <p>Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)</p> |
| <p>25 CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - APPENDIX D
(Pages 293 - 294)</p> | <p>Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)</p> |
| <p>26 AQUISITION OF INVESTMENT PROPERTY
(To Follow)</p> | <p>Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)</p> |

.....

This page is left intentionally blank

EXECUTIVE

Minutes of the meeting held on 10 June 2015 starting at 7.00 pm

Present:

Councillor Stephen Carr (Chairman)
Councillors Graham Arthur, Robert Evans, Peter Fortune,
Kate Lymer, Peter Morgan and Colin Smith

Also Present:

Councillor Nicholas Bennett J.P., Councillor Simon
Fawthrop, Councillor William Huntington-Thresher,
Councillor Ian F. Payne and Councillor Angela Wilkins

209 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

210 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Nicholas Bennett declared in relation to minute 216, Bromley Museum and The Priory, Orpington, that he was a member of the following - the Imperial War Museum, the London Transport Museum, the National Archives and the Bromley Local History Society.

Councillor William Huntington-Thresher declared in relation to minute 216, Bromley Museum and The Priory, Orpington, that he was an adviser to the Orpington Business Improvement District (BID) and in relation to minute 220 Local Intermediate Housing Income Threshold Review that he was a member of the Affinity Sutton Regional Scrutiny Board.

Councillor Peter Morgan declared in relation to minute 213, Provisional Final Accounts 2014/15, that his daughter was a director of Kier.

211 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 20TH MAY 2015 Report CSD15073

The Executive received a summary of matters arising from previous meetings.

A sheet setting out some additional working group memberships (minute 197) and some minor changes to Appendix A was tabled.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 20th May 2015 be confirmed.

212 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING

A number of questions had been received from members of the public for oral and written reply – these are set out in appendix 1 to these minutes.

213 PROVISIONAL FINAL ACCOUNTS 2014/15
Report FSD15034

The Committee considered the provisional outturn for 2014/15 at portfolio level and Council-wide, as well as the implications for the Council's financial position in 2015/16. There was an overall net nil movement in balances consisting of net variations on Cr£2.4m on services, Dr£4.9m on central items and carry forwards, prior year adjustments of Cr3.8m, carry forwards from 2013/14 of Dr£1.6m and general grants of Cr£0.3m. The Director of Finance emphasised that the Council had to consider both stewardship and sustainability, with a longer term financial planning approach as austerity continued, and not deferring savings and investing to achieve returns that would provide ongoing support for key services was a more sustainable approach.

Councillor Angela Wilkins expressed surprise at the proposals to transfer over £10m into the Investment Fund, suggesting that the much larger than expected underspend should be allocated to building homes and protecting services. The Leader responded that much of the underspend was from un-needed contingency and the Council had to deal with future budget projections and the year on year reductions in grant. The Council had to generate additional income, take savings early and invest in the fabric of the borough to reduce costs. The Leader stated that it was important that tight gatekeeping and effective management of budgets should continue.

RESOLVED that

(1) The provisional revenue and capital outturns for the 2014/15 financial year and the earmarked balances on the General Fund as at 31st March 2015 be noted.

(2) It is noted that a more detailed analysis of the 2014/15 final outturn will be reported for each portfolio to the relevant PDS Committees.

(3) The variations in 2014/15 impacting on the Council's 2015/16 financial position be noted.

(4) The comments from the Education, Care and Health Services Department, the Director of Regeneration and Transformation and the Director of Environment and Community Services as detailed in appendix 1B to the report be noted.

(5) The carry forwards of £484k relating to repairs and maintenance, approved under delegated powers as detailed in Appendix 5 to the report be noted.

(6) The requests for carry forwards totalling £1,186 (net), as detailed in Appendix 5 to the report, be approved subject to the funding being allocated to the Central Contingency, to be drawn down on the approval of the relevant Portfolio Holder.

(7) A total of £2,248k funding be released from Central Contingency as detailed in paragraph 3.2.1 to the report.

(8) The return to Central Contingency of a total of £578k as set out in paragraph 3.2.2 be noted.

(9) The Prior Year Adjustments totalling £3,754k as detailed in section 3.4 of the report be noted.

(10) Council be recommended to transfer £10,165k to the Investment Fund as detailed in section 4.1 of the report.

(11) Council be recommended to create a Business Rates Risk Reserve of £1,200k as detailed in section 4.2 of the report.

(12) Council be recommended to transfer £1,250k to the Healthy Bromley Fund as detailed in section 4.3 of the report.

214 CAPITAL PROGRAMME OUT-TURN 2014/15
Report FSD15032

The Executive received a report setting out the final outturn on capital expenditure and receipts for 2014/15. Capital expenditure for the year was £50.5m, compared to the final approved budget of £52.5m agreed in February 2015. At that time, further slippage of £2m was assumed for capital financing purposes, so there was no overall variation in the use of capital receipts, external contributions and revenue contributions.

RESOLVED that the report be noted and the carry forward of the unspent capital budget (£18k) on the block provision for emergency works to surplus sites be approved.

215 INVESTMENT PROPERTY REVIEW
Report DRR15/056

The report provided an overview of the Council's investment portfolio and proposed a process for reviewing this portfolio. The following categories of property would be reviewed in priority order over the coming year – estate shops (freehold and leasehold), shopping centres, green belt, miscellaneous commercial properties, residential properties and sports and community uses.

The first report, on estate shops, was scheduled to be presented to Members in September. All properties would be challenged rigorously.

The Executive was also asked to reaffirm a set of management policies set out in the report as (a) to (k). The Executive and Resources PDS Committee had scrutinised the report on 3rd June 2015 and proposed that policy (k), which was not to dispose of small areas of land for garden extensions unless it was in the Council's interest, should be deleted. Members agreed that this should be deleted and considered that unused land should be disposed of wherever possible. The PDS Committee had also suggested that policy (g) should be reviewed to ensure compliance with competition legislation.

RESOLVED that

(1) The proposed programme for the review of the Investment Property Portfolio be approved as set out in section 4 of the report.

(2) The management policies outlined in section 5 of the report be endorsed, with the exception that policy (k) be deleted and policy (g) be reviewed.

216 BROMLEY MUSEUM AND THE PRIORY ORPINGTON
Report DRR15/046

In February 2015 officers had recommended, in the context of the need to make budget savings, that the Bromley Museum be relocated to the Central Library and the Priory building be disposed of on the open market. Since then, at the request of the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation, officers had investigated the future of the Museum and the Priory and held discussions with residents and interested parties. Although heritage and arts were highly valued by residents, it was accepted that the current museum standard was weak, and a new approach to provision of a local museum was needed with significantly reduced revenue costs.

Relocating the Museum to the Central Library still offered the best solution for an improved and sustainable Museum that would be in a position to attract more visitors, and officers were exploring different options for a pool of trained staff to be available to assist with particular school visits, or for trained volunteers to assist in running the exhibits.

The future of the Priory was a separate issue which was still being considered. The building had been declared an asset of community value and various Council and community group based options were being investigated.

The report had been scrutinised by the Executive and Resources PDS Committee on 3rd June. The Committee had supported the recommendations with some small changes to include reference to disposal of a leasehold interest, to delete reference to the cost of the proposed relocation being funded from capital receipts to avoid any impression that the move depended

on sale of the Priory and to make the capital and revenue funding decisions up to £395k and up to £15k.

In addition, PDS Members had supported a resolution calling for the Executive to decide to offer the Lubbock Collection back to the family. Councillor Nicholas Bennett, the Council's Heritage and Design Champion, argued that the artefacts in the Lubbock Collection had no link to the borough other than that Sir John Lubbock had lived in the borough. He felt that as display space at the Central Library would be limited it should be focussed instead on exhibits more directly related to the history of Bromley. The Leader stated that he would be happy to consider the future of the Lubbock collection further once the new exhibitions were in place and their success had been measured. The Executive members felt that there was scope for the new Museum to include both the Lubbock Collection and space for local history.

RESOLVED that

(1) The cessation of the museum service at the Priory, Orpington, and the provision of new museum exhibitions at the Central Library, Bromley, managed by Local Studies and Archives, be agreed.

(2) The Priory be declared surplus to operational requirements with effect from 1st October 2015 and, subject to further work by Strategic Property Services on other Council uses for the building, authority is given to offer the property for sale or disposal of a leasehold interest on the open market.

(3) The outcome of the staff consultation be noted and the proposal to cease the museum service be endorsed.

(4) The allocation of up to £395k for the relocation of exhibitions, the addition of the scheme to the capital programme, and the allocation of up to £15k per annum revenue to Local Studies and Archives to commission temporary exhibitions and care for the collection be approved.

(5) The proposal from the Executive and Resources PDS Committee to offer the Lubbock Collection back to the Lubbock family is not supported.

217 BROMLEY TOWN HALL AND SOUTH STREET CAR PARK
Report CSD15075

The proposed developer of the Bromley Town Hall and South Street Car Park site had asked the Council to (i) add a small area of additional land fronting Widmore Road to the area which the Council had agreed to lease (subject to planning), and (ii) appropriate the site of the South Street Car Park for planning purposes. The Executive was reassured that these were minor technical issues and there was no reason for the Council to object.

RESOLVED that

(1) The addition to the area already included within the Town Hall site in the agreement for lease of the area shown hatched on plan 1 attached to the report be approved.

(2) The South Street Car Park site shown hatched on plan 2 attached to the report be appropriated under section 122 of the Local Government Act 1972 to planning purposes in order to enable the powers in section 237 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to be used to facilitate the redevelopment of the site.

218 BECKENHAM TOWN CENTRE CONSERVATION AREA
Report DRR15/052

At its meeting on 24th March 2015 the Development Control Committee approved a proposal for a new Beckenham Town Centre Conservation Area. Extensive consultation had been carried out and the report set out officer responses to various suggested additions and removals.

The proposals had also been supported by the Beckenham Town Centre Working Group.

Officers were requested to check whether the conservation area boundary extended into Kelsey and Eden Park ward.

RESOLVED that a new conservation area named “Beckenham Town Centre Conservation Area” with boundaries as set out in the map in section 3 of the report be adopted.

219 SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD) ON PLANNING OBLIGATIONS ADDENDUM ON CHANGES TO POOLING S106 CONTRIBUTIONS AND S106 THRESHOLD CHANGES
Report DRR15/009

The report proposed an addendum to the Council’s existing Supplementary Planning Document Planning Obligations (2010) to reflect changes introduced by the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 (as amended), which came into effect from 6th April 2015. As an interim measure, until a local CIL was in place, the Council would need to seek financial contributions from developers only for specific purposes and ensure that only a maximum of five contributions were spent for specific items of infrastructure.

It was noted in particular that the threshold at which the Council would require affordable housing contributions had been changed in a ministerial statement issued on 28th November 2014 from ten units to eleven.

The proposed changes had been endorsed by Development Control Committee on 24th March 2015.

RESOLVED that the addendum at Appendix 1 to the report updating references to pooling and threshold changes be agreed.

220 LB BROMLEY LOCAL INTERMEDIATE HOUSING INCOME THRESHOLD REVIEW
Report DRR15/047

The Councils Supplementary Planning Documents on Affordable Housing and Planning Obligations specified that local intermediate housing income threshold figures should be reviewed regularly. The current figure of £35,000, set in 2008, did not reflect local house prices and incomes. At its meeting on 24th March 2015 the Development Control Committee had agreed reviewed local upper limit intermediate housing income thresholds for one, two and three bedroom units.

RESOLVED that reviewed local upper limit intermediate housing income thresholds be agreed as follows –

- 1 bedroom units £38,800**
- 2 bedroom units £50,500**
- 3 bedroom units £62,500**

GLA upper limit applies to 4 bedroom + units.

221 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 AS AMENDED BY THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) (VARIATION) ORDER 2006 AND THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000

RESOLVED that the Press and public be excluded during consideration of the items of business referred to below as it is likely in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings that if members of the Press and public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information.

**The following summaries
refer to matters
involving exempt information**

222 EXEMPT MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 20TH MAY 2015

The exempt minutes of the meeting held on 20th May 2015 were confirmed.

Executive
10 June 2015

223 RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS

The Executive approved a proposal to enter into a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) to purchase properties to assist the Council in addressing homelessness pressures.

The Meeting ended at 9.03 pm

Chairman

EXECUTIVE

10th June 2015

(A) QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC FOR ORAL REPLY

1. From Michael Meekums, Bromley Museum Volunteer Co-ordinator

Bromley Museum staff have opened the Poverest Roman Bath House to the public every year since it was excavated in the 1970s, and it will be open to the public on 25th July this year. Will the Bath House be open to the public every year in the future?

Reply –

The Council is currently committed to enabling the opening of the bath house once a year by having a member of staff present at the opening which we have to do for insurance purposes.

2. From Gill Hughes

The Bromley Museum report refers in some places to “moving the museum”, but in others to “new museum exhibitions”. Which is being proposed – moving the museum from the Priors to the Central Library, or closing the museum and putting in its place museum exhibitions?

Reply -

The museum exhibitions are proposed to move to Central Library, where they will be overseen by Local Studies staff, who will also commission temporary exhibitions and take over the care of the collection.

Supplementary Question -

As a supplementary question, Ms Hughes read out a definition of a museum. The Portfolio Holder confirmed that the Council would look to have the new Museum accredited with the Museums Association.

3. From Gill Hughes

What expertise do the Local Studies and Archives staff have in commissioning temporary exhibitions and caring for the collection?

Reply –

Local Studies has experience in exhibitions, for example the Caring for Casualties exhibition this year, and they are experienced in caring for collections. The local studies archive is currently in their care.

Supplementary Question –

Ms Hughes asked whether Local Studies staff had experience with artefacts. The Portfolio Holder responded that the service already had a number of artefacts which it looked after very well.

4. From Gill Hughes

What will happen to all the history boxes currently used for outreach work?

Reply –

Local Studies may decide to keep the boxes so they are available to groups visiting the new exhibitions. If the boxes are considered to no longer be required they will be given to schools or other non-profit community groups to use.

Supplementary Question –

Ms Hughes asked the Portfolio Holder to ensure that this was done. The Portfolio Holder responded that he would.

5. From Margot Rohan

Have Councillors, particularly members of the Executive, read the Outline Proposal submitted to Colin Brand by the Save The Orpington Priory campaign group? Will the Council consider a Community Asset Transfer when a detailed business plan is submitted, based on the Outline Proposal and, if so, on what terms?

Reply -

Councillors have received a copy of the proposal. The Council will consider all options including a Community Asset Transfer when we have a detailed sustainable business plan.

Supplementary Question –

Ms Rohan asked how long the Council would allow for a detailed business plan to be drawn up. In response the Portfolio Holder stated that there was the statutory period of six months, but if towards the end of this more time was required then this could be discussed.

6. From Margot Rohan

Croydon Council encourages creative and cultural industries, a growing demand. A proposal for artists' studios in Eurocrown House and Marmi Works is likely to be approved at Planning Committee on 4 June. Why does not Bromley Council consider this an appropriate use and revenue generator for part of The Priory?

Reply -

This may be a good use for the Priory and generate the revenue required to manage and maintain the building, this type of use was identified in the Historic England commissioned report. However, the work that officers have done has shown that this

type of use in part of the building would not generate enough income to offset the costs if a museum is the majority user of the building.

7. From Mr Richard Gibbons

How you will achieve 10-fold increase in visitors to 200,000 (43% of 468,096 Central Library visitors in 2013/14) to proposed Bromley Revisited and Lubbock Gallery displays stated as “a fair assumption” to Executive on 11 February, compared to 19,000 to Bromley Museum (6% of 308,966 Orpington Library visitors)?

Reply -

The proposed exhibition spaces are located in spaces that are used by many library users, and are very visible, therefore the potential to attract visitors is high. The Bromley town centre location is easy for visitors across the borough to get to, and the exhibitions proposed are of a much higher quality and will be developed with community input and using advice received from the British Museum and others.

Supplementary Question –

Mr Gibbons asked how, given that the new Museum would be spread over two floors, the Council would monitor visitor numbers. The Portfolio Holder responded that details had not been sorted out as yet, but the technology was available to do this.

8. From Mr Richard Gibbons

Given that Bromley Museum is being systematically run down in preparation for proposed closure, would the Council actively assist the ‘Save The Orpington Priory’ Community Group in its efforts to support “key priority” bullet points 1, 2, 3 on page 2 of the published Renewal & Recreation Portfolio Business Plan?

Reply -

The museum is not being systematically run down, additional efforts have been made to ensure that the museum is open as normal during this period of uncertainty. The community group would need to specify what assistance it wants from the Council before a definitive answer could be given.

9. From Mr Richard Gibbons

To assist the Council in reducing costs whilst maintaining a key theme of Renewal & Recreation “aspirations around our town centres and the borough’s cultural and leisure offer” would the Council consider offering items in the museum collection of specific relevance to Orpington to a local Community Group to manage?

Reply -

Consideration can be given during this process to this request. However, the Council will be restricted by the terms of each acquisition and will be following Museum Association guidelines.

10. From Mrs Andrea Stevens, PWDRA Committee member

Have you run any projections on how many students the aviation college would attract and, considering that the Airport has stated that Bromley Council will be financing the college, how many places would be reserved for students whose families live in Bromley?

Reply -

As no proposal has been submitted, it is not possible to speculate on funding requirements or student profiles.

Supplementary Question –

What amount of funding would the Department for Education be allocating to the new college? The Portfolio Holder responded that this would be a matter for the Department for Education to consider.

11. From Mrs Andrea Stevens, PWDRA Committee member

What type of courses will be offered at the new college and what NVQ level would these be?

Reply -

No proposal has been submitted to the Council.

Supplementary question –

Would courses at the college be private and paid for by the students or are they going to be financed by state grants? If private, who would receive the income? Ms Stevens also asked if the Portfolio Holder had any idea of the time-frame. The Portfolio Holder responded no proposal has been submitted to the Council and that he had no idea what the time-frame would be.

12. From Penny Denby

As the NAP is based on noise measurements over a 16-hour period, why do you believe that the NAP is more beneficial to residents during the requested unsocial hours than the provisions in the Lease, which ask for 'individual flight' measures?

Reply -

The Council is very keen to see better, more reliable flight path and noise monitoring arrangements which are transparent to everyone, including residents, to ensure that local residents are less bothered by flight movements. The provisions in the Lease remain unaltered and will stay in force: the provisions in the NAP seek to impose more stringent noise limits than those contained in the Lease. The Airport's proposals would serve to strengthen not dilute current management arrangements to achieve this aim. In considering the Airport's proposals, the Council must seek to achieve a reasonable balance between the needs of residents and the Airport, and this will be the subject of a further report to Members in due course.

Supplementary Question –

Ms Denby suggested that the terms being proposed were less beneficial than in the lease and this was unacceptable. The Portfolio Holder disagreed.

13. From Penny Denby

The Airport have stated that their clients do not necessarily want to fly late at night or early in the morning but they want to know that they can, then why are flights in the first half hour between 6.30 and 7.00 increasing from 31 in 2014 to 730 by 2030?

Reply -

The Airport's proposal is based on the need for greater flexibility in hours to attract new investment and jobs (730 flights being an annual figure.) The proposed flights in the extended hours are intended to achieve this. The proposal amounts to an annual average of not more than 2 flights in each early morning 30 minute period.

Supplementary Question -

As a supplementary question Ms Denby stated that business clients would need some certainty about knowing that they could fly when they wanted.

14. From Dr Nicola Stevens

Given that BHAL have stated that the planes arriving and departing are now larger, compared to 10-15 years ago, what revised emergency procedures are in place to cope with any incident at Biggin Hill airport and the nearby locality?

Reply -

All aircraft are categorised as requiring specific levels of Rescue and Firefighting Capability (RFF) at any aerodromes they use. Categories range from Category 1 (a light aircraft) to Category 10. The maximum RFF required at Biggin Hill is RFF Category 4 but can, with 1 hours advance notice, provide RFF Category 6. The equipment, staffing and training required to meet this level of RFF cover is laid out in regulatory documentation and BHAL is audited regularly by the CAA to ensure that they meet the required standards. Their Task and Resource Analysis is reviewed annually and includes liaison with the emergency services. Responses to all potential scenarios, both on and off airfield, are considered and agreed where necessary with relevant emergency services. Periodic exercises are held to test that response. The last major "all services" exercise was held in late 2013 which involved some 200 personnel and which was widely reported in the local press. There have been numerous smaller exercises since. The major exercise is normally bi-annual.

BHAL's emergency response requirements follow the same protocols and regulation as is employed at all major UK and EU airports, subject to European Aviation Safety Agency regulations.

Any changes in aerodrome operation or aircraft type or size drive review of the RFF response and resource. For instance, any new operating hours will necessarily require a review and doubtless an increase in resources.

Supplementary Question -

Dr Stevens asked whether the Princess royal University Hospital (PRUH) had been involved in any discussions about the airport. The Portfolio Holder was not aware, but offered to find out.

15. From Dr Nicola Stevens

What will the £3.5 million allocated to the airport be used for?

Reply -

The Portfolio Holder stated that he was not sure what the £3.5m figure referred to. It was suggested that this could be money set aside in the Growth Fund for development in the Biggin Hill Area – i.e. not for the airport.

Supplementary Question –

Dr Stevens asked what the impact of this investment would be. The Portfolio Holder clarified that rateable income would increase, but it was not possible to quantify this at present.

(B) QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC FOR WRITTEN REPLY

1. From Richard Barnes

Could the Director for Finance please list how much Bromley Council has paid in connection with the Airport since the signing of the lease, including but not limited to the provision of reports by consultants?

Reply –

Since the lease was signed on 6th May 1994, the Council has spent a total of £1,768k in connection with Biggin Hill Airport. This comprises £185k revenue expenditure, and £1,583k capital expenditure, a breakdown of which is provided in the table below.

	1994/95- 1998/99	1999/00- 2003/04	2004/05- 2008/09	2009/10- 2013/14	2014/15-	Total
Revenue Expenditure						
Pumping Station Repairs	10,462	0	0	0	0	10,462
Minor Grounds Improvements	0	0	0	7,980	0	7,980
Insurances	636	0	0	0	0	636
Legal Expenses	363	12,820	0	0	0	13,183
Noise Monitoring	34,590	24,220	17,632	15,088	1,635	93,165
Noise Survey	8,214	0	0	0	0	8,214
Consultancy Fees	16,486	169	0	0	9,000	25,655
Survey/Consultation Costs	0	0	0	0	25,500	25,500
Capital Expenditure						
Runway Resurfacing	1,500,850	0	0	0	0	1,500,850
Lighting Improvements	82,619	0	0	0	0	82,619
Total	1,654,221	37,209	17,632	23,068	36,135	1,768,264

2. From Richard Barnes

As the Airport is pledging to ban the noisiest aeroplanes during the requested unsocial hours, will the Council ask that helicopters are also banned during those hours (with the exception of medical emergencies)?

Reply -

The lease does not require that helicopter movements are treated differently to any other aircraft movements. In considering the Council's response to the proposed increase in operating hours, we will need to ensure that we are acting reasonably in the interests of both residents and the Airport. It is recognised that the subject of helicopters is sensitive and was specifically referred at the meeting of the Executive in March 2015. Noise mitigation to be applied to all types of aircraft movements are matters currently under consideration in further discussions with the Airport, the outcome of which will be reported to a further meeting of Members.

3. From Susan Sulis, Secretary, Community Care Protection Group

Council's proposals to close Bromley Museum, and sell off the historic Priory building. The report (DRR15/046, p.117) states that Ward Councillors have been asked for their views.

- (a) Which Ward Councillors have been approached, and in which wards?
- (b) What are the responses received from all Councillors (apart from Cllr Michael Rutherford)?
- (c) What were the views of the Members of the Policy, Development and Scrutiny Committee?

Reply –

- (a) All ward Councillors for Orpington and Bromley Town were asked for their views for the report.
- (b) No other responses for publishing in the report were received, however Cllr Huntington-Thresher had previously provided his view which was included in the February report, and he said that his view had not changed since this time.
- (c) The minutes for the E&R PDS will be published and available to the public.

4. From Susan Sulis, Secretary, Community Care Protection Group

Consultation on Council's proposals with regard to the Museum and the Priory.

- (a) Was this a 'Public Consultation'? Was it:-
- (b) prominently advertised on the home page of the Council's website?
- (c) Advertised in all Council Libraries and at the Bromley Museum?
- (d) Advertised in the local press?
- (e) Were non-internet users excluded?
- (f) Did it comply with the Cabinet Office Code of Conduct on Public Consultations?

Reply –

- (a) Yes
- (b) Yes it was advertised prominently on the home page.
- (c) It was advertised in Central Library and at Bromley Museum. Additionally information about the consultation was circulated by email and by local people.
- (d) Details of the consultation and how to take part were written up in the News Shopper on 22nd April.
- (e) No, paper copies of the survey were provided on request, and officers attended 16 meetings during spring 2015 alone.
- (f) The Local Authority has relatively few statutory duties to consult. This is not one of those occasions. There has been consultation on Bromley Museum at the Priory since 2009. The Cabinet Office's consultation criterion is reflective of good practice, and the Council's consultation on Bromley Museum at the Priory has been in line with good practice.

Report No.
CSD15091

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: Development Control Committee
Executive

Date: 13th July 2015
15th July 2015

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

Title: PETITION – BULL LANE ALLOTMENTS

Contact Officer: Graham Walton, Democratic Services Manager
Tel. 020 8461 7743 E-mail: graham.walton@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Mark Bowen, Director of Corporate Services

Ward: Chislehurst

1. Reason for report

At the full Council meeting on 29th June 2015 Members received a petition from the Bull Lane Action Group with 801 validated signatures calling on the Council to designate the Bull Lane Allotments in Chislehurst as Local Green Space. The Petition was referred to Development Control Committee and the Executive to consider.

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

That Development Control Committee recommends to the Executive that the merits of designating the Bull Lane Allotments as Local Green Space be formally considered through the Local Plan process, and the Petition be included as a submission seeking this change.

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy:
 2. BBB Priority: Quality Environment Vibrant, Thriving Town Centres:
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: No Cost:
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable:
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Not Applicable
 4. Total current budget for this head: £ Not Applicable
 5. Source of funding: Not Applicable
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): Not Applicable
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: Not Applicable
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: None:
 2. Call-in: Applicable:
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): The petition has been signed by 801 people who live or work in the borough.
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Yes
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: Ward Councillors supported the aims of the petitioners at full Council on 29th June 2015.

3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 The Council has received a petition with 801 validated signatures (with more signatures received since validation) from the Bull Lane Action Group. The petition stated –

“LOCAL GREEN SPACE” is the most protective of planning designations in recent legislation and will provide the best possible safeguards for the allotment, the surrounding area and the wider local environment in the long term. This measure has the advantage of linking the best interests of residents with those of the allotment tenants. All Bromley voters and those working or studying in the Borough can sign. If this petition is large enough we intend to request that the following motion be put before the full Council:

We, the undersigned, request that Bromley Borough Council designate the site of Bull Lane Allotments as Local Green Space

- 3.2 The Council’s formal response to the petition, from the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation, was as follows -

“Thank you for your petition with over 800 valid signatures requesting that the Council designates the site of the Bull Lane Allotments as Local Green Space.

The Bull Lane Allotments are at present subject to the Town Planning designation ‘Urban Open Space’.

The petition seeks designations as ‘Local Green Space’ which is another Town Planning designation. In general, this is a more exacting designation than Urban Open Space.

The designation is established via the Local Plan, which is at present in preparation.

It is therefore proposed to respond to the petition by assessing its merits through the Local Plan process and including the petition as a submission seeking the change of designation to ‘Local Green Space’.

If you are not satisfied with this response then, as you have more than 500 signatures on your petition, you can request to address the next meeting of the full Council for five minutes in support of your case. If you wish to do this please contact Graham Walton, Democratic Services Manager on 020 8461 7743 or graham.walton@bromley.gov.uk .”

- 3.3 The lead petitioners exercised their right to speak at a full Council meeting, and Mr Ben Lyon addressed the Council at the meeting on 29th June in support of the petition. He stated that local residents, allotment holders and other supporters objected to the possibility of the Diocese of Rochester, who owned the land, building a school on the site, which was designated as Urban Open Space and in a conservation area, but which needed and deserved the increased protection of being designated as Local Green Space. He declared that the special attributes of the land could be demonstrated in terms of its recreational value, historical significance and beauty and tranquillity.
- 3.4 The Council decided to refer the issue to Development Control Committee and then to the Executive for consideration.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Policy/Finance/Legal/Personnel
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Petition submitted June 2015 from the Bull Lane Action Group

Report No.
FSD15047

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: EXECUTIVE

Date: 15th July 2015

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

Title: BUDGET MONITORING 2015/16

Contact Officer: James Mullender, Finance Manager
Tel: 020 8313 4292 E-mail: james.mullender@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Director of Finance

Ward: All Wards

1. Reason for report

- 1.1. This report provides the first budget monitoring position for 2015/16 based on expenditure and activity levels up to the end of May 2015. The report also highlights any significant variations which will impact on future years as well as any early warnings that could impact on the final year end position.

2. RECOMMENDATION(S)

2.1. Executive are requested to:

- (a) consider the latest financial position;
- (b) note that a projected net overspend on services of £614k is forecast based on information as at May 2015;
- (c) consider the comments from the Education, Care and Health Services Department, the Director of Transformation and Regeneration and the Director of Environment and Community Services as detailed in sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4;
- (d) note that a report elsewhere on the agenda requests drawdown of £213k funding from Central Contingency relating to the Flooding and Water Act 2010 as detailed in para 3.5.2;
- (e) agree the release of £326k from Central Contingency for the additional costs of Concessionary Fares as detailed in para 3.5.3;

- (f) agree the release of £60k from the Central Contingency for the additional pension costs of LBB staff that transferred to Liberata and The Landscape Group as detailed in para 3.5.4;
- (g) note the carry forwards being requested for drawdown as detailed in section 3.6;
- (h) note a projected reduction to the General Fund balance of £2.3m as detailed in section 3.7;
- (i) note the full year costs pressures of £1.2m as detailed in section 3.8;
- (j) identify any issues that should be referred to individual Portfolio Holders for further action.

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy
 2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Not Applicable
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Council Wide
 4. Total current budget for this head: £204.0m
 5. Source of funding: See Appendix 1 for overall funding of Council's budget
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 3,218 (per 2015/16 Budget), which includes 1,356 for delegated budgets to schools.
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: Not Applicable
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement: The statutory duties relating to financial reporting are covered within the Local Government Act 1972; the Local Government Finance Act 1998; the Accounts and Audit Regulations 1996; the Local Government Act 2000 and the Local Government Act 2002
 2. Call-in: Applicable:
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): The 2015/16 budget reflects the financial impact of the Council's strategies, service plans etc. which impact on all of the Council's customers (including council tax payers) and users of the services.
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments:

3. COMMENTARY

3.1. Summary of variations

- 3.1.1. The Resources Portfolio Plan included the target that each service department will spend within its own budget.
- 3.1.2. Current projections show an overall net overspend of £614k on portfolio budgets, and £3k underspend on central items.
- 3.1.3. A summary of the overall 2015/16 Budget and the Projected Outturn is shown in the table below:

Portfolio	2015/16 Original Budget £'000	2015/16 Latest Budget £'000	2015/16 Projected Outturn £'000	2015/16 Variation £'000
Care Services	102,794	102,819	102,385	Cr 434
Education	5,124	5,211	5,679	468
Environment	32,095	32,999	33,403	404
Public Protection & Safety	2,120	2,120	2,120	0
Renewal & Recreation	9,214	9,289	9,259	Cr 30
Resources	37,869	38,847	39,053	206
Total Controllable Budgets	189,216	191,285	191,899	614
Capital Charges and Insurance	20,980	20,980	20,980	0
Non General Fund Recharges	Cr 793	Cr 793	Cr 793	0
Total Portfolio Budgets	20,187	20,187	20,187	0
Contingency Provision	14,003	13,604	13,601	Cr 3
Interest on General Fund Balances	Cr 2,741	Cr 2,741	Cr 2,741	0
Other Central Items	Cr 16,835	Cr 16,835	Cr 16,835	0
General Government Grants	Cr 72,629	Cr 72,629	Cr 72,629	0
Collection Fund Surplus	Cr 2,300	Cr 2,300	Cr 2,300	0
Total Central Items	Cr 80,502	Cr 80,901	Cr 80,904	Cr 3
Total Variation	128,901	130,571	131,182	611

- 3.1.4. A detailed breakdown of the Latest Approved Budgets and Projected Outturn for each Portfolio, together with an analysis of variations, is shown in Appendix 2.

3.2. Comments from the Education, Care and Health Services Department

Care Services Portfolio

- 3.2.1. Overall the current outlook in the Care Services Portfolio is positive with a £435k underspend predicted for the financial year. Additional costs of placements in older people and children's services are being offset by staffing vacancies and placements in learning disabilities and mental health services. Containing costs has proved a challenge, particularly in our older people's services.
- 3.2.2. In the coming year, the new 'front door' arrangement will continue to contain and we expect divert residents early from our statutory services giving individuals more control over their lives. Commissioning activity continues to secure value for money in placements and makes a significant contribution to ameliorating some of the pressures.

- 3.2.3. Housing continues to exert very considerable pressures on our budgets and although funding has been set aside in the Central Contingency, numbers continue to rise, so it is important that Manorfields comes on stream at the earliest opportunity to help control these pressures.
- 3.2.4. Children's Social Care continues to see pressures from No Recourse to Public Funds.
- 3.2.5. The Department will continue to closely monitor its activities in order to at least balance the budget in year and look to future years where the funding will become an even greater challenge.

Education Portfolio

- 3.2.6. It should be noted that the projected overspend of £468k includes the sum of £382k for Adult Education. A report is due to go to the July PDS which focuses on the council's core responsibilities in this area and proposes a solution to the overspend.
- 3.2.7. Managers of statutory services continue to oversee their budgets very effectively and indeed these areas are predicting a slight underspend rather than overspend.

3.3. Comments from the Executive Director of Environment and Community Services (Environment Portfolio)

- 3.3.1. Overall, the controllable budget for the Environment Portfolio is projected to be over spent by £404k.
- 3.3.2. The projected overspend of £100k in Waste Services, is in line with what was reported to the Portfolio Holder when the proposal for the changes to the paper collection service was recommended. The savings in future years will be £500k, £250k more than the saving currently built into the 2015/16 budget. This overspend is partly offset by the savings from the closure of the public conveniences and additional off street parking income.
- 3.3.3. The effect of the legislation changes for parking enforcement by CCTV is a projected deficit of £856k. This is partly offset by additional off-street parking income and one-off bus lane enforcement income. Parking officers are reviewing the camera enforcement service with a view to preparing options for the future of the service as well as calculating what is required from the £1m held in the Central Contingency.
- 3.3.4. The Environment Portfolio budget is expected to be balanced for future years.

3.4. Comments from the Director of Transformation and Regeneration (Resources Portfolio)

- 3.4.1. The £409k overspend within Strategic Property Services mainly relates to a shortfall in rental income and includes the projection for properties financed by the Investment Fund for which a shortfall of £649k is currently projected.
- 3.4.2. The 2015/16 Budget includes an income target of £3m and to date properties purchased will achieve revenue income of £2.4m, resulting in a shortfall of £649k. A number of further acquisitions are being considered, and the aim is to buy properties which will achieve the budgeted target for this year and next year. The full rent contractually payable under the leases is being received and further rent increases cannot be applied until rent reviews become due.

3.5. Central Contingency Sum

- 3.5.1. Details of the allocations from and variations in the 2015/16 Central Contingency are included in Appendix 3.
- 3.5.2. As detailed in a report elsewhere on the agenda, it is the Council's fourth year as a Lead Local Flood Authority and funding of £213k is held in the Contingency to meet the responsibilities required by the Flooding and Water Act 2010. The report details the utilisation of this funding and requests the Executive to agree the drawdown of this money held in the Central Contingency.
- 3.5.3. Concessionary Fares are administered by London Councils on behalf of the London Boroughs. A change in the apportionment of Concessionary Fares between Boroughs is being implemented over three years, commencing in 2014/15, as a result of updated data becoming available. The change in apportionment has a significant impact for LBB. Provision was made for this in the 2015/16 Central Contingency pending details being provided by London Councils. Provision of £10,540k was made in the Chief Executive's budget and £326k in the central contingency for the change in apportionment. Members are requested to approve the draw-down of the £326k from the central contingency.
- 3.5.4. During 2014/15, the HR and Finance Statutory Schools, Financial Assessments and Appointeeship & Deputyship teams were outsourced to Liberata. This resulted in the transferred staff remaining in the LBB pension through Liberata's Admitted Body status. It was agreed that any additional employers pension costs would be funded by LBB. Liberata have requested an increase in the contract payments following a calculation by the actuary at an additional cost to Bromley of £37k. Similarly, the increased costs relating to the Parks staff who transferred to The Landscape Group is £23k. Members are requested to approve the draw-down of £60k from the central contingency to cover these two amounts.

3.6. Carry forwards from 2014/15 to 2015/16

- 3.6.1. At its meeting on 10th June, Executive approved the carry forward to 2015/16 of £1,186k underspend in 2014/15. Additionally £484k was approved under delegated authority, bringing the total carried forward to £1,670k. The carry forwards were allocated to Central Contingency, to be drawn down on the approval of the relevant Portfolio Holder.
- 3.6.2. The carry forwards being requested this cycle are summarised in the table below and details will be reported to the relevant PDS Committee:

	Carry Forward Requests £'000s
Renewal & Recreation	100
Public Protection & Safety	27
Resources	200
Environment	618
Education	151
Care Services	1,217
Total Expenditure	2,313
Contribution from Government Grants reserve Cr	1,327
Total net carry forwards requested for drawdown this cycle	986

3.7. 0General Fund Balances

3.7.1. The level of general reserves is currently projected to reduce by £2.3m to £17.7m at 31st March 2016 as detailed below:

	2015/16 Projected Outturn £'000
General Fund Balance as at 1st April 2015	Cr 20,000
Total net variation on Services and Central Items (section 3.1)	611
Carry forwards (funded from 2014/15 underspends) (para 3.6.1)	1,670
General Fund Balance as at 31st March 2016	<u>Cr 17,719</u>

3.8. Impact on Future Years

3.8.1. The report identifies expenditure pressures which could have an impact on future years. The main areas to be considered at this stage are summarised in the following table:

	2015/16 Budget £'000		2016/17 Impact £'000
Care Services Portfolio			
Assessment & Care Management	19,528		121
Learning Disabilities Care Management	2,652	Cr	83
Supporting People	1,413	Cr	40
Children's Placements	14,286		42
Adults with Learning Difficulties	24,595		397
Mental Health Services	6,233	Cr	196
			<u>241</u>
Education Portfolio			
Adult Education	Cr 601		382
Schools & Early Years Commissioning & QA	396	Cr	120
Education Services Grant	Cr 2,128		159
			<u>421</u>
Environment Portfolio			
Waste	1,986	Cr	250
Parking	Cr 6,696		800
			<u>550</u>
Resources Portfolio			
Operational Property - planned	375		152
Investment & Non-Operational Property	390	Cr	168
			<u>Cr 16</u>
TOTAL			<u><u>1,196</u></u>

3.8.2. Given the significant financial savings that the council will need to make over the next four years, it is important that all future cost pressures are contained and that savings are identified early to mitigate these pressures.

3.8.3. Further details including action to be taken to contain these pressures are included in Appendix 4.

3.9. Interest on Balances

3.9.1. There have been no improvements to counterparty credit ratings, as a result of which the restrictions to investment opportunities that followed rating downgrades in recent years are still in place. However, the increases in the limits for the two part-nationalised banks (Lloyds and RBS) approved by the Council in October, together with the anticipation of continued strong performance by the CCLA Property Fund and the Diversified Growth Fund investments have enabled the 2015/16 budget to be increased from £1,591k in 2014/15 to £2,741k in 2015/16. At this early stage in the year, it is estimated that the 2015/16 budget for interest earnings will be achieved.

3.10. The Schools Budget

3.10.1. Expenditure on Schools is funded through the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) provided for by the Department for Education (DfE). DSG is ring fenced and can only be applied to meet expenditure properly included in the schools budget. Any overspend or underspend must be carried forward to the following years Schools Budget.

3.10.2. There is a total projected overspend of £774k on DSG funded services, which will be set against the £9.9m carried forward from 2014/15. Details of the 2015/16 monitoring of the School's Budget will be reported to the Education Portfolio Holder.

3.11. Investment Fund

3.11.1. Full details of the current position on the Investment Fund and the Growth Fund are included in the Capital Programme Monitoring report elsewhere on the agenda. The uncommitted balances currently stand at £27.6m on the Investment Fund and £7.0m on the Growth Fund.

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

4.1. "Building a Better Bromley" refers to the Council's intention to remain amongst the lowest Council Tax levels in Outer London and the importance of greater focus on priorities.

4.2. The "2015/16 Council Tax" report highlighted the financial pressures facing the Council. It remains imperative that strict budgetary control continues to be exercised in 2015/16 to minimise the risk of compounding financial pressures in future years.

4.3. Chief Officer's comments are included in sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1. These are contained within the body of the report with additional information provided in the appendices.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Legal Implications Personnel Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Financial Management Budget Monitoring files across all Portfolios Provisional final Accounts - Executive 10 th June 2015 2015/16 Council Tax – Executive 11 th February 2015 Draft 2015/16 Budget and Update on Council's Financial strategy 2016/17 to 2018/19 - Executive 14 th January 2015

GENERAL FUND - PROJECTED OUTTURN FOR 2015/16

Portfolio	2015/16 Original Budget £'000	Budget Variations allocated in year # £'000	2015/16 Latest Approved Budget £'000	2015/16 Projected Outturn £'000	Variation £'000
Care Services	102,794	25	102,819	102,385	Cr 434
Education (incl. Schools' Budget)	5,124	87	5,211	5,679	468
Environment	32,095	904	32,999	33,403	404
Public Protection & Safety	2,120	0	2,120	2,120	0
Renewal and Recreation	9,214	75	9,289	9,259	Cr 30
Resources	37,869	978	38,847	39,053	206
Total Controllable Budgets	189,216	2,069	191,285	191,899	614
Capital and Insurances (see note 2)	20,980	0	20,980	20,980	0
Non General Fund Recharges	Cr 793	0	Cr 793	Cr 793	0
Total Portfolios (see note 1)	209,403	2,069	211,472	212,086	614
Central Items:					
Interest on General Fund Balances	Cr 2,741	0	Cr 2,741	Cr 2,741	0
Contingency Provision (see Appendix 3)	14,003	Cr 399	13,604	13,601	Cr 3
Other central items					
Reversal of Net Capital Charges (see note 2)	Cr 19,698	0	Cr 19,698	Cr 19,698	0
Contribution to Investment Fund and other Reserves	1,436	0	1,436	1,436	0
Levies	1,427	0	1,427	1,427	0
Total other central items	Cr 16,835	0	Cr 16,835	Cr 16,835	0
Bromley's Requirement before balances	203,830	1,670	205,500	206,111	611
Carry Forwards from 2014/15 (see note 3)	0	Cr 1,186	Cr 1,186	0	1,186
Carry Forward from 2014/15 Delegated Authority - R&M	0	Cr 484	Cr 484	0	484
Adjustment to Balances	0	0	0	Cr 2,281	Cr 2,281
Revenue Support Grant	Cr 32,971	0	Cr 32,971	Cr 32,971	0
Business Rates Retention Top Up	Cr 9,950	0	Cr 9,950	Cr 9,950	0
Business Rates Retention	Cr 23,955	0	Cr 23,955	Cr 23,955	0
Section 31 Grants	Cr 504	0	Cr 504	Cr 504	0
New Homes Bonus	Cr 4,400	0	Cr 4,400	Cr 4,400	0
New Homes Bonus Top Slice	Cr 760	0	Cr 760	Cr 760	0
Local Services Support Grant	Cr 89	0	Cr 89	Cr 89	0
Collection Fund Surplus	Cr 2,300	0	Cr 2,300	Cr 2,300	0
Bromley's Requirement	128,901	0	128,901	128,901	0
GLA Precept	36,913	0	36,913	36,913	0
Council Tax Requirement	165,814	0	165,814	165,814	0

# Budget Variations allocated to portfolios in year consists of:	£'000
1) Carry forwards from 2014/15 (see note 3)	1,670
2) Allocations from the central contingency provision (see Appendix 3)	399
	<u>2,069</u>

1) **NOTES**

Portfolio Latest Approved Budgets analysed over Departments as follows:

	2015/16 Original Budget £'000	Budget Variations allocated in year # £'000	2015/16 Latest Approved Budget £'000	2015/16 Projected Outturn £'000	Variation £'000
Education Care & Health Services	130,780	112	130,892	130,941	49
Environmental & Community Services	54,013	855	54,868	55,227	359
Chief Executive's Department	24,610	1,102	25,712	25,918	206
	<u>209,403</u>	<u>2,069</u>	<u>211,472</u>	<u>212,086</u>	<u>614</u>

2) **Reversal of Net Capital Charges**

This is to reflect the technical accounting requirements contained in CIPFA's Code of Practice for Local Authority Accounting and has no impact on the Council's General Fund.

3) **Carry Forwards from 2014/15**

Carry forwards from 2014/15 into 2015/16 totalling £1,670k were approved by the Executive and under the delegated authority of the Director of Finance. Full details were reported to the June meeting of the Executive in the "Provisional Final Accounts 2014/15" report.

Care Services Portfolio Budget Monitoring Summary

2014/15 Actuals £'000	Division Service Areas	2015/16 Original Budget £'000	2015/16 Latest Approved £'000	2015/16 Projected Outturn £'000	Variation £'000	Notes	Variation Last Reported £'000	Full Year Effect £'000
EDUCATION CARE & HEALTH SERVICES DEPARTMENT								
Adult Social Care								
25,785	Assessment and Care Management	23,630	24,111	24,191	80	1	0	121
3,389	Direct Services	3,200	3,200	3,200	0		0	0
3,532	Learning Disabilities Care Management	3,879	3,703	3,624	Cr 79	2	0	Cr 83
1,949	Learning Disabilities Day and Short Breaks Service	1,953	1,953	1,953	0		0	0
1,326	Learning Disabilities Housing & Support	1,250	1,320	1,320	0		0	0
35,981		33,912	34,287	34,288	1		0	38
Operational Housing								
Cr 1	Enabling Activities	Cr 1	Cr 1	Cr 1	0		0	0
Cr 1,594	Housing Benefits	Cr 2,122	Cr 2,122	Cr 2,122	0		0	0
5,683	Housing Needs	5,638	5,663	5,663	0		0	438
	Housing funds held in contingency							Cr 438
4,088		3,515	3,540	3,540	0	3	0	0
Strategic and Business Support Service								
1,807	Strategic & Business Support	2,143	2,143	1,983	Cr 160	4	0	0
298	Learning & Development	305	305	305	0		0	0
2,105		2,448	2,448	2,288	Cr 160		0	0
Children's Social Care								
16,897	Care and Resources	17,245	17,245	17,300	55	5	0	114
1,783	Safeguarding and Quality Assurance	1,384	1,384	1,384	0		0	0
3,420	Safeguarding and Care Planning	3,343	3,343	3,343	0		0	0
3,583	Referral and Assessment	3,537	3,537	3,614	77		0	Cr 72
2,101	Children's Disability Service	2,379	2,379	2,379	0		0	0
27,784		27,888	27,888	28,020	132		0	42
Commissioning								
3,101	Commissioning	2,748	2,753	2,831	78	6	0	0
1,199	Information & Early Intervention							
	- Net Expenditure	1,265	1,265	1,188	Cr 77	7	0	0
	- Recharge to Better Care Fund	Cr 1,265	Cr 1,265	Cr 1,188	Cr 77	7	0	0
24,054	Learning Disabilities	24,694	24,595	24,485	Cr 110	8	0	397
5,765	Mental Health Services	6,514	6,233	5,974	Cr 259	9	0	Cr 196
1,779	Supporting People	1,413	1,413	1,373	Cr 40	10	0	Cr 40
	Better Care Fund							
	- Expenditure	18,331	18,331	18,331	0		0	0
	- Income	Cr 18,482	Cr 18,482	Cr 18,482	0		0	0
	- Variation on Protection of Social Care	0	0	77	Cr 77	11	0	0
	NHS Support for Social Care							
11,078	- Expenditure	0	614	614	0		0	0
Cr 11,759	- Income	0	Cr 614	Cr 614	0		0	0
35,217		35,218	34,843	34,435	Cr 408		0	161
Public Health								
12,238	Public Health	12,582	12,582	12,532	Cr 50		0	0
Cr 12,601	Public Health - Grant Income	Cr 12,954	Cr 12,954	Cr 12,904	Cr 50		0	0
Cr 363		Cr 372	Cr 372	Cr 372	0		0	0
104,812	TOTAL CONTROLLABLE ECHS DEPT	102,609	102,634	102,199	Cr 435		0	241
1,401	TOTAL NON CONTROLLABLE	378	378	394	16		0	0
10,516	TOTAL EXCLUDED RECHARGES	9,404	9,404	9,404	0		0	0
116,729	TOTAL ECHS DEPARTMENT	112,391	112,416	111,997	Cr 419		0	241
Environmental Services Dept - Housing								
169	Housing Improvement	185	185	185	0		0	0
169	TOTAL CONTROLLABLE FOR ENV SVCES DEPT	185	185	185	0		0	0
104	TOTAL NON CONTROLLABLE	Cr 600	Cr 600	Cr 600	0		0	0
364	TOTAL EXCLUDED RECHARGES	329	329	329	0		0	0
637	TOTAL FOR ENVIRONMENTAL SVCES DEPT	Cr 86	Cr 86	Cr 86	0		0	0
117,366	TOTAL CARE SERVICES PORTFOLIO	112,305	112,330	111,911	Cr 419		0	241

Reconciliation of Latest Approved Budget	£'000
2015/16 Original Budget	112,305
Carry forwards requested this cycle:	
Social Care funding via the CCG under s256 (Invest to Save)	
<i>Dementia:</i>	
- expenditure	122
- income	Cr 122
<i>Physical Disabilities:</i>	
- expenditure	87
- income	Cr 87
<i>Impact of Care Bill</i>	
- expenditure	105
- income	Cr 105
<i>Integration Fund - Better Care Fund</i>	
- expenditure	300
- income	Cr 300
<i>Welfare Reform Grant</i>	
- expenditure	66
- income	Cr 66
<i>Helping People Home Grant</i>	
- expenditure	28
- income	Cr 28
<i>Winter Resilience</i>	
- expenditure	15
- income	Cr 15
<i>Adoption Reform Grant</i>	
- expenditure	284
- income	Cr 284
<i>Tackling Troubled Families Grant</i>	
- expenditure	226
- income	Cr 226
<i>Housing Regulations Grant</i>	
- expenditure	3
- income	Cr 3
<i>Social Care Innovation Grant</i>	
- expenditure	100
- income	Cr 100
	<hr/>
	0
Transfer of Housing budgets from Renewal and Recreation Portfolio	25
2015/16 Latest Approved Budget	<u>112,330</u>

REASONS FOR VARIATIONS

The projections in this report have been based on current PSR classifications in Carefirst but the pattern of variation may shift between individual PSR budget heads in future months if these are amended.

1. Assessment and Care Management - Dr £80k

The overspend in Assessment and Care Management can be analysed as follows:

	Variation £'000
<u>Physical Support / Sensory Support / Memory & Cognition</u>	
Services for 65 + - Placements	-116
- Domiciliary Care / Direct Payments	-42
Services for 18 - 64 - Placements	126
- Domiciliary Care / Direct Payments	32
Extra Care Housing	80
	<hr/>
	80

As part of the budget setting process for 2015/16, the full year effects of the overspends in Adult Social Care during 2014/15 as reported in the January 2015 budget monitoring were fully funded. Savings of £250k were also included in the budget for the management of demand at first point of contact, and the projections assume that these will be achieved during the year.

The external extra care housing schemes are showing a projected overspend of £80k in relation to the potential costs of voids which are not budgeted for. With the expected closure of the in-house scheme at Lubbock House and the need to move residents to alternative extra care accommodation, units in the external schemes are being kept vacant in preparation for these transfers. These however incur a weekly void cost equivalent to the rental price of the unit and the core costs of care staff, which Bromley has to pay for.

2. Learning Disabilities Care Management - Cr £79k

The projected underspend relates to the provision of domiciliary care services and direct payments for adults aged 18 and over.

3. Operational Housing - Dr 0k

Temporary Accommodation budgets are currently forecast to overspend the latest approved budget by £543k. Increased client numbers (net increase of 15 per month during 2013/14 and 11 per month during 14/15, inclusive of welfare reform) and rising unit costs are evident and the projections assume the trend continues during this financial year. Although the average increase in 14/15 was lower than 13/14, the average increase for the final quarter of 14/15 was 17 per month. These increases have been noticeable across all London Boroughs and are the result of the pressures of rent and mortgage arrears coupled with a reduction in the numbers of properties available for temporary accommodation. There are high levels of competition and evidence of 'out bidding' between London boroughs to secure properties and this has contributed towards the high costs of nightly paid accommodation.

The full year effect of the projected overspend is currently anticipated to be a pressure of £438k in 2016/17. However, this only takes account of projected activity to the end of March 2016 and does not include any projected further growth in numbers beyond that point.

Although there is an overspend and a full year effect of this overspend, it is assumed that this will be dealt with through the draw down of contingency.

4. Strategic and Business Support - Cr £160k

There is anticipated to be an underspend of £160k on the salaries budget in ECHS Strategic and Business Support Division.

5. Children's Social Care - Dr £132k

The current projected overspend in Children's Social Care is £132k, with the main areas of under / overspending being:

Care and Resources - Placements - Dr £198k

The budget for children's placements is projected to overspend in the region of £198k this year, however given that we are in the early stages of the year and the level of volatility around the budget, certain financial assumptions have had to be made. Officers will monitor these assumptions during the course of the year and update the projections as required.

Referral and Assessment - No Recourse to Public Funds - Dr £77k

The cost to Bromley for people with no recourse to public funding continues to exceed the budget established for these costs. Additional budget was moved into this area for 2015/16, however the trend of increased costs continues with an overspend of £77k currently being projected.

Care and Resources - Leaving Care Clients - 16/17 year olds and 18 plus - Cr £143k

Expenditure relating to leaving care services for 16 and 17 year olds is projected to underspend by £269k this year, partly due to clients becoming 18. Conversely the budget for 18 plus clients is projected to see an overspend of £126k, partly due to the levels of rents being paid not being matched by housing benefit payments.

6. Commissioning - Dr £78k

The net overspend of £78k comprises:

	Variation
	£'000
Staffing and related budgets	98
Share of ECHS management savings not yet achieved	24
Taxicard	Cr 30
Contracts	Cr 14
Net underspend	<u>78</u>

The projected overspend on Commissioning staffing and related budgets results mainly from a combination of a post no longer attracting health funding and additional temporary staff. Funding sources are being explored to mitigate these costs but this has not been reflected in this set of projections as it is currently unconfirmed.

Management savings totalling £103k were deducted from the ECHS budget late in the 2015/16 budget process. These were apportioned across divisions on a pro rata basis and the Commissioning share amounted to £24k. It may be possible to identify savings in-year to offset this but this is not currently the case.

The projected underspend of £30k on Taxicard has arisen from current TfL data indicating that Bromley's take up will be lower than budgeted in 2015/16, resulting in a reduced charge to LBB. However this is based on the assumption that trip numbers remain the same as 2014/15 so may vary as the year progresses.

Commissioning contracts budgets are projected to be underspent by £14k as the cost of the Healthwatch contract is less than expected at the time the 2015/16 budget was prepared.

7. Information and Early Intervention - Cr & Dr £77k

An underspend of £77k is currently anticipated which is largely a continuation of the pattern of spend in 2014/15. This figure is net of minor overspends where a contract ceased as a result of a 2015/16 budget saving but where, because of contractual obligations, only a part year saving will be achieved in 2015/16.

The Information and Early Intervention budget is fully funded from the Better Care Fund in 2015/16. As the budget is currently predicted to underspend it will result in a reduced charge to the Better Care Fund. As the intention of this element of the Better Care Fund was to protect existing social care services it has been assumed that the amount of this underspend will be diverted to fund other costs within social care (see also ref 11 below).

8. Learning Disabilities - Cr £110k

At this early stage in the financial year the projections include a considerable level of financial assumptions relating to uncertainties e.g. transition clients, increased care needs, carer breakdowns, attrition, health funding, start dates etc. Based on the information currently available a net underspend of £110k is anticipated but this could vary significantly as the year progresses.

9. Mental Health - Cr £259k

As mentioned above, there continues to be a degree of client Primary Support Reason (PSR) misclassification for Mental Health. This may result in the pattern of spend variation shifting between PSRs in future months.

Based on current client PSR classifications, an underspend of £259k is anticipated on Mental Health care packages although this may be offset by higher spend in Assessment and Care Management. Similarly to Learning Disabilities above, at this stage the projections include a number of assumptions on future uncertainties (client moves, new placements, cost changes, health funding etc) and therefore may vary considerably as the year progresses.

10. Supporting People - Cr £40k

The projected underspend of £40k on Supporting People budgets arises from inflationary savings and the effect of re-tendering / extending contracts at a reduced cost. There were savings of £304k built in to the 2015/16 Supporting People budget and the £40k underspend is in excess of this.

11. Better Care Fund - Variation on amount earmarked to protect social care - Cr £77k

An amount of funding from the Better Care Fund has been earmarked to protect social care. This contributes to a range of services across Adult Social Care and Commissioning Divisions. The amount allocated to Commissioning budgets is currently forecast to underspend by £77k (Information and Early Intervention, see ref 7 above) and it is assumed that this will contribute to other existing budgets within Commissioning.

Waiver of Financial Regulations:

The Council's Contract Procedure Rules state that where the value of a contract exceeds £50k and is to be exempt from the normal requirement to obtain competitive quotations, the Chief Officer has to obtain the agreement of the Director of Resources and Finance Director and (where over £100,000) approval of the Portfolio Holder, and report use of this exemption to Audit Sub-Committee bi-annually.

Since the last report to the Executive there have been no waivers approved.

Virements Approved to date under Director's Delegated Powers

Details of virements actioned by Chief Officers under delegated authority under the Financial Regulations "Scheme of Virement" are included in financial monitoring reports to the Portfolio Holder. Since the last report to the Executive, there have been no virements actioned.

2014/15 Actuals £'000	Service Areas	2015/16 Original Budget £'000	2015/16 Latest Approved £'000	2015/16 Projected Outturn £'000	Variation £'000	Notes	Variation Last Reported £'000	Full Year Effect £'000
EDUCATION CARE & HEALTH SERVICES DEPARTMENT								
Education Division								
Cr 355	Adult Education Centres	Cr 602	Cr 602	Cr 220	382	1	0	382
202	Alternative Education and Welfare Service	264	264	264	0		0	0
296	Schools and Early Years Commissioning & QA	396	396	259	Cr 137	2	0	Cr 120
4,633	SEN and Inclusion	4,833	4,833	4,774	Cr 59	3	0	0
218	Strategic Place Planning	216	227	227	0		0	0
36	Workforce Development & Governor Services	4	4	4	0		0	0
Cr 2,419	Education Services Grant	Cr 2,128	Cr 2,128	Cr 2,128	0	4	0	159
Cr 1,493	Schools Budgets	Cr 1,509	Cr 1,509	Cr 1,509	0	5	0	0
139	Other Strategic Functions	133	133	133	0		0	0
1,257		1,607	1,618	1,804	186		0	421
Children's Social Care								
2,315	Bromley Youth Support Programme	1,473	1,549	1,831	282	6	0	0
2,303	Referral and Assessment Children's Centres	2,044	2,044	2,044	0		0	0
4,618		3,517	3,593	3,875	282		0	0
5,875	TOTAL CONTROLLABLE FOR EDUCATION - ECHS	5,124	5,211	5,679	468		0	421
11,852	Total Non-Controllable	9,278	9,278	9,278	0		0	0
3,493	Total Excluded Recharges	3,987	3,987	3,987	0		0	0
21,220	TOTAL EDUCATION PORTFOLIO - ECHS	18,389	18,476	18,944	468		0	421
Memorandum Item								
Sold Services								
	Education Psychology Service (RSG Funded)	Cr 21	Cr 21	Cr 11	10	}	0	0
	Education Welfare Service (RSG Funded)	Cr 39	Cr 39	Cr 39	0		0	0
	Workforce Development (DSG/RSG Funded)	Cr 14	Cr 14	Cr 14	0		0	0
	Governor Services (DSG/RSG Funded)	Cr 8	Cr 8	Cr 8	0		0	0
	Community Vision Nursery (RSG Funded)	0	0	Cr 70	Cr 70		0	Cr 70
	Blenheim Nursery (RSG Funded)	0	0	Cr 50	Cr 50		0	Cr 50
	Business Partnerships (RSG Funded)	0	0	0	0		0	0
	Total Sold Services	Cr 82	Cr 82	Cr 192	Cr 110		0	Cr 120

Reconciliation of Latest Approved Budget

£'000

Original Budget 2015/16

18,389

SEND Reform Implementation Grants (Exec March 2015) - expenditure	456
SEND Reform Implementation Grants (Exec March 2015) - income	Cr 456
YOT Service Strategic Review carry forward (subject to approval)	76
Review of Place Planning carry forward (subject to approval)	11
Early Years Grant carry forward (subject to approval) - expenditure	19
Early Years Grant carry forward (subject to approval) - income	Cr 19
SEN Preparation for Employment carry forward (subject to approval) - expenditure	46
SEN Preparation for Employment carry forward (subject to approval) - income	Cr 46

Latest Approved Budget for 2015/16

18,476

REASONS FOR VARIATIONS

1. Adult Education - Dr £382k

As members will be aware, there has been significant reduction in grant allocation from the Skills Funding Agency for the Adult Education Service in recent years. In addition, tuition fee income has been reducing, resulting in a total income shortfall of £518k projected for 2015/16.

The service has managed to offset part of this with £120k of temporary staffing reductions and vacancies, in addition to other minor reductions in running expenses, resulting in a projected net overspend of £382k.

The service was market tested as a separate 'lot' with Education services during 2014/15, but no solution was found. Officers are currently investigating other options to help contain this overspend going forward which be presented to members in due course.

	Variations
	£'000
Skills Funding Agency grant/fee income	518
Supplies and services	Cr 16
Staffing	Cr 120
	<u>382</u>

2. Schools and Early Years Commissioning and Quality Assurance - Cr £137k

The two in-house nurseries are projected to generate a total surplus of £120k. The trading accounts, set up in April 2013, are not on a full cost recovery basis, so this surplus doesn't cover the £185k recharges allocated. The service is currently undergoing a market testing exercise which might, depending on the level of rental income and concession fee agreed, result in a reduction of net income if delivered by an external provider. A virement has been approved to create new posts at Community Vision to open up an unused room which could generate an additional £25k net income.

No variation is currently projected for Early Years which is expected to meet the £130k savings agreed for 2015/16. A £19k grant from DfE to help implement Early Years Pupil Premium was announced on 17th February, and was approved by Executive to be carried forward to 2015/16 and is now requested to be drawn down from Central Contingency.

There are also underspends on staffing within the School Standards team as a result of staff vacancies.

	Variations
	£'000
Blenheim Nursery	Cr 50
Community Vision Nursery	Cr 70
School Standards	Cr 17
	<u>Cr 137</u>

3. SEN and Inclusion - Cr £59k

To help authorities with the amount of work required to convert existing Statements of SEN to the new Education Health and Care (EHC) plans, and to implement the changes to working practices required, the Department for Education has created the SEN Implementation (New Burdens) Grant. LBB's allocation of this grant for 2015/16 is £177k, of which £148k was approved for drawdown by Executive in March 2015, in addition to the carry forward of £200k underspend from 2014/15.

The Head of Service post is now being covered part time, and at a lower grade whilst the previous post holder is working solely on the reforms. This, plus temporary vacancies, and staff working reduced hours has resulted in a projected £30k underspend in the SEN assessment and monitoring team, and £39k on the Head of Service.

These are partly offset by a small shortfall of income of £10k on the Education Psychology trading account.

Although the travel training programme is progressing well, the savings this is generating on the SEN Transport budget are currently only offsetting increased costs due increasing number of pupils in general, and of those with complex needs.

	Variations
	£'000
SEN assessment & monitoring team	Cr 30
Head of Service	Cr 39
Education Psychologists trading account	10
	<u>Cr 59</u>

4. Education Services Grant - Cr £0k

Current projections for the Education Services Grant (ESG) allocation is £562k less than budget. The ESG allocation is re-calculated on a quarterly basis, so the grant reduces in-year as schools convert to academies. The current projection is based on the 4 conversions on 1st April and 14 conversions expected during the year. The full year effect of these 18 conversions is £721k. It is currently assumed that the shortfall will be drawn-down from contingency to cover this, so no variation is being reported.

5. Schools Budgets (no impact on General Fund)

Expenditure on Schools is funded through the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) provided by the Department for Education (DfE). DSG is ring fenced and can only be applied to meet expenditure properly included in the Schools Budget. Any overspend or underspend must be carried forward to the following years Schools Budget.

The projected overspend of £774k will reduce the £9.9m carried forward from 2014/15, against which £3.5m will be distributed as one-off funding to schools, £3m for Beacon House refurbishment, and £1m for growth in 2016/17.

Staffing vacancies in the School Standards team have resulted in a projected £42k underspend.

SEN placements costs are projected to overspend by a total of £420k, mainly due to a significant projected increase in pupil numbers in independent and outborough placements, and SEN support costs for students in further education is currently projected to underspend by £152k.

There is an underspend of £77k in the Sensory Support Service and support in mainstream, mainly due to vacant posts and delays in recruitment, as well as specific posts linked to pupils for sensory support that are not currently required.

The Early Years SEN (Phoenix) and Specialist Support and Disability Services are currently projected to underspend by a total of £74k, mainly on staffing costs. This budget was reduced for 2015/16 to help contain anticipated pressures in other areas of the Schools Budget.

The DSG funded element of SEN Transport is projected to underspend by £96k. The funding regulations do not permit this budget to be increased from the previous year, so it is kept at the current level in anticipation of increased take up of lower cost in-borough placements in future years.

The underspends above are offset by a continued increase in the requirement for bulge classes, and for the first time, a need for them at secondary level, a year earlier than had been anticipated, resulting in an overspend of £800k on the £1.5m budget. This £1.5m includes the additional £500k which was agreed to be added to the budget for two years, funded from the DSG carry forward. Officers are currently planning to work with Schools Forum to review the future funding of bulge classes.

	Variations	
		£'000
School Standards	Cr	42
Bulge Classes		800
SEN:		
- Placements		420
- Support in FE colleges	Cr	152
- Sensory support service	Cr	54
- Support in mainstream	Cr	23
- Specialist Support & Disability Service	Cr	20
- Pre-school service	Cr	54
- Transport	Cr	96
- Business Support	Cr	5
		<u>774</u>

6. Youth Services - Dr £282k

The Youth Service has a projected overspend in year on salaries and some running costs during a period of restructure required to reconfigure the service to achieve the 2015-16 saving target of £506k whilst continuing to provide both universal and targeted youth support. A clearer picture will be available on the completion of the appropriate consultation processes which started earlier in the year.

There is also a projected overspend in the Youth Offending Team of up to £50k; as a consequence of the outcome of the recent HMIP inspection, it has been necessary to delay the planned restructure of the service.

7. Sold Services (net budgets)

Services sold to schools are separately identified in this report to provide clarity in terms of what is being provided. These accounts are shown as memorandum items as the figures are included in the appropriate Service Area in the main report.

Waiver of Financial Regulations:

The Council's Contract Procedure Rules state that where the value of a contract exceeds £50k and is to be exempted from the normal requirement to obtain competitive quotations, the Chief Officer has to obtain the agreement of the Director of Resources and Finance Director and (where over £100k) approval of the Portfolio Holder, and report use of this exemption to Audit Sub committee bi-annually. No waivers have been approved since the last report to the Executive.

Virements Approved to date under Director's Delegated Powers

Details of virements actioned by Chief Officers under delegated authority under the Financial Regulations "Scheme of Virement" will be included in financial monitoring reports to the Portfolio Holder. Since the last report to Executive, a virement of £27k has been agreed by the Portfolio Holder for the creation of additional posts at Community Vision nursery to be funded by the additional income generated.

2014/15 Actuals £'000	Service Areas	2015/16 Original Budget £'000	2015/16 Latest Approved £'000	2015/16 Projected Outturn £'000	Variation £'000	Notes	Variation Last Reported £'000	Full Year Effect £'000
77	Public Protection Emergency Planning	75	75	75	0		0	0
77		75	75	75	0		0	0
4,115	Street Scene & Green Space Area Management/Street Cleansing	4,048	4,048	3,998	Cr 50	1	0	0
252	Depots	275	275	275	0		0	0
2,429	Highways	2,542	2,542	2,542	0		0	0
Cr 42	Markets	Cr 2	Cr 2	Cr 2	0		0	0
5,745	Parks and Green Space	5,676	5,809	5,809	0		0	0
467	Street Regulation	513	513	513	0		0	0
327	Transport Support Services	342	342	342	0		0	0
17,613	Waste Services	17,853	18,411	18,511	100	2	0	Cr 250
30,906		31,247	31,938	31,988	50		0	Cr 250
545	Support Services Support Services	518	518	518	0		0	0
545		518	518	518	0		0	0
6,921	Transport & Highways Highways incl London Permit Scheme	6,794	7,007	7,007	0		0	0
Cr 6,496	Parking	Cr 6,696	Cr 6,696	Cr 6,342	354	3, 4, 5, 6	0	890
176	Traffic & Road Safety	157	157	157	0		0	0
601		255	468	822	354		0	890
32,129	TOTAL CONTROLLABLE	32,095	32,999	33,403	404		0	640
6,238	TOTAL NON-CONTROLLABLE	5,332	5,282	5,267	Cr 15		0	0
2,221	TOTAL EXCLUDED RECHARGES	2,290	2,290	2,290	0		0	0
40,588	PORTFOLIO TOTAL	39,717	40,571	40,960	389		0	640

Reconciliation of Latest Approved Budget

£'000

Original Budget 2015/16

39,717

Keston Ponds Dam - carry-forward from 2014/15

20

Countryside & Woodland works - carry-forward from 2014/15

40

Waste - 3 split-bodied vehicles - carry-forward from 2014/15

558

Increase in contract costs re TLG pension contributions

23

Lead Local Flood Authorities Grant

213

Latest Approved Budget for 2015/16

40,571

REASONS FOR VARIATIONS

1. Area Management & Street Cleansing Cr £50k

Implementation of the closure of the remaining public conveniences began before the end of 2014/15, which has resulted in Cr £50k more savings being achieved in 2015/16. This is partly offsetting the overspend within the waste service.

2. Waste Services Dr £100k

Waste disposal tonnages are currently projected to be £80k overspent, largely due to additional tonnage being brought over the Weighbridges. For information there has been 180 additional tonnes at the Weighbridges in April and May 2015 compared to the same period in 2014-15. This is based upon April's actual and May's provisional data, which also indicates a net nil variation across other tonnage types.

The additional tonnage from the weighbridge has generated extra income of £80k for trade waste delivered which will offset the waste disposal overspend.

Savings of £250k were built into the 2015/16 waste services budget for the revision to the kerbside paper collection service. The report to the Environment Portfolio Holder on 18 February 2015 highlighted that after taking account of the one-off implementation costs, the savings expected to be delivered during 2015/16 would be below the target by £107k. The savings for future years would however be exceeded by £250k per annum.

0

Summary of overall variations within Waste Services	£'000
Waste disposal tonnages	80
Surplus trade waste delivered income	Cr 80
Revised kerbside collection arrangements	100
Total variation for Waste Services	100

3. Income from Bus Lane Contraventions Cr £267k

As a result of reinstating bus lane enforcement following completion of public realm works in Bromley North from March 2015, there is projected additional income of around £267k for 2015/16. This projection from Parking takes into account the likely drop off by the end of the financial year due to motorists' increased compliance and therefore the potential full year effect is only likely to be £40k.

4. Off Street Car Parking Cr £175k

Overall a surplus of £175k is projected for off street parking income. Cr £45k is expected from Village Way and the Civic Centre multi-storey car parks, £80k from surface car parks and an additional Cr £50k is projected from the Mitre Close car park. It should be noted that the average income per month from Mitre Close for April 2014 to February 2015 was £2k, however in March 2015 this rose to £6k and has continued at this level for April and May 2015. This is because some spaces were being used by the Bromley North contractors during the period of works and therefore enforcement did not commence until March 2015.

Summary of variations within Off Street Car Parking	£'000
Off Street Car Parking income - multi-storey car parks	Cr 45
Off Street Car Parking income - other surface car parks	Cr 130
Total variations within Off Street Parking	Cr 175

5. Car Parking Enforcement Dr £796k

Based on activity levels up to May 2015, there is a projected net surplus of £60k from PCNs issued by Vinci in the current year due to an increase in the number of contraventions. If these volumes continue at the current level, this could be as high as £180k at the financial year end. The number of contraventions will be closely monitored over the next few months.

A net deficit of Dr £856k is projected for mobile and static cameras due to changes in legislation from April 2015. Contravention numbers will be closely monitored during the next few months and Officers will review the service in order to prepare a report providing Members with options for the future of this service and a request to draw down monies from the £1m which is held in the Central contingency for the impact of the legislation changes.

Summary of variations within Car Parking Enforcement	£'000
PCNs issued by wardens	Cr 60
PCNs issued by mobile & static cameras	856
Total variations within Car Parking Enforcement	796

Summary of overall variations within Parking:	£'000
Bus Routes Enforcement	Cr 267
Off Street Car Parking	Cr 175
Car Parking Enforcement	796
Total variation for Parking	354

Waiver of Financial Regulations:

The Council's Contract Procedure Rules state that where the value of a contract exceeds £50k and is to be exempted from the normal requirement to obtain competitive quotations, the Chief Officer has to obtain the agreement of the Director of Resources and Finance Director and (where over £100,000) approval of the Portfolio Holder, and report use of this exemption to Audit Sub committee bi-annually. Since the last report to the Executive, the following waivers over £50k have been actioned:

- TFL Engineering Consultancy - April to October 2015 £90k

Virements Approved to date under Director's Delegated Powers

Details of virements actioned by Chief Officers under delegated authority under the Financial Regulations "Scheme of Virement" will be included in financial monitoring reports to the Portfolio Holder. Since the last report to Executive, no virements have been actioned.

Public Protection & Safety Budget Monitoring Summary

2014/15 Actuals £'000	Service Areas	2015/16 Original Budget £'000	2015/16 Latest Approved £'000	2015/16 Projected Outturn £'000	Variation £'000	Notes	Variation Last Reported £'000	Full Year Effect £'000
311	Public Protection Community Safety	256	256	256	0		0	0
341	Mortuary & Coroners Service	353	353	353	0		0	0
1,607	Public Protection	1,511	1,511	1,511	0		0	0
2,259	TOTAL CONTROLLABLE	2,120	2,120	2,120	0		0	0
92	TOTAL NON CONTROLLABLE	6	6	6	0		0	0
9	TOTAL EXCLUDED RECHARGES	151	151	151	0		0	0
2,360	PORTFOLIO TOTAL	2,277	2,277	2,277	0		0	0

Reconciliation of Latest Approved Budget

£'000

Original Budget 2015/16

2,277

Domestic Abuse - Grant Related Expenditure

26

Domestic Abuse - Grant Related Income

Cr 26

Latest Approved Budget for 2015/16

2,277

REASONS FOR VARIATIONS

Waiver of Financial Regulations:

The Council's Contract Procedure Rules state that where the value of a contract exceeds £50k and is to be exempted from the normal requirement to obtain competitive quotations, the Chief Officer has to obtain the agreement of the Director of Resources and Finance Director and (where over £100,000) approval of the Portfolio Holder, and report use of this exemption to Audit Sub committee bi-annually. Since the last report to the Executive, no waivers have been actioned:

Virements Approved to date under Director's Delegated Powers

Details of virements actioned by Chief Officers under delegated authority under the Financial Regulations "Scheme of Virement" will be included in financial monitoring reports to the Portfolio Holder. Since the last report to Executive, no virements have been actioned.

Renewal and Recreation Budget Monitoring Summary

2014/15 Actuals £'000	Division Service Areas	2015/16 Original Budget £'000	2015/16 Latest Approved £'000	2015/16 Projected Outturn £'000	Variation £'000	Notes	Variation Last Reported £'000	Full Year Effect £'000
	R&R PORTFOLIO							
0	Commissioning Fund Commissioning Fund	0	0	0	0		0	0
0		0	0	0	0		0	0
	Planning							
Cr 27	Building Control	14	14	Cr 16	Cr 30	1	0	0
Cr 164	Land Charges	Cr 168	Cr 168	Cr 168	0		0	0
433	Planning	617	617	617	0	2	0	0
1,090	Renewal	1,825	1,850	1,850	0		0	0
1,332		2,288	2,313	2,283	Cr 30		0	0
	Recreation							
1,940	Culture	1,973	1,973	1,990	17	3	0	0
5,087	Libraries	4,734	4,734	4,717	Cr 17	4	0	0
255	Town Centre Management & Business Support	219	269	269	0		0	0
7,282		6,926	6,976	6,976	0		0	0
8,614	Total Controllable R&R Portfolio	9,214	9,289	9,259	Cr 30		0	0
11,630	TOTAL NON CONTROLLABLE	3,916	3,916	3,916	0		0	0
2,159	TOTAL EXCLUDED RECHARGES	2,469	2,476	2,476	0		0	0
22,403	PORTFOLIO TOTAL	15,599	15,681	15,651	Cr 30		0	0

Reconciliation of Latest Approved Budget

£'000

Original budget 2015/16

15,599

Local Plan Implementation - carry-forward from 2014/15

60

Biggin Hill Air Noise Action Plan - carry-forward from 2014/15

40

Adj. re Housing Strategy Service Excluded Recharges

7

Transfer of Housing budgets to Care Services Portfolio

Cr 25

Latest Approved Budget for 2015/16

15,681

REASONS FOR VARIATIONS

1. Building Control Cr £30k

For the chargeable service, an income deficit of £110k is anticipated based on information to date. This is being more than offset by a projected underspend within salaries of £185k arising from reduced hours working / vacancies. In accordance with Building Account Regulations, the net surplus of £75k will be carried forward via the earmarked reserve for the Building Control Charging Account.

Within the non-chargeable service, as a result of delays in not appointing to vacant posts, there is a projected underspend of £30k.

2. Planning £0k

Income from non-major planning applications is £7k above budget for the first two months of the year, and a surplus of £20k is projected for the year, although this could be as high as £60k if last year's outturn is repeated. For information, actual income received for April and May is £5k higher than that received for the same period last year.

For major applications, £85k has been received for as at 31st May, which is almost £40k higher than for the same period in 2014/15. Planning officers within the majors team have provided a schedule of additional potential income that may be received in the coming months of approximately £225k. A balanced budget is projected from major applications at this stage of the year, allowing for delays in some of the income being received, as well as other items not being received at all.

Currently there is projected surplus income of £30k from pre-application meetings due to higher than budgeted activity levels, although this could be as high as between £50k to £120k. For information, £39k has been received for the first two months of the year, compared with £24k for the same period in 2014/15.

There is a projected overspend within staffing budgets of £50k. This is due to the imminent recruitment of two additional temporary planner staff in order to assist with the current increase in volumes of planning applications.

Summary of variations within Planning:

	£'000
Surplus income from non-major applications	Cr 20
Surplus pre-application income	Cr 30
Overspend on staffing	50
Total variation for planning	<u>0</u>

3. Culture Dr £17k

Although savings were built into the 2015/16 budget in anticipation of the closure of the Priory Museum, the subsequent delayed decision in this taking place, has led to a projected overspend of £31k, as detailed in the recent Executive report. Management action across the culture service totalling £14k has been taken to partly-offset this overspend.

4. Libraries Cr £17k

Following strike action taken by a number of libraries staff in April and May 2015, there is a projected one-off underspend of £17k. This is being used to fund the overspend within Culture as described above, thus ensuring an overall balanced budget for the Recreation division.

Waiver of Financial Regulations

The Council's Contract Procedure Rules state that where the value of a contract exceeds £50k and is to be exempted from the normal requirement to obtain competitive quotations, the Chief Officer has to obtain the agreement of the Director of Resources and Finance Director and (where over £100,000) approval of the Portfolio Holder, and report use of this exemption to Audit Sub committee bi-annually. No waivers over £50k have been approved since the last report to the Executive.

Virements Approved to date under Director's Delegated Powers

Details of virements actioned by Chief Officers under delegated authority under the Financial Regulations "Scheme of Virement" will be included in financial monitoring reports to the Portfolio Holder. Since the last report to Executive, no virements have been actioned.

Resources Portfolio Budget Monitoring Summary

2014/15 Actual £'000		2015/16 Original Budget £'000	2015/16 Latest Approved £'000	2015/16 Projected Outturn £'000	Variation £'000	Notes	Variation Last Reported £'000	Full Year Effect £'000
	CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S DEPARTMENT							
	FINANCIAL SERVICES DIVISION							
	Financial Services & Procurement							
191	Director of Finance & Other	202	202	202	0		0	
6,507	Exchequer - Revenue & Benefits	6,389	6,389	6,336	Cr 53	1	0	
495	Financial Accounting	495	495	495	0		0	
1,179	Management Accounting	1,109	1,113	1,065	Cr 48	2	0	
8,372	Total Financial Services Division	8,195	8,199	8,098	Cr 101		0	0
	CORPORATE SERVICES DIVISION							
4,386	Information Systems & Telephony	4,394	4,516	4,516	0		0	
	Operational Property Services							
419	Operational Property	375	375	453	78	3		152
1,809	Repairs & Maintenance (All LBB)	1,920	2,354	2,354	0	4	0	
945	Customer Services (inc. Bromley Knowledge)	923	923	923	0		0	
	Legal Services & Democracy							
685	Electoral	312	312	312	0		0	
1,450	Democratic Services	1,383	1,383	1,383	0		0	
Cr 106	Registration of Births, Deaths & Marriages	Cr 94	Cr 94	Cr 94	0		0	
1,447	Legal Services	1,548	1,578	1,578	0		0	
1,613	Admin. Buildings	1,613	1,613	1,589	Cr 24	5	0	
481	Facilities & Support	467	467	417	Cr 50	6	0	
166	Management and Other (Corporate Services)	148	148	148	0		0	
13,295	Total Corporate Services Division	12,989	13,575	13,579	4		0	152
	HR DIVISION							
1,481	Human Resources	1,543	1,545	1,545	0		0	
1,481	Total HR Division	1,543	1,545	1,545	0		0	0
	CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S DIVISION							
770	Audit	733	733	715	Cr 18	5	0	
379	Financial Systems	421	421	421	0		0	
427	Procurement	446	446	446	0		0	
1,726	Exchequer - Payments & Income	1,516	1,547	1,530	Cr 17	6	0	
201	Comms	213	213	182	Cr 31	7	0	
601	Management and Other (C. Exec)	786	786	764	Cr 22	8	0	
141	Mayoral	144	144	126	Cr 18	9	0	
4,245	Total Chief Executive's Division	4,259	4,290	4,184	Cr 106		0	0
	TRANSFORMATION & REGENERATION DIVISION							
	Strategic Property Services							
214	Investment & Non-Operational Property	390	390	233	Cr 157	10	0	Cr 168
550	Strategic Property Services	606	635	635	0		0	
Cr 5,630	Investment Income	Cr 7,393	Cr 7,393	Cr 6,827	566	11	0	0
Cr 833	Other Rental Income - Other Portfolios	Cr 824	Cr 824	Cr 824	0		0	
Cr 5,699	Total Transformation & Regeneration Division	Cr 7,221	Cr 7,192	Cr 6,783	409		0	Cr 168
21,694	Total Controllable Departmental Budgets	19,765	20,417	20,623	206		0	Cr 16
	CENTRAL ITEMS							
7,450	CDC & Non Distributed Costs (Past Deficit etc.)	7,542	7,542	7,542	0		0	
10,425	Concessionary Fares	10,562	10,888	10,888	0		0	
39,569	Total Controllable	37,869	38,847	39,053	206		0	Cr 16

2014/15 Actual £'000	Financial Summary	2015/16 Original Budget £'000	2015/16 Latest Approved £'000	2015/16 Projected Outturn £'000	Variation £'000	Notes	Variation Last Reported £'000	Full Year Effect £'000
Cr 1,311	Total Non Controllable	3,367	3,367	3,367	0		0	
Cr 19,609	Total Excluded Recharges	Cr 19,424	Cr 19,431	Cr 19,431	0		0	
Cr 1,384	Less: R&M allocated across other Portfolios	Cr 1,522	Cr 1,472	Cr 1,472	0		0	
833	Less: Rent allocated across other Portfolios	824	824	824	0		0	
18,098	TOTAL CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S DEPARTMENT	21,114	22,135	22,341	206		0	Cr 16
18,098	TOTAL RESOURCES PORTFOLIO	21,114	22,135	22,341	206		0	Cr 16
	Memorandum Item					12		
	Sold Services							
31	Facilities (Caretaking) Schools Trading Account	12	12	45	33		0	
Cr 6	Reactive Maintenance Schools Trading Account	0	0	0	0		0	
25	Total Sold Services	12	12	45	33		0	0

Reconciliation of Final Budget	£'000
Original budget 2015/16	21,114
Repairs and Maintenance carry forward from 2014-15 (delegated authority)	484
Concessionary Fares	326
Liberata contract - Effect of updated Pension Contributions re HR, Finance, Fairer Charging / A & D	37
Adj. re Housing Strategy Service Excluded Recharges	Cr 7
Carry forwards from 2014-15 requiring Members' approval	
- IER Grant - Related Expenditure	19
- IER Grant - Draw down from Grants Reserve	Cr 19
- Hardware for Disaster Recovery / Windows 7	122
- Legal Case Work system upgrade	30
- Transparency Agenda	29
Latest Approved Budget for 2015/16	22,135

REASONS FOR VARIATIONS

FINANCIAL SERVICES DIVISION

1 Exchequer Services - Revenue & Benefits - £53k Cr

An overall underspend of £53k Cr is projected for Revenue and Benefits. £39k Cr relates to vacant posts for which there are no plans to fill this financial year. A further £55K Cr is expected on Licences and Support costs for the Exchequer systems. The contracts budget is expected to overspend by £30k of which £47k Dr relates to 2 additional Council Tax Recovery Officers offset by £17k Cr for reduced cash collections. Other variations net out to £11K Dr.

2 Management Accounting - £48k Cr

An underspend of £48k Cr is projected for Management Accounting. This mainly relates to vacant posts.

CORPORATE SERVICES DIVISION

3 Operational Property Services £78k Dr

An overspend of £78K is currently projected for Operational Property. This mainly relates to the following :

An overspend of £117k Dr is forecast for the planned service in 15-16. In previous years, the 10% management fee recharged to Education capital schemes contributed towards the cost of the service's corporate work. Due to the number of academy conversions, the total recharge has reduced significantly over the past couple of years. Unlike other Council sold services, however, this was not matched by an increase in income, as the majority of academies opted not to buy in to this service.

The shortfall is likely to get worse as the remaining schools convert to academy status, and the service cannot reduce staffing levels further without causing operational issues. The budget is historic and assumes funding of approx. £200k from school related works (10% charges on works of approx. £2M). The latest capital programme suggests that most of this work will fall out in 16-17 and consequently the shortfall is expected to increase to £191K in 16-17.

An historic shortfall in caretaking income of £11k Dr is expected to continue. These overspends are offset by a projected underspend of £50k Cr on the Walnuts Boiler Plant (mainly relating to gas) which is likely to be ongoing.

4 Repairs & Maintenance (All LBB)

At this early stage in the year, R & M is forecast to spend to budget. The latest approved budget includes the carry forward from 14-15 of £484K.

General note - The Property & Finance Sub-Committee, in December 2001, agreed that a carry forward could be made at the end of each financial year of revenue underspends on landlord building maintenance on the basis that Property will continue to seek to contain total expenditure within approved annual budgets.

5 Admin. Buildings - £24k Cr

This variation mainly relates to staffing pending the outcome of a review of the service.

6 Facilities & Support - £50k Cr

This variation mainly relates to a post being held vacant pending the outcome of a review of the service.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S DIVISION

7 Audit - £18k Cr

An underspend of £18k Cr is projected for Audit. This mainly relates to a vacant post.

8 Exchequer Services - Payments & Income - £17k Cr

An underspend of £17k Cr is projected for Payments & Income. This mainly relates to the contracts budget.

9 Comms - £31k Cr

An underspend of £31k Cr is projected for Comms, mainly relating to a vacant post.

10 Management & Other (Chief. Exec.) - £21k Cr

An underspend of £21k is projected for Management & Other. This is mainly due to a reduction in employers pension fund contributions as a result of an employee no longer needing to contribute to the Pension Fund.

11 Mayoral - £18k Cr

An underspend of £18k is projected for Mayoral Services. This is due to a vacant Mayoral attendant post £31k Cr , partially offset by an allowance for additional overtime to cover for the vacancy £10k Dr and a temp £3k Dr.

TRANSFORMATION & REGENERATION DIVISION

The 2015/16 projected outturn for Strategic Property Services is an overspend of £409k which consists of £566k Dr on Rental Income and £157k Cr on Strategic Property Services and Investment and Non-Operational Property.

12 Investment and Non-Operational Property (expenditure) £157k Cr

The forecast for expenditure on Investment and Non Operational Property is an underspend of £157k Cr. This includes the following items:

a) Anerley Business Centre - An underspend of £11k Cr is projected which mainly relates to business rates. It is assumed in this projection that the current management arrangements will continue, however the future of this site is under review and a further report to Members is due to be submitted in the near future which may change the position.

b) Surplus Properties - An overspend of £22k is projected. This relates to additional costs of £7k for utilities, £12k for business rates, and other minor variation of £3k.

c) Exchequer House (Bromley Old Town Hall). This building is vacant and listed. An underspend of £168k Cr is expected which consists of £9k Cr on premises, £102k Cr on business rates, £30k Cr on other hired and contracted services, £22k Cr on security costs and £5k Cr on pest control. The sale of this building is expected to be completed this financial year.

13 Investment Income £566k Dr

A net shortfall of £566k is expected on Investment Income. This includes the following items:

a) Shortfall of income on Investment Fund properties of £649k Dr.

For the past few years, contributions have been made to reserves to create an Investment Fund. A substantial part of this Fund has been used to buy Investment Properties. The capital spend to date on the purchase of these properties is £41.2m of which £28.5m relates to properties in Bromley High Street. The 2015/16 budget for the expected income is £3m and the income achieved from the properties purchased to date is £2.4m. A number of possible acquisitions are being considered.

b) Other variations in rental income net out to £83k Cr. This mainly relates to the additional income at Yeoman House from the NHS CCG with regards to the section 75 agreement, although this may not be on-going beyond 2017/18.

EARLY WARNING

INTU have been granted planning approval for a proposed new development at The Glades Shopping Centre, which involves internal alterations and extending on to the roof to provide a Cinema and new restaurants. These works are currently estimated to cost approx. £14m. INTU are still working on their detailed proposals for this project and have not yet requested Bromley's consent as Landlord and approval for funding. It is assumed, however, that they will want to proceed with this scheme in due course and Bromley's contribution to the cost of these works under the existing leasing arrangements would be approx. £2.1m. A detailed report will be submitted to Members, including proposed funding arrangements, once INTU have made a formal request and provided the business case.

14 **Sold Services (Net Budgets)**

Services sold to schools are separately identified in this report to provide clarity in terms of what is being provided. These accounts are shown as memorandum items as the figures are included in the appropriate Service Area in the main report.

Waiver of Financial Regulations

The Council's Contract Procedure Rules state that where the value of a contract exceeds £50k and is to be exempted from the normal requirement to obtain competitive quotations, the Chief Officer has to obtain the agreement of the Director of Resources and Finance Director and (where over £100,000) approval of the Portfolio Holder, and report use of this exemption to Audit Sub committee bi-annually. Since the last report to the Executive, the following waivers have been actioned :

Exemption from tendering arrangements for contract for Pension Fund Advice Service. This service comprises advice on the Local Government Pension Scheme governance, changes in regulations, scheme investments and strategy etc. The service was tendered in 2012 and a three year contract was awarded . This waiver relates to the award of a new contract for three years with the same contractor (with an option to extend for a further two years). Annual contract value £16k . Whole Life contract value £80k (over 5 years). Exemption sought under contract procedure rule 13.1.

Virements Approved to date under Director's Delegated Powers

Details of virements actioned by Chief Officers under delegated authority under the Financial Regulations "Scheme of Virement" will be included in financial monitoring reports to the Portfolio Holder. Since the last report to Executive, the following virement has been actioned :

The Director of Corporate Services has agreed a virement of £3,200 from the budget for the Concessionary Fares Post Office contract to Customer Services.

Allocation of Contingency Provision for 2015/16

Item	Original Contingency Provision	Allocations				Variation to Original Contingency Provision
		Previously Approved Items	New Items Requested this Cycle	Items Projected for Remainder of Year	Total Allocations/ Projected for Year	
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Environmental Services						
Street Environment contract	60,000			60,000	60,000	0
Renewal and Recreation						
Planning Appeals - change in legislation	60,000			60,000	60,000	0
Care Services						
Public Health						
Transfer of 0 - 5 years old Services (health visitors etc)	1,901,000			1,901,000	1,901,000	0
Government Funding to meet cost of service	Cr 1,901,000			Cr 1,901,000	Cr 1,901,000	0
Education						
Reduction in Education Services Grant	400,000			400,000	400,000	0
General						
Provision for unallocated inflation	2,508,000	60,000		2,448,000	2,508,000	0
Provision for risk/uncertainty	2,193,000			2,193,000	2,193,000	0
Provision for cost pressures arising from variables	2,000,000			2,000,000	2,000,000	0
Provision for risk/uncertainty relating to volume and cost pressures	1,950,000			1,950,000	1,950,000	0
Increase in Cost of Homelessness/Impact of Welfare Reforms	1,100,000			1,100,000	1,100,000	0
Changes in Parking Enforcement	1,000,000			1,000,000	1,000,000	0
Retained Welfare Fund	450,000			450,000	450,000	0
Freedom Passes	326,000		326,000	0	326,000	0
Deprivation of Liberty	314,000			314,000	314,000	0
Growth for Waste Services	300,000			300,000	300,000	0
Impact of Auto Enrolment (additional employee costs)	300,000			300,000	300,000	0
Grants to Voluntary Organisations	275,000			275,000	275,000	0
Disabled Facilities Grant RCCO	232,000			232,000	232,000	0
# Care Act - Revised Assessment Costs	2,876,000			2,876,000	2,876,000	0
Care Act - Funding from Better Care Fund	Cr 750,000			Cr 750,000	Cr 750,000	0
Care Act - Government Funding	Cr 1,848,000			Cr 1,848,000	Cr 1,848,000	0
Other Provisions	341,000			341,000	341,000	0
Organisational Efficiencies & Management costs - Further savings to be identified	Cr 300,000			Cr 300,000	Cr 300,000	0
	13,787,000	60,000	326,000	13,401,000	13,787,000	0
Grants included within Central Contingency Sum						
SEND Implementation Grant						
Grant related expenditure	176,819	148,343		28,476	176,819	0
Grant related income	Cr 176,819	Cr 148,343		Cr 28,476	Cr 176,819	0
Regional Lead for the SEND Reforms						
Grant related expenditure	62,000			61,924	61,924	Cr 76
Grant related income	Cr 62,000			Cr 61,924	Cr 61,924	76
Lead Local Flood Authorities						
Grant related expenditure	216,000		213,000	0	213,000	Cr 3,000
Adoption Reform						
Grant related expenditure	273,000			273,000	273,000	0
Grant related income	Cr 273,000			Cr 273,000	Cr 273,000	0
Tackling Troubled Families Grant						
Grant related expenditure	426,000			426,000	426,000	0
Grant related income	Cr 426,000			Cr 426,000	Cr 426,000	0
Transformation Challenge Award						
- expenditure	344,000			344,000	344,000	0
- income	Cr 344,000			Cr 344,000	Cr 344,000	0
Individual Electoral Registration Process						
- expenditure	102,000			102,000	102,000	0
- income	Cr 102,000			Cr 102,000	Cr 102,000	0
Domestic Abuse						
- expenditure				60,610	60,610	60,610
- income				Cr 60,610	Cr 60,610	Cr 60,610
Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards						
- expenditure				126,980	126,980	126,980
- income				Cr 126,980	Cr 126,980	Cr 126,980
Social Care innovation Grant						
- expenditure			100,000	0	100,000	100,000
- income			Cr 100,000	0	Cr 100,000	Cr 100,000
Housing Regulations						
- expenditure		3,000		0	3,000	3,000
- income		Cr 3,000		0	Cr 3,000	Cr 3,000
Total Grants	216,000	0	213,000	0	213,000	Cr 3,000
TOTAL CARRIED FORWARD	14,003,000	60,000	539,000	13,401,000	14,000,000	Cr 3,000

Notes:

(1) Approved by Executive 25th March 2015

Allocation of Contingency Provision for 2015/16 (continued)

Item	Carried Forward from 2014/15	Allocations				Variation to Original Contingency Provision
		Previously Approved Items	New Items Requested this Cycle	Items Projected for Remainder of Year	Total Allocations/Projected for Year	
	£	£	£	£	£	£
TOTAL BROUGHT FORWARD	14,003,000	60,000	539,000	13,401,000	14,000,000	Cr 3,000
Items Carried Forward from 2014/15						
Care Services						
Social Care Funding via the CCG under S256 agreements						
Invest to Save - Dementia and PD						
- expenditure	208,790	208,790		0	208,790	(2) 0
- income	Cr 208,790	Cr 208,790		0	Cr 208,790	0
Impact of Care Bill						
- expenditure	104,750	104,750		0	104,750	(2) 0
- income	Cr 104,750	Cr 104,750		0	Cr 104,750	0
Integration Funding - Better Care Fund						
- expenditure	300,000	300,000		0	300,000	(2) 0
- income	Cr 300,000	Cr 300,000		0	Cr 300,000	0
Helping People Home						
- expenditure	27,930	27,930		0	27,930	(2) 0
- income	Cr 27,930	Cr 27,930		0	Cr 27,930	0
Adoption Reform						
- expenditure	417,737	285,414		132,323	417,737	(2) 0
- income	Cr 417,737	Cr 285,414		Cr 132,323	Cr 417,737	0
Tackling Troubled Families						
- expenditure	1,260,151	225,580		1,034,571	1,260,151	(2) 0
- income	Cr 1,260,151	Cr 225,580		Cr 1,034,571	Cr 1,260,151	0
Step Up to Social Work						
- expenditure	72,159			72,159	72,159	0
- income	Cr 72,159			Cr 72,159	Cr 72,159	0
Public Health						
- expenditure	140,909			140,909	140,909	0
- income	Cr 140,909			Cr 140,909	Cr 140,909	0
Welfare Reform Funding for Housing						
- expenditure	65,063	65,063		0	65,063	(2) 0
- income	Cr 65,063	Cr 65,063		0	Cr 65,063	0
Chief Executive's						
Individual Electoral Registration						
- expenditure	19,000	19,000		0	19,000	(5) 0
- income	Cr 19,000	Cr 19,000		0	Cr 19,000	0
Education						
Early Years Grant						
- expenditure	18,808		18,808	0	18,808	(6) 0
- income	Cr 18,808		Cr 18,808	0	Cr 18,808	0
SEND Reform/Implementation						
- expenditure	307,357	307,357		0	307,357	(1) 0
- income	Cr 307,357	Cr 307,357		0	Cr 307,357	0
SEN Preparation for Employment						
- expenditure	45,941		45,941	0	45,941	(6) 0
- income	Cr 45,941		Cr 45,941	0	Cr 45,941	0
Public Protection & Safety						
Domestic Abuse						
- expenditure	26,570	26,570		0	26,570	(4) 0
- income	Cr 26,570	Cr 26,570		0	Cr 26,570	0
General						
YOT Service Strategy Review	76,500		76,500	0	76,500	(6) 0
Review of Placing Planning	11,000		11,000	0	11,000	(6) 0
Waste - 3 split bodied vehicles	558,000		558,000	0	558,000	(3) 0
Countryside & Woodland Improvement Works	40,000		40,000	0	40,000	(3) 0
Keston Ponds Dam	20,000		20,000	0	20,000	(3) 0
Local Plan Implementation	60,000		60,000	0	60,000	(7) 0
Biggin Hill Airport - Noise Action Plan	40,000		40,000	0	40,000	(7) 0
IT Purchase of Hardware for Disaster Recovery/Windows	122,000	122,000		0	122,000	(5) 0
Legal Case Work System Upgrade	29,900	29,900		0	29,900	(5) 0
Transparency Agenda	29,000	29,000		0	29,000	(5) 0
Staff Merit Awards (held in Contingency)	200,000			200,000	200,000	0
	1,186,400	180,900	805,500	200,000	1,186,400	0

Item	Carried Forward from 2014/15	Allocations				Variation to Original Contingency Provision
		Previously Approved Items	New Items Requested this Cycle	Items Projected for Remainder of Year	Total Allocations/ Projected for Year	
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Grants included within Central Contingency Sum						
Winter Resilience Funding (Bromley CCG)						
- expenditure	366,480		15,002	351,478	366,480	0
- income	Cr 366,480		Cr 15,002	Cr 351,478	Cr 366,480	0
Total Grants	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Carried Forward	1,186,400	180,900	805,500	200,000	1,186,400	0
GRAND TOTAL	15,189,400	240,900	1,344,500	13,601,000	15,186,400	Cr 3,000

Notes:

- (1) Approved by Executive 25th March 2015
- (2) Approved at Care Services PDS 23rd June 2015
- (3) Requested at Environment PDS 7th July 2015
- (4) Requested at Public Protection and Safety PDS 30th June 2015
- (5) Approved by Executive & Resources PDS 3rd June 2015
- (6) Requested at Education Budget Sub-Committee 30th June 2015
- (7) Approved at Renewal & Recreation PDS 24th June 2015

Description	2015/16 Latest Approved Budget £'000	Variation To 2015/16 Budget £'000	Potential Impact in 2016/17
Education Services Grant	Cr 2,128	0	The Education Services Grant (ESG) is allocated on the basis of pupil numbers, and grant reduces in-year as schools convert to academies. The full year effect of the 18 conversions estimated to occur during 2015/16 is £721k, and is included in the financial forecast for the 2017/18 budget.
Adult Education	Cr 601	382	The current overspend for the Adult Education Service has continued from 2013/14, and is expected to continue into at least part of 2016/17. Some efficiency savings have been implemented to help contain this, however there is a total income shortfall of £518k, with only a net reduction of £136k on running costs to offset this. A report is due to go to the July meeting of the Education PDS Committee which will present options to help contain this going forward.
Housing Needs - Temporary Accommodation	5,638	0	Pressures in Temporary Accommodation (TA) (Bed and Breakfast) in 2015/16 are forecast to be £543k overspent. However there is funding available in the central contingency to a maximum of £1.1m and it is assumed that this will be drawn down to reduce the overspend to a net zero
Assessment and Care Management - Care Placements	19,528	0	The current full year effect on client projections is £121k. This figure assumes the reduction in cost of £250k as a result of the management of demand at first point of contact is achieved.
Learning Disabilities Care Management	2,652	Cr 79	The full year effect on client projections is £83k credit in relation to Domiciliary Care and Direct Care payments budgets.
Residential, Supported Living, Shared Lives - Learning Disabilities	24,595	Cr 110	Despite a current year projected underspend, the full year effect is estimated at an overspend of £397k. This is because the forward assumptions are based on an increasing number of LD clients (clients expected to be placed in-year in 2015/16 will only have a part year cost in 2015/16 but a full year cost in 2016/17).
Residential, Supported Living, Flexible Support, Direct Payments - Mental Health	6,233	Cr 259	The full year effect impact is estimated at Cr £196k. However this should be treated with caution given that there is a degree of client misclassification for mental health.
Supporting People	1,413	Cr 40	The current year's projected underspend of £40k is expected to continue in 2016/17. This has arisen from inflationary savings and re-tendering / extending contracts at a reduced cost.
Children's Social Care - Placements	14,286	132	The full year effect impact is estimated at £42k. This can be analysed as £267k on placements, £72k credit for no recourse to public funds and £153k credit on leaving care clients.

Description	2015/16 Latest Approved Budget £'000	Variation To 2015/16 Budget £'000	Potential Impact in 2016/17
Operational Property Services	375	78	<p>An overspend of £117k Dr is forecast for the planned service in 15-16. In previous years, the 10% management fee recharged to Education capital schemes contributed towards the cost of the service's corporate work. Due to the number of academy conversions, the total recharge has reduced significantly over the past couple of years. Unlike other Council sold services, however, this was not matched by an increase in income, as the majority of academies opted not to buy in to this service.</p> <p>The shortfall is likely to get worse as the remaining schools convert to academy status, and the service cannot reduce staffing levels further without causing operational issues. The budget is historic and assumes funding of approx. £200k from school related works (10% charges on works of approx. £2M). The latest capital programme suggests that most of this work will fall out in 16-17 and consequently the shortfall is expected to increase to £191K in 16-17.</p> <p>An historic shortfall in caretaking income of £11k Dr is expected to continue. These overspends are offset by a projected underspend of £50k Cr on the Walnuts Boiler Plant (mainly relating to gas) which is likely to be ongoing.</p>
Investment & Non-Operational Property	390	233	<p>Exchequer House (Bromley Old Town Hall). This building is vacant and listed. An underspend of £168k Cr is expected which consists of £9k Cr on premises, £102k Cr on business rates, £30k Cr on other hired and contracted services, £22k Cr on security costs and £5k Cr on pest control. The sale of this building is expected to be completed this financial year.</p>
Waste	1,986	100	<p>Although in the current year the expected saving as a result of the revision to the paper collection service is £100k below the expected saving of £250k. In subsequent years, the savings target will be exceeded by £250k as the full year saving is expected to achieve £500k.</p>
Parking	Cr 6,696	354	<p>1) For 2015/16 the income from bus lane contraventions is projecting a surplus of £267k, the full year effect of the reinstatement of the camera in Bromley North is only expected to achieve Cr £40k. 2) The additional income from off-street parking is expected to continue for future years, although it will be closely monitored and any major variances reported. 3) At this stage the full year effect of the legislation changes is projected to be Dr £1m, however the service is being reviewed over the next few months and options explored for the future of the service, with a report being presented to Members in September, which will also include a request to drawdown some of the £1m held in the Central Contingency.</p>

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
FSD15046

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: Executive Council

Date: 15th July 2015
19th October 2015

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

Title: CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING – 1ST QUARTER 2015/16

Contact Officer: Martin Reeves, Principal Accountant
Tel: 020 8313 4291 E-mail: martin.reeves@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Director of Finance

Ward: All

1. Reason for report

This report summarises the current position on capital expenditure and receipts following the 1st quarter of 2015/16 and seeks the Executive's approval to a revised Capital Programme.

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

The Executive is requested to:

- (a) Note the report, including the rephrasing of £2,123k from 2014/15 into 2015/16 and £9,049k from 2015/16 into 2016/17 (see paragraph 3.3.11) and agree a revised Capital Programme;
- (b) Approve the following amendments to the Capital Programme:
 - (i) Addition of £638k in 2015/16 re. annual revenue contributions to Bromley Mytime Investment Fund (see para 3.3.1);
 - (ii) Addition of £289k in 2015/16 for Gosshill Road, Chislehurst – Private Street Works (funded by S106 receipts (£209k) and Transport for London (£80k)) (see para 3.3.2);
 - (iii) Addition of £130k in 2015/16 for Oprington Railway Station (funded by S106 receipts (£80k) and Transport for London (£50k)) (see para 3.3.3);
 - (iv) Addition of £18k re. Autism Capital grant received from Department of Health (see para 3.3.4);
 - (v) Addition of £18k in 2015/16 to the Churchill Theatre & Central Library Chiller scheme to reflect the additional contract cost (see para 3.3.5);

- (vi) A net reduction of £156k over four years 2015/16 to 2018/19 in respect of reduced Schools Formula Devolved Capital grant support (see para 3.3.6);
- (vii) Reduction of £220k in 2015/16 to reflect revised grant support from Transport for London (TfL) for highway schemes (see para 3.3.7);
- (viii) Transfer (virement) of £43k from the budget for Financial Systems Upgrade to Rollout of Windows 7 budget (see para 3.3.8);
- (ix) Inclusion of £5.7m Housing Zone Bid (Site G) (Executive 24/03/15) into the Capital programme (see para 3.3.9);
- (x) Section 106 receipts from developers - net increase of £2,827k (£2,760k in 15/16 and £67k in 16/17) to reflect the funding available and remaining unallocated balance (see para 3.3.10);

Full Council is requested to:

- (a) Approve the inclusion of the £5.7m Housing Zone Bid into the Capital Programme (see para 3.3.9)

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy: Capital Programme monitoring is part of the planning and review process for all services. Capital schemes help to maintain and improve the quality of life in the borough. Affective asset management planning (AMP) is a crucial corporate activity if a local authority is to achieve its corporate and service aims and objectives and deliver its services. The Council continuously reviews its property assets and service users are regularly asked to justify their continued use of the property. For each of our portfolios and service priorities, we review our main aims and outcomes through the AMP process and identify those that require the use of capital assets. Our primary concern is to ensure that capital investment provides value for money and matches the Council's overall priorities as set out in the Community Plan and in "Building a Better Bromley". The capital review process requires Council Directors to ensure that bids for capital investment provide value for money and match Council plans and priorities.
 2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Estimated Cost: Total increase of £11.4m over the 4 years 2015/16 to 2018/19, mainly due to rephasing of expenditure from 2014/15 into 2015/16, the Housing Zone Bid (Site G) and the revised S106 schemes to reflect the funding available.
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Capital Programme
 4. Total current budget for this head: Total £152.9m over 4 years 2015/16 to 2018/19
 5. Source of funding: Capital grants, capital receipts and earmarked revenue contributions
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 1fte
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: 36 hours per week
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Non-Statutory - Government Guidance
 2. Call-in: Not Applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): N/A
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

3. COMMENTARY

Capital Expenditure

3.1 Appendix A sets out proposed changes to the Capital Programme following a detailed monitoring exercise carried out after the 1st quarter of 2015/16. The base position is the revised programme approved by the Executive on 11th February 2015, as amended by variations approved at subsequent Executive meetings. If the changes proposed in this report are approved, the total Capital Programme 2015/16 to 2018/19 would increase by £11.4m, mainly due to rephasing from 2014/15 into 2015/16 (£2.1m), the inclusion of the Housing Zone Bid (Site G) (£5.7m) and an increase of £2.8m in the S106 unallocated budget to reflect the current funding available.

The variations are summarised in the table below with further detail set out in Appendix A.

	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	TOTAL 2015/16 to 2018/19
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
Programme approved by Executive 11/02/15	64,215	46,737	4,612	4,610	120,174
Variations approved at subsequent Executive meetings	11,599	909	8,838		21,346
Approved Programme prior to 1st Quarter's Monitoring	75,814	47,646	13,450	4,610	141,520
Variations requiring the approval of the Executive	9,316	50	-17	-105	9,244
Variations not requiring approval:					
Net underspendings in 2014/15 rephased into 2015/16	2,123	0	0	0	2,123
Net rephasing from 2015/16 into 2016/17	-9,049	9,049	0	0	0
Total Amendment to the Capital Programme	2,390	9,099	-17	-105	11,367
Total Revised Capital Programme	78,204	56,745	13,433	4,505	152,887
Assumed Further Slippage (for financing purposes)	-10,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	-4,000
Assumed New Schemes (to be agreed)	0	0	2,500	2,500	5,000
	-10,000	2,000	4,500	4,500	1,000
Projected Programme for Capital Financing Forecast (see appendix C)	68,204	58,745	17,933	9,005	153,887

3.2 Variations approved at subsequent Executive meetings

3.2.1 As detailed in Appendix A, variations of £21.3m have been approved since the February meeting of Executive. This mainly comprises £8.8m on the 2017/18 allocation for Basic Need to support the provision of school places, £8.7m for further property acquisitions funded by the Investment Fund, £1.5m for additional School Capital Maintenance Grant, and £1.3m for Penge and Orpington Town Centre schemes funded by the New Homes Bonus and the High Street Fund.

3.3 Variations requiring the approval of the Executive (£9,244k net increase)

3.3.1 Bromley Mytime Investment Fund (£638k increase in 2015/16):

There is annual provision in the revenue budget for a contribution towards capital investment in Council leisure centres by Bromley MyTime and Members are asked to approve the inclusion of £638k in 2015/16, which will bring the total contribution to £1,892k in 2015/16.

3.3.2 Gosshill Road, Chislehurst – Private Street Works (£289k increase in 2015/16)

Members are asked to approve the inclusion of the Gosshill Road scheme into the Capital Programme. On 1st July 2014, the Environment Portfolio Holder received the first resolution report regarding the use and condition of Gosshill Road, Chislehurst (under the Private Street Works code). The estimated cost of the implementation works is £289k of which £209k is funded from S106 and £80k is funded from the TfL budget for Public Transport Interchange and Access. This was agreed by the Portfolio Holder in the second resolution report to the Environment PDS Committee on 23rd September 2014.

3.3.3 Orpington Railway Station – Improved Access and Bus stop Enhancement (£130k increase in 2015/16)

Members are asked to approve the inclusion of the Orpington Railway Station scheme into the Capital Programme. On 4th November 2014, the Environment Portfolio approved the allocation of £80k of S106 monies towards access and bus stop improvements as part of the Orpington railway station car park and forecourt scheme. The estimated implementation cost of the proposal is £130k and the remaining £50k is funded from the TfL allocation for Public Transport Interchange and Access.

3.3.4 Autism Capital Grant (£18k increase in 2015/16)

Confirmation has been received from Department of Health of a new capital grant of £18k, which will be used to support work on implementing Think Autism, the recent update to the 2010 Adult Autism Strategy for England. Although the grant is not ring fenced, conditions are included in a supporting memorandum of understanding.

3.3.5 Churchill Theatre & Central Library Chillers (£18k increase in 2015/16)

The Churchill Theatre & Central Library Chiller scheme aims to replace the existing mechanical plant at the Central Library / Churchill Theatre Site. This is required for Health & Safety reasons (legionella) and to mitigate the risk of financial claims from the theatre in the event of equipment failure. The contract for the chiller replacements has been recently awarded to East West Connect Ltd. It is anticipated that the total cost of the scheme will vary slightly from the original estimated budget (within the 5% threshold) and Members are asked to approve an additional £18k to the existing budget of £457k.

3.3.6 Formula Devolved Capital Grant (net reduction of £156k in 2015/16 to 2018/19)

The level of funding received from the Department for Education for 2015/16 Formula Devolved Capital Grant (£285k) is lower than anticipated due to the increasing level of Academy conversion as Academies receive separate devolved capital funding from the Education Funding Agency. The capital programme has been adjusted to reflect an overall reduction of £156k. (£17k in 2015/16, £17k 2016/17, £17k in 2017/18 and £105k in 2018/19).

3.3.7 Transport for London (TfL) – Revised Support for Highway Schemes (£220k reduction in 2015/16)

Provision for transport schemes to be 100% funded by TfL was originally included in the Capital Programme 2015/16 to 2018/19 on the basis of the bid in our Borough Spending Plan (BSP). Notification of an overall reduction of £220k in the 2015/16 grant has been received from TfL. Grant allocations from TfL change frequently and any further variations will be reported in subsequent capital monitoring reports.

3.3.8 Virement of £43k from Financial Systems Upgrade to Rollout of Windows 7

Due to the impact of moving to Windows 7, additional works are required to upgrade older dependent systems and software along with service improvements to bring the system into line with recognised industry best practice. £43k from the budget for the Financial Systems Upgrade scheme has been allocated to contribute towards upgrading Version One. Members are asked to approve a virement of £43k to the Rollout of Windows 7 budget to ensure the funding is located where the actual spend is.

3.3.9 Housing Zone Bid (Site G) – (increase of £5.7m in 2015/16)

On 24th March 2015, the Executive approved the Housing Zone Bid (Site G) proposal to support the delivery policy objectives set out within the Council's adopted Bromley Town Centre Area Action Plan. Members are asked to approve the inclusion of the £5.7m Housing Zone Bid (Site G) into the Capital Programme of which £3m is funded from the Housing Payment In Lieu Fund (S106) and £2.7m is funded from the Growth Fund. This will also require the approval of Full Council.

3.3.10 Section 106 receipts (uncommitted balance) – net increase of £2,827k (£2,760k in 2015/16 and £67k in 2016/17)

In previous years, the Capital Programme budget for Section 106 receipts has been adjusted as and when new spending plans receive approval. In future, however, it seems sensible to match the Capital Programme budget with the total of S106 receipts available to fund expenditure and it is proposed, therefore, that the Capital Programme be increased by a total of £2,827k (£2,760k in 2015/16 and £67k in 2016/17). As per the table below, this would leave a total budget of £6,948k in 2015/16 and 2016/17, which matches the total of available S106 receipts in paragraph 3.7.

	Total Approved S106 Budget £000	Actuals upto FY14/15 £000	Budget FY15/16 £000	Budget FY16/17 £000
Housing:				
Purchase of Properties	1,120	1,016	104	0
Site K	672	0	605	67
Site G (£5.7m - £3m PIL £2.7m Growth Fund)	3,000	0	3,000	0
Uncommitted balance (as at May 2015)	1,286	0	1,286	0
Housing Total	6,078	1,016	4,995	67
Education:				
Basic Need	706	456	250	0
Uncommitted balance (as at May 2015)	1,341	0	1,341	0
Education Total	2,047	456	1,591	0
Highways:				
Gosshill Road	209	0	209	0
Orpington Railway Station	80	0	80	0
Uncommitted balance (as at May 2015)	6	0	6	0
Highways Total	295	0	295	0

3.3.11 Scheme Rephasing

The 2014/15 Capital Outturn was reported to the Executive on 10th June 2015. The final capital outturn for the year was £50.5m compared to a revised budget of £52.5m. After allowing for other net variations of £0.1m, a total of £2.1m has been re-phased from 2014/15 into 2015/16.

In the quarter 1 monitoring exercise, slippage of £9,049k has been identified and this has been re-phased from 2015/16 into 2016/17 to reflect the latest estimates of when expenditure is likely to be incurred. This has no overall impact on the total approved estimate for the capital programme. Further details are provided in Appendix B.

Capital Receipts

- 3.4 Details of the receipts forecast in the years 2015/16 to 2018/19 are included elsewhere on the agenda in a confidential appendix to this report (Appendix D). Actual receipts from asset disposals totalled some £7.1m in 2014/15, compared to a forecast of £9.2m reported to the February meeting. The latest estimate for 2015/16 has increased to £9.8m from £6m reported in February. Estimates for 2016/17, 2017/18 and 2018/19 remain at £6.5m, £1.0m and £1.0m respectively, as was reported in February. A total of £1m per annum is assumed for later years, in line with the target included in the Resources Portfolio Plan. The financing and balances projections shown in Appendix C reflect prudent assumptions for capital receipts.

Financing of the Capital Programme

- 3.5 A capital financing statement is attached at Appendix C and the following table summarises the estimated impact on balances of the revised programme and revised capital receipt projections, which reflect prudent assumptions on the level and timing of disposals. Total balances would reduce from £48.9m (General Fund £20.0m and capital receipts £28.9m) at the end of 2014/15 to £37.8m by the end of 2018/19 and would then reduce further to £31.3m by the end of 2023/24. It is estimated that the General Fund would not be required to make any contributions to the funding of capital expenditure in any year.

	Balance 1/4/15	Estimated Balance 31/3/19	Estimated Balance 31/3/20
	£m	£m	£m
General Fund	20.0	20.0	20.0
Capital Receipts	28.9	17.8	11.3
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	48.9	37.8	31.3

Investment Fund and Growth Fund

(formerly Economic Development and Investment Fund)

- 3.6 Full details of the Investment Fund and Growth Fund were reported to the June meeting of the Executive in the Capital Programme Outturn 2014/15 report. A total of £41.4m has been spent to date, and schemes totalling £46.2m have been approved. The uncommitted balance currently stands at £27.6m for the Investment Fund and £7.0m for the Growth Fund

<u>Investment Fund:</u>	£'000
<u>Funding:</u>	
Approved by Executive 7th September 2011	10,000
Approved by Council 27th February 2013	16,319
Approved by Council 1st July 2013	20,977
Approved by Executive 10th June 2014	13,792
Approved by Executive 15th October 2014	90
New Home Bonus (2014/15)	5,040
Approved by Executive 11th February 2015	4,400
Approved by Executive 10th June 2015	10,165
	80,783
Less: Allocated to Growth Fund (Executive 26/11/14)	10,000
Total spend to 25th June 2015	41,385
<u>Actual Fund balance 25th June 2015</u>	29,398
<u>Schemes Approved, but not spent</u>	
Approved by Executive 12th June 2013 (Growth & Delivery Plans)	85
Approved by Executive 20th November 2013 (Queens's Garden)	893
Approved by Executive 16th October 2013 (Crystal Palace Park exclusivity agreement)	163
Approved by Executive 15th January 2014 & 26th November 2014 (Bromley BID Project)	245
Approved by Executive 12th February 2014 (147 - 153 High St)	38
Approved by Executive 24th March 2015 (Morrisons)	67
Approved by Executive 24th March 2015 (Civic Centre for the future)	50
Valuation for Biggin Hill and Westmoreland Rd	5
Strategic Property cost	258
Total further spending approvals	1,804
Uncommitted Balance on Investment Fund	27,594
In addition to the sum identified above, Members have approved a further provision of £15m to supplement the Investment Fund in 2016/17 (to be met from capital receipts)	
<u>Growth Fund:</u>	£'000
<u>Funding:</u>	
Transfer from Investment Fund (Executive 26/11/14)	10,000
<u>Schemes Approved, but not spent</u>	
Approved by Executive 24th March 2015 (Housing Zone Bid (Site G))	2,700
Renewal Team Cost	310
Total further spending approvals	3,010
Uncommitted Balance on Growth Fund	6,990

Section 106 Receipts

- 3.7 In addition to capital receipts from asset disposals, the Council is holding a number of Section 106 contributions received from developers. These are made to the Council as a result of the granting of planning permission and are restricted to being spent on capital works in accordance with the terms of agreements reached between the Council and the developers. These receipts are held in a reserve, the balance of which stood at £6,447k as at 31st March 2015, and will be used to finance capital expenditure from 2015/16 onwards. The current position on capital Section 106 receipts (excluding commitments) is shown below:

Specified capital works	Balance 31/03/15 £000	Receipts 2015/16 £000	Expenditure 2015/16 £000	Balance 30/06/15 £000
Housing	4,856	206	-	5,062
Education	1,591	-	-	1,591
Highways	0	295	-	295
TOTAL	6,447	501	-	6,948

The Council's budgets are limited and, where a developer contribution (S106) can be secured consistent with the national Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations, this will be required as a contribution towards projects, notwithstanding any other allocation of resources contained in the Council's spending plans.

Post-Completion Reports

- 3.8 Under approved Capital Programme procedures, capital schemes should be subject to a post-completion review within one year of completion. These reviews should compare actual expenditure against budget and evaluate the achievement of the scheme's non-financial objectives. Post-completion reports on the following schemes should be submitted to the relevant Portfolio Holders during 2015/16:

Bellegrave – reduce temporary accommodation

The Hill Car Park – strengthening works

Bromley Town Centre – increased parking capacity

Former Chartwell Business Centre – improvement works

Increasing Network Security

Civic Centre Cabling Renewal

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 Capital Programme monitoring and review is part of the planning and review process for all services.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 These are contained in the main body of the report and in the appendices. Attached as Appendix C is a capital financing statement, which gives a long-term indication of how the revised Programme would be financed if all the proposed changes were approved and if all the planned receipts were achieved. The financing projections continue to assume no General Fund support to the revenue budget in future years. They also assume approval of the revised capital programme recommended in this report, together with an estimated £2.5m pa for new capital schemes and service developments from 2017/18 onwards.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Legal and Personnel Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Departmental monitoring returns July 2015. Approved Capital Programme (Executive 11/02/15) Q3 Monitoring report (Executive 11/02/15). Capital Programme Outturn 2014/15 report (Executive 10/06/15). List of potential capital receipts from Valuation & Estates as at 12/06/15. Housing Zone Bid (Executive 24/03/15) Gosshill Road, Chislehurst - Private Street Works (Environmental PDS 23/09/14) Orpington Railway Station: Improved Access and Bus Stop Enhancement (Environmental PDS 04/11/14)

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - JUL 2015 - SUMMARY OF VARIATIONS FROM APPROVED PROGRAMME

Variations on individual schemes	Date of Portfolio meeting	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	TOTAL 2015/16 to 2018/19 £000	Comments/reason for variation
Current Approved Capital Programme								
Programme approved by Executive 11/02/15	Exec 11/02/15	52,460	64,215	46,737	4,612	4,610	120,174	
Glebe School Expansion	Exec 11/02/15		88				88	
Capital Maintenance Grant - FY15/16 allocation from DfE	Exec 24/03/15							
- Seed Challenge			200				200	
- Security Works			50				50	
- Suitability			250				250	
- Capital Maintenance in schools			952				952	
Property Investment Fund - additional acquisition	Exec 24/03/15		8,739				8,739	
Civic Centre for the Future	Exec 24/03/15		50				50	
Penge Town Centre / Crystal Palace Public Realm Scheme	Exec 24/03/15		300	446			746	
Orpington Town Centre - Walnut Centre & New Market infrastructure	Exec 24/03/15		285	240			525	
Crystal Palace park - Alternative Management Options	Exec 24/03/15		272	223			495	
Basic Need - FY17/18 allocation from DfE	Exec 20/05/15				8,838		8,838	
Relocation of Exhibitions - Bromley Museum	Exec 10/06/15		395				395	
Block provision c/fwd into 2015/16 - emergency works to surplus sites	Exec 10/06/15	-18	18				18	
Approved Programme prior to 1st Quarter's Monitoring		52,442	75,814	47,646	13,450	4,610	141,520	
Variations in the estimated cost of approved schemes								
(i) Variations requiring the approval of the Executive								
Bromley Mytime Fund			638				638	See paragraph 3.3.1
Gosshill Road – Private Street Works			289				289	See paragraph 3.3.2
Orpington Railway Station			130				130	See paragraph 3.3.3
Autism Grant			18				18	See paragraph 3.3.4
Churchill Theatre & Central Library Chiller			18				18	See paragraph 3.3.5
Formula Devolved Capital Grant			-17	-17	-17	-105	-156	See paragraph 3.3.6
Reduction in TfL funding for Highway schemes			-220				-220	See paragraph 3.3.7
Virement re. Window 7								See paragraph 3.3.8
From: Financial Systems Upgrade			-43				-43	
To: Rollout of Windows 7			43				43	
Housing Zone Bid (Site G)	Exec 24/03/15							See paragraph 3.3.9
- Funded from PIL			3,000				3,000	
- Funded from Growth Fund			2,700				2,700	
Section 106 receipts from developers			2,760	67			2,827	See paragraph 3.3.10
		0	9,316	50	-17	-105	9,244	
(ii) Variations not requiring approval								
Rephasing of schemes								
Rephasing from 2014/15 into 2015/16		-2,123	2,123				2,123	
Other miscellaneous items in 2014/15		154					0	
Net rephasing from 2015/16 into 2016/17			-9,049	9,049			0	See paragraph 3.3.11 and Appendix B
		-1,969	-6,926	9,049	0	0	2,123	
TOTAL AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL PROGRAMME		-1,969	2,390	9,099	-17	-105	11,367	
TOTAL REVISED CAPITAL PROGRAMME		50,473	78,204	56,745	13,433	4,505	152,887	
Less: Further slippage projection			-10,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	-4,000	
Add: Estimate for further new schemes					2,500	2,500	5,000	
TOTAL TO BE FINANCED		50,473	68,204	58,745	17,933	9,005	153,887	

NB. ROUNDED		50,470	68,200	58,750	17,930	9,010	153,890	
-------------	--	--------	--------	--------	--------	-------	---------	--

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - JUL 2015 - SUMMARY OF VARIATIONS FROM APPROVED PROGRAMME - SCHEME REPHASING

Variations on individual schemes	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	TOTAL £000	Comments/reason for variation
Rephasing of schemes						
Basic Need	-4,708	4,708				A full detailed report on the various projects within the Basic Need Programme was reported to Executive on 20/05/15. It is unlikely that all projects will be completed in 15/16, request to rephase £ 4,708k into 16/17.
Beacon House Refurbishment	-1,000	1,000				Tender is in development and we are waiting on the tender report back on an enabling works package. It is unlikely that the scheme will complete in 15/16 and request to rephase £1m into 16/17.
Gateway Review of Housing I.T System	-100	100				This scheme was approved by Executive on 14/01/15 and funding should be split across 15/16 and 16/17. Request to rephase £100k to 16/17 to reflect this.
Glebe School Expansion	-100	100				Contracts have recently been awarded. We estimate majority of the works to be completed in 15/16 and request to rephase £100k into 16/17 which will cover the final payment and consultancy cost.
PCT Learning Disability Reprovision Programme - Walpole Road	-850	850				Approximately £850k has been identified for alternative day service provision following the closure of the Bassetts Day Centre. LD Day activities are being reviewed and their future would be heavily influenced by the proposed award of a tender to an external provider. The tender process has taken longer than originally anticipated and it is now forecast that any resulting capital expenditure is unlikely to occur before 16/17. Request to rephase £850k into 16/17.
Schools Access Initiative	-100	100				Works at Charles Darwin and Valley schools which are due to start in the summer, Tubbenden and Unicorn schools are currently at the consultancy stage. Request to rephase £100k into 16/17.
Seed Challenge Fund	-200	200				For 15/16 Seed programme which will be subject to approval of Education PDS, works have not been allocated yet and we do not expect the works to be completed in 15/16. Request to rephase £200k into 16/17.
Social Care Grant	-1,940	1,940				This funding is made available to support reform of adult social care services. Several projects are in progress including works to Council owned learning disability properties, proposed investment in older people day opportunity services and the reconfiguration of extra care housing. We do not expect to spend all of the money in 15/16 and request to rephase £1,940k to 16/17.
Universal Free School Meals	-15	15				We anticipate £275k of works to be completed in 15/16. It is unlikely that the scheme will finish in 15/16 and request to rephase £15k into 16/17.
Winter Maintenance - Gritter replacement	-36	36				Following a condition review of the winter maintenance fleet and associated equipment at the end of the 14/15 winter season, replacements will need to be rephased into following years. Request to rephase £36k into 16/17.
TOTAL REPHASING ADJUSTMENTS	-9,049	9,049	0	0	0	

CAPITAL FINANCING STATEMENT Executive JUL 15 - ALL RECEIPTS

(NB. Assumes all capital receipts - see below)

	2014-15		2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
	Estimate	Actual	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate
	£000	£000	£000	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's
Summary Financing Statement											
Capital Grants	8,532	10,036	31,355	29,557	9,123	285	285	285	285	285	285
Other external contributions	8,280	7,780	13,755	7,956	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
Usable Capital Receipts	2,948	1,432	4,871	19,467	4,537	4,445	4,445	4,445	2,445	2,445	2,445
Revenue Contributions	30,700	31,225	18,219	1,770	270	270	270	270	270	270	270
General Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Borrowing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total expenditure	50,460	50,473	68,200	58,750	17,930	9,000	9,000	9,000	7,000	7,000	7,000
Usable Capital Receipts											
Balance brought forward	21,987	21,987	28,851	33,915	24,553	21,121	17,781	16,941	13,521	12,101	12,681
New usable receipts	9,430	8,296	9,935	10,105	1,105	1,105	3,605	1,025	1,025	3,025	1,025
	31,417	30,283	38,786	44,020	25,658	22,226	21,386	17,966	14,546	15,126	13,706
Capital Financing	-2,948	-1,432	-4,871	-19,467	-4,537	-4,445	-4,445	-4,445	-2,445	-2,445	-2,445
Balance carried forward	28,469	28,851	33,915	24,553	21,121	17,781	16,941	13,521	12,101	12,681	11,261
General Fund											
Balance brought forward	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Less: Capital Financing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Less: Use for Revenue Budget	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Balance carried forward	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
TOTAL AVAILABLE RESERVES	48,469	48,851	53,915	44,553	41,121	37,781	36,941	33,521	32,101	32,681	31,261
Assumptions:											
GF contribution to support capital programme not required in any year.											
New capital schemes - £2.5m p.a. from 2017/18 for future new schemes.											
Capital receipts - includes figures reported by Property Division as at 12/06/15 (pessimistic/realistic estimate, including Tweedy Road & Town Hall) and £1m pa from 2017/18.											
Current approved programme - as recommended to Executive 15/07/15											

Report No.
FSD 15037

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: EXECUTIVE

Date: Wednesday 15 July 2015

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Key

Title: COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT/REDUCTION SCHEME - 2016/17

Contact Officer: John Nightingale, Head of Revenues and Benefits
Tel: 020 8313 4858 E-mail: john.nightingale@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Director of Finance

Ward: All Wards

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 To provide information regarding the financial effect on the Authority of increasing the minimum contribution that working-age claimants are required to pay towards their Council Tax liability. This information was requested at the November 2014 meeting of the Executive.
 - 1.2 For a decision as to the Council Tax Support/Reduction scheme to be forwarded for public consultation.
-

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

- 2.1 **Members to consider whether they wish to propose a change to the percentage (%) of the liability on which working-age claimants entitlement would be calculated in 2016/17 and 2017/18. The proposed percentage(s) would then be forwarded for public consultation.**

Members to consider whether any other elements of the scheme should be amended, other than those resulting from a legislative change and/or the annual uprating.

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: New Policy:
 2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council:
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Not Applicable:
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable:
 3. Budget head/performance centre: 400002
 4. Total current budget for this head: £3.4m
 5. Source of funding: Government Grant
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 1 plus Liberata staff
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: Not Applicable
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement: Local Government Finance Act 2012
 2. Call-in: Applicable:
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): 18,000 households (approximately 10,500 working- age households are receiving Council Tax Support)
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? No
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: Not Applicable

3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 At the November 2014 meeting of the Executive, the recommendation in respect of the CTS scheme was agreed and forwarded for adoption at Full Council. At the time of agreeing the recommendation, officers were requested to prepare a report on the implications of increasing the percentage of Council Tax that claimants have to pay themselves from 2016/17.

Schemes operated by other London Borough's

The minimum liability for working-age claimants in 2015/16 varies as follows; however it should be noted that all these schemes vary in other ways, including specific exemptions and/or availability of a hardship fund.

- 10 London Authorities have no minimum liability (However, 2 have support capped at "band E", one of which has a minimum award of £5.00pw and another has a minimum liability of £3.65 pw)
- 1 London Authority has a minimum liability of 3%
- 1 London Authority has a minimum liability of 5%
- 3 London Authorities have a minimum liability of 8.5%
- 1 London Authority has a minimum liability of 10%
- 7 London Authorities have a minimum liability of 15%
- 1 London Authority has a minimum liability of 16%
- 1 London Authority (Bromley) has a minimum liability of 19%
- 1 London Authority has a minimum liability of 19.5%
- 1 London Authority has a minimum liability of 19.8%
- 4 London Authorities have a minimum liability of 20%
- 1 London Authority has a minimum liability of 25%
- 1 London Authority has a minimum liability of 30%

Financial Effect on the claimant of increasing the minimum Council Tax liability

Below is tabled the minimum contribution for working-age claimants payable on the basis of 19%,20%, 25% and 30% minimum liability. These amounts are based on the Council Tax rates for 2015/16 and will be reduced should a Single Person Discount (SPD) of 25% be applicable.

Band	19% Weekly Liability	20% Weekly Liability	25% Weekly Liability	30% Weekly Liability
A £883.43	£3.22	£3.39	£4.24	£5.08
B £1030.66	£3.76	£3.95	£4.94	£5.93
C £1177.90	£4.29	£4.52	£5.65	£6.78
D £1325.14	£4.83	£5.08	£6.35	£7.62
E £1619.62	£5.90	£6.21	£7.77	£9.32
F £1914.09	£6.97	£7.34	£9.18	£11.01
G £2208.57	£8.05	£8.47	£10.59	£12.71
H £2650.28	£9.66	£10.17	£12.71	£15.25

Financial Impact on the Authority by increasing the minimum Council Tax liability

The following information is based on the caseload at the time of drafting the report and the 2015/16 Council Tax liability. The estimates in respect of reduced collection rate and additional administration costs as compared to the current position have been provided by the Revenues contractor (Liberata).

Minimum Liability	20%	25%	30%
Reduction in Council Tax Support	£105,151	£629,023	£1,147,912
Less — Estimate not collected (12.2%) **	£12,828	£76,741	£140,045
Less — Additional Collection Costs (Liberata)	£17,460	£90,684	£156,465
Net reduction in expenditure – GLA share	£20,551	£122,938	£224,351
Net reduction in expenditure – LBB share	£54,312	£338,660	£627,051

** The 12.2% non-collection is based on current in-year recovery rate in respect of those receiving Council Tax Support. This figure is likely to increase as the household's "contribution" rises.

Consultation

Prior to the adoption of a new scheme, the Authority is obliged to undertake a public consultation exercise, seeking the views of both those in receipt of Council Tax Support as well as those meeting their full liability. The exercise to be undertaken will be more comprehensive than last year's exercise, where a poor response was received. It is planned to forward a consultation document to a sample of resident households, these will include those receiving Council Tax support as well as those meeting their liability from their own means.

Impact Assessment

Appendix 1 is the Impact Assessment based on an increase in the minimum contribution.

4. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

The Local Government Finance Act 2012 amended Section 13A of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 and imposed a statutory duty on the Council to make a Council Tax Reduction Scheme specifying the reductions which are to apply to amounts of Council Tax payable, in respect of dwellings situated in its area, by:

- Persons whom the authority considers to be in financial need; or
- Persons in classes consisting of persons whom the authority considers to be, in general, in financial need.

The Council is required to design and implement its own Council Tax Reduction Scheme by 31 January to take effect from 1 April of the same year. The first scheme introduced by Bromley took effect on 1st April 2013. By law each financial year the Council must consider whether to revise or replace its scheme and again decisions need to be made by 31 January for the year the scheme is to take effect.

When revising or replacing a scheme the Council must (in the following order):

- consult major precepting authorities;
- publish a draft scheme in such a manner as it sees fit; and
- consult other persons as it considers likely to have an interest in the scheme

The enabling provisions set out in the 2012 Act allow the authority to use its discretion to design schemes for support for those not of pension age but contain requirements that certain elements must be included in all schemes. These include:

- The classes of person who are entitled to a reduction;
- The reduction to which persons in each class are to be entitled; and different reductions may be set out for different classes;
- The procedure by which a person may apply for a reduction;
- The procedure by which a person can appeal against a decision of an authority which affects the amount of any entitlement or reduction;
- The procedure by which a person can apply for a discretionary reduction under section 13A(1)(c)(discretionary reductions)
- Such other matters as prescribed by Regulations

The public sector equality duty, as set out in section 149 of the 2010 Equality Act, requires the Council, when exercising its functions, to have “due regard” to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited under the Act, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between those who have a “protected characteristic” and those who do not share that protected

characteristic. The “protected characteristics” are: age, disability, race (including ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation, pregnancy and maternity, and gender reassignment. Marriage and civil partnership are also a protected characteristic for the purposes of the duty to eliminate discrimination

The Council must pay due regard to any obvious risk of such discrimination arising in respect of the decision before them. There is no prescribed manner in which the equality duty must be exercised, though producing an EIA is the most usual method. For this reason these matters are examined in the EIA appended to this report. Where it is apparent from the analysis of the information that the policy would have an adverse effect on equality, then adjustments should be made to seek to reduce that effect and this is known as “mitigation”.

The public sector equality duty is not to achieve the objectives or take the steps set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. The duty on the Council is to bring these important objectives relating to discrimination into consideration when carrying out its public functions. The phrase “due regard” means the regard that is appropriate in all the particular circumstances in which the Council is carrying out its functions. There must be a proper regard for the goals set out in section 149 of the 2010 Act. At the same time, when making their decision on what scheme to adopt for localised council tax support, councillors will also need to pay regard to other factors which it is proper and reasonable for them to consider. Budgetary pressures and economic and practical factors will also be relevant. The amount of weight to be placed on the same countervailing factors in the decision making process will be for councillors to decide when the final decision on the scheme is made.

In addition to the Public Sector Equality Duty, the Department for Communities and Local Government has provided the following guidance to local authorities in its May 2012 document entitled: “Localising Support for Council Tax: Vulnerable people – key local authority duties” which reminds local authorities of the need to take other duties into account when setting up a Council Tax Reduction Scheme: Child Poverty Duty under the Child Poverty Act 2010; Homelessness Act 2002; Armed Forces Covenant; Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970; Disabled Persons (Services, Consultation and Representation) Act 1986, and the Children Acts 1989 and 2004.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Policy, Legal and Personnel
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	

Impact Assessment for Council Tax Support

London Borough of Bromley

Part 1: Description of policy change and its relevance to equality

Category of trigger for Impact Assessment: A change to existing policy

Proposed change

Council Tax Benefit (CTB) was abolished on the 01 April 2013. The Local Government Act replaced CTB for working age claimants with a scheme to be designed by the local authority – Council Tax Support (CTS). Funding was no longer demand led, but based on an estimate of Borough caseloads, with an initial overall budget 10% lower than that of CTB. Residents meeting the state pension credit age being eligible for a separate national scheme to "leave them no worse off than they are now".

Reason for the service change

Bromley adopted a 2 year scheme in January 2013 for the financial years 2013/14 and 2014/15. The scheme was based on a minimum liability of 8.5% for 2013/14 and 19% for 2014/15. In December 2014 the Council agreed to retain the minimum liability at 19%.

CTS is a local scheme to assist those who are on a low income to meet their Council Tax liability. Individuals apply for CTS and if their income is below a certain level, which takes account of their circumstances, they are eligible for a reduction on their Council Tax bill.

The "generosity" of the scheme has a direct impact on the Authority's finances. Therefore, the cost of the scheme will influence service provision in other areas, reserves and/or the Council Tax level.

Given Bromley's projected budget gap, the Authority is of the opinion that the level of assistance provided by mean of CTS will need to be reduced. This Impact Assessment is based on a reduction in assistance provided to working-age claimants. In other words, working-age claimants will have their entitlement assessed on a lower level of their Council Tax liability.

Information about the proposed change

Following agreement as to the proposed scheme for inclusion in our consultation exercise, views will be sought from the Greater London Authority and a sample of Bromley households. These households will include those currently in receipt of CTS as well as those meeting their Council Tax liability from their own means.

Part 2 — Collection of Evidence — what do we know?

Description of data used

In order to assess the impact of this policy change, Bromley has used information from a variety of different sources including:

- Data collected from records from the Council Tax and Housing Benefit systems;
- Consultation responses – including equality monitoring data;
- Census 2011 first release data;
- Bromley's Budget Strategy & other financial information about the service

General Information - Bromley's population and evidenced inequality

The most up to date information about Bromley's population from the Census 2011 first release can be found here:

http://www.bromley.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/1557/census_2011_-_first_data_release_bromley_only

http://www.bromley.gov.uk/info/200088/statistics_and_census_information/322/census/10

Financial Information and Impact

The impact of this proposed scheme will affect all working-age claimants from the 1/4/16. With effect from the 1/4/16, the maximum amount of assistance available to working-age claimants under the CTS scheme will be reduced. Calculations have been supplied based on minimum liabilities of 25% and 30%.

Table 1 shows the assumed impact of a reduction in Council Tax Support for those of working age based on a current reduction of 19% (based on the current rates of Council Tax), 25 % and 30%

Table 1 - Financial Impact of Introduction of Local Scheme

	Liability	Maximum assistance Pensionable Age	Maximum assistance under current CTS (81%)	Minimum weekly amount to pay 19%	Maximum assistance under proposed CTS (75%)	Minimum weekly amount to pay (25%)	Maximum assistance under proposed CTS (70%)	Minimum weekly amount to pay (30%)
Band A - Full Charge	£883.43	£883.43	£715.58	£3.22	£662.57	£4.24	£618.40	£5.08
Band A - with 25% discount	£662.57	£662.57	£536.68	£2.41	£496.93	£3.18	£463.80	£3.81
Band B - Full Charge	£1,030.66	£1,030.66	£834.83	£3.76	£773.00	£4.94	£721.46	£5.98
Band B - with 25% discount	£773.00	£773.00	£626.13	£2.82	£579.75	£3.71	£541.10	£4.45
Band C - Full Charge	£1,177.90	£1,177.90	£954.10	£4.29	£883.43	£5.65	£824.53	£6.78
Band C - with 25% discount	£883.43	£883.43	£715.57	£3.22	£662.57	£4.24	£618.40	£5.08
Band D - Full Charge	£1,325.14	£1,325.14	£1,073.36	£4.83	£993.86	£6.35	£927.60	£7.62
Band D - with 25% discount	£993.86	£993.86	£805.02	£3.62	£745.39	£4.77	£695.70	£5.72
Band E - Full Charge	£1,619.62	£1,619.62	£1,311.89	£5.90	£1,214.72	£7.77	£1133.73	£9.32
Band E - with 25% discount	£1,214.72	£1,214.72	£983.92	£4.43	£911.04	£5.82	£850.30	£6.99

Band F - Full Charge	£1,914.09	£1,914.09	£1,550.41	£6.97	£1,435.57	£9.18	£1339.86	£11.01
Band F - with 25% discount	£1,435.57	£1,435.57	£1,162.81	£5.23	£1,076.68	£6.88	£1004.90	£8.26
Band G - Full Charge	£2,208.57	£2,208.57	£1,788.94	£8.05	£1,656.43	£10.59	£1546.00	£12.71
Band G - with 25% discount	£1,656.43	£1,656.43	£1,341.71	£6.04	£1,242.32	£7.94	£1159.50	£9.53
Band H - Full Charge	£2,650.28	£2,650.28	£2,146.73	£9.66	£1,987.71	£12.71	£1855.20	£15.25
Band H - with 25% discount	£1,987.71	£1,987.71	£1,610.05	£7.24	£1,490.78	£9.53	£1391.40	£11.44

Breakdown of current claimants

In order to understand how the proposed changes will impact on different protected groups Bromley has examined data, where available, based on the current benefit caseload. Data is available on the following: age, gender and disability which are noted in Table 2. There is very limited data available on the ethnic breakdown of current claimants as only 2896 claimants have completed the appropriate section on the benefit application form and of that 1343 declined to disclose the information.

Table 2 - Breakdown of Current claimants Council Tax Support

Type	Total	Female	Male	Disabled	Disabled female	Disabled male	DLA/PIP Income
Working age - Passported (equalisation definition)							
Single no child dependant	3415	1658	1757	1435	704	731	1254
Single with child dependant	2719	2612	107	289	270	19	474
Couple no child dependant	303	133	170	125	52	73	155
Couple with child dependant	526	273	253	130	47	83	218
Working age - Non Passported							
Single no child dependant	1007	552	455	241	117	124	214
Single with child dependant	1628	1564	64	45	44	1	114
Couple no child dependant	112	33	79	34	8	26	40
Couple with child dependant	796	380	416	39	20	19	112
Total Working age	10506	7205	3301	2338	1262	1076	2581
Pensioner- Passported	4840	3161	1679	1299	924	375	779
Pensioner- Non Passported	2427	1370	1057	564	309	255	262
Total Pensioner	7267	4531	2736	1863	1233	630	1041
Overall Total	17773	11736	6037	4201	2495	1706	3622

The table below provides some additional evidence by protected characteristic that has been used to complete this EIA.

Protected Characteristic	Evidence																																																							
Age	<p>Please see table 2 for detailed breakdown</p> <p>10506 (59.11%) of current claimants are under Pension Credit age and will be affected by the proposed change in policy. <i>Data based on May 2015 caseload. Caseload numbers may fluctuate on a daily basis.</i></p> <p>The data demonstrates that 4347 (41.4%) of current working-age claimants are single parent families with child dependents</p>																																																							
Disability	<p style="text-align: center;">Bromley's population</p> <p>The following table shows the number and percentage of working-age residents in receipt of benefits, including those related to sickness and Disability (latest identified data).</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">Bromley (numbers)</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Bromley (%)</th> <th style="text-align: center;">London (%)</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Great Britain (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Total claimants</td> <td style="text-align: center;">22,400</td> <td style="text-align: center;">11.2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">14.6</td> <td style="text-align: center;">15.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="5" style="text-align: center;">By statistical group</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Job seekers</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6,250</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4.3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ESA and incapacity benefits</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8,500</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4.3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5.9</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lone parents</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3,100</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.6</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.9</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Carers</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1,770</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.9</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Others on income related benefits</td> <td style="text-align: center;">600</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disabled</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1,800</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.9</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.8</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bereaved</td> <td style="text-align: center;">370</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Key out-of-work benefits'</td> <td style="text-align: center;">18,460</td> <td style="text-align: center;">9.3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">12.6</td> <td style="text-align: center;">12.5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Source: DWP benefit claimants - working age client group</p> <p>Key out-of-work benefits include the groups: job seekers, ESA and incapacity benefits parents and others on income related benefits. See the Definitions and Explanations for details Note: % is a proportion of resident population of area aged 16-64</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Breakdown of current claimants</p> <p>Please see table 2 for detailed breakdown of information on our current claimants</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2338 (22.5%) of current claimants below pension credit age have declared a disability • 2581(24.57%) are receiving DLA/PIP 		Bromley (numbers)	Bromley (%)	London (%)	Great Britain (%)	Total claimants	22,400	11.2	14.6	15.0	By statistical group					Job seekers	6,250	3.1	4.3	4.1	ESA and incapacity benefits	8,500	4.3	5.9	6.5	Lone parents	3,100	1.6	1.9	1.5	Carers	1,770	0.9	1.0	1.2	Others on income related benefits	600	0.3	0.4	0.4	Disabled	1,800	0.9	0.8	1.1	Bereaved	370	0.2	0.2	0.2	Key out-of-work benefits'	18,460	9.3	12.6	12.5
	Bromley (numbers)	Bromley (%)	London (%)	Great Britain (%)																																																				
Total claimants	22,400	11.2	14.6	15.0																																																				
By statistical group																																																								
Job seekers	6,250	3.1	4.3	4.1																																																				
ESA and incapacity benefits	8,500	4.3	5.9	6.5																																																				
Lone parents	3,100	1.6	1.9	1.5																																																				
Carers	1,770	0.9	1.0	1.2																																																				
Others on income related benefits	600	0.3	0.4	0.4																																																				
Disabled	1,800	0.9	0.8	1.1																																																				
Bereaved	370	0.2	0.2	0.2																																																				
Key out-of-work benefits'	18,460	9.3	12.6	12.5																																																				
Sex	<p style="text-align: center;">Bromley population</p> <p>According to Census 2011 Bromley's population is 52% female and 48% male</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Breakdown of current claimants</p> <p>Please see table 2 for detailed breakdown of information on our current claimants</p> <p style="text-align: center;">68.58% of current claimants under pensionable age are female</p> <p>Indicates that women are over represented amongst our CTS claimants</p>																																																							
Gender reassignment	<p>The Council does not anticipate this policy will have a particular equality impact on this protected group.</p>																																																							

Pregnancy & Maternity	No specific evidence. We do not anticipate this policy will have a particular equality impact on this protected group.
Race	<p style="text-align: center;">Bromley population - Current claimants</p> <p>As advised earlier, there is very limited data available on the ethnic breakdown of the current claimants as only a few complete the non-mandatory section of the form.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Borough wide information</p> <p>With only around 9% of its population "non-white", Bromley also has a far less ethnically diverse population than most other London boroughs, although a distinctive group within the borough is a settled traveller community in Crays Hill in the east of the borough. With an estimated 2,000 members, this is the largest such community in Britain and one of the largest in Europe. The BME population is expected to grow to 16% by 2036.</p>
Religion & Belief	No specific evidence. We do not anticipate this policy will have a particular equality impact on this protected group.
Civil Partnerships & Marriage	No specific evidence. We do not anticipate this policy will have a particular equality impact on this protected group.
Sexual Orientation	No specific evidence. We do not anticipate this policy will have a particular equality impact on this protected group.

Part 3 - Analyse of evidence and description of the impact

Characteristic	Actual or likely impacts (negative/positive/no impact) and justification	Actions to be taken to mitigate potential negative impacts <small>(include name of lead and estimated date of completion)</small>
Age	<p>Neutral impact for pension age claimants as the Government has stipulated this group must have their claims assessed as they are now.</p> <p>Given the large number of CTS claimants that are single parent families with dependent children the change in policy may have a negative impact on levels of child poverty. There is insufficient evidence to be certain what this impact will be.</p> <p>Justification The current scheme is being revised</p>	<p>It is proposed a hardship fund be retained for those faced with exceptional circumstances. It is further planned to retain all aspects of the current CTS scheme that provides assistance by way of disregards of income and increased allowances.</p> <p>The Council will monitor the impact on this Client group through monitoring of communications, complaints, appeals, request for discretionary awards</p>

	<p>in response to the need to significantly reduce the Authority's expenditure. Legislation dictates that the level of assistance for those of pensionable age is no lower than would have been received under the CTB scheme</p> <p>Like other councils throughout the country, Bromley's financial position remains challenging. Reduced Government funding has put significant pressure on the Authority's finances. As such it is not considered financially sustainable to maintain the current model of support provided to those claiming help with their Council Tax.</p>	<p>Responsible Officer(s) Welfare Reform Manager & Head of Revenues & Benefits — Monitoring to commence immediately</p>
Disability	<p>The increased level of 'contribution' will have a negative impact on current and future disabled CTS claimants as working age claimants will have to pay more towards their council tax bill.</p> <p><i>Justification – please see above</i></p>	<p>The proposed Council Tax Support scheme allows for the complete disregard of certain income types such as Disability Living Allowance/PIP and the award of Disability premiums in the benefit calculation. These will be retained to mitigate the impact on those who are disabled. The planned continuation of the hardship scheme for those faced with exceptional circumstances will further alleviate any impact on the disabled.</p> <p>Responsible Officer(s) Welfare Reform Manager & Head of Revenues & Benefits — Monitoring to commence immediately</p>

Sex	<p>Females are disproportionately represented amongst current CTS claimants.</p> <p>The policy change will have a negative impact on current and future working age CTS claimants (regardless of gender) as claimants will have to contribute more towards their council tax bill than they have had previously.</p> <p>Although the policy change is applied universally (i.e. men and women will both face the same reduction in CTS) our evidence makes clear that a greater proportion of current CTS claimants are women and therefore as a protected group women will feel the impact of this policy change in greater numbers.</p> <p><i>Justification — please see earlier response</i></p>	<p>Monitoring of the impact on women who claim Council Tax Support will continue. In order to mitigate impact it is proposed that the scheme retains the income disregards and allowances that are predominately received by females for example allowances in respect of child care costs. The planned continuation of the hardship scheme will provide a further safeguard for those faced with exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>Responsible Officer(s) Head of Revenues & Benefits — Monitoring to commence immediately</p>
Gender reassignment	No specific impact identified other than all claimants will have to contribute more towards their council tax bill	
Pregnancy & Maternity	No specific impact identified other than all claimants will have to contribute more towards their council tax bill	
Race	<p>The policy change will have a negative impact on current and future CTS claimants (regardless of race) as some claimants will have to contribute more towards their council tax bill than they have had previously.</p> <p>There is very limited evidence available to quantify if there will be a differential impact on the different ethnicities.</p>	<p>In order to mitigate any adverse impact it is proposed that a hardship fund is retained for those faced with exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>Responsible Officer(s) Head of Revenues & Benefits — Monitoring to commence immediately</p>

	There is evidence to indicate that BME communities are more likely to be unemployed and, therefore, possibly more reliant on CTS. However, there is insufficient evidence on current claimants to demonstrate this is in fact the case in Bromley.	
Religion & Belief	No specific impact identified other than all claimants will have to contribute more towards their council tax bill	
Civil Partnerships & Marriage ²	No specific impact identified other than all claimants will have to contribute more towards their council tax bill	
Sexual Orientation	No specific impact identified other than all claimants will have to contribute more towards their council tax bill	

Part 5 — Completion and authorisation

Officer completing assessment	John Nightingale, Head of Revenues and Benefits
EIA completed	
Officer responsible for monitoring impact	John Nightingale
Date EIA is scheduled to be reviewed	March 2017

Report No.
ED15099

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: EXECUTIVE

Date: For Pre-Decision Scrutiny by the Education Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee on Wednesday 8 July 2015

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

Title: REORGANISATION OF BROMLEY ADULT EDUCATION COLLEGE

Contact Officer: Jane Bailey, Assistant Director: Education
Tel: 020 8313 4146 E-mail: jane.bailey@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Chief Executive

Ward: (All Wards);

1. Reason for report

1.1 This report outlines a proposal for the reorganisation of the Council's Adult Education service

2. RECOMMENDATION(S)

2.1 That Education PDS Members note and comment on the content of this report

2.2 That the Council's Executive endorse the proposal that the Assistant Director: Education commences consultation with staff and their representatives, stakeholders and service users to restructure and reduce the adult education service as outlined in this report. This option will reduce the budget overspend and retain a level of service from Bromley residents that is focussed on the areas of greatest need.

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy:
 2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council Supporting Independence
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Not Applicable:
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable:
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Adult Education College
 4. Total current budget for this head: £Cr 601k (controllable)
 5. Source of funding: External / Revenue Budget
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 45 staff on permanent contracts, 294 casual/sessional workers, 69.6 FTE
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: N/A
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Non-Statutory - Government Guidance:
 2. Call-in: Not Applicable:
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): 6,500
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Yes No Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments:

3. INTRODUCTION

3.1 This report outlines a proposal for a reorganisation of the Council's Adult Education service. The proposed reorganisation will put in a structure that could enable the service to return to a balanced budget position.

3.2 The structure of the report is as follows:

- Paragraph 4 provides an outline of the context for the proposal.
- Paragraphs 5 and 6 outline the proposal along with the proposed timeline for implementation
- Paragraphs 7 and 8 provide an overview of the key benefits and main impacts as identified at this preliminary stage

4. BACKGROUND

4.1 At the end of the 2014/15 financial year the Adult Education service had a budget overspend of £246k. A further overspend of £382k is forecast for the 2015/16 financial year. A report outlining a proposal for an organisational restructure aimed at reducing operating costs was prepared for the Education PDS in January 2015; however the report was withdrawn.

4.2 The service covers all of its direct costs and, as a result of historic budget decisions to maximise the use of the grant and fee income, has a controllable budget of £601k credit which contributes towards corporate and departmental recharges allocated to the service.

4.3 In March 2015 the service received an indicative allocation from the Skills Funding Agency (SFA) of the Adult Skills (AS) grant. This shows a predicted reduction in the AS grant of £249k or 21% when compared to the current year's allocation. Further reductions in this grant are anticipated for the foreseeable future, with English, maths and training for unemployed adults and those with learning disabilities likely to remain as the key priorities for the adult education service.

4.4 The 2015/16 grant for Community Learning (CL) provision has remained the same at £796k. The long term future of this grant is unknown at this stage.

4.5 Following agreement by the Council's Executive to market test Education Services, Adult Education formed part of the tender, but as a separate Lot. Although two submissions were received for the Adult Education Lot, both providers were deemed not to have met the minimum Pre-Qualifying requirements. As no eligible tenders were received, the tendering process for Adult Education formally came to an end and Members were advised of this in March 2015.

4.6 The Adult Education service underwent an Ofsted inspection in early March 2015. During the inspection the current uncertainty around the future strategic direction for adult education was heavily criticised. This, along with the lack of an agreed plan to address the overspend contributed significantly to the final overall grade of Requires Improvement being applied to the service.

4.7 Ofsted were also critical of the volume of the community learning allocation used to support traditional non-accredited adult learning. *"Leaders focus too much on the community learning and leisure courses, and too little on how the services can better meet the local needs of disadvantaged members of the community"*

4.8 The purpose of the CL grant was set out in the government document *"New Challenges New Chances"* (2011). It is focussed around three principles; that the funding should be targeted at

people who are disadvantaged and least likely to participate in education and training; that a localised devolved approach, working in partnerships is used; that value for money is maximised, through collecting fee income where people can afford to pay and contributions in kind are used where fee income would exclude an ability to participate. This approach has been required of all providers with effect from September 2014. It was the view of Ofsted that within Bromley an insufficient percentage of the grant is being targeted at disadvantaged and disengaged adults rather than those who can afford to pay student fees.

4.9 Whilst the current operational overspend is recognised as a key driver for an organisational restructure of the service, the continuing annual reduction in the AS grant, the uncertainty of the long term future of the CL grant and the recommendations from Ofsted should be considered when developing any future strategy for the delivery of adult education in Bromley.

5. PROPOSAL

5.1 Officers recommend that the purpose and mission of the adult education service is reviewed and revised to ensure that resources are predominantly focussed on adults and communities of the greatest identified need.

5.2 Under the current operational model, approximately 56% of the CL grant is used to subsidise mainstream (traditional) adult education classes. Learners enrolling on this provision pay course fees based on the assumption that 50% of the costs of delivering the course are subsidised by the CL grant.

5.3 The remainder of the grant is used to support adult learning with disadvantaged groups in community settings, usually in partnership with local schools, community groups and third sector agencies (see table 1). By increasing the percentage of the grant used to target adult learning in community settings the local authority would be able to increase the volume of work focussed on meeting the needs of its disadvantaged residents.

5.4 Table 1 below provides an example of how the new Community Learning Fund might be apportioned under the new operational model compared to current operational practice.

5.6 Table 1 – Use of CL funding

Type of provision	Partners	Current model	Example, new model
Family English maths & language	School Standards, primary schools, Children and family centres (CFC's)	£150,000	£200,000
Wider family learning	Bromley Children Project, CFC's, primary schools, community groups.	£100,000	£100,000
Older learners	Adult social care, Age UK, care homes	£10,000	£75,000
Learning Partnerships	Mottingham and Cotmandene Centres	£20,000	£50,000
Other partnerships	Local agencies and community groups	£10,000	£75,000
Sub-contracting	Local agencies and community groups	£60,000	£120,000
Mainstream traditional adult learning	Direct delivery by adult education service	£446,555	£176,555
	TOTAL	£796,555	£796,555

5.7 Through targeted delivery of the CL fund to engage with long term unemployed adults, the service would provide a clear progression pathway through to low level accredited and/or English and maths courses funded through the AS grant. This could support adults back into

employment or higher level training with another local provider, thus helping to reduce the size of the welfare bill and contribute towards preparing disengaged local citizens to become economically independent. During inspection, Ofsted judged the employability provision that the Adult Education College delivers to be of a high quality and it was their view that this area of provision should be expanded.

5.8 Table 2 provides a strategic overview of the type of provision under the proposed new delivery model

5.9 Table 2 – Provision Overview

<u>Community Learning Fund</u> Predominantly delivered in community settings, with small volumes in BAEC sites.	<u>Adult Skills Fund</u> Predominantly delivered in BAEC venues with small pockets in community settings where volume is sufficient for economic viability
Would be used to deliver:	Provision would be focused on:
Family English, maths and language – delivered in partnership with schools, Children and Family Centres (CFC’s) and LBB school improvement team	English and Maths (government priority), this includes Entry, level 1, level 2 (incl GCSE)
Wider Family Learning – delivered in partnership with CFC’s, schools and other partners who support disadvantaged families	Employability courses – accredited courses in partnership with JCP that will support adults into employment, Entry up to levels 1 and 2
PCDL (personal and community developmental learning). Non-accredited learning. Majority delivered in partnership with a wide range of community partners, some via subcontracting delivery, others delivered by BAEC at venues provided by partners at no cost to BAEC. Small volumes of traditional adult learning remaining at BAEC’s own centres.	Preparation for Life and Work (accredited provision for adults with learning disabilities and difficulties)
NLDC (neighbourhood renewal in deprived communities) used to support local VCS to deliver learning opportunities to disadvantaged neighbourhoods, with a focus on pre-employment support or progression into other learning that could lead into sustained employment.	English for speakers of other languages Option to consider NEETS / Traineeships once Ofsted inspection grade has improved to overall effectiveness grade 2 (Good)

5.10 Under the model described in Table 2 above, the volume of traditional non-accredited learning provision (leisure type courses) and the numbers of adults participating would be significantly reduced. Learning in disadvantaged communities could be fully funded at the point of delivery, i.e. free to the student. The identification of local priorities and subsequent distribution of the Bromley CL fund could be determined by a Community Engagement Partnership Board. This approach would ensure the localised approach required and help to devolve some of the decision making processes into the communities being targeted.

5.11 Increasing the volume of community partnership work and reducing the amount of traditional adult learning provision would reduce the service’s need for accommodation and thus

infrastructure costs. This will allow the authority to rationalise the current accommodation resources, potentially releasing a site for school expansion and reducing infrastructure costs for the adult education service.

- 5.12 The Widmore site was originally built in 1905 as a secondary school and subsequently expanded at various stages throughout its continued existence as a school. If the adult education service were to vacate this site, it would then release a large site for potential development as a school once again.
- 5.13 As the largest of the three dedicated centres, Widmore is costly to maintain both in terms of running costs and maintenance expenditure. However, in the 2014/15 academic year to date, 55% of the enrolments for the service have been at the Widmore site. This is also the centre that accommodates many of the specialist workshop facilities and associated courses which were praised in the recent Ofsted inspection report. For reasons of economy or available space, relocating many of these to Kentwood or Poverest is unlikely to be a viable option.
- 5.14 Although the Kentwood and Poverest Centres are much smaller than the Widmore site, neither currently operates at full capacity. Poverest only opens during the daytime and Kentwood is closed on a Monday and Friday afternoon and evening. Neither site opens at the weekend. However, both sites are located near to areas of identified disadvantage in the borough, with Kentwood serving the Penge and Anerley wards on the north side of Bromley and Poverest being located near to the Cray's and the Ramsden Estate in Orpington.
- 5.15 Reducing the volume of CL funding used to support the traditional adult education classes would reduce the volume of CL courses by approx 60%. Based on 2013/14 volumes this would mean a reduction down from 440 to approximately 175. It is currently assumed that this would reduce the income to the service from students' fees by a similar amount. Based on 2013/14 fee income for CL courses this would be a reduction from £684k to around £271k

6. TIMELINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

6.1 The proposed target completion date would be the end of July 2016, with full implementation from the start of the 2016/17 academic year. The milestones in this process would be as follows:.

6.2

August – September 2015	Develop detailed, fully costed plans for proposed new structure, job descriptions and consultation documentation
Early October 2015	Meet with staff directly affected by proposals
October – November 2015	Consultation – staff, staff representatives, stakeholders and public. Impact assessments completed
December 2015	Consider responses to proposals and develop revisions and responses as appropriate
January 2016	Reports to elected members
February/March 2016	Planning starts for site closure and relocation Planning starts for the revised curriculum
April 2016	Interviews to new posts
1 August 2016	New staffing structure in place. Start of the SFA 2016/17 funding year
1 September 2016	New 2016/17 Academic year starts

7. KEY BENEFITS

- 7.1 This model retains an adult education service, ensuring that the local authority continues to fulfil the requirements of the funding grants, meets the expectations of Ofsted and satisfies its duty under the Learning and Skills Act (2000).
- 7.2 It provides the local authority with an opportunity to move the service closer towards a commission led model in both delivery and backroom office functions.
- 7.3 It provides an adult education service that will be in a strong position to work alongside other council services, such as public health, social and children's services, to tackle the impact of social deprivation and support early intervention processes.
- 7.4 The model has the potential to lead to a leaner service that could deliver within budget and provide best value.
- 7.5 This proposal would allow the release of the Widmore site for alternative use whilst retaining the sites in Penge and Orpington.

8. IMPACTS OF IMPLEMENTATION

- 8.1 There would be a significant organisational restructure and significant numbers of staff at risk of redundancy. The restructure may also include some outsourcing of elements of the service.
- 8.2 The majority of the current management and administration staff are accommodated at the Widmore Centre. Although the number of support posts would be reduced, there would be limited accommodation for support staff at the Poverest and Kentwood sites and alternative accommodation may be required.
- 8.3 Loss of the Widmore site would reduce income generated from room rental, some of which are Council activities and events. There would also be a knock-on impact on other LBB services e.g. Corporate ICT training, EDC delivery, Appropriate Body role for NQT's, Child car seat service, LBB training and development accommodation. There would also be a reduction in nursery places as a result of the Widmore nursery closure and consideration would need to be given to the future use of the former Children and Family Centre, which currently forms part of the Widmore nursery accommodation. The nursery at the Kentwood Centre may also need to be closed to free up accommodation for adult education classes relocated from the Widmore site.
- 8.4 There would be site closure costs (Widmore) and expenditure associated with the relocation/re-installation of some equipment and resources to the two remaining sites.
- 8.5 As a result of any service reduction, managers in other departments that support the service such as HR, Finance, Legal (Support Services) would look to make appropriate reductions in their own services where possible. However, immediate savings are unlikely to be achieved at significant levels until the effect of any other potential changes across council services are also considered.
- 8.6 Any other predicted impact including alternative delivery options identified or raised during the stakeholder/staff consultation process will also be reported to Members for full consideration.

9 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 The work of the Adult Education service contributes to the Building a Better Bromley vision of remaining a place where people choose to live and do business, maximising the opportunities that all residents have to lead fulfilling and independent lives.

10 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 Until more detailed work is done on the operational structure required it is not possible to provide reliable figures at this point as to what extent the redesign of the service proposed might help to reduce the current overspend projected for the service.
- 10.2 Rough outline figures produced by the service suggest the shortfall could be reduced to around £63k (a £538k surplus instead of the budgeted £601k surplus).
- 10.3 The shortfall may in part be mitigated by reductions in corporate support services as mentioned in 8.5 above. However, this will only be in the medium term, and the recharges will not disappear altogether as there are statutory functions and fixed (outsourced) costs embedded in them that will remain chargeable even if the service contracts.
- 10.4 The table below shows a summary of the current budget position for the Adult Education service as at the end of May 2015, and includes estimate figures for the effect of the proposal in this document.

10.5 Table 3 Budget Position

	Latest Approved Budget £'000	Projected Outturn £'000	Projected Variation £'000	Proposal £'000	Effect of Proposal £'000
Employees	2,255	2,136	-119	951	-1,304
Premises	282	282	0	131	-151
Transport	3	3	0	3	0
Supplies and Services	485	469	-16	365	-120
Savings to be identified	-517	0	517	0	517
Transfer Payments	0	0	0	0	0
Income	-3,112	-3,112	0	-1,988	1,124
Controllable Recharges	3	3	0	0	-3
Total Controllable	-601	-219	382	-538	63
Supplies and Services - Insurance	20	20	0		
Premises - Repairs and Maintenance	26	26	0		
Capital Charges/Financing	552	552	0		
Total Non-Controllable	598	598	0		
Excluded Recharges	697	697	0		
Total Net Budget	694	1,076	382		

11 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 The Council has a duty under the Learning and Skills Act (2000) to provide “reasonable facilities” for persons of age 19 and over. In performing this duty of “reasonable facilities” the Council must “take account of facilities whose provision the Council thinks might reasonably be secured by other persons” and “make best use of Council’s resources and in particular avoid provision which might give rise to disproportional expenditure”.

- 11.2 In addition, under section 15ZA Education Act 1996; the Council must ensure there is sufficient education and training for persons aged between 19-25 who are subject to learning disabilities.
- 11.3 The local authority will need to undertake the necessary equality impact assessment in order to assess the impact of the proposal on groups with protected characteristics. The necessary consultation will also be undertaken .

12 PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

- 12.1 The proposed change to the adult education service will give rise to significant HR issues, including possible redundancy, TUPE etc. Any changes will need to be carefully planned for and managed in accordance with the Council’s policies and procedures and with due regard for the existing framework of employment law. Some staff at the college are on different contracts of employment including non-standard contracts e.g. sessional workers. As stated in paragraph 6.2 above, staff and trade union perspectives will be canvassed and considered, and fed into the final report for Elected Member consideration.

Non-Applicable Sections:	None.
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	[Title of document and date]

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
CS15904

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: Executive

For Pre-Decision Scrutiny by Care Services PDS Committee on:

Date: 23rd June 2015

Decision Type: Non urgent Executive Non Key

Title: **SOCIAL CARE INNOVATION GRANT - DRAWDOWN OF FUNDING**

Contact Officer: Hilary Rogers, Joint Commissioner for Disabled Children Services
Contact: hilary.rogers@bromley.gov.uk 020 8464 3333 x 3059

Mark Smith, Group Manager, Disabled Children's Team
Contact: mark.smith@bromley.gov.uk 020 8461 7915

Chief Officer: Kay Weiss, Director Children's Social Care

Ward: Borough wide

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 This report requests the release of funds which are confirmed by the Department of Education to be transferred into Bromley Council's central contingency in the sum of £100,000 in June 2015.
- 1.2 This funding has been awarded to Bromley Council as a result of a successful bid to the Department of Education's SEND Innovation Fund which is intended to test new models of service efficiencies within Children's Social Care.
- 1.3 The funding is ring fenced for the specific purpose of Social Care innovation as detailed in the bid documentation.

2. RECOMMENDATION(S)

- 2.1 The Care Services Policy and Development Scrutiny Committee is asked to consider and comment upon the recommended decision to approve the release of the ring fenced £100,000 from the central contingency into the Social Care budget for 2015/16.
- 2.2 The Executive is asked to consider the content of this report and approve the release of £100,000 from the central contingency into the Social Care budget for 2015/16.

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status Existing Policy : Draft Care Services Plan for 2015/16
 2. BBB Priority Children and Young People: Enjoy learning and achieve their full potential; ensuring the health and wellbeing of children and young people, and their families., promoting independence
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal:: £100,000
 2. Ongoing costs: Not applicable. One off payment until 31 March 2016
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Childrens Disability Service, Children's Social Care (814001, 834105 & 834110)
 4. Total current budget for this head: £580,000, £508,740, £1,289,900 **Total: £2,378,640**
 5. Source of funding: External funding: Department of Education, Social Care Innovation Fund
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): Two part time temporary positions for up to 32 weeks
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: Approximately 500 hours over project period
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Non statutory
 2. Call-in: Applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): Approximately 200 disabled children and young people and their parents/carers
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? no
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: n/a

3. COMMENTARY

Background

- 3.1 The 2014 JSNA identified that the borough is experiencing significant increases in both the number of children and young people with Special Educational Needs (SEN) and disabilities and experiencing an increase in the complexity of need of this group, who then in turn require an increasing level of support from specialist services.
- 3.2 There are clear indications that the level of needs of the children and young people will continue to increase over the next 10 years.
- 3.3 Historically, Bromley has funded a proportionally high number of children with Special Educational Needs (SEN) placed in out of borough residential schools and colleges. However, in recent years the local authority has developed a strategy to increase 'in borough' specialist SEN provision which has resulted in continuing high levels of demand for short breaks from this group.
- 3.4 There are currently 360 children open to the Bromley's Disabled Children's Team in Social Care. The majority of these children are receiving a short break and all of these children have had at least an initial assessment of needs, with some having a more detailed core assessment of need.
- 3.5 Typically an Initial Assessment requires 15 hours of social care staff time. A more detailed assessment requires an average of 30 hours of social care time.
- 3.6 There are presently only three children open to Bromley's Disabled Children's Team in Social Care who are subject to a Child Protection plan. Although rigorous child protection and effective casework is in place, research suggests that, proportionately, there should be more children who have a severe/profound disability subject to a Child Protection plan, given that disabled children are more than 3 times more likely to be abused than their non-disabled peers.
- 3.7 Increasing the frequency of Children in Need visits and meetings for children for whom there are concerns will aid in identifying abuse.
- 3.8 With the introduction of the Children and Families Act 2014, and the new SEND Reform Programme including Education, Health and Care (EHC) Plans and the Local Offer, there may be an increased demand for short breaks.

PROPOSAL

- 3.9 There is therefore now a need to re-consider what constitutes an appropriate level of assessment and monitoring and whether this should be undertaken in proportion to need, whilst ensuring timely decision making and ensuring that social care resources can be targeted towards the most complex cases.
- 3.10 Resources need to be focused to ensure the use of qualified Social Workers to support those children and families in most need; to prevent family breakdown and children coming into care, to support looked after children and to ensure that disabled children are safeguarded from harm
- 3.11 The above description of demand and pressures upon children's social care resources is recognised nationally. Local budgets are under tight constraint with services needing to find efficiencies whilst responding to these demands and pressures.

- 3.12 In order to address this, in February 2015 the Department of Education (DfE) sought bids from local authorities to develop and test new ways of working which will target the right level of resource in a way which is proportionate with need and which will be sustainable into the future without the need for additional funding resource.
- 3.13 The Group Manager, Disabled Children's Team and other colleagues have worked closely with the Council for Disabled Children (CDC) to formulate a funding bid which was confirmed as successful in March 2015. The total bid was for £100,000.
- 3.14 The desired outcomes for this funding are:-
- An exploration and trial of new methods and timescales for assessment of social care provision, typically short break provision
 - A methodology to link into the new Education, Health and Care reforms which seek to determine appropriate access to education, health and care services through one assessment process
 - Social workers and social work assistants will work in more focussed way, with less time spent on assessments and more on interventions
 - More children will utilise the local offer/ targeted and universal services instead of reliance on specialist, local authority funded services. i.e. needs will be being identified which can be met without referral for local authority provision.
 - Earlier identification of need will lead to earlier 'signposting' to universal provision where appropriate
 - Well-functioning families will receive a low level of assessment
 - Parents/carers will receive a timely response to requests for service intervention and will feel less pressurised by experiencing a level of social care intervention which is commensurate with their needs and will 'tell their story' less often.
- 3.15 The funding bid was co-produced with representatives from Bromley Parent Voice
- 3.16 One of the pre-requisites of the project is for the local authority to work with parents/carers and disabled children and young people, which will ensure that their views and needs are reflected in any proposed service changes. This will require the spot commissioning of Bromley Parent Voice and Advocacy for All to for these purposes as these organisations are already well established in Bromley to respond in a timely way to facilitate this co-production.
- 3.17 The project will require that a co-ordinator be engaged on a consultancy basis for the duration of the project, together with a temporary business support and data management function.
- 3.18 Bromley's voluntary sector has also been invited to work on the project which will extend the reach for representation from a diverse group.
- 3.19 Opportunities will be investigated to work with professionals across Education and Health which will further enhance the integration of these services for disabled children and young people.

3.19 Outcomes from this work will be shared at national level which will showcase the London Borough of Bromley as a champion of efficiency transformation, and which are expected to influence future legislative frameworks.

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

This request is in line with the draft Care Services Portfolio Plan 2015/16 : to support children with complex disabilities to remain within their family home and their local community

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Confirmation of the funding has been received by DfE. The funding is ring fenced and expenditure /progress of the scheme has to be reported to DfE on a quarterly basis, up to 31 March 2016.

5.2 The grant allocation is one off funding that does not lead to ongoing future expenditure being incurred by the service

5.3 The detailed proposed project expenditure is detailed in attached Appendix One.

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

The local authority has a duty to provide social care assessments within designated timescales and to ensure the safeguarding of vulnerable children.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Personnel Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chronically Sick & Disabled Person’s Act 1970 • Children Act 1989 • Childrens & Family’s Act 2014 • SEN & Disability Code of Practice 0-25, 2014 • Munro Review of Child Protection 2011 • Pan London Child Protection Procedures 2015

This page is left intentionally blank

Period	Outputs	Payment Amount
	<p>ates support and programme input via coaching calls and visits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Participate in the independent evaluation of the programme- arrange interviews with key stakeholders and providing supplementary local data to independent evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administration <p>Events:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Initial Stakeholder Group Meeting ● Initial ‘sense making’ sessions x3 (with Children and young people, parents/carers and professionals) ● Initial Journey mapping events x3 (with Children and young people, parents/carers and professionals) <p>Outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Plan for ongoing Children and Young people’s participation throughout the programme. ● Stakeholder mapping to identify who might have a wider role to play/contribution to make to the programme. ● Engage stakeholders and establish stakeholder group ● Cost Analysis of the current system. ● Identification and recruitment of 10-15 diverse families. ● Action plan in place from monthly conference calls with CDC ● Evidence of learning and dissemination activities with wider learning community via CDC (i.e. sessions in sector events, media presence, publications) ● Schedule of questions which may in turn lead to Self-assessment ● Communication strategy <p>Quarter 1 Total:</p>	<p>1,200</p> <p>500</p> <p>1,000</p> <p>2,000</p> <p>14,500</p>
<p>Quarter 2: 01/07/15 -30/09/15</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Project Lead & Co-ordination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Participate with the other local authorities to share learning across the programme ○ Work with key stakeholders to develop a clearly defined understanding of the problem of assessment through the outputs from the sense-making sessions ○ Work with independent evaluators 	<p>6,000</p>

Period	Outputs	Payment Amount
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lead on planning for ideas generating event ○ Lead on planning for co-design and testing event ○ Begin analysing likely costs of the new approach ● Disabled Children’s Team <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Participate in ideas gathering and co-design events ○ Support work with stakeholders to develop a clearly defined understanding of the problem of assessment ● Parent Participation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Support work with stakeholders to develop a clearly defined understanding of the problem of assessment ○ Work with service designer to finalise outputs from insight gathering and journey mapping sessions ○ Support planning and facilitation of ideas generating and co-design events ● Children and Young people’s Participation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Work with service designer to finalise outputs from insight gathering and journey mapping sessions ○ Work with CDC participation lead to develop ongoing children and young people’s participation plan. ● All Staff <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Participate in CDC’s shared learning events with local authorities within the programme and wider stakeholders. ○ Engage with CDC staff and appointed associates support and programme input via coaching calls and visits ○ Participate in the independent evaluation of the programme- arrange interviews with key stakeholders and providing supplementary local data to independent evaluation ● Administration <p>Events:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Second Stakeholder Group Meeting 	<p>2,000</p> <p>8,900</p> <p>5,500</p> <p>3,600</p> <p>500</p>

Period	Outputs	Payment Amount
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Engage with CDC staff and appointed associates support and programme input via coaching calls and visits ○ Participate in the independent evaluation of the programme- arrange interviews with key stakeholders and providing supplementary local data to independent evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Administration <p>Events:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Final co-design and testing event <p>Outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Initial learning output from redefined solutions ready for final testing <p>Quarter 3 Total:</p>	<p>3,600</p> <p>1,500</p> <p>26,500</p>
<p>Quarter 4: 01/01/16-31/03/16</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Project Lead & Co-ordination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Participate with the other local authorities to share learning across the programme ○ Analyse insights and learning from final tests and co-design and develop the final learning outputs. ○ Develop sustainability plan ● Disabled Children’s Team <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Participate in development of final learning outputs ● Parent Participation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ensure method of sustainability of the learning from this programme is in place. ○ Participate in the final conference ● Children and Young people’s Participation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ensure method of sustainability of the learning from this programme is in place. ○ Participate in the final conference ● All Staff <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Participate in CDC’s shared learning events with local authorities within the programme and wider stakeholders. ○ Engage with CDC staff and appointed associ- 	<p>6,000</p> <p>2,500</p> <p>5,400</p> <p>1,500</p>

Period	Outputs	Payment Amount
	<p>ates support and programme input via coaching calls and visits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Participate in the independent evaluation of the programme- arrange interviews with key stakeholders and providing supplementary local data to independent evaluation <p>• Administration</p> <p>Events:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participate in the final conference <p>Outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation at learning workshop for the community of practice • Sustainability plan • Final outputs aims to include training program for workforce in the new assessment process • Costings to determine level of savings • Revised Communication strategy to inform ongoing service development <p>Quarter 4 Total:</p>	<p>3,600</p> <p>500</p> <p>3,000</p> <p>22,500</p>
	<p>Programme Total:</p> <p>Contingency:</p> <p>TOTAL:</p>	<p>92,500</p> <p>7,500</p> <p>100,000</p>

Report No.
CS15909a

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: Executive

For Pre-Decision Scrutiny by Care Services PDS Committee on:

Date: 23rd June 2015

Decision Type: Non Urgent Executive Key

Title: **DIRECT CARE (LEARNING DISABILITIES) - CONTRACT AWARD**

Contact Officer: Alicia Munday, Programme Manager- Commissioning
Tel: 020 8313 4559 E-mail: Alicia.munday@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Lorna Blackwood, Assistant Director Commissioning & Partnerships
Tel: 020 8313 4110 E-mail: lorna.blackwood@bromley.gov.uk

Ward: (All Wards);

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 This report follows the Gateway Review (report No CS12060), and the subsequent report on the update on the market testing (report No CS14122).
- 1.2 As part of the agreed Gateway process for determining the method that offers best value and quality for delivering the Adult Social Care Services (Learning Disabilities) in accordance with the Council's Corporate Operating principles, this report provides details of the tender and recommendation for an award of a contract.

2. RECOMMENDATION(S)

- 2.1 **The Care Services PDS Committee is asked to note and comment on the content of this report.**
- 2.2 **Executive is asked to agree the award of the contract for Adult Social Care – Learning Disabilities Services to the Southside Partnership for a period of 5 years from 1 October 2015, with an option to extend for a further period up to, but not exceeding 2 years.**

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy: Further Details
 2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council Supporting Independence:
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: £18,466,000:
 2. Ongoing costs: on going over the life of the 5 year contract:
 3. Budget head/performance centre: 815, 822, 828,
 4. Total current budget for this head: £4,035,159
 5. Source of funding: Revenue Support Grant
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional):110 staff / 72.37 FTE
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours:
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement:
 2. Call-in: Applicable:
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected):

Day Opportunities	315
Respite	max of 12 at a time/approx. 54 stays per month
Supported Living	35 tenants
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments:

3. COMMENTARY

BACKGROUND

- 3.1. The Council continues to face a period of unprecedented reduction in public funding, and over the next few years will need to identify further savings in the region of £50million to balance the revenue budget. The Council is responding by reviewing and remodelling services to provide value for money while continuing to deliver its statutory obligations and safeguard vulnerable residents through quality care services.
- 3.2. In line with the Council's corporate operating principles, in July 2013, Executive approved the recommendation to commence market testing the last remaining in house Direct Care Services. This decision was based upon the need to modernise the existing in-house provision as well as to secure the best value for money. The majority of adult social care services are already outsourced.
- 3.3. Following Member approval to commence market testing, the Services were tendered for in 2 lots, Older peoples Services (Lot 1) and Services for Adults with learning Disabilities (Lot 2) for a contract award of 5 years, with an option to extend for a period of up to 2 further years. Given the existing in-house delivery model, potential innovation needed combined with the need to secure best value, the decision was taken to tender the Services through a competitive dialogue process. Competitive dialogue allows the Council to ask suppliers to provide their proposals and solutions for future delivery models, and to negotiate on proposed models until the Council believes a workable solution has been clearly defined and understood by both commissioner and provider.
- 3.4. Following an elective notice for these services published in November 2013, a number of providers were engaged in the process for 2 lots. For various commercial reasons, in February 2015, a decision was taken to not continue with Lot 1. (Report CS14122), the same report also recommended that a preferred provider was confirmed for Lot 2, this was agreed and the team have been working directly with the Southside Partnership (Certitude) throughout April and May.
- 3.5. The Services in Scope of this Lot 2 tender are:
- Day Opportunities
 - Respite/Short Breaks
 - Supported Living

4. Tender Process

- 4.1. The tender was undertaken using the London Tenders Portal, Pro-Contract, the Council's electronic system. The tender comprised of 4 stages:
- Stage 1 : Pre-Qualification Questionnaire (PQQ)
 - Stage 2: Invitation to Submit and Outline Proposal
 - Stage 3: Invitation to Submit a Detailed Proposal
 - Stage 4: Invitation for Final Tender

- 4.2. At each of the stages listed, dialogue meetings were held with providers focusing on the content of previous submissions.
- 4.3. 44 Pre-Qualification Questionnaires were returned (for both Lots 1 and Lot2). 11 Providers across both Lots were selected to go through to the next stage of the tender, 6 of which were for the LD services (Lot 2).
- 4.4. Executive's approval to work with the Southside Partnership as a preferred provider has enabled the commissioning team to engage directly with staff and Service users to inform the final tender.
- 4.5. Initial pricing from the Provider, the Southside Partnership had already been submitted, and it was agreed that this mitigated the risk of confirming a preferred provider at this sensitive stage in a tender process. In addition there were a number of advantages of being able to work more openly with the provider and the current service users during the later stages of the tender.

5. The Services: Current Services and Tender Outcome

Day Opportunities

- 5.1. The Day Opportunities Services essentially provides 2 services; a critical respite function for families and carers that enables them to continue in their caring role, as well as providing opportunities for the service users to obtain valuable independent living skills. It is recognised that the Council's current model is a very traditional Day Centre Service, which is very building based. The Service is currently delivered from 3 key locations, Astley day centre, Kentwood day centre, and Cotmandene day centre. The Service provides for circa 315 clients, who attend an average of 3 days per week.
- 5.2. The Council commenced the modernisation of Day Opportunities Services some time ago, with the closure of the Leasons centre. Younger service users do not want to attend day centres based in a traditional day centre environment, this was reinforced by the survey that was conducted in February 2015 of current day service users; and the Council looked to Providers to develop a solution to bring in expertise to support the future of community based provision.
- 5.3. The Service needs to offer a more personalised approach promoting training, employment, and building on useful social skills that continues to meet the needs of individuals supporting them to become increasingly independent. The Southside Partnership's offer proposes a review of the service over time, whereby clients will be offered more community based activities, an offer of local support and opportunities that promote independent living skills including a focus on employment and training. The approach would be to move to smaller community based hubs that reduce the need for travel, but also utilise existing community settings. Smaller settings will provide for those service users that find larger settings harder to connect with. The offer includes continuing to provide 3 accessible vehicles to support the service and reduce the reliance on passenger transport services. The transformation of the service is expected to be delivered over the first three years of the contract.

Respite/Short Breaks

- 5.4. The Respite Service is provided from the recently refurbished 118 Widmore Road building that was transferred to the Council from the PCT. The service again provides critical respite that supports carers in their caring role, reducing residential placements. The building has

capacity for up to 12 guests per night, although this capacity is really only reached at weekends. There are approximately 90 Service users utilising the service. The service receives a small income from the selling of some places to Lewisham LA.

5.5. The Southside Partnership offer will include developing the Service into more of a short breaks service, with activities for service users to undertake during their stay including community based activities. The offer also includes the use of a dedicated vehicle to support service user transport whilst staying at the centre. Over time it is anticipated that the centre will become a day service hub, an improved use of an excellent resource especially considering its central location in the Borough.

5.6. The Southside Partnership already run a similar scheme in London, and it was noted during visits how they manage stays of friends and their extensive support for families and service users in the transition from children's services to adult respite. Southside also plan to promote the Service to neighbouring boroughs, and their offer includes guaranteeing an income from this at their risk. The contract monitoring will assure that Bromley clients have primary access.

Supported Living

5.7. The current Services supports 35 clients across 9 different houses to live as independently as possible with support/care staff. The houses are all maintained through Registered Social Landlords. Currently each service user receives 1 day 1:1 support to promote their independent living skills.

5.8. Southside's offer takes on board the complex and differing needs of the service users, whilst undertaking to work and support clients to maximise their independence through improved independent living skills.

5.9. Southside's offer includes access to their specialist communication staff which will be a significant benefit for many service users and their families. The Southside Partnership already successfully manage 3 supported living schemes in Bromley.

Overall

5.10. In addition to the separate Service considerations, the offer from the Southside Partnership includes supporting the levels of transformation that is required in these services in order to make them sustainable for the future. If these Services are not awarded, the Council will need to consider a substantial investment programme in the Services in order to equip them to meet with future demand and need.

5.11. Taking into account the cost and quality benefit of working with the Provider it is therefore recommended to award all 3 Services to the Southside Partnership for a period of 5 years from the 1 October 2015, with an option to extend for further period up to, but not exceeding 2 years.

Next Stages

5.12. As part of the implementation and transformation process, consideration will be given to the resourcing requirements to ensure a smooth transition of Services. This is likely to be from care management and the strategic commissioning team within Education, Care and Health Services.

5.13. Contract monitoring and performance management will fall under the contracts and compliance team within Education Care and Health Services, and provision for this has been allowed within the financial resources (see Part 2 report).

Risk Management

5.14. The recommended tender provides a fixed price for the entirety of services, includes a significant investment in transport as well as service transformation. However, the Council and Southside Partnership would agree an open book accounting policy to ensure key milestones in investment and transformation have been met by the end of the contract. The Provider has also agreed to work with the Council to negotiate a spot purchasing arrangement during the contract. This will give the Council and service users increased flexibility over time, whilst assuring the investment needed is made.

6. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

6.1. All of the services considered for award support the Council's aim to help people maximise their independence and be able to live as independently as possible in the community. The services provide direct support to service users as well as carers, a key feature of the Care Act. The provision of Services by whoever is best placed to deliver quality and value for money continues to be in accordance with Council's Corporate Operating Principles.

7. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1. The results of the analysis of the Tender received has resulted in a recommendation being made to award the contract for LD Direct Care Services to Southside Partnership delivering an in year saving of circa £30k for 2015-16 (part year), and an average saving of over £250k per annum thereafter.

7.2. The Tender is able to subsume a small increase in demand for day activities, as it is anticipated that there is likely to be an increase rather a decrease in community based support as bed based care is reduced over time. Any decrease in demand will be dealt with as part of the overall annual review of the contract.

7.3. The financial details are included in the report of the same name contained in PART 2 of this agenda.

8. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

8.1. This procurement has been undertaken as a residual Part B Service, under the Public Contracts Regulations 2006. It has been undertaken having regard to the need for a fair, transparent and compliant procurement exercise and has complied with Council Financial Regulations. The Public Contract Regulations 2015 replaced the 2006 regulations and apply to procurements after 26 February 2015. However by virtue of regulation 118 the 2015 regulations do not apply where a contract award procedure has commenced prior to that date as is the case here. Therefore the recent change in the law does not affect this procurement and any contract award. Should the contract be awarded then any modifications which may be required in the future would be subject to the 2015 and not the 2006 regulations.

8.2. The project team are mindful that at the later stages the Council was working with one provider in a final tender submission, and the Council's duty to demonstrate value for money. By receiving initial costings from the Provider prior to them being a preferred bidder, the project team are satisfied this has been successfully completed.

8.3. It is not anticipated that any award of contract will result in any changes to the level of service to individuals as this is determined by Care Management and not by the Provider. Having completed an initial stage 1 screening of the Equality Impact Assessment, there are no identifiable negative impacts on equality of opportunity. The stage 1 document is available upon request from the contact officer.

9. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1. The Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006 (TUPE) as amended (2014) will apply to these proposals. There are approximately 90 staff working across the Direct care Learning Disabilities Services who it is proposed would TUPE across to the Southside Partnership if Members agree to the proposals within this report. There are an additional 20 casual staff currently employed across the Services. The posts affected are set out in Appendix 1.
- 9.2. As indicated in previous reports informal consultation with staff and their representatives around market testing these services has been ongoing since 2011 following the publication of the departmental Business Plan which outlined the services identified for market testing.
- 9.3. Following the Executive's approval to commence market testing of these services, and the subsequent issuing of the elective notice, staff and representatives including trade unions were invited to attend briefing sessions with the Assistant Director for Care Services in November 2013. Concerns from staff at this stage were around how the Council would assure quality of any contracted provision. Staff were assured that the evaluation process would, as indicated in Appendix 2, take into account both costs and quality.
- 9.4. Staff have been engaged throughout the process of market testing, to the extent that commercial sensitivities has made this permissible. This included opportunities to feed into the process with representatives' panels and staff seminars. These were underutilised by staff as a means of engagement, although those that attended felt they were positive. Comments from staff at the events were reflected during dialogue meetings with Providers.
- 9.5. Following the Executive's approval of a Preferred Provider at its meeting in February 2015 staff have had opportunities to attend meetings with Southside Partnership, the Preferred Provider to find out more about them as an organisation and meet with their strategic leadership team.
- 9.6. Formal consultation with staff and their representatives on the proposals outlined in this report commenced on 26th May and ends on 9 July 2015. A summary of the main points raised during the consultation process and management response is provided in Appendix 3. Any responses received after the publication of this report will be communicated to the Committee at the meeting.
- 9.7. Should the proposed transfer be agreed then a further period of consultation on the detailed transfer proposals would take place with staff and their representatives in accordance with employment legislation and the Council's Managing Change procedures. This will enable staff to explore in more detail the impact of the transfer on their employment situation.

Non-Applicable Sections:	
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Gateway Review (report No CS12060)

Appendix 1 The posts affected by the award of services:

Post Number	Job Title	Grade	Number of staff	Number of staff (FTE)
Respite/Short Breaks				
3437	Short Breaks Manager	BR10+2	1	1
13915	Assistant Officer in Charge	BR9+2	1	1
3406/3408/3409/3410/3412/3413/3454/12955/12957/3471	Support Worker (including Support Worker Nights)	BR7+2	10	6.9
14082	Careworker	BAND4 (NHS)	1	1
Sub Total			13	9.9
Supported Living				
10294	Group Manager	MG6	1	1
3420/3451/3452	Team Manager	BR9+2	3	3
3414/3438/3444/3421/3422/3426/3427/3475/3489/3431/3460/3486/3488/3455/3458/3459/3462/3463/3478	Support Worker (including Support Worker Nights)	BR7+2	19	17.2
3415	Administrative Officer	BR5	1	1
14086	Careworker	BAND4 (NHS)	1	1
	Bank Carers	BR5	20	N/A
	Supported Living Casual Cover Post	BR5	1	N/A
Sub Total			46	23.2
Day Opportunities				
	LD Day Services Manager	BR14	1	1
	Senior Day Opportunities Officer	BR9	4	3.08
	Day Opportunities Officer	BR7	20	17.38
	Day Opportunities Assistant	BR4	6	5
	Senior Trainer	BRBD5 (NHS)	4	4
	Trainer	BRBD4 (NHS)	7	5.2
	Lunchtime Helper	BR3	2	0.42
	Caretaker	BR5	1	1
	Assistant Caretaker	BR2	1	0.56
	Cook	BR4	1	0.69
	Kitchen Assistant	BR1	2	0.55
	Domestic Cleaner	BR1	2	0.39
Sub Total			51	39.27
Overall Total			110	72.37

Appendix 2 Quality Matrix used for scoring the tender:

1. Evaluation Criteria

1.1. The Solutions are evaluated on the basis of the most economically advantageous Solution for the Council having regard to the general criteria set out below:

- Financial - 60%
- Quality/Technical – 40%

1.2. The Quality/Technical element representing 40% of the evaluation score is further broken down as follows:

Proposed Solution	60%
Quality Monitoring Strategies	20%
Promoting Independence	15%
Impact of Contract Amendments	5%

1.3. Each area identified in the evaluation criteria will be scored out of 10. The appropriate weighting will then be applied. A minimum score of 6 must be awarded for each element.

Appendix 3 Comments during consultation

Staff were informed by the Assistant Director of Adult Social Care on the 26th May that there would be a recommendation to the Executive on the 15th July to award the services in scope of this tender to The Southside Partnership.

1. Staff Comments – formally received

1.1. Will there be any voluntary redundancies?

At this stage the Council is unable to comment on any potential redundancies that the Provider would be proposing. In the event that the Southside Partnership were to be awarded the contract they would be required to consult on their proposed measures and staffing structures.

1.2. Will TUPE apply to all posts listed?

It is anticipated that TUPE would be applicable to those posts listed in the consultation documentation (as set out in Appendix 1)

2. Service user comments – informally received

2.1. Services Users would like more interesting and varied activities

The Southside Partnership would respond to this by working with service users to determine what activities meet their needs as well as their interests.

2.2. Service users would like different activities at lunchtime/different opportunities

2.3. The Southside Partnership hold a variety of events, including their working together for change events that bring together service users and wider stakeholders to determine how best to plan support that meets and interests.

2.4. Services Users are concerned about accessibility to other venues if Astley closes

Ensuring services and facilities are accessible is a key support need, and new or existing facilities will be assessed for this.

2.5. Service users would like to go out from the day centres more

The Southside Partnership's offer would respond to this by ensuring that community activities are maximised wherever possible, and supporting people in the community.

2.6. Service users have asked about paying to come to Astley

This is part of a charging policy that is determined by the Council and not affected by this tender, or award of this work.

2.7. Service users have said that clean environments are important for them

This is important to both the Council and the preferred Provider, environments are a consideration in contract monitoring also.

3. Parents/Carers comments/questions – formally received

3.1. Is it your intention to keep a building based Day Service Facility?

The council has for a long time made it clear that it is our intention to move towards more modern community based activities. That is not to say that we will not have building based activities, but they are likely to be to be more like the hubs of Cotmandene and Kentwood in the future rather than large underutilised facilities like Astley. Any potential closure of Astley would be subject to a consultation and suitable alternative activities being available.

The Council is aware of the limitations of the Astley building and the significant investment the building needs, however, these factors should not be a driving factor for the current services to remain as they are, whether that is keeping Astley as a day centre or not in the future

3.2. Certitude (Southside Partnership), having not run or have any previous knowledge/experience in running a Day Service, what is your criteria/agenda for doing this?

The Southside Partnership (Certitude) have gone through a rigorous quality assurance process to get to this point of the tender, including commissioners visiting their Services and meeting with existing Service users, parents and carers. The tender process is robust in it is assessment of Provider experience as is the Council's continuing monitoring of provider services.

3.3. Certitude (Southside Partnership), will be responsible for the welfare, care and support of some of the most vulnerable adults with complex needs, your website clearly states when advertising for Staff "no previous experience necessary" .How are you intending to address the needs of clients, which maybe health issues, breathing problems, toileting, feeding to name but a few where prior knowledge of individual needs is paramount to their welfare, care and support?

It would be inappropriate for the Council to comment on an organisations recruitment processes. However the Council can confirm that it asked all Providers in scope of this tender to submit details of how they approach staff training and support creating local employment opportunities where appropriate and possible, and that tenders were scored on aspects of this. It is important to note, that whilst there may be some roles where this applies, it is not a 'blanket' approach to all roles.

The Council has a robust quality assurance programme to ensure Providers they engage with and contract with are able to meet the needs of Service users.

3.4. Are you intending to introduce any supported employment to day services?

The Council asked for a Provider to deliver a holistic range of Services, including supporting clients with employment skills and independent living skills. This will not be a replacement of other Services, but a new modernised approach to support clients' needs.

3.5. As well as social sessions are you intending to introduce any life skill sessions as our sons and daughters need these and can still be taught them?

The Council would like parents, carers and service users to know that a key criteria to this tender was the provider demonstrating how they support clients independence. Supporting people to live as independently as possible is a key value of the Council and we expect any provider we contract with to work to achieve this.

3.6. Can you tell us a bit more about the hubs in the community, where will they be, how many people will be in them etc.?

Any hubs that are established will be done in conjunction with the Council and will be based around need. The numbers of people each hub can support is likely to differ, but we are not anticipating any decreases in services, rather a contract will make for an increased provision.

3.7. Are you looking to employ more staff, alongside the continuity of existing staff?

Staffing must always be balanced between the needs of the clients and the resources available. The Council looks at staffing of providers as part of its quality assurance of contracted services.

3.8. Will the hours that clients attend day services change?

If Service users want to undertake different activities that meet their eligible un-met needs, yes their hours may change. Please note, it is not Providers that assess needs, but care managers.

3.9. Can Certitude (Southside Partnership), tell us what activities they are going to introduce that can help our relatives now and in the future?

This cannot be responded to as the Council has not awarded these Services to the Southside Partnership (Certitude), however, parents and cares may like to view the Southside Partnership website to explore the kinds of activities they support people in services they currently deliver.

3.10. How are you going to fill the gap caused by the closure of Shaw Trust and Thyme Out?

Thyme Out was not a Social Care Services Project and whilst we recognise some clients were making use of this programme, this was never regarded as Service in the same way as Shaw Trust or Day Opportunities.

With regards to Shaw Trust, all clients along with their parents/carers have been offered 1:1 meetings with Council representatives to discuss their individual options.

Decision Maker:	Executive For Pre-Decision Scrutiny by the Care Services Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee on Tuesday 23 June 2015
Date:	15th July 2015
Decision Type:	Non Urgent Executive Key
Title:	DIRECT CARE(LEARNING DISABILITIES) - CONTRACT AWARD
Contact Officer:	Alicia Munday, Programme Manager- Commissioning Tel: 020 8313 4559 E-mail: Alicia.munday@bromley.gov.uk
Chief Officer:	Lorna Blackwood, Assistant Director Commissioning & Partnerships Tel: 020 8313 4110 E-mail: lorna.blackwood@bromley.gov.uk
Ward:	(All Wards);

Additional Information Following the Care Services PDS Committee,

Tender Process

Section 4 of report CS15909a identified the procurement method utilised for this tender. The Care Services PDS Committee requested more detail about the tender process, as this has been subject to a number of questions from staff and a small number of parents of service users.

The decision was taken to utilise a procurement method called competitive dialogue. This method was chosen as the Council recognised they were seeking innovation from skilled and experienced providers with a track record for service re-design as well as the need to consider the financial challenges the Council continues to face.

In addition to the usual technical questions in relation to company performance and quality measures, providers were also asked to detail, their skills and experience in delivering these services, approaches to the quality of care, evidence of working with other providers, to demonstrate their commitment to social values in their partnership arrangements, as well as how they promote service user independence and ensure quality through their commitment to staff training and development.

Following the Pre-Qualification Stage, providers were invited to submit outline proposals of how they would deliver the services in scope within Bromley. These proposals were scrutinised by an evaluation panel. Following feedback to the providers on the outline proposals, they were then invited to submit detailed proposals, which specified how the services would be delivered and particularly how the outcomes the Council wanted to achieve would be met. It was at this stage that Members agreed to confirm the Southside Partnership as the preferred provider. The Southside

Partnership undertook a range of engagement activities with staff and service users before being invited to submit a final tender.

It was explicit, that at each stage of the process, the feedback on earlier stages or engagement activities was fed into the next iteration.

As part of the process, members of the evaluation team, who also visited the provider, met service users and families currently being supported and reviewed some of the services the provider currently manage.

The Assistant Director of Adult Social Care Services represented the service on the evaluation panel, other members of the panel included representatives from care management, Safeguarding (at appropriate stages), procurement, commissioning, finance and HR.

This has been an innovative procurement method which has allowed the Council, in partnership with a skilled and experienced provider, to shape services that are now being recommended.

The details of any final tender cannot be disclosed at this time. However, the final tender from the Southside Partnership is exceptionally detailed, outlining how they would implement and deliver services and work in partnership with service users and their families.

Information about the recommended provider

Members of the PDS requested more information on the Southside Partnership (SSP), which is part of the Certitude group.

Throughout the tender, the team considered the skills and experience the provider could bring if they were delivering services on behalf of Bromley, as well the contribution to social value. The Southside Partnership is a specialist - not for profit -, Learning Disabilities Provider with over 25 years' experience, employing over 730 staff, with an annual turnover of over £24 million. Below, are some of the provider's relevant skills in relation to the services in scope of this tender:

- The SSP supports over 446 individuals across 9 boroughs to access community options. The SSP community options offer includes supporting people to access work pathway programmes, travel buddy programmes, vocational courses as well as shared and individual support through community hubs.
- SSP manage a resource centre (a modernised day centre) in Ealing, which supports over 180 people each week.
- The SSP work pathways programme has supported over 90 people into employment opportunities.
- The SSP re-designed the respite service in Wandsworth, significantly improving quality as measured by the CQC and improved outcomes for individuals and families, whilst making efficiencies.
- The SSP support approx. 100 service users who live either independently or with families in the community.
- The SSP deliver a programme called Treat me Right! which is a peer led programme to raise awareness amongst health professionals of how to support people with learning disabilities.
- The SSP through the use of community connections have supported service users with complex needs into community activities that they can continue to attend with minimal support maximising each individual's independence.
- The SSP support over 200 people in supported living environments.

Staff Engagement and Consultation

Staff representatives were invited to take part in engagement activities, which allowed them to feed into any suggestions or concerns they had in the dialogue meetings. Procurement restrictions meant that staff could not take part in dialogue meetings directly, and this was considered the best way to ensure staff were given an opportunity to engage. Whilst these opportunities were under-utilised by staff, those that did attend the meetings commented on how helpful they were.

The Council has consulted with staff in relation to this recommendation. The extended consultation commenced on May 26th for 45 days to the 9 July. Management responses to formal questions received have been included in this report for consideration by the Executive. As part of this consultation staff were able to request individual or group meetings with their line manager/and or Human Resources Personnel. 3 group meetings for staff were also convened, one of which was provided out of traditional work hours at the request of the staff. A meeting with Union representatives was also convened. Unions were invited to submit written comments and permitted to speak at the Care Services PDS meeting on the 23 June. Written responses were also invited and received, which are included in this report for consideration by Members.

Service Users and Carers

Service Users and carers have been engaged throughout the process. All communications have been accessible wherever possible. This has included updates on the process, and at the later stage once a preferred provider was established, opportunities to meet with the preferred provider. These meetings were exceptionally valuable, and some of the ideas from these meetings were fed into the final tender. If an award is made, further visions and values meetings will be held with service users and their parents.

This page is left intentionally blank

Comments for Care Services PDS to consider in relation to the Direct Care (LD Services) Contract Award

The following comments have been received from a parent of a Service User who attends the Astley Day Centre, which he requested to be circulated to the Care Services PDS Committee.

Received 9 June 2015

How many freemasons and/or common purposes graduates were involved in the tender of this contract?

The Parent was informed that the Council does not collate this information on its staff.

Received 11 June 2015

The letter sent to Service Users is virtually the same false promises that were made to carers, staff and clients when Bromley Council shut down Leasons. It is hard to believe that Bromley Council would be trying the same tricks and deceits again.

Perhaps the council are hoping most people involved with what happened at Leasons will have forgotten the false promises made, or are no longer involved with Bromley Council Social Services.

ClIr Arthur is a familiar name from Leasons days.

The Parent was informed that his comments would be made available to Members of the committee.

Received 11 June 2015

Please will you let me know the names of the members of the Council Executive committee dealing with the privatisation of Astley centre.

The Parent was sent the link to the Council website with this information.

Received 11 June 2015

There are several ramifications regarding the property at Astley whether this privatisation goes through or not.

Is the site of Astley centre to be sold off?

The Parent was referred to the Service User letter which was so distributed to parents/carers noting that we are not currently consulting about the closure of the Astley Day Centre.

Received 11 June 2015

Does the Freedom of Information act cover me to ask questions of and receive replies from Bromley Council.

The Parent was sent the link to the Council website detailing what information can be asked under the Freedom of Information Act.

This page is left intentionally blank

Item 8c

Unions were invited to submit any comments they would like Care Services PDS committee to see prior to the end of the consultation on 9 July.

The attached was received on Friday 19 June. The questions are answered, either in the public questions, staff questions received to date, or the public report.

A formal written response will be issued to these comments at the end of the consultation period.



Bromley local Government Branch submission

Dear Councillor

Re: PROPOSAL TO PRIVATISE THE LEARNING DISABILITY SERVICES

1. I am writing in response to the above proposal due to be debated at the Scrutiny community on Tuesday 23rd June.

At the meeting you are being asked to agree to privatise the following three services run for adults with Learning disabilities.

- The running of the homes of 35 clients across 9 different houses that enable them to live as independently as possible with support/care staff.
- The Respite care at 18 Wilmore Road used by 90 clients and their families. The service provides critical respite that supports carers in their caring role, reducing residential placements.
- The Day Opportunities Services provides 2 services; a critical respite function for families and carers that enables them to continue in their caring role, as well as providing opportunities for the service users to obtain valuable independent living skills. The Service provides for 315 clients, who attend an average of 3 days per week.

Why not keep the services in house as privatisation has already shown to fail.

2. The report before you dismisses out of hand and without explanation the continued running of the services in house. There is no evidence of any demand for the privatisation of this service from the clients, their families or the staff and trade unions. In fact the opposite is the case where concern is being raised that the company chosen have no experience in running a number of these types of services.
3. In addition the council has very recent experience of the impact of privatising these type of services and it going wrong. Recently the council via Astley day centre has had to step in and pick up the support for clients after the Shaw trust contract failed. The Shaw Trust was given the contract to run services that were previously run by the council at the Oakfield day centre.

How will it save the council any money- the figures don't add up?

4. The report before you states. ***It is not anticipated that any award of contract will result in any changes to the level of service to individuals*** (section 8.3) in fact if anything it implies it will improve the service.
5. The report also accepts that the TUPE regulations will apply and as such all the staff will transfer on their current terms and conditions meaning that there is no saving from any staffing costs.
6. If the service is not to be cut and the staff all transfer, it begs the question how are the private company going to be able to provide the services for £250k a year cheaper than the council? (7.1 of the report)
7. The report also fails to explain why the part year savings (from October to April 2015/16) are only £30k and yet it's alleged that the full year saving will be £250k nearly tenfold more? These figures simply don't add up unless you and I are not being told the whole story.(7.1 of the report)

Is the council planning to sell off the Astley day centre in another property deal were not being told about?

8. A number of years ago the service was transformed into a community based model, however it had to be recognised that the level of need and high dependency of some clients meant that their needs could only be met through the day centre at Astley. As stated above the use of this provision has in fact increased with failure of Shaw Trust contract failure.
9. Despite this the report is very vague over the future of the Astley centre. Clients, families and workers have the right to know if there is a commitment to maintain this centre.
10. If the council has plans to decommission it for yet another land/ property speculation then the people of the borough have a right to know? If that is the case how can the council say it is their intention to provide the same quality and level of service?
11. Until all of these question have been adequately answered then as a minimum UNISON is asking that you do not award the contract for the services and that a genuine exploration of keeping the services is house is made.

Glenn Kelly
UNISON Branch secretary

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
CS 15913

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: Executive

For Pre-Decision Scrutiny by Care Services PDS Committee on:

Date: 23rd June 2015

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Key

Title: **GATEWAY REPORT FOR LEARNING DISABILITY SUPPORTED LIVING SCHEMES**

Contact Officer: Colin Lusted, Business & Planning Manager, Education, Care & Health Services
Tel: 020 8461 7650 E-mail: colin.lusted@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Assistant Director Commissioning, Education, Care & Health Services

Ward: (All Wards);

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 There are 3 Learning Disability (LD) supported living schemes with contracts that will co-terminate on 24 April 2016. The schemes collectively accommodate 11 people with significant disabilities and incur combined expenditure of £908,308pa.
- 1.2 The co-termination of the schemes provides an opportunity for them to be grouped together for tendering which is an approach from which the Council has achieved the following benefits:
 - Lower bids resulting from economies of scale
 - More efficient use of resources
 - Tenders that are more attractive for providers
- 1.3 With a proposed 5 year term, the value of the contract is expected to be approximately £4M - £5M and therefore requires Executive approval to enable the procurement process to commence in accordance with the Council's financial and contractual requirements.

2. RECOMMENDATION(S)

- 2.1 Care Services PDS are asked to note and comment on the contents of this report prior to the Executive being asked to:

- i) agree to grouping the schemes for tendering in order to drive the best possible quality / pricing; and**
- ii) approve the commencement of the procurement procedure to enable award in accordance with the Council's financial and contractual requirements.**

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy:
 2. BBB Priority: Supporting Independence:
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: No additional cost in undertaking proposal
 2. Ongoing costs: The existing cost of the 3 schemes is £908,308 per annum. The future recurring cost will be subject to tender that will be undertaken to enable award on 25 April 2016.
 3. Budget head/performance centre: 819 *** 3618 (LD Supported Living)
 4. Total current budget for this head: £11,404,850
 5. Source of funding: Contained within existing budget, no additional funding required
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): LBB staff are engaged in contract monitoring and quality assurance
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: 0.1 full time equivalent.
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement
 2. Call-in: Applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): 11
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: Not Applicable

3. COMMENTARY

3.1 The contracts relating to the following learning disability (LD) supported living schemes will be expiring on 24 April 2016:

Scheme Name	Provider	Expiry	£'000pa	Tenants No.
Crofton 1	Certitude	24/4/2016	308	4
Crofton 2	Certitude	24/4/2016	306	3
Mottingham	Certitude	24/4/2016	294	4

3.2 All of the schemes were purchased with capital from the Strategic Health Authority as part of the NHS Campus Re-provision Programme. The properties were developed to meet the specific needs of adults with learning and physical disabilities and are viewed as a key resource in meeting the existing and future needs of Bromley's adult LD population and in particular in avoiding the need for people to move into residential care. Projection of future supply and demand suggests that these schemes will be required for the foreseeable future. Should there be an imbalance between supply and demand at any point in the future these schemes would be a priority for retention due to the purpose built nature and age of the properties.

3.3 Education, Care & Health Services Commissioners are seeking opportunities to co-terminate existing contracts in order to group similar services together for the purposes of tendering; this approach has the following advantages for the Council:

- The volume of services in a single tender make them more attractive for providers
- Increased volumes lead to keener bids as the provider is able to reflect increased economies of scale in their pricing
- More efficient use of Council resources for tendering

3.4 It is proposed that the three schemes set out in 3.1 would be progressed as a single tender for a 5 year period. The contract would be awarded for a three year term with an option to extend up to a maximum of two years.

3.5 The schemes were all subject to formal tendering when they were originally commissioned and they have been subject to subsequent negotiated cost reduction. Assessment of the market, including detailed analysis of cost composition obtained through recent tender exercises, show that the prices obtained by the Council are extremely competitive and that the Council is unlikely to obtain the magnitude of cost reduction seen in previous tender exercises without significantly compromising the quality and sustainability of services.

3.6 In light of this and due to concerns regarding the future stability of the market it is proposed that the evaluation criteria for the tenders be split 60% quality and 40% price. Whilst still ensuring that value for money is secured through the tendering process, the emphasis on quality will safeguard service standards in schemes that are supporting some of our most vulnerable clients.

3.7 A full communications plan has been developed to ensure that tenants and families affected by this tender will be advised and supported appropriately. The plan will be implemented following Executive approval.

3.8 Care Services PDS are asked to note and comment on the contents of this report prior to the Executive being asked to:

- i) agree to grouping the schemes for tendering in order to drive the best possible quality / pricing; and
- ii) approve the commencement of the procurement procedure to enable award in accordance with the Council's financial and contractual requirements

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

In accordance with the Council's commitment to Building a Better Bromley in supporting people to live as independently in the community as possible within the community, the proposals reflect the Council's strategic objectives for people with disabilities.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 The contracts detailed in the report are currently funded from existing budgets. The annual expenditure of these three schemes is £908,308 per annum.

5.2 Education, Care & Health Services are committed to reducing expenditure through effective and efficient commissioning. The grouping of schemes for tendering is viewed as a key enabler in making tenders attractive to bidders and generating efficiencies via improved economies of scale that will be reflected in pricing.

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 Previously the contracts would have been classed as "Part B" services under the Public Contract Regulations 2006 which meant they were not fully subject to the provisions of the regulations and the EU procurement regime. The concept of Part B services was removed by the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 and the threshold for application of the regulations was set at £625,000.

6.2 However, [Regulation 7](#) of the 2015 regulations introduces a light touch regime for services that are considered "social and other specific services" and above the set threshold of £625 000. We are required to publicise in advance our intention to award contracts of this value and announce the contract award decision after the procedure. The procedural rules are detailed in [paragraph 76](#) of the 2015 Regulations and details the following:

- Free choice of procedure which must "be at least sufficient to ensure compliance with the principles of transparency and equal treatment of economic operators".
- Including during the publication of intention to award a contract the following information:
 - Conditions for participation.
 - Time limits for contacting the contracting authority (these must be "reasonable and proportionate").
 - The award procedure to be applied.

Despite the above requirements, [paragraph 76\(4\)](#) of the Regulation states that "The contracting authority may, however, conduct the procurement, and award any resulting contract, in a way which is not in conformity with that information" in the following circumstances:

- “The failure to conform does not, in the particular circumstances, amount to a breach of the principles of transparency and equal treatment of economic operators”.
 - If, prior to commencement of the procurement procedure, the contracting authority has:
 - “given due consideration to the matter”.
 - Concluded that there is no breach of the principles of transparency and equal treatment of economic operators.
 - Documented this conclusion and the reasons for it.
 - Notified all suppliers who have indicated an interest (and who have not yet been excluded) their intentions to proceed in a way which differs from the initial specified intention.

6.2 The proposed tender will be undertaken in accordance with the Council’s Financial Regulations & Contract Procedure Rules and procurement policies

Non-Applicable Sections:	Personnel Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	

Report No.
DRR15/070

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE – PUBLIC

Decision Maker: **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE EXECUTIVE**

Date: 13th July 2015
15th July 2015

Decision Type: NonUrgent Non-Executive Non-Key

Title: **BROMLEY'S LOCAL PLAN - 'POTENTIAL SITE ALLOCATIONS DRAFT POLICY AND DESIGNATIONS ALTERATIONS' FOR CONSULTATION**

Contact Officer: Mary Manuel, Head of Planning Strategy and Projects
Tel: 020 8313 4303 E-mail: mary.manuel@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Chief Planner

Ward: (All Wards);

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 This report seeks Development Control Committee's (DCC) endorsement of Appendix 1 as the consultative 'Local Plan – Potential Sites, Draft Policy and Designation Alterations' stage in the preparation of Bromley's Local Plan. DCC is asked to consider the report and refer it to the Executive for approval for the purpose of consultation with residents, partner organisations, and the wider community.
- 1.2 The consultation is made under regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations 2012. Early in 2014 the Council consulted on its Draft Policies and Designations, also under regulation 18. The planned consultation focuses on potential draft site allocations, in line with the vision and objectives in the earlier local plan documents. It also includes a limited number of new and revised policies and designations reflecting the requirement for the Local Plan to be in conformity with the London Plan (March 2015), and the updated evidence base. The report also sets out the proposed consultation in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.
- 1.3 The report highlights the potential draft site allocations, policies and designations to be set out in the consultative document. Appendix 1 sets out the substantive content of the consultation document for approval.
-

2. RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Development Control Committee:

- 2.1 Endorse Appendix 1 as the 'Local Plan – Potential Sites, Draft Policy and Designation Alterations' document for the Executive to agree for public consultation.**

That the Executive:

- 2.2 Consider the comments from Development Control Committee with regard to the Local Plan – Potential Sites, Draft Policy and Designation Alterations, and**
- 2.3 Agree Appendix 1 as the Local Plan – Potential Sites, Draft Policy and Designation Alterations document for consultation, subject to the Director of Regeneration and Transformation, in consultation with the Chairman, being authorised to make any minor alterations to the document as required prior to publication.**

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: New Policy:
 2. BBB Priority: Children and Young People Excellent Council Quality Environment Safer Bromley Supporting Independence Vibrant, Thriving Town Centres
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Estimated cost for the current consultation £3k
 2. Ongoing costs: Non-Recurring Cost
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Planning and Renewal
 4. Total current budget for this head: £2.2m
 5. Source of funding: Existing controllable revenue budget 2015/16
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 65ftes
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours:
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement
 2. Call-in: Not Applicable:
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): Borough-wide
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Ward Councillors have been invited to participate in earlier stages of the plan preparation, and will be consulted as part of the wider consultation process.
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: Ward Councillors comments have been taken into account in the preparation of this stage of the Local Plan.

3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 The Local Development Scheme (LDS) agreed in May 2015 by the Executive sets an ambitious programme for the Local Plan in recognition of the importance of the Borough having an 'up to date plan' as required by Government guidance.
- 3.2 Consultation on the 'Draft Policies and Designations' document was undertaken in early 2014 which followed the 'Options and Preferred Strategy' consultation in Spring 2013. DCC considered the response to the 'Options and Preferred Strategy' document consultation undertaken in Spring 2013 at its June 2013 meeting and agreed that the Preferred Options be progressed to draft policies and site allocations, with key issues and areas of potential non-conformity with the London Plan brought back to the Local Development Framework Advisory Panel (LDFAP) and Development Control Committee (DCC) for further discussion.
- 3.3 In 2014 the Council undertook consultation on its Draft Policies and Designations Document (DP&D) which also included a 'Call for Sites' inviting the submission of sites for assessment as potential draft site allocations in the Local Plan. Comments and sites continued to be received during 2014. During this time the Mayor consulted on his Further Alterations to the London Plan, to which the Council made representations. Following an Examination in Public, and an Inspector's report, in March 2015 the revised London Plan was published.
- 3.4 As planned this consultation focuses on the identification of Draft Site Allocations, however, it also includes a limited number of revised and new draft policies which are considered important alongside the proposed draft allocations to reflect the requirement for the Local Plan to be in general conformity with the amended London Plan (March 2015) and updated evidence base. The proposed consultation is an 'informal' stage under regulation 18. It plays an important role in ensuring the early and ongoing engagement of the community and partners in the plan making process as required by Government. It provides a timely opportunity for residents, statutory and other partners to respond to, and comment on the draft allocations and ensure that the Draft Local Plan when finalised is a robust and 'sound' plan that also meets regulatory requirements.
- 3.5 The intention is for responses to consultation to be reported to DCC and the Executive alongside the earlier consultation responses to enable consideration to inform the preparation of the Draft Local Plan and the formal consultation under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations.
- 3.6 The Planning Strategy Team lead the Local Plan preparation, working with officers across the Council and partner organisations, producing further evidence where necessary and developing the plan in line with the 'Vision and Objectives' and the Council's priorities.
- 3.7 Appendix 1 comprises the draft consultative 'Potential Site Allocations, Further Draft Policy and Designations, a key stage in the development of Bromley's Local Plan.
- 3.8 Development Control Committee is asked to consider and comment on Appendix 1 in advance of the Executive being asked to endorse the document for consultation. Comments from the DCC meeting will be reported to the Executive.
- 3.9 The Local Plan sets out the vision and objectives, and the policies against which planning applications will be determined (together with the London Plan) and the priorities against which the plan will be monitored and reviewed. The Local Plan is the spatial expression of Bromley 2020 as the Borough's Community Strategy and extends the vision to 2031.
- 3.10 Bromley's Local Plan, together with the London Plan, when adopted, will form the Development Plan for the Borough. The Local Plan has to be in general conformity with the London Plan (March 2015) and with the National Planning Policy Framework published in March 2012.

3.11 The preparation of the Local Plan has to meet the requirements of planning legislation and regulations, including the Duty to Co-operate introduced in the 2011 Localism Act, (amending the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act). Planning legislation and regulations set out procedures to be followed in the preparation of development plans and for the plan to be 'legal and sound'. The Duty to Co-operate places a legal duty on the Council to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis to maximise the effectiveness of Local Plan preparation relating to strategic cross boundary matters. This has been met to date through meetings and dialogue with individual boroughs and partners and sub-regional officer groups and is ongoing. The London Plan is also relevant in the context of Greater London.

3.12 National Context

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 sets out the four 'Tests of Soundness' against which Bromley's Local Plan will be assessed by the Planning Inspectorate when examined. To demonstrate that the plan is 'sound' the Council the Plan will be:-

- Positively prepared –based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
- Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
- Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.

The Government published the national planning policy guidance in March 2014, The relevant guidance to the plan making process has been followed

3.13 London Plan 2015

The Local Plan is required to be in 'general conformity with the London Plan. The formal amendments to the London Plan (March 2015) contain several key changes impacting on the preparation of the Local Plan. These include:

- Revised minimum housing figure of 641 homes per annum for the Borough, in the context of 423,887 per annum across London, and an identified need of 49,000 homes over a ten year period.
- Recognition of the need for flexibility for more generous parking standards in parts of Outer London where public transport is very poor.
- Bromley Town Centre designated as an Opportunity Area.
- Crystal Palace identified as a potential Strategic Outer London Development centre.
- Lower level classification of the guidelines for office development in Bromley Town Centre, and removal of office classification for Orpington Town Centre.
- Revised employment forecasts and wording requiring greater flexibility with regard to vacant commercial floorspace in particular, retail and office floorspace.

3.14 Consultation

It is proposed that the consultation on the 'Draft Allocations' follows the format used for the previous stages of the Local Plan preparation as outlined below. This consultation forms an informal stage of consultation in the Local Plan preparation, but a very important one. It will comply with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement (2006).

Evidence of the consultation and engagement undertaken during the plan-making process will be required to demonstrate the Local Plan has followed the prescribed process, as set out in planning legislation and regulations, and the NPPF. This will be a matter for the Inspector at the Examination into the 'soundness' of the Local Plan.

The proposed consultation, as previously will be web based to minimise the costs to the Council and facilitate the analysis of responses. However, to maximise the awareness of the opportunity to respond it will include:

- Emails/ letters to around 1500 contacts on the planning database advising of the consultation details. This includes statutory consultees, adjoining boroughs and other partner agencies, residents associations and individuals, businesses and developers who have registered their interest in being consulted.
- A dedicated webpage and link from the Council's home page.
- Press releases and articles in the local papers and community newsletters.
- Poster and flyers placed in Council offices (including the Civic Centre, Mottingham and Cotmandene Outreach Centres and libraries).
- Article and link to the webpage in Community Links Bromley e-bulletin to over 500 voluntary and community organisations.
- Article and link to the webpage in the Council's business bulletin sent to over 2500 businesses.
- A display promoting the consultation within the Civic Centre
- Inclusion in 'Update' circulated to all residents associations.

In addition copies of the consultation document will be made available for inspection at the Civic Centre, Mottingham and Cotmandene Outreach Centres and Bromley Community Links.

Format of the Consultation Document

- 4.1 The **Introduction and Strategic Context** explain the purpose of the document and set the scene in relation to the scale and nature of the Borough. The Vision, Objectives, and Spatial Strategy forming the basis for the last consultation will be included to provide the context for the Potential Site Allocations, policies and further designations.
- 4.2 The **Spatial Strategy** is then set out, as in the Draft Policies and Designations document, highlighting:
- Bromley Town Centre – a focus for sustainable growth for retail, office, homes, and leisure and cultural activities
 - Cray Business Corridor - the main industrial and business area within the borough, providing accommodation for a full range of businesses, and improving the offer for modern business
 - Biggin Hill SOLDC a cluster of businesses focused on aviation and high tech related industries
 - Protecting and enhancing the quality and character of all Bromley's Places
 - Protecting and enhancing the Borough's varied open spaces and natural environment
 - Improvement of Renewal Areas
 - Maintaining and enhancing the network of town centres, local centres and neighbourhood parades.

Planning Strategy

- 4.3 The planning strategy is outlined followed by draft allocations, policies and designations set out under the thematic chapters, where appropriate, used in previous consultations for ease of reference.. The relevant chapters comprise: ***Living in Bromley, Supporting Communities, Getting Around, Valued Environments*** and ***Working in Bromley***.

Draft Revised and New Policies

- 4.4 The consultation document only includes draft revised and new policies where they directly relate to the revisions to the London Plan 2015 to ensure the emerging Local Plan is in conformity , or to new and revised designations. The policies are set out below, however, the consultation document includes supporting text, and the broader context and links to the associated documents and evidence.

Living In Bromley

Revised Draft Policy - Housing Supply

The Council will make provision for **a minimum of 641** additional homes per annum over the fifteen year Plan period which will be facilitated by:

- i. The development of Proposal Sites;
- ii. Town centre renewal involving the provision of housing;
- iii. The development of housing within Renewal Areas where appropriate;
- iv. The development or redevelopment of windfall sites;
- v. The conversion of suitable properties;
- vi. Mixed use developments including housing in suitable locations;
- vii. The provision of suitable non-self-contained units;
- viii. Vacant properties being brought back into use;
- ix. Resisting the loss of existing housing except where accommodation is unsuitable and incapable of being adapted for continued residential use or where the proposal meets an identified need for community facilities.

Getting Around

Revised Draft Policy - Parking

i. The Council will normally require off-street parking spaces to be provided in new residential development at the following minimum levels:

4 or more bedrooms	2 spaces
3 bedrooms	1.5 spaces
1-2 bedrooms	1 space

Except in the three 'parking zones' identified on Maps a, b, c where

The Council will normally require off-street parking spaces to be provided in new residential development at the following minimum levels:

4 or more bedrooms 1.5 spaces

3 bedrooms 1 space

1-2 bedrooms 0.7 space

ii. The accessibility, type, mix and use of any new development along with availability and opportunity for public transport will be considered when determining appropriate levels of residential vehicle parking.

iii. Parking for all other types of development is to be provided at levels set out in London Plan (LP) Table 6.2

iv. In addition to the above, developments must:

- provide designated blue badge parking as per LP Table 6.2.
- meet minimum cycle parking standards as per LP Table 6.3
- ensure 1 in 5 spaces have provision (both active and passive) for electric vehicle charge points.
- make provision for a car club, if above the minimum Transport for London (TfL) threshold.

v. Where parking pressures are identified at and around key public transport interchanges, new parking proposals will be supported on the basis that they do not undermine policies to encourage walking, cycling and public transport use.

vi. For development where servicing problems may arise, the Council will normally require off-street/rear servicing facilities.

Revised Draft Policy - Safeguarding land for transport investment

The Council will continue to safeguard land for the following transport investment schemes:

- A21 Masons Hill, between Kentish Way and the B265 intersection Hayes Lane and Homesdale Road

The Council will **continue** safeguards currently in force relating to land at:

- A233 Leaves Green Road/Downe Road to Blackness Lane, Keston
- A208 Mottingham Road/ Whitehorse Hill/ William Barefoot Drive/ Elmstead Lane
- B251 Hayes Lane/ Shortlands Road/ Scotts Lane

The Council proposes to explore with TfL the potential for improvements at the junction of the A232 Croydon Road and the A233 Westerham Road and Oakley Road.

The Council proposes the safeguarding of land and route alignment for the following public transport investment (including land for construction and operation):

- Docklands Light Railway from Catford to Bromley South via Bromley North
- Tramlink from Beckenham Junction to Crystal Palace

Valued Environments

Revised Draft Policy - Areas of Special Residential Character

Development proposed within Areas designated as Areas of Special Residential Character on the proposals maps will be required to respect, **enhance and strengthen their special and distinctive qualities.**

Working in Bromley

New Draft Policy - Crystal Palace Strategic Outer London Development Centre

The Council will expect any proposals for the Crystal Palace Strategic Outer London Development Centre (SOLDC) as defined on the policies map to maintain enhance and support the unique existing strategic cultural, sports, tourism and leisure functions of the Crystal Palace Park, and particularly the sub-regional importance of the National Sports Centre.

Any development proposals will be subject to other policies within the Local Plan, notably Metropolitan Open Land policies and guidance related to the Crystal Palace Park Conservation Area and will be required to be in accordance with the objectives identified as part of the approved masterplan for the park. They will be expected to contribute to and/or strengthen as appropriate the sub-regional importance of the SOLD having regards to its specialist identified strengths whilst maintaining and improving the park's open setting and the visual and landscaping amenities which inform its character and that of the key heritage assets within its boundaries.

The Council will work with the Mayor, the community and other stakeholders to ensure that development proposals and other initiatives within the SOLD contribute to the long term planning and regeneration strategies for the park and support where appropriate the wider Crystal Palace, Penge and Anerley renewal area objectives.

Proposed SOLDC Boundary



New Draft Policy - Key office Clusters (KOCs)

The council seeks to retain an adequate stock of good quality office floorspace to meet the forecast employment growth for the Borough.

The offices and sites in the following locations, defined as Key Office Clusters (KOCs) on the policies map, will be safeguarded for office use:

- i Beckenham High Street , Beckenham Town Centre
- ii Crayfield Business Park, The Crays
- iii Knoll Rise, Orpington Town Centre
- iv. Masons Hill, Bromley Town Centre

New Draft Policy - East of South Camp

Development proposals for the area east of South Camp will be restricted to airport and aviation related development. This location is not considered appropriate for non-airport related development but could be used for replacement or relocated flying club buildings, aircraft parking and maintenance and similar aviation facilities.

New Draft Policy - Terminal Area

Development proposals for the Terminal Areas will be restricted to airport and aviation related development. This location is not considered appropriate for non-airport related development.

Potential Draft Site Allocations and Designations

- 4.5 Table 1 summarises recommended draft site allocations and designations for inclusion in the consultation document. The local plan identifies, designates and safeguards land for a particular use (such as housing, employment, education and open space) to ensure sufficient land is available to implement the Local Plan vision and objectives.

Table 1

Ward	Site	Recommended Draft Designation/Allocation
Bickley	Vacant Gasholder Station, Homesdale Road / Liddon Rd,	Mixed Use Retail and Residential
Bickley	St Hugh's Playing Field, Chislehurst Road	Education Use
Bickley	Land Adjacent to Bickley Station	Residential
Bickley	Scotts Park Primary School	Safeguarded as Education Land - remove from Metropolitan Open Land and designate as Urban Open Space,
Biggin Hill	Strategic Outer London Development Centre (SOLDC), Biggin Hill (BH)	For employment development (aviation related) West Camp – remove from Green Belt for aviation related use airside and business/enterprise use as part of the SOLDC Terminal Area – remove from Green Belt for airport and aviation related uses as part of the SOLDC East Camp – retained in Green Belt for aviation and airport related uses as part of the SOLDC Land East of South Camp – remove from Green Belt for aviation and airport related use as part of the SOLDC South Camp - aviation and airport use airside and business/enterprise on remainder of land as part of SOLDC Biggin Hill Locally Significant Industrial Site for business use and part of the SOLDC
Biggin Hill	Oaklands Primary School	Safeguarded as Education Land - remove from Green Belt and designate as Urban Open Space,
Biggin Hill	Saltbox Hill	Traveller Site
Bromley Common & Keston	148 Croydon Road	Traveller Site
Bromley Common & Keston	The Beechwood Centre, Lower Gravel Road	Locally Significant Industrial Site
Bromley Common & Keston	Bencewell Business Park, Oakley Road	Locally Significant Industrial Site
Bromley Common & Keston	Bromley Education Trust (BET) Hayes Lane	Education Use, removal from Green Belt and designation as Urban open Space
Bromley Common & Keston	Enterprise House, Hastings Road	Locally Significant Industrial Site
Bromley Common & Keston	Land at Turpington Lane	Education Use, removal from Green Belt and re-designation as Urban Open Space

Ward	Site	Recommended Draft Designation/Allocation
Bromley Town	Bromley Industrial Centre + others, Waldo Road	Locally Significant Industrial Site
Bromley Town	1 Westmoreland Rd	Education Use
Bromley Town	Bromley Civic Centre	Mixed use with potential education use, housing , civic centre uses and other town centre uses.
Bromley Town	Bromley North Station	Mixed use including residential
Bromley Town	Masons Hill	Key Office Cluster
Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom	Chelsfield Park proposed ASRC	Area of Special Residential Character
Chislehurst	Edgebury Primary	Safeguarded as Education Land - remove from Green Belt and designate as Urban Open Space,
Chislehurst	Land adjacent Edgebury Primary	Safeguard for Education Use - remove from Green Belt and designate as Urban Open Space,
Chislehurst	Mead Road Infants School	Safeguarded as Education Land - remove from Metropolitan Open Land and designate as Urban Open Space,
Chislehurst	Marlings Park Estate proposed ASRC	Area of Special Residential Character
Chislehurst and Mottingham & Chislehurst North	Land at Bushell Way	Education Use
Copers Cope	Beckenham High Street	Key Office Cluster
Copers Cope	Maybrey Works, Worsley Bridge Road	Mixed use including residential
Cray Valley East	St Mary Cray Primary School	Safeguarded as Education Land - remove from Green Belt and designate as Urban Open Space,
Cray Valley East	Old Maidstone Road (Council Site)	Traveller Site
Cray Valley East	Star Lane (Council Site)	Traveller Site
Cray Valley East	Trunks Alley, Hockenden Lane	Traveller Site
Cray Valley East	Adj Vinsons Cottages, Hockenden Lane	Traveller Site"
Cray Valley West	Crayfields Industrial Park	Key Office Cluster
Cray Valley West	Bromley Valley Gymnastics Club, Chipper field Road	Mixed Use Including Residential
Cray Valley West	Midfield School / Groveland site	School sites safeguarded for Education Use, removal from Green Belt and re-designation as Urban Open Space
Crystal Palace	Crystal Palace	Strategic Outer London Development Centre
Crystal Palace	James Dixon Primary School	Safeguarded as Education Land - remove from Metropolitan Open Land and designate as Urban Open Space,

Ward	Site	Recommended Designation/Allocation
Darwin	Higham Hill Farm, Layhams Road Keston	Locally Significant Industrial Site
Darwin	Kimberley Business Park, Blackness Lane	Locally Significant Industrial Site
Darwin	Meads Green, Millies View, St Joseph's Place, Layhams Road	Traveller Sites
Darwin	Keston Mobile Park, Layhams Road	Traveller Site
Darwin	Keston's Showman's Park, Layhams Road	Traveller Site (Travelling Showmen's Yard)
Darwin	Land at junction with Sheepbarn Lane	Allocate as Traveller Site (extending the Travelling Showmen's Yard Traveller Site)
Farnborough and Crofton	No new proposed allocations/designations	
Hayes and Coney Hall	Wickham Common Primary	Safeguarded as Education Land - remove from Green Belt and designate as Urban Open Space,
Kelsey & Eden Park	Langley Park Girls & Boys Schools	Safeguarded for Education Use, remove from Green Belt and designate as Urban Open Space
Kelsey & Eden Park	Former Co-op Sports Ground, Balmoral Avenue	Safeguard for Education Use (retained as Urban Open Space)
Mottingham & Chislehurst North	Castlecombe Primary and Youth Centre	School site safeguarded as Education Land - remove from Metropolitan Open Land and designate as Urban Open Space,
Orpington	Former Milk Depot, Bruce Grove	Mixed use including residential
Orpington	Knoll Rise	Key Office Cluster
Penge & Cator	Franklin Industrial Centre, Franklin Road	Locally Significant Industrial Site
Petts Wood and Knoll	No new proposed allocations/designations	
Plaistow and Sundridge	No new proposed allocations/designations	
Shortlands	No new proposed allocations/designations	
West Wickham	No new proposed allocations/designations	

Ward	Site	Recommended Draft Designation/Allocation
Parking Standards - Revised		
Bromley Town, Plaistow & Sundridge, Shortlands	Parking Area covering area including parts of wards focused on Bromley Town Centre with high public transport accessibility and good connectivity	Residential parking standards in 'conformity' with London Plan
Orpington, Farnborough & Crofton, Petts Wood & Knoll	Parking Area covering areas within wards focused on Orpington Town Centre with high public transport accessibility and good connectivity	Residential parking standards in 'conformity' with London Plan
Crystal Palace, Penge & Cator, Clock House, Copers Cope	Parking Area identified including areas within wards in the NW of the borough with high public transport accessibility and good connectivity	Residential parking standards in 'conformity' with London Plan
Borough-wide	Various extended, new and upgraded SINC's	Extended, new and upgraded Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC's)
Bromley Common and Keston	Junction A232 Croydon Road and A233 Westerham Road and Oakley Road (Keston Mark)	Junction improvements

4.6 The consultation process will include the opportunity for comments on all the draft designations, policies and potential site allocations. Maps will be included where appropriate. However, where these are numerous and large in terms of complexity and electronic size they may be provided in a separate document for ease of reading and reference. A series of appendices will be attached and links to background documents and the evidence base. This includes information regarding all the sites submitted in response to the 'Call for Sites'. Sites assessed for potential housing or mixed use as part of the site assessment process but not recommended to be taken forward as potential site allocations in the consultation document are set out in Table 2.

Table 2 – Sites not recommended for housing/mixed use allocations

Ward	Site
Bickley	Bickley Manor Hotel, Thornet Wood Road, Bickley
Bickley	Former MOD Playing field, Thornet Wood Road, Bickley
Bickley	Land on Thornet Wood Road, Bickley
Bickley	Land fronting Blackbrook Lane, Bickley
Biggin Hill	Land at Highfield Road and Beech Road, Biggin Hill
Biggin Hill	Land adjacent to no.1 Norheads Farm Cottages, Biggin Hill
Biggin Hill	Land to the north of Norheads Lane, Biggin Hill
Biggin Hill	Land to the rear of Norheads farm Cottages, Biggin Hill
Biggin Hill	Land to the SE of Swivelands Road, Biggin Hill
Bromley Common and Keston	Jackson Road Nursery, Jackson Road, Bromley BR2 8NS
Bromley Common and Keston	Land west of Randolph Rd, Randolph Road, Bromley Common
Bromley Common and Keston	Land west of Randolph Rd (combined sites), Randolph Road, Bromley Common
Bromley Common and Keston	Potters Yard, Turpington Lane, Bromley Common
Bromley Common and Keston	Sea Cadets site, Hastings Road, Bromley Common
Bromley Common and Keston	Keston Garden Centre, Oakley Road, Keston
Bromley Common and Keston	The Drift, Croydon Road, Keston
Bromley Common and Keston	Land rear of properties in Fox Lane (Option 1), Keston
Bromley Common and Keston	Land between 57 & 67 Fox Lane (Option 3), Keston
Bromley Common and Keston	Land between 57, 67 (part), 67, 69 Fox Ln & The Granary Jackass Ln (Option 2), Keston
Bromley Common and Keston	Land on the North East side of Princes Plain, Bromley Common
Bromley Common and Keston	Oakley Farm, Oakley Road, Bromley Common
Bromley Town	Bromley Fire Station, North Street, Bromley
Bromley Town	Church House Gardens Depot, Church Road, Bromley
Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom	Land bounded by The Highway, Warren Road & Orpington Bypass, Chelsfield
Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom	Lillys Farm, Chelsfield Lane, Chelsfield
Chislehurst	Beaverwood Depot, Beaverwood Rd, Chislehurst
Chislehurst	Flamingo Park, Sidcup Bypass, Chislehurst
Chislehurst	Land on the North West side of Kemnal Road, Chislehurst
Chislehurst	Virgin Active Health Club, Sidcup By-pass, Chislehurst
Chislehurst	World of Golf, A20 Sidcup By-pass
Chislehurst	Land off Bushell Way
Clock House	National Grid Site, Churchfields Road, Beckenham
Copers Cope	Former Nat West Bank Sports Ground, Copers Cope Road

Copers Cope	SeGas sports ground, Worsley Bridge Road
Cray Valley West	Crayfields Business Park (Area 1), Main Road St. Pauls Cray
Cray Valley East & West	Crayfields Business Park (Area 2a), Main Road St. Pauls Cray
Cray Valley East	Crayfields Business Park (Area 2b), Main Road St. Pauls Cray
Cray Valley West	Crayfields Business Park adjoining open land (Area 3), Main Road St. Pauls Cray
Cray Valley East	Crayfields Business Park adjoining open land (Area 4), Sandy Lane, St. Pauls Cray
Cray Valley East & West	Crayfields Business Park adjoining open land (Area 5), Sandy Lane. St. Pauls Cray
Cray Valley East	Land rear of Tesco, Edgington Way
Cray Valley East	Land off Chapmans Lane, Chalkpit Avenue, St Paul's Cray
Cray Valley East	Ruxley Cottage, Maidstone Road
Cray Valley East	Lower Hockenden Farm, Hockenden Lane
Cray Valley West	Gasholder Station St Mary Cray, Lessons Hill/ Sevenoaks Way, St Mary Cray
Cray Valley West	Bournewood Quarry, off A20
Cray Valley West	Land fronting Sevenoaks Way, adjoining Ruxley Lakes
Darwin	Land north west of Leaves Green Road Keston
Darwin	Land at Leaves Green Road (A233) Keston
Darwin	Land to the south-east of Belvedere Road, Biggin Hill
Darwin	Land to west of Blackness Lane (Adj Foxley) Keston
Darwin	Layhams Farm, Layhams Road, Keston
Kelsey and Eden Park	Land at North End Drive
Orpington	Priory Gardens Depot, High Street, Orpington
Penge and Cator	Penge Auto Sprays, 85 Maple Road, Penge

- 4.7 As indicated earlier the Local Plan process requires particular stages and steps to be followed to be found 'sound' at the Examination in Public. This also applies to associated documents including the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and supporting documents to introduce a Community Infrastructure Levy to help deliver the Local Plan. The Council has to pay the costs of the Examination in Public together with the cost of the further consultation stages of the plan preparation and the production of evidence where gaps need to be addressed or updates required as circumstances change.

5 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 Bromley 2020 as the Sustainable Community Strategy for the Borough was the starting point for developing the Core Strategy Issues Document in 2011 and for the Vision and Objectives in the Options and Preferred Strategy stage of the Local Plan preparation. The Local Plan will extend this vision until 2031 and contributes to all the priorities within Building a Better Bromley. The Local Plan together with the London Plan will form the development plan for the Borough. The Local Plan, once adopted will replace the saved policies of the UDP.
- 5.2 The Local Plan has to be in general conformity with the London plan (March 2015) and with the National Planning Policy Framework published in March 2012. Importantly the Local Plan sets out the vision and objectives, and the policies against which planning applications will be determined (together with the London Plan) and the priorities against which the plan will be monitored and reviewed.

6 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The cost of the consultation process for this stage of the Local Plan is estimated to be in the region of £3k which will be funded from the local plan budget within Planning.
- 6.2 The Executive agreed a carry forward sum of £60k to fund the preparation of the Council's Local Plan in June 2015. The revised timetable in the Local Development Scheme agreed by the Executive in May 2015 indicated that the examination of the Plan will now take place during 2016. A further request may have to be made to the Executive to carry forward some or all of the £60k into 2016/17, in order to meet the future costs of the examination in public and to undertake any further evidence work required.

7 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The proposals are consistent with the planning legislation and regulations.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Personnel Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	<p>Report No DR 14/002 DCC and Executive 'Draft Policies and Designations for Consultation'</p> <p>Report No DRR13/016 DCC 29/1/13 Bromley's Local Plan – Options and Preferred Strategy for Consultation</p> <p>Report to Executive 12/6/13 Growth and Delivery Plans for Bromley Town Centre, Biggin Hill and Cray Corridor Employment Areas</p> <p>Report No DRR13/082 DCC Report on Local Plan 'Options and Preferred Strategy' consultation June 2013</p> <p>Bromley 2020 Bromley's Community Strategy</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework March 2012</p> <p>London Plan (March 2015))</p> <p>LBB UDP 2006 (Saved)</p> <p>Local Plan Evidence Base http://www.bromley.gov.uk/ldf</p>

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
DRR15/0XX

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: EXECUTIVE

Date: 15 July 2015

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Key

Title: BROMLEY NORTH VILLAGE IMPROVEMENTS -
CONTINGENCY OPTIONS

Contact Officer: Kevin Munnelly, Head of Renewal
Tel: 020 8313 4582 E-mail: kevin.munnelly@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Director of Regeneration & Transformation

Ward: Bromley Town;

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 Public Realm improvements to Bromley North Village have been a key part of the improvement programme for Bromley Town Centre as set out in the Bromley Town Centre Area Action Plan adopted in 2010. The improvement works have now been substantially completed and this report seeks Executive approval to a recommended package of additional works to complete and enhance the scheme, to be funded from the unallocated contingency budget.
-

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

- 2.1. **The Executive approve funding for the enhancement projects set out in Paragraph 3.4 funded from the unallocated Bromley North Village Improvements contingency budget and delegate to the Portfolio Holder for Recreation and Renewal, authority to agree any further amendments to ensure the full project spend and the drawdown of all external funding allocations.**

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy:
 2. BBB Priority: Quality Environment Safer Bromley Vibrant, Thriving Town Centres:
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: £5.549m
 2. Ongoing costs: N/A
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Capital Programme
 4. Total current budget for this head: £5.549m
 5. Source of funding: Outer London Fund 2012/13, TfL Area Based funding and Capital Receipts.
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 2ftes
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: N/A
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement:
 2. Call-in: Applicable:
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): Borough Wide
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Yes
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: Included in body of the report

3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 The final phase of Bromley North Village works were substantially completed on November 30th 2014 in accordance with the project timetable. However, some snagging and contingency works have continued in early 2015 to finalise the scheme implementation. As part of the post completion evaluation of the scheme a Stage 3 Safety Audit and business and visitor questionnaires will be undertaken and the results of the evaluation reported back to a future meeting of the R&R PDS Committee.
- 3.2 The original scheme budget had a built in project contingency of 15% or £676k of the build costs, to deal with unforeseen issues that can arise with the implementation of such a large capital works project. A significant element of the contingency budget was used to pay Thames Water Utilities to contribute to the cost of replacing a major water main in High Street North and Market Square, for which the scheme was deemed liable. There have also been other calls on the contingency budget including additional costs for CCTV, business liaison officer and upgrading of street furniture.
- 3.3 Final accounts for the completion of the first stage of the BNV project have been provisionally signed off and after allowing for outstanding commitments, the contingency sum currently stands at £124k. Officers are currently awaiting the results of the Stage 3 Safety Audit which could make further calls on this contingency. However, in order to fully utilise the external funding available, the Project Board are recommending that the contingency sum is used to fund a number of enhancements to the scheme, some of which formed part of the original design.
- 3.4 Local Ward members and the Portfolio Member for Renewal and Recreation have been consulted on the contingency projects and their views have been reflected in the priorities attached to the project list.

Bromley North Village Contingency Project List	£'000
Enhanced cleaning regime	103
Tree maintenance	10
Edison Way Gate/Sign	11
Total estimated cost	124

3.5 The contingency projects include:

- A clear priority for the Council is the maintenance of improvement works to Bromley North Village. It is proposed that the existing cleansing regime as set out in the term contract with Kier is enhanced. Officers have negotiated an enhanced cleansing regime which will involve the use of a dedicated mechanical scrubber for a minimum of eighteen hours per week for use in the BNV area. The precise nature of the suggested enhanced cleaning regime is flexible enough to respond to seasonal requirements. The recommended contingency amount of £103k also includes a provision for the refurbishment/replacement of the existing bins in BNV. This sum includes the revenue cost of the enhanced cleaning programme for a period of up to two years after which it is anticipated that any further capital or revenue liability will fall to the Bromley Business Improvement District Company, which should be established by 2017.

3.6 The proposed additional works would not be commissioned until the stage 3 safety audit is complete and the final contingency sum confirmed. The table above recommends an order of priority for suggested schemes to ensure full spend is achieved for the project.

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 Work delivering the Town Centres Draft Development Programme is entirely consistent with Policy Objectives set out in Building A Better Bromley 2011 and Renewal & Recreation Portfolio Plan 2011/12. The work of the Renewal Group links to the Building a Better Bromley priorities by working towards the provision of Vibrant and Thriving Town Centres.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The table below summarises the current financial position of the capital scheme: -

	Budget	Projected Spend	Projected Variance
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Expenditure			
Capital works	5,048	4,971	-77
Design Fees	398	371	-27
Project management	100	80	-20
	5,546	5,422	-124
Funding			
TfL	3,298	3,298	0
LBB capital receipts	1,500	1,500	0
Outer London Funding	748	748	0
	5,546	5,546	0
Net projected underspend (contingency sum balance)			-124

- 5.2 This report is requesting approval to spend the contingency sum, currently estimated at £124k on a number of enhancement projects as set out in 3.4 . This would enable the Council to make full use of the external funding available from TfL. Two of the proposals involve capitalising revenue costs totalling £37k.
- 5.3 The implementation of the projects would only be *progressed* as and when the project costs have been finalised to ensure that the cost of the overall project would be within the £5.549m budget.
- 5.4 It is expected that the Bromley BID company, if established in 2017, would meet the on-going revenue costs for the enhanced cleaning of the area.

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 As part of the settlement with Thames Water Utilities to cover the cost of the water main replacement, the Council was made aware of a claim was submitted to TWU relating to compensation payable in relation to loss of business because of the disruption brought about because of the water main replacement work. The Council has not accepted any liability in relation to any loss of business claim in relation to any of the Bromley North Village Public Realm Improvement works.

7. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 None for the purposes of this report.

Non-Applicable Sections:	N/a
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Bromley North Village Public Realm Improvements Executive Report 9 th January 2013.

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
ES15041

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: EXECUTIVE

FOR PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY BY ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ON 7TH JULY 2015

Date: 15th July 2015

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

Title: LEAD LOCAL FLOOD AUTHORITY UPDATE AND GRANT DRAW-DOWN

Contact Officer: Garry Warner, Head of Highways
Tel: 020 8313 4766 E-mail: garry.warner@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Nigel Davies, Executive Director of Environment & Community Services

Ward: All

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 This report updates Members on the Council's role as the Lead Local Flood Authority, including the latest changes in responsibilities;
 - 1.2 Seeks approval of Local Flood Risk Strategy and Action Plan;
 - 1.3 Reviews the authorities response to the 2014 groundwater flooding issue, and;
 - 1.4 Seeks agreement from the Executive to release dedicated Central Contingency funding to ensure the Council meets its statutory duties as the Lead Local Flood Authority.
-

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

That the Executive agrees to:

- 2.1 Release a sum of £213k from the 2015/16 Central Contingency budget to implement the proposals detailed in this report.

That the Environment Portfolio Holder:

- 2.2 Approves the Local Flood Risk Strategy and associated Action Plan,
- 2.3 Approves the LLFA future works programme.

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy
 2. BBB Priority: Quality Environment
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Estimated Cost: £213k
 2. Ongoing costs: Recurring Cost:
 3. Budget head/performance centre: DEFRA grant held in Central Contingency for implementation of the Flooding & Water Management Act 2010
 4. Total current budget for this head: £213k
 5. Source of funding: £139k through the settlement funding assessment (SFA) and £74k from Local Services Support Grant (LSSG) from DEFRA.
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 2
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: 2 fte
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement
 2. Call-in: Applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): Boroughwide
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Yes – Councillors have been consulted on the draft Local Strategy
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments:

3. COMMENTARY

Background

- 3.1 The Flooding and Water Management Act 2010 (FWMA) requires the London Borough of Bromley, as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), to develop, maintain, apply and monitor a strategy for local flood risk management in its area.
- 3.2 The LLFA has a duty to identify the causes of surface water flooding, including groundwater, and determine those organisations or authorities that have a role in mitigating the flood risk. Having identified those parties the LLFA must provide a forum where such parties can be brought together to produce a considered and coordinated response to flood risk in the borough.
- 3.3 This report reviews the Council's progress in the role of LLFA, and considers its responsibilities and activities for the coming year.
- 3.4 The impact of the flooding experienced across the borough during the 'groundwater emergency 2014 is also considered.

Progress

- 3.5 During the last year good progress has been made on implementing the FWMA, including;
 - The groundwater recovery and response phases, including cooperation with the Environment Agency option studies on the Ravensbourne South and East Branches.
 - Implementation of highway drainage schemes that augment local surface water drainage systems, including clearance of highway ponds.
 - Support for the Chislehurst Commons Conservators with vital surface water drainage connections between the Chislehurst ponds.
 - Surveys and improvements to ordinary watercourses.
 - Engagement with developers, to promote and where appropriate, require the use of sustainable drainage systems (SUDS).
 - Production of the Local Flood Risk Strategy – As 3.11 below.
- 3.6 In February 2012 a report was considered by the Environment Portfolio Holder and Development Control Committee to adopt the role of SUDS Approving Body (SAB) to approve Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) submitted by developers. After consultation the requirement to adopt SUDS has been dropped by the Government and the responsibility for development control with regard to surface water management has been left with planners rather than a SAB taking an enforceable lead in the process.
- 3.7 Bromley has been part of the South East London Flood Risk Group (SELFRG), working in partnership with the boroughs of Bexley, Lewisham and Greenwich. The SELFRG provides a forum at which officers and elected Members from each authority come together to exchange information and identify opportunities for partnership working. Representatives from the Environment Agency and Thames Water Utilities regularly attend quarterly meetings, together with any other authority or organisation that has an interest in flood risk within its catchment area. The Partnership has met regularly throughout the year.

- 3.8 Flood Reporting: A flood register has been established and populated with historic data on known flooding incidences. This will be used to record all future reports of flooding across the borough to use in subsequent investigations. Over the last 12 months the weather has been relatively benign, hence few new entries but historic flood incidents are still being added.
- 3.9 Flood Asset Register: Our knowledge of assets in the borough with the potential to contribute to flooding continues to develop as a result of condition surveys and ad hoc investigations.
- 3.10 Condition Surveys: The condition of surface water drainage assets determine their effectiveness during storm conditions. For the coming year surveys of Ordinary Watercourses in the borough will be a priority to quantify any issues and raise awareness with land owners of their responsibilities as Riparian Owners.

Local Flood Risk Strategy

- 3.11 A Local Flood Risk Strategy (LFRS) has been drafted as part of the joint procurement approach with SELFRG, including dedicated appendices for each authority for which borough-specific actions and priorities are detailed. There is a statutory requirement for public consultation on the LFRS, which must be concluded by mid June 2015 to be included in the Environment Agency's Thames Catchment Flood Risk Management Plan.
- 3.12 Councillors and key stakeholders have been consulted on the proposals, as Appendix 'A', and it is proposed that the LFRS and action plans are approved.

Groundwater Flood Events of 2013/14

- 3.13 In February 2014 significant flooding occurred nationally, and groundwater flooding returned Borkwood Court in Sevenoaks Road, Orpington and the Addington Road area of West Wickham.
- 3.14 As a LLFA Bromley has a responsibility for the strategic management of flood risk including that from groundwater, and as a category one responder under the Civil Contingencies act Bromley has a mandate to engage in an emergency. It was on the basis of our Emergency Planning role that Bromley spent contingency funds on protecting homes and vital infrastructure.
- 3.15 Following the flooding event the Government allocated funding to residents through the Repair and Renewal Grant to improve flood resilience to domestic properties. This grant has been administered by the Council, with funding provided to the six flats in Borkwood Court and three properties in Courtfield Rise.
- 3.16 In July 2014 Members approved the allocation of £30k to supplement the R&R grants provided by the Governments in order to provide mitigation/flood protection measures to reduce the risk of the Council being involved in any future ground water flooding event. A control chamber has been constructed at the head of main river in Corkscrew Hill which will allow any future groundwater flooding on the Sparrows Den playing to be drained in a controlled manner to the main river culvert as capacity becomes available within that pipe. While this measure may not directly prevent future groundwater flooding within the back gardens of properties in Courtfield Rise and Addington Road, the flow from these springs will be reduced by the improved lake drain down capability.
- 3.17 In West Wickham the Environment Agency has repaired the significant blockage in the piped main river culvert and improved the open channel to the rear of Addington Road. They have also engaged consultants to undertake an options study on the Ravensbourne South branch which includes the effects of significant GW emergence at Sparrows Den.

Future Responsibilities and Work Streams

- 3.18 It is proposed that the following tasks are completed during the coming year, funded by LLFA grants.
- 3.19 Publish LFRS and commence works detailed within the Action Plan, including publication of Flood Risk Management Plans: Submit LBB LS and Action plan to EA for inclusion in their Catchment Basin Flood Risk Management Plan - £60k.
- 3.20 Review of impounded water bodies: The FWMA introduced new standards for the management of reservoirs, and the Council is required to assess the risk associated with failure of the reservoir structure. There are 18 sites within the borough that may require regular statutory inspections under the FWMA, half of which are within Council-owned land - £15k.
- 3.21 Complete the review and update LBB Strategic Flood Risk Assessment - £15k.
- 3.22 Work with the Environment Agency to investigate and improve main rivers, which are a vital part of surface water drainage across the borough's catchments - The EA currently have 4 option studies underway within the borough – Ravensbourne East , Ravensbourne South, Kydbrook and Beck. These studies are likely to identify flood risk reduction measures that will require local contributions in order to go ahead - £60k.
- 3.23 Enhancements to highway drainage schemes - £8k.
- 3.24 During the last three years local residents have been encouraged to retro-fit sustainable rainwater drainage to existing residential properties, through the installation of subsidised water butts. Whilst the physical impact of this is negligible it helps raise awareness of flooding issues and encourages residents to take some responsibility for minimising the impact of their won activity. This initiative will be continued this year - £5k.
- 3.25 CCTV and condition surveys on open water courses and other integrated urban surface water drainage - £45k.
- 3.26 Development of Flood Risk Management pages on the LBB web site to include enhanced links to EA data and other informative sites explaining the principles of sustainability in urban surface water drainage - £5k.

4 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The draft Environment Portfolio Plan 2015/17 includes the following Aim and Objectives:

Aim	Minimise the risk of flooding
In 2014/15 we will:	
4.9: Increase flood risk awareness and develop resilience through our Lead Local Flood Authority role	
4.10: Adopt the role of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems Approval Body through the Planning / Building Control process to ensure that surface water drainage is properly considered in the development process and that suitable plans are in place to maintain sustainable drainage assets into the future	
4.11: Consult on, publish, adopt and act upon the Local Flood Risk Strategy for Bromley.	

4.2 In order for the Council to fulfil its statutory requirements under the FWMA, the Director of Environment and Community Services has been given delegated responsibility for co-ordinating the tasks with other Council departments, including the introduction of the additional responsibilities from the revised schedule 3 . It is proposed that this arrangement continues.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Since 2011/12, DEFRA has provided grant funding to the Council to carry out its new responsibilities under the FWMA.

5.2 As an LLFA, Bromley has been allocated £213k for local flood risk management during 2015/16. £139k is provided through the settlement funding assessment (SFA) and the remaining £74k paid via the Local Services Support Grant (LSSG).

Activity	2015/16 £'000
Review and update LBB Strategic Flood Risk Assessment	15
CCTV condition survey, maintenance & improvement of surface water drainage assets. Enhancement of HD infiltration schemes	53
Impounded water body review	15
Contribution to Environment Agency Flood catchment initiatives / internal surface water flood risk management works & other internal surface water / flood management projects	60
Contribution to retro-fitted SUDS to existing residential properties (water butts)	5
LFRS Action plan	60
Website development	5
Total	213

6 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 The London Borough of Bromley has a statutory duty under the Flooding and Water Management Act 2010, as the Lead Local Flood Authority, to develop, maintain, apply and monitor a strategy for local flood risk management within the borough.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Personnel Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	LBB Local Flood Risk Strategy DRAFT and Action Plan

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is left intentionally blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is left intentionally blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is left intentionally blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is left intentionally blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is left intentionally blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is left intentionally blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is left intentionally blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is left intentionally blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is left intentionally blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is left intentionally blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is left intentionally blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is left intentionally blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is left intentionally blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is left intentionally blank