

TO MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Notice is hereby given that a meeting of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley is to be held in the Council Chamber at Bromley Civic Centre on Monday 10 October 2022 at 7.00 pm which meeting the Members of the Council are hereby summoned to attend.

PLEASE NOTE: This meeting will be held in the Council Chamber at the Civic Centre, Stockwell Close, Bromley, BR1 3UH. If you wish to attend please contact us, before the day of the meeting if possible, using our web-form:

<https://www.bromley.gov.uk/CouncilMeetingNoticeOfAttendanceForm>

Prayers

A G E N D A

- 1 Apologies for absence
- 2 Declarations of Interest
- 3 To confirm the Minutes of the meetings of the Council held on 25 July and 15 September 2022 (Pages 3 - 50)
- 4 Questions (Pages 51 - 60)

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, questions that are not specific to reports on the agenda must have been received in writing 10 working days before the date of the meeting – 26th September 2022.

Questions specifically on reports on the agenda should be received within two working days of the normal publication date of the agenda. Please ensure that questions specifically on reports on the agenda are received by the Democratic Services Team by 5pm on 4th October 2022.

- (a) Questions from members of the public for oral reply.
- (b) Questions from members of the public for written reply.
- (c) Questions from members of the Council for oral reply.
- (d) Questions from members of the Council for written reply.

- 5 To consider any statements that may be made by the Leader of the Council, Portfolio Holders or Chairmen of Committees.
- 6 Budget Monitoring 2022/23 - Additional Staffing Capacity for Children's Social Care (Pages 61 - 112)

- 7 Capital Programme Monitoring - 1st Quarter 2022/23 (Pages 113 - 130)
- 8 To consider Motions of which notice has been given. (Pages 131 - 132)
- 9 The Mayor's announcements and communications.

.....

Ao Adetosoye

**Ade Adetosoye CBE
Chief Executive**

**BROMLEY CIVIC CENTRE
BROMLEY BR1 3UH
Friday 30 September 2022
Vol.59 No.4**

LONDON BOROUGH OF BROMLEY

MINUTES

**of the proceedings of the Meeting of the
Council of the Borough
held at 7.00 pm on 25 July 2022
(scheduled for 18th July 2022)**

Present:

**The Worshipful the Mayor
Councillor Hannah Gray**

**The Deputy Mayor
Councillor Christine Harris**

Councillors

Jeremy Adams
Jonathan Andrews
Felicity Bainbridge
Kathy Bance MBE
Kim Botting FRSA
Mike Botting
Graeme Casey
Will Connolly
Aisha Cuthbert
Peter Dean
Sophie Dunbar
Simon Fawthrop
Adam Jude Grant
Dr Sunil Gupta FRCP
FRCPATH

Colin Hitchins
Alisa Igoe
Julie Ireland
Simon Jeal
Kevin Kennedy-Brooks
Josh King
Jonathan Laidlaw
Andrew Lee
Tony Owen
Christopher Marlow
Ruth McGregor
Tony McPartlan
Alexa Michael
Angela Page
Chris Price

Chloe-Jane Ross
Will Rowlands
Shaun Slator
Colin Smith
Diane Smith
Mark Smith
Alison Stammers
Melanie Stevens
Harry Stranger
Ryan Thomson
Michael Tickner
Pauline Tunnicliffe
Thomas Turrell
Sam Webber

The meeting was opened with prayers

In the Chair
The Mayor
Councillor Hannah Gray

Before commencing with formal business, the Mayor presented a scroll to the previous Mayor, Mr Russell L Mellor, in appreciation of his service as Mayor for 2021/22.

The Mayor also presented a certificate and badge to Mr Angel Victorio on his retirement in recognition of his forty-five years of service as Council steward.

15 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Jessica Arnold, Yvonne Bear, Nicholas Bennett, Mark Brock, David Cartwright, Robert Evans, Kira Gabbert, Mike Jack, David Jefferys, Charles Joel, Kate Lymer, Keith Onslow and Rebecca Wiffen. Councillors Bear, Jack and Wiffen joined the meeting online.

Apologies for late arrival were received from Cllr Christopher Marlow.

16 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

17 To confirm the Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 18th May 2022

RESOLVED that the minutes for the annual meeting of the Council held on 18th May 2022 be confirmed.

18 Questions

Two questions had been received from members of the public for oral reply. The questions, with the answers given, are set out in Appendix A to these minutes.

Five questions had been received from members of the public for written reply. The questions, with the answers given, are set out in Appendix B to these minutes.

Eighteen questions had been received from members of the Council for oral reply. The questions, with the replies given, are set out in Appendix C to these minutes.

Thirteen questions had been received from members of the Council for written reply. The questions, with the answers given, are set out in Appendix D to these minutes.

19 To consider any statements that may be made by the Leader of the Council, Portfolio Holders or Chairmen of Committees.

The following statements were made at the request of Councillors Simon Jeal and Alisa Igoe -

(A) Planning for an Economic Downturn

Councillor Christopher Marlow, Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management, made a statement in response to a request to explain how the Council would plan for an economic downturn over the next twelve months. He rejected the premise of the request, stating

that the greatest risk was higher inflation, with much of the Council's expenditure indexed to inflation, but its income limited. Sustained high inflation without an increase in income from Government or a higher Council Tax would cause a decline in the Council's financial strength. The administration had a laser-like focus on inflation – an example of this was that the Council had negotiated a below-inflation increase in the Liberata contract. All chief officers had been asked to explore similar opportunities, and all officers were asked to justify any increases in budget – this was the best way to mitigate this risk.

In response to questions about the risk of suppliers walking away from their contracts, or going bust, the Portfolio Holder stated that much would depend on the contract, and this was addressed through the procurement process by looking at the financial strength of the counterparties. The risk was mitigated through imposing penalties and seeking to recover costs. He also confirmed that these risks were captured on the Risk Register.

(B) High Standards in Public Office

Councillor Colin Smith, Leader of the Council, made a statement on the importance of integrity, high standards and vetting processes for candidacy for public office. He emphasised the critical importance of the seven Nolan Principles and stated that he was certain that all parties vetted and selected their candidates with these principles to the fore.

In response to questions, he agreed that, given recent events in Parliament, residents in Bromley could be confident in the integrity of their councillors and also that any question of giving a political honour to someone with a criminal record, even if spent, would be for the General Purposes and Licensing Committee to consider

20 Minor Constitutional Change - Standards Committee Report CSD22082

Two minor errors in paragraph 1.1 of the report were noted – that the proposals had been considered by General Purposes and Licensing Committee on 6th July 2022 (not Standards Committee), and that there were five Groups (not four) on the Council.

A motion to remove recommendation (2) in the report was moved by Councillor Tony McPartlan and seconded by Cllr Simon Jeal but was LOST.

A motion to update Article 9 of the Constitution replace paragraph 9.2(a) with –

“The Standards Committee will have a membership comprising one member from each minority group and sufficient members of the majority group to maintain a majority.”

and to replace paragraph 9.2 (b) with –

“Members of the Executive may sit on the Standards Committee, subject to not being in a majority.”

was moved by Councillor Pauline Tunnicliffe, seconded by Councillor Melanie Stevens and **CARRIED**.

(Note: The new membership of the Standards Committee would be Councillors Nicholas Bennett, David Cartwright, Andrew Lee, Tony McPartlan, Mark Smith, Melanie Stevens, Michael Tickner, Pauline Tunnicliffe and Sam Webber.)

21 Authorisation to proceed to Contract: Energy Services
Report CSD22084

A motion to approve the following recommendations from the Executive was moved by Councillor Christopher Marlow, seconded by Councillor Tony Owen and **CARRIED**.

(1) Approve an annual budget from October 2022 of £4,026k for the purchase of Renewable Energy Guarantees of Origin (REGO) backed electricity, an increased requirement of £1,888k on the existing budget; Members should note that the cost would be £3,965k for brown electricity, which would be a required budget increase of £1,827k.

(2) Approve an annual budget from October 2022 of £1,095k for the purchase of Renewable Gas Guarantees of Origin (RGGOs) backed gas, an increased requirement of £736k on the existing budget; Members should note that the cost would be £979k for brown gas, which would be a required budget increase of £620k.

(3) Agree a drawdown from the unallocated inflation provision in the 2022/23 Central Contingency of £1,312k for renewable energy, or £1,224k for brown energy, for the part-year increased cost in 2022/23, and to reflect the full year annual budget impact in the financial forecast.

(4) Note that the sums above are the indicative cost for first year of the 3-year contract. Energy market volatility is hard to predict and cost may go up in years 2 and 3 or may fall.

22 Treasury Management Annual Report 2021/22
Report CSD22091

A motion to

- (a) Note the Treasury Management Annual Report for 2021/22;
- (b) Approve the actual prudential indicators within the report; and

- (c) Note the publication of the revised Treasury Management and Prudential Codes, with formal adoption required in 2023/24.

was moved by Councillor Christopher Marlow, seconded by Councillor Tony Owen and **CARRIED**.

23 Annual Report of the Standing Advisory Council for Religious Education (SACRE) 2020/21
Report CSD22050

A motion to note the SACRE annual report for the academic year 2020/21 was moved by Councillor Mike Botting, seconded by Councillor Pauline Tunnicliffe and **CARRIED**.

24 Annual Report of the Health and Wellbeing Board 2021/22
Report CSD22052

A motion to receive and note the Health and Wellbeing Board Annual Report for 2021/22 was moved by Councillor Colin Smith, seconded by Councillor Diane Smith and **CARRIED**.

25 Annual Policy Development and Scrutiny (PDS) Report 2021/22
Report CSD22051

A motion to receive and note the Annual Policy Development and Scrutiny Report 2021/22 was moved by Councillor Christopher Marlow, seconded by Councillor Simon Fawthrop and **CARRIED**.

26 Councillor Attendance 2021/22
Report CSD22081

A motion to note Councillor attendance data for meetings in the 2021/22 Council year was moved by Councillor Pauline Tunnicliffe, seconded by Councillor Mike Botting and **CARRIED**.

27 Next Steps for the Crystal Palace Park Regeneration Plan (Part 1)
Report CSD22

A motion to approve the following recommendations from the Executive was moved by Councillor Tony Owen, seconded by Councillor Shaun Slator and **CARRIED** –

- (1) The decisions made by the Executive in relation to Crystal Palace Park at its meeting on 29th June 2022 be noted.
- (2) That Council approve an initial addition of £4.5m to the capital programme in 2023/24 to forward fund the capital regeneration works in Crystal Palace Park, which will need to commence prior to any of

the housing land capital receipt being received, and notes that subsequent Crystal Palace Park works will then be funded from the capital receipt from disposal of the housing land.

- (3) That Council approve the commencement of the forwarded funded heritage restoration capital works, limited to £4.5m (expected housing receipt £17.5m) noting that the capital programme will regularly be updated to reflect the impact of this on total scheme expenditure.
- (4) That Council approve the following course of action in respect of the capital requirements for the regeneration of the Park:
 - i. Approve that any capital receipt generated by the disposal of the Housing Sites will be ringfenced solely for heritage works in Crystal Palace Park, as required by the enabling development Planning Permission, as set out in paragraph 3.10 of the report.
 - ii. Agree that any capital receipt generated by the Housing Sites will be spent on the Park's Regeneration Plan capital scheme (including returning funds spent to date to the Council and the endowment) within ten years of the capital receipt entering the Council's bank account. If the funds are not spent within this time period, as set out in this report, the Council will be penalised by 2% per annum of the remaining funds and required to grant the penalty monies to the Trust.
 - iii. Approve that once the capital receipt for the Housing Sites is received that the Council's capital programme budget is increased in line with the value of the receipt, subject to details of that amendment with updated scheme costs and funding being agreed by the Executive through the capital monitoring reporting process; any such amendments will be subject to the principle that total spending on this scheme will never exceed actual income to the Council secured from capital receipts and grants and contributions from third parties.
 - iv. Agree that any interest accrued by the Council from the capital receipt for the Housing Sites is also used for the regeneration of the Park, with interest calculated at General Treasury Management rates, and the approved capital programme updated accordingly.
- (5) Agree that the spend to date of £1.185m returned to the Council will be used as the match funding required for grant applications effectively recycling the investment to date.

28 Meadowship Homes Phase 2 (Part 1)
Report CSD22083

A motion to approve the following recommendations from the Executive was moved by Councillor Tone Owen, seconded by Councillor Shaun Slator and **CARRIED –**

(1) Agree the loan of up to £15m to the LLP for a period of 50 years with annual repayments starting from year 3 of 1.6% per annum and increasing annually by CPI (collared at 0-5%), funded from unallocated balances on the Housing Investment Fund, Housing Invest to Save Fund and New Homes Bonus earmarked reserves.

(2) Agree to enter into a guarantee agreement with the Funder to guarantee the loan facility of up to £100m to the LLP and undertake to meet the liabilities of the LLP in respect of the loan facility in the event of loan repayment default.

29 To consider Motions of which notice has been given.

(A) Sporting Success

The following motion was moved by Cllr Simon Jeal and seconded by Cllr Tony McPartlan -

“The London Borough of Bromley has had a wonderful recent spell of sporting success - from Emma Raducanu at the US Open, to Bromley FC men's FA Trophy win and women's league title.

To ensure we keep delivering more sporting successes, tackle childhood obesity and promote the importance of physical activity for good health and well-being, this Council pledges to work with key stakeholders and local sports clubs to ensure that high quality:

- sporting facilities
- organised physical activity sessions
- green spaces

Are available across the Borough, with adequate financial resources, to ensure that all residents, particularly young people, can participate in sport and physical activity, regardless of financial means.

The Council also agrees that a member should be appointed as ‘Sports and Active Champion’ to lead on these efforts.”

On being put to the vote, the motion was **LOST**.

(B) Cost of Living Crisis

The following motion was moved by Cllr Julie Ireland and seconded by Cllr Graeme Casey.

“Britain is undergoing the most severe cost-of-living crisis in recent history. In low-income households, particularly, people are having to choose between eating and heating. Bromley Council has a duty and the means to act. So, we are calling on the Council to declare a cost-of-living emergency and for it to refocus resources on helping Bromley residents at this dire time.

This Council should therefore take these urgent steps:

- Immediately declare a cost-of-living emergency in Bromley – making this the highest political priority and marshalling existing Council

resources to help Bromley residents. This would include undertaking urgent cost-of-living assessments for the most vulnerable residents.

- Review the use of debt proceedings against struggling residents and follow the lead of other councils by choosing not to take these cases to court.
- Speed up the release of the council tax rebate discretionary payments.
- Urgently establish a local Cost-of-Living Emergency Summit, with stakeholders, including Citizens Advice, Food Banks, Local Trades Unions, Age Concern and Chambers of Commerce and invite local MPs to attend this hybrid meeting.

We hope you share our aspirations in making sure that the Council does everything in its powers to support our residents in this cost-of-living emergency.”

The following Members voted in favour of the motion -

Councillors Jeremy Adams, Kathy Bance, Graeme Casey, Will Connolly, Alisa Igoe, Julie Ireland, Simon Jeal, Kevin Kennedy-Brooks, Josh King, Ruth McGregor, Tony McPartlan, Chris Price, Chloe-Jane Ross, Mark Smith, Alison Stammers, Ryan Thomson, and Sam Webber.

The following Members voted against the motion -

Councillors Jonathan Andrews, Felicity Bainbridge, Kim Botting, Mike Botting, Aisha Cuthbert, Peter Dean, Simon Fawthrop, Adam Grant, Dr Sunil Gupta, Christine Harris, Colin Hitchins, Jonathan Laidlaw, Andrew Lee, Christopher Marlow, Alexa Michael, Tony Owen, Angela Page, Will Rowlands, Shaun Slator, Colin Smith, Diane Smith, Melanie Stevens, Harry Stranger, Michael Tickner, Pauline Tunnicliffe, and Thomas Turrell.

The following Members abstained -

The Mayor, Cllr Hannah Gray, and Cllr Sophie Dunbar.

The motion was **LOST**.

(C) The Mayor of London's proposal to extend the Ultra-Low Emission Zone to Outer London

The following motion was moved by Cllr Colin Smith and seconded by Cllr Aisha Cuthbert -

“This Council supports the objective of improving air quality and to this end has published a comprehensive Air Quality Action Plan 2020-2025 with a matrix of twenty-five actions. The Council is committed to ensuring that its operation is carbon net zero by 2027. In addition, a further 5,000 trees are being planted on the borough's roads to add to the existing 36,000. We are also continuing our rollout of LED street lighting, installing new electric charge points, and investing in renewable energy. The Council, however, disagrees

strongly with the proposal to extend the Ultra-Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) to outer London by August 2023. Bromley is, geographically, the largest London Borough, and contains many rural areas which have little public transport and where, unlike inner London, residents are dependent on their cars. The Council is particularly concerned about the impact on the self-employed, small businesses which rely on their vehicles to conduct their trade and on elderly residents and others on fixed incomes. Already facing substantial increases in fuel costs, the imposition of a daily charge to drive in the borough will be an additional financial burden and, for many, without the means purchase a compliant vehicle, it will mean they can no longer trade or afford to drive. The imposition of the ULEZ charge on motorists, including those entering Bromley from neighbouring counties will also be detrimental, especially for those like nurses, police officers, supermarket shelf fillers and others working anti-social hours when public transport is not available. The Council therefore calls on Sadiq Khan, the Mayor of London, to abandon his plans to extend the ULEZ.”

The following amended version of the motion was moved by Cllr Alisa Igoe and seconded by Cllr Jeremy Adams –

“The Council, however, has concerns about the proposal to extend the Ultra-Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) to outer London by August 2023. Bromley is, geographically, the largest London Borough, and contains many rural areas which have little public transport and where, unlike inner London, residents are dependent on their cars. The Council is particularly concerned about the impact on the self-employed, small businesses which rely on their vehicles to conduct their trade and on elderly residents and others on fixed incomes. Already facing substantial increases in fuel costs, the imposition of a daily charge for those with non-compliant vehicles, estimated to be fewer than one in five in outer London, to drive in the borough, will be an additional financial burden and, for many, without the means to purchase a compliant vehicle, it could mean they can no longer trade or afford to drive. The imposition of the ULEZ charge on motorists who have noncompliant vehicles, including those entering Bromley from neighbouring counties, could also be detrimental, especially for those like nurses, police officers, supermarket shelf fillers and others working anti-social hours when public transport is not available. The Council therefore calls on the new Prime Minister and Sadiq Khan to work constructively to agree adequate funding for a scrappage scheme that will leave no one who has to change their vehicle significantly out of pocket while removing these polluting vehicles from London’s roads, improving air quality and reducing the harm to residents’ health caused by air pollution.”

On being put to the vote, the amendment was LOST.

The following Members voted in favour of the original motion -

Councillors Jonathan Andrews, Felicity Bainbridge, Kim Botting, Mike Botting, Aisha Cuthbert, Peter Dean, Sophie Dunbar, Simon Fawthrop, Adam Grant, Dr Sunil Gupta, Christine Harris, Colin Hitchins, Jonathan Laidlaw, Andrew Lee, Christopher Marlow, Alexa Michael, Tony Owen, Angela Page, Will Rowlands, Shaun Slator, Colin Smith, Diane Smith, Alison Stammers, Melanie

Stevens, Harry Stranger, Michael Tickner, Pauline Tunnicliffe, and Thomas Turrell.

The following Members voted against the original motion -

Councillors Jeremy Adams, Kathy Bance, Graeme Casey, Will Connolly, Alisa Igoe, Julie Ireland, Simon Jeal, Kevin Kennedy-Brooks, Josh King, Ruth McGregor, Tony McPartlan, Chris Price, Chloe-Jane Ross, Mark Smith, Ryan Thomson, and Sam Webber.

The Mayor, Cllr Hannah Gray abstained.

The original motion was **CARRIED**.

(During consideration of this item the Mayor drew attention to the fact that the meeting had reached the three-hour limit set out in Council Procedure Rule 8; members agreed to continue the meeting until all business was completed.)

30 The Mayor's announcements and communications.

The Mayor thanked members for attending the following events –

- The Armed Forces Day service in June
- The Bromley Stars staff awards on 1st July
- The Reception for Voluntary Workers on 21st July

The Mayor also informed Members about the following forthcoming events –

- A fundraising event for Ukraine, supported by Rotary Clubs, on 24th August (independence day in Ukraine)
- A charity concert on the lawn of the Old Palace on 24th September
- A Ball at Oakley House on 19th November
- A Burns Night in January
- A Dinner at the Royal Artillery Company in the Spring

She also reminded members about the prize draw to win a flight in a Spitfire.

31 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

**32 Next Steps for the Crystal Palace Park Regeneration Plan
(Part 2)**
Report CSD22085B

A motion to note the exempt information relating to Crystal Palace Park was moved by Councillor Tony Owen, seconded by Councillor Shaun Slator and **CARRIED.**

33 Meadowship Homes Phase 2 (Part 2)
Report CSD22083B

A motion to note the exempt information relating to Meadowship Homes Phase 2 was moved by Councillor Tony Owen, seconded by Councillor Shaun Slator and **CARRIED.**

The Meeting ended at 10.27 pm

Mayor

This page is left intentionally blank

Council

25th July 2022

Questions from Members of the Public for Oral Reply

1. From John Gardner to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

Following road surveys for the prioritisation of funding for maintenance, do the Council prioritise repairs to main thoroughfares, rather than small crescents or cul-de-sacs? This seems the case in our area even though some are high traffic areas.

Reply:

Regular safety inspections are undertaken to ensure that all roads and footways in the borough are in a safe condition. All roads, regardless of road class or usage, are maintained to the same standards. Boroughwide condition surveys are also used to identify those roads and footways that may require planned maintenance. As well as surface condition, road classification and usage are also considered as part of the prioritisation process, but this does not preclude the inclusion of quieter roads and cul-de-sacs that are found to be in a poor structural condition.

2. From John Gardner to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

Why has Hillview Crescent in Orpington, BR6 0SL been repeatedly overlooked when it comes to highway maintenance and repair? All adjacent roads have seen major works to the road, pavements and crossovers in this and in previous years.

Reply:

The last walked safety inspection of Hillview Crescent was completed on 11/08/21, when one footway repair was identified. The next safety inspection is due next month. Our current footway maintenance policy is to undertake localised repairs when required rather than wholesale resurfacing. The latest carriageway condition survey identified Hillview Crescent to be in a sound structural condition, with only minor surface defects. This will continue to be monitored and considered for patching or resurfacing in the future.

(As Mr Gardner was not present at the meeting written replies were sent.)

This page is left intentionally blank

Council

25th July 2022

Questions from Members of the Public for Written Reply

1. From Richard Gibbons to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

Regarding DfT 'Active Travel: toolkit for local authorities'
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/active-travel-local-authority-toolkit/active-travel-local-authority-toolkit>

The DfT's Active Travel Toolkit includes four primary actions for local authorities:

1. Develop a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan
2. Develop a Travel Demand Management Plan
3. Plan for active travel
4. Develop a behaviour change programme for active travel

Will the Portfolio Holder follow his Government's guidance?

Reply:

Bromley's Transport Plan, LIP3, is very much in line with national and regional guidance.

2. From Richard Gibbons to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

Regarding DfT Active Travel England
<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/business/2022/07/01/less-mile-cycle-walk-urges-chris-boardman/>

How will the Portfolio Holder rise to the challenge of the Government's National Active Travel Commissioner, Chris Boardman, who has said "we have to drive a lot less", and that "cars should not be used for journeys less than a mile" where people are able to in LB Bromley?

Reply:

Bromley continues to support and encourage alternatives to the car where this is possible, but it will be for individuals to decide how they need to travel.

3. From Andrew Stotesbury to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing

Please confirm that Bromley Council are rigorously applying 'Planning Gateway One' that the Government introduced in August 2021 as part of reforms to the building safety regime following the Grenfell disaster for higher risk building applications.

Reply:

Planning Gateway One is being implemented as required in legislation.

4. From Andrew Stotesbury to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing

If it is - Please detail the response from the H&SE or Building Safety Regulator for the Areli Development for the Walnuts which was submitted in December 2021.

Reply:

The HSE response is attached. (Appendix 1)

5. From Brayley Small to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces

I refer to the Annual Policy Development and Scrutiny (PDS) Report 21/22 item 7 in which the Committee states that it has "...pushed our suppliers to match our net zero ambitions..." Please state how many contractors the Council uses in total and which ones (by name) have committed to match the Council's net zero ambition of 2027.

Reply:

As of 15th July, there were 327 live contracts on the Council's Contract Database, comprised of 267 providers. The Corporate Procurement Team is not aware of any contractors that have committed to match the Council's net zero ambition of 2027; this target is monitored through the Environment and Public Protection Department.

This is in the context that almost all existing contracts were tendered prior to the introduction of the net zero ambition.

Substantive response

Substantive response from the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) to the local planning authority (LPA) as a statutory consultee.

To LPA	Bromley
LPA planning ref no	21/05907/OUT
Our ref	pgo-0824
Site address	The Walnuts Shopping Centre High Street Orpington
Proposal description	Demolition of existing buildings and comprehensive redevelopment of the site to provide a mixed use scheme. Full planning permission is sought for the construction of part of Block A (A1 and A2) (max height 126.18m AOD), part of the podium at ground and first floor of Block A3, and the public realm throughout the Site. Block A (A1 and A2) will provide 251 residential units and 908.6 sqm of Use Class E (a), (b) and Sui Generis floorspace. Outline permission with all matters reserved is sought for the redevelopment of the remainder site consisting of the construction of blocks (Blocks A3 to F) ranging from 4 to 19 storeys (maximum height 126.18m AOD) with Blocks A-C connected to a podium (above existing ground floor); provision of up to 4,806 sqm (GIA) of Use Class E (a), (b) and Sui Generis floorspace, up to 9,434 sqm (GIA) of Use Class E (d) floorspace, up to 903.9 sqm (GIA) of Use Class E (f) floorspace and up to 990 residential units (Class C2 / C3) with associated private and community garden areas and amenity spaces (including balconies / terraces), associated car parking and all other associated works including demolition of existing buildings and enabling works.
Date on fire statement	17/12/2021
Date application received	24/01/2022
Date response sent	14/02/2022

Headline response from HSE

Headline Response from HSE ('Advice to LPA' - Significant Concern)

1. Substantive response

Thank you for consulting HSE about the above application.

« Nature of Response Advice provided to the planning authority Nature of Response »

Scope of consultation

1.1 It is noted that the above consultation is in relation to a hybrid planning application. This is comprised of a full planning application relating to blocks A1 and A2 and part of block A3; and an outline planning application relating to blocks A3 to block F. As there is presently insufficient fire safety information available in relation to the outline planning application, HSE is unable to comment fully on the outline application.

1.2 Should the Local Planning Authority be minded to grant permission for the hybrid application, we strongly recommend the following:

- the planning permission is subject to a suitable condition requiring the submission of a satisfactory fire statement with any reserved matters application, and
- that HSE (Planning Gateway One) is consulted in conjunction with the Local Planning Authority's consideration of any reserved matters application.

This would ensure that the purpose of HSE being made a statutory consultee for such applications is achieved.

Means of escape and fire service access

1.3 It is noted that blocks A1, A2 and A3 have proposed storey heights of 67.18m, 57.13m and 66.35m respectively; and that these blocks will be served by single firefighting shafts constituting both the firefighting stair and escape stair.

1.4 The fire safety design guide cited in the fire statement (BS 9991) states that where a building has a storey above 50m, a design review may be needed to determine whether the fire safety provisions are appropriate. Given that the proposed buildings have storey heights exceeding 50m, the LPA should satisfy itself that a design review has been undertaken. From the documentation included with the application it is not immediately obvious that a review has been undertaken, such that it has informed the design of the scheme.

- 1.5 A design review should assess the implications of fire safety systems failure or foreseeable events. This may include the potential for fire conditions to deteriorate, thereby requiring immediate building evacuation concurrently with firefighting operations in the single stair. This matter may be the subject of later regulatory consideration which may result in changes affecting land use planning considerations.
- 1.6 It is noted that the stairs in block C1, C2 and C3 serve the covered car park; and that the stairs in each block constitute single staircases serving flats. A common staircase forming part of the only escape route from a flat should not serve a covered car park. This is necessary to ensure that fire and/or smoke from a car park fire cannot enter the staircase and compromise the escape route and firefighting operations. Resolving this issue may affect land use planning considerations such as layout and appearance of the building and car parking provision.
- 1.7 Similarly, it is unclear how firefighters would fight a fire in the covered car park adjacent to block A. Firefighters may not wish to use the rising mains in the staircases to access water, as to do so would necessitate opening the door to the stairs, and the door to the car park on fire, and wedging these open with fire hose. This would allow smoke and/or fire from a car park fire to enter the single escape route from the upper floors. However, if firefighters enter the car park from the vehicle access point, it appears that hose laying distances are too great to allow effective firefighting.
- 1.8 Likewise, the fire statement states in relation to the car park in block D: '*Fire-fighting operations block D1 and D2 will be carried out from a protected core fitted with a wet fire main (as under 18m in height). Fire-fighting operations within existing car park will be carried out from two protected cores fitted with a wet fire main*'. Again, fighting a car park fire from a protected core, would necessitate opening the doors separating the stairs from the car park and may allow the ingress of smoke into the single means of escape from upper floors. Resolving this issue may affect land use planning considerations such as layout and appearance of the building and car parking provision.
- 1.9 Section 8 of the fire statement states in relation to fire service vehicle access: '*In some instances the distance between the parking position and the firefighting shaft entrance (e.g. block E1) or distance between firefighting shaft entrance and firefighting lift door (e.g. block A1) exceeds the recommended 18m. As the firefighters are considered in place of relative safety within the protected corridor it is considered reasonable for one of the distances to be exceeded on a basis that the total distance between parking position and firefighting lift entrance is within 36m (18m + 18m)*'.

- 1.10 In a building fitted with a wet fire main there should be access for a fire appliance to within 18m of, and within sight of, a suitable entrance giving access to the wet fire main; and fire service vehicle access within sight of the inlet for the emergency replenishment of the water tank for the wet fire main. Additionally, due to firefighting safety considerations, the horizontal and vertical distances that firefighters have to travel to fight a fire, or rescue a casualty, must be limited. Resolving this issue may affect land use planning considerations such as layout and appearance of the building.
- 1.11 Ground floor plan drawings appear to show that there is no way of accessing the firefighting shaft at ground floor level in building C3, other than via the car park. Access to a firefighting shaft at the access level should be either directly from outside, or via a fire protected corridor. Resolving this issue may affect land use planning considerations such as layout and appearance of the building.

2 Supplementary information

The following points do not contribute to HSE's overall headline response and are intended only for guidance/clarification purposes. These comments identify items that may have implications for planning and could usefully be considered now.

- 2.1 Plan drawings show car parking spaces immediately adjacent to the external wall of block A3. There is insufficient information on the proposed construction of this external wall to determine whether a car fire in this location could spread into the building via flat windows on the elevation above. Further engineering analysis may be required to assess this risk of fire spread. Such analysis may affect land use planning considerations such as the appearance of the building and car parking provision.
- 2.2 Plan drawings show windows of adjacent flats in close proximity and at right angles to each other. This proximity and angle may allow fire spread between flats. The fire safety design guide cited in the fire statement (BS 9991) is currently under review and a draft of a revised version has been published. The draft version of the standard contains provisions relating to the angle and proximity of adjacent flat windows. Whilst this is a draft version of the design standard, and cannot presently be relied on, it may be the extant standard at time of construction. Consequently, further consideration of this issue during later regulatory consideration may result in changes affecting land use planning considerations such the appearance of the building.
- 2.3 Plan drawings indicate that roof levels will include the provision of bio-diverse roofs and solar panels. There is insufficient information provided to assess whether the fire risks posed by green roofs and solar panels, and the interaction between the two, has been considered.

14/02/2022



Signed by: Jon Bryan

This substantive response provides fire safety advice to the local planning authority. It's based on the information provided as it relates to land use planning.

This response does not provide advice on any of the following:

- **matters that are or will be subject to Building Regulations regardless of whether such matters have been provided as part of the application**
- **matters related to planning applications around major hazard sites, licensed explosive sites and pipelines**
- **applications for hazardous substances consent**
- **London Plan policy compliance**

This page is left intentionally blank

Council

25th July 2022

Questions from Members of the Council for Oral Reply

1. From Councillor Sam Webber to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management (answered by the Leader of the Council in the Portfolio Holder's absence)

Now that the problematic microphones in the Council Chamber have been replaced, will the Portfolio Holder now move ahead with making recordings of Council meetings available online to residents where they are already welcome to attend in person in the gallery. If not, why not and if not now when?

Reply:

I understand that General Purposes and Licensing Committee has called for a report on the options for recording and live-streaming of all meetings at its next meeting in September, and I suggest that we follow their recommendation on this issue after that.

2. From Councillor Will Connolly to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces

Will the Portfolio Holder now urgently consider installing air quality monitors at all schools so that we can measure the effectiveness of current measures to improve air quality, measure the performance of new measures introduced and share good practice between schools.

Reply:

I am pleased to confirm that all Bromley schools meet the legal limits set by the Government and that we can measure the effectiveness of our air quality measures. We gather the data by our monitors and other local authorities' monitors. This allows us to provide street-level data for air quality and crucially what it is that our schools and we can do if there is a problem.

There is an organisation called the London Schools Pollution Helpdesk which is open to any school or nursery to join. They run a forum which is designed to share best practice ideas and discuss any issues and concerns. I would encourage any school or nursery to join that Forum and please do come and talk to our excellent Environmental Protection Team if there is any particular school that has any issues or concerns.

Supplementary Question:

I would welcome a meeting with the Portfolio Holder to look into some of this data. As you will appreciate some organisations do use different data, such as the WHO and other information that we may be party to. Is the Portfolio Holder aware that the measurement of one air quality monitor is not good enough to understand air pollution in the borough, appreciating what the Portfolio Holder says about using data from other local authorities, but pollution will differ on a street by street basis. I did reach out to an Asthma and Lung UK charity this week and they have said it is really not good enough. Is the Portfolio Holder aware that one air quality monitor is not good enough?

Reply:

We have thirty five. I appreciate that they measure different types of pollutants, but my understanding is that our air quality monitors do measure nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter which are of most concern. But in terms of the WHO Guidelines I completely appreciate that they are very ambitious. The document says that, currently, 97% of major cities across the world do not meet those guidelines. Of course it is an ambition of this Council and around the world and I welcome a bilateral meeting with you and your organisation. As we know, this is a big issue and I am keen to tackle it.

Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Simon Jeal:

You mentioned that there are thirty-five monitors that the borough has in place. How many of those are located within school grounds or immediately outside them?

Reply:

I do not have the data on me but I am very happy to write to you and let you know.

Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Julie Ireland:

Can I ask the Portfolio Holder to clarify? My understanding is that you have one live monitor based at Harwood Road in Bromley which measures particulate matter and the others are all diffusion tubes, which do not give you live or hourly data – it gives you an average over the space of a month. These diffusion tubes are usually derided as being of little interest. Can you clarify that of the ones that you have spoken about, only one gives live data, the others are averages over a monthly period based on diffusion tube readings?

Reply:

It is my understanding that the information we collect from all of our monitors gives us really important data on nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter. I am happy to follow up with an email to clarify. This is something that we will be discussing in further detail at the Committee in September.

Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Michael Tickner:

Is there anything preventing our academy schools installing their own air monitors?

Reply:

My understanding is no. I do believe there are grants available for schools wishing to purchase but that is maybe something they can follow up with the forum and ourselves.

3. From Cllr Kevin Kennedy-Brooks to the Portfolio Holder for Adult Care and Health

Will the Portfolio Holder agree that a large number of Bromley's carers are relatives?

Reply:

Yes I do agree.

Supplementary Question:

I have had a few accounts of relatives who care for elderly people and those elderly people either sadly pass or they do go into homecare. The relatives that were carers have some severe issues in facing eviction. Can you please outline what the Council can provide for those carers in liaison with housing associations to make sure that there is a period of grace?

Reply:

I think I will need to discuss this with Councillor Bear from the point of view of eviction queries, but if you have any specific issues then I would be happy to take those forward on behalf of you and your residents.

4. From Cllr Igoe to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing (answered by the Leader of the Council in the Portfolio Holder's absence)

On 9 November 2021 the Portfolio Holder answered my query on the amount remaining within the Welfare Fund - "balance as at 1 April 2020 of £639k. During 2020/21, £147k was drawn down, leaving a balance of £492k as at 31 March 2021." Could you please tell me how many funds have been used since that date to assist Bromley families and how much remains?

Reply:

£160k, leaving a balance of £332k.

Supplementary Question:

I believe the Welfare Fund is also providing articles for Ukrainian families which is wonderful. We have in Plaistow ward the Z Pods where twenty-five homeless families will move in. I went to two of them. They are carpeted, the officers are looking into curtains, but they had no fridges. Would it be alright to meet with officers to discuss those families, if they needed a fridge or a bed and they were not bringing them with them, if we could help them to get them from the Welfare Fund?

Reply:

That is precisely what the fund is for, so, yes, most definitely.

5. From Cllr Kathy Bance MBE to the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Enforcement

Sutton Council have achieved a White Ribbon Accreditation in its commitment to reduce VAWG and this was raised as a key issue at the VAWG Roundtable event you attended in February. Does Bromley Council have the same aspirations to achieve a White Ribbon Accreditation?

Reply:

There are no plans to sign up for White Ribbon accreditation as it is preferred that available resources are used on direct service delivery locally. This includes looking at ways to engage and raise awareness around the Safer Bromley Violence Against Women & Girls priority.

Supplementary Question:

Did you make that comment at that meeting that you were at, that Bromley was not going to take up the accreditation?

Reply:

No, that was not how the discussion went on the day. There was a presentation from Sutton and it was a situation where we watched a presentation then there was a general discussion afterwards. At that point it was a case of looking in to it – as you know that was quite some time ago and since then we have looked into it and that is the case.

Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Julie Ireland:

Is the Portfolio Holder aware that all the Liberal Democrat Councils in London have this accreditation, underlining how important we feel it is?

Reply:

Yes, indeed, it was Cllr Ruth Dombey who led on that who I know quite well. That was why Sutton was involved in that – it was a presentation that they made to the Violence Against Women and Girls Round Table.

6. From Cllr Tony McPartlan to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing (answered by the Leader of the Council in the Portfolio Holder's absence)

I note from recent Audit Sub-Committee minutes that ‘...audit had made the observation that the information provided on the Council website was inadequate for people to properly navigate and find solutions to their various [housing] needs.’

When can we expect this information to be online so that some of our most vulnerable residents have access to the information that they desperately need?

Reply:

I am advised that a full review and refresh of all information held in relation to housing on the website was scheduled for March 2022. However, the timescales have had to be revised due to the upgrading of the Council website, meaning that the bulk of all outstanding work will have been completed by September, the balance in Q3 2022.

Supplementary Question:

Has the Council ever done any user testing for Housing Service users to make sure that they can access information in the right way, and if not is it something that they would consider doing?

Reply:

I don't know the answer to that, but if Cllr McPartlan can pass that question to Cllr Bear outside the meeting I am sure that she can get back to him.

7. From Cllr Josh King to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contracts Management

Can the Portfolio Holder give a list of open posts across the Council broken down by department/job function and indicate those posts which have been open for (a) 3 months and (b) 6 months?

Reply:

There are currently 91 vacant posts (equivalent to 72.13 full time equivalents (FTE).)

Of these, 10 have been vacant for less than 3 months and 11 have been vacant between 3-6 months.

12 are qualified Social Work roles but there are also 20 other professional or technical roles such as Lawyers, Engineers, Surveyors, Environmental Health Officers and Educational Psychologists which are known hard to fill roles

Section	No. of Vacancies
Adult Services	27
Chief Executive's Office	1
Children's Services	23
Corporate Services	3
Environment & Public Protection	18
Finance	2

Housing, Planning & Regeneration	15
Public Health	2
Total	91

Supplementary Question:

Pay is one important factor to help the Council's vacancies seem attractive, but does the Portfolio Holder accept that the lean staffing model, and possible subsequent career progression, can also impact, possibly in a negative way, the attractiveness of positions with the Council?

Reply:

I think the fact that Bromley has opted out of national pay and conditions and can therefore choose to decide how we remunerate officer ourselves more than makes up for the demands we make on officers through the lean model which saves money for the taxpayer.

Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Simon Jeal:

Can he confirm that, based on the figures he has just provided, there are currently seventy vacancies in the Council that have been vacant for more than six months?

Reply:

That is correct, but the Council workforce is well over a thousand staff, which needs to be born in mind as well.

Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Colin Hitchins:

Would the Portfolio Holder agree that if the Mayor of London puts through his proposals for ULEZ we will find it even harder to get employees to fill those posts?

Reply:

I agree entirely – the needs of outer London boroughs are not well understood by this inner London Mayor.

Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Kevin Kennedy-Brooks:

Would it be possible to provide a comparison with local boroughs?

Reply:

I am sorry, you will need to submit that request in writing please.

(Cllr Diane Smith added that the Director of Adult Services had informed her today that seven newly qualified social workers had been recruited.)

8. From Cllr Rebecca Wiffen to the Portfolio Holder for Children, Education and Families (answered by the Leader of the Council in the Portfolio Holder's absence)

Following the last minute changes to the SEND transport reports and policies issued on 15th June this year, what policy vetting procedures have you now put in place to ensure that policies are not based on incorrect or out-of-date information?

Reply:

It is the collective responsibility of all Councillors to ensure that policies are not based on incorrect or out of date information, and it is particularly important that this scrutiny function is carried out by the PDS Committees and the Executive.

To that end, and with regards to the SEND Transport report, credit and recognition is due to the CEF PDS Chairman, Cllr Kira Gabbert, who identified officers' misinterpretation of what they describe as "the somewhat vague references to TfL transport charging" on the TfL website, suggesting that the scrutiny function is working well and as it should be locally.

9. From Cllr Chris Price to the Portfolio Holder for Children, Education and Families (answered by the Leader of the Council in the Portfolio Holder's absence)

Hard working parents in Bromley, earning just above the income level to be able to access free school meals and other benefits, are reporting that some Academies are putting up prices on breakfast and after-school clubs, for some families with more than one child by over £700 a year (a 20% rise). Many families do not have the flexibility or savings to meet this demand.

In a time of the worst cost of living crisis since the second world war, will Bromley Council commit to step in to support families affected by these increased charges in these extraordinary times?

Reply:

As the questioner is I'm sure aware, academy schools are autonomous from the Council's control in this regard; the Council does not hold the power to direct an academy to set particular charges or to not cover its costs.

However, at Cllr Lymer's request, Council Officers have already raised this matter at the Schools Forum, where it was noted that many academies have hardship policies to support disadvantaged families and that should be Members' first advice, should any of their residents contact them on the subject.

Supplementary Question:

A lot of the families that we are talking about are not in hardship, they are just above that line. I'm really asking for advice – what would you say to families who are struggling at the moment in this cost of living crisis when the costs are going up

within our borough and our borough will not support. What advice can I give to families? They pay their Council Tax, so it is their money.

Reply:

What I would suggest any councillor of any party tells their residents if they are in hardship or struggling is to seek advice at the earliest possible stage, contact the Council, which provides an excellent service in terms of financial recommendations and training, and generally make their problems known early to stave off debt and problems further down the line.

Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr

Would the Leader be able to assure me that help that has been provided for some of these families? Some of these children are so poor that they only meal that they can rely on being regularly there is the meal they have at school, key stage 1 kids. What support is the Council able to support them with over the school holidays which are an increasing pressure?

Reply:

My advice is that there is significant funding being placed with the schools for precisely that purpose over the school holidays. I would suggest contacting officers in Education, and if I recall, there was a recent report to the Executive stating that this money was coming into the Council from central government.

10. From Cllr Simon Jeal to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces

Bromley Council owns around 70 Childrens' playgrounds across the Borough, how many of these playgrounds have equipment that is designed and accessible for children with disabilities in them?

Reply:

There are 19 playgrounds that contain equipment that is designed and accessible for children with disabilities. The data is currently partial, so what we have asked is for the next inspections by our Grounds Maintenance contractor Idverde to look to implement a category to better capture this data during safety inspections. There is already a safety inspection, so we are asking them to add that on. Once this is finished the full list can be provided. This is happening in October, so we should have the full list then.

Supplementary Question:

Once this additional data is captured, do you expect that number to increase significantly, and if it doesn't do you share my disappointment at the low number of accessible equipment in our playgrounds, and what action will you take over the next four years to address this inequality, if indeed it is as bad as 19 out of 70?

Reply:

I do have a sense that it is under-reported. I know that at my own playground there are a couple of pieces of equipment that were not recorded. Councillor Lymer,

Portfolio Holder for Children, Education and Families has already talked to me about this, because we do want to encourage more playgrounds that have equipment for children with disabilities, and we do want to be inclusive. What I would say to Members who are interested in applying for the Jubilee grant is that we will take a special interest in pushing those forward that do have that in their bid.

Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Tony McPartlan:

As welcome as the £1m investment is, is the Portfolio Holder aware that a maximum bid of £20k is likely to buy you roughly half a piece of accessible play equipment? Is that money really going to make our parks and play spaces more accessible?

Reply:

I don't recognise that figure. If you do have data please share that with me. This fund can be supplemented with other organisations' funding. I know that Big Lottery funding was obtained in your patch - they did get a whole bunch of funding including from the Council, and I know that there is some great equipment there in terms of accessibility.

Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Alisa Igoe:

There isn't any in the park that you are referring to.

Reply:

I stand corrected.

11. From Cllr Jeremy Adams to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management

With regard to delays in signing off Bromley Council's accounts, auditor EY has commented: "The Council's finance team has been run on lean principles, with limited capacity to support the reporting process". Can the Portfolio Holder please confirm numbers of staff (FTE) employed to support the reporting process at year end 2019, 2020, 2021 and today?

Reply:

In practice most staff within finance are involved in the annual financial close. The FTEs in the central 'Technical & Control Team' which co-ordinates and oversees the annual financial close consisted of 5fte in 2018/19 and 2019/20 which is lean compared to other authorities. Since the appointment of the Head of Corporate Finance and Accounting in 2020 the workload was reviewed and resulted initially in a new graduate trainee post being created and subsequently a further post specifically recognising external audit issues approved as part of the 2022/23 Budget which is currently being recruited. The team now consists of 7 FTEs, which is a 40% equivalent from 2019/20..

Supplementary Question:

It is heartening that there has been an increase from 5 to 7 FTEs. I wanted to highlight a couple of comments that Ernst and Young, the auditor, made. They talk about significant weaknesses in arrangements in 2020/21, and the support processes in place around the year-end processes, and they also talked about the significant time incurred leading to additional fees. Can the Portfolio Holder confirm how much those additional fees were?

Reply:

I cannot confirm the fees at the present time. I will ask officers from the Finance department to find out the figure, and it will be shared with you.

Additional supplementary question from Cllr Michael Tickner:

Can the Portfolio Holder confirm that these accounting delays referred to in the question are not related to staffing shortages but to a disproportionate challenge to the accounts by one individual?

Reply:

You are quite right – a disproportionate share of the delays is caused by the objections, and this year we have managed to fully sign-off two years of accounts within the last few months, which is a great achievement, and now we hope to sign off more within the rest of this financial year.

Additional supplementary question from Cllr Simon Jeal:

Could the Portfolio Holder also possibly confirm that the Council's auditors did write us a letter in which they explicitly referenced the lack of resource in addressing their concerns as one of the things the Council needed to improve on?

Reply:

I am not quite sure of the purpose of asking a question that you already know the answer to, particularly as you have asked something similar within the last six months.

12. From Cllr Simon Fawthrop to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management

How much is the cost of holding an additional meeting of a PDS committee in the Council Chamber including the notional value to hire the Council Chamber, postering (including web page updates), heating, lighting, sound systems, printing and distribution of agendas, staff preparation and attendance (including security)?

Reply:

The very approximate cost would be around £640. This includes the items mentioned in your question, and assumes a two hour meeting with five officers attending and three attendants on duty.

The breakdown is as follows -

Room Hire (including lighting/heating)	£100
PA & audio equipment	£60
Meeting Room Preparation	£6.50
Refreshments	£30
Agenda Printing	£15
Agenda Postage (including preparation)	£45
Agenda Preparation & Report Writing	£75
Attendants	£60
Service & DS Officers Attending	£250

Depending on the reports required that line item is probably a conservative estimate.

Supplementary Question:

Would the Portfolio Holder confirm that when an item has already been thoroughly scrutinised at a PDS Committee this is a waste of taxpayer's money?

Reply:

I wholeheartedly concur – it is a waste of time and money.

Additional supplementary question from Cllr Kathy Bance:

Does that mean that, from now on, nobody is allowed to call anything in for scrutiny reasons?

13. From Cllr Chloe-Jane Ross to the Leader of the Council

Only two Councils in England and Wales are not members of the Local Government Association (LGA) and Bromley is one of them. The LGA provides a range of benefits to Councillors including training, support for political groups, and shared working across issues Councils wish to influence. Can the Council reconsider, by canvassing Councillors individually, its membership of the Local Government Association?

Reply:

I'm afraid not. It would divert £ 48,000 from essential services to Bromley residents elsewhere.

Supplementary Question:

Does the Leader think that there might be value with banding together with other Councils to fight for a better settlement from central government, especially noting that we have the second lowest in London?

Reply:

The whole of London, inner and outer, inclusive, has been fighting for fairer funding on a cross-party level, predominantly through London Councils, for at least the past five years, and probably longer. There is a great worry that the impending fairer funding change, if and when it eventually happens, is going to see money diverted away from London under the levelling up programme and out to the shires in a

reversal of what happened the last time local government funding was adjusted under the Brown/Blair years, when they pushed money into the inner cities, and Councils in the north. Yes, it is happening, it should happen and it should continue to happen, as London as a whole is disadvantaged, and outer London in particular.

Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Simon Fawthrop:

Is the Leader aware that the LGA employs 65 people at over £75k per annum as part of its costs? As well as you have already indicated that £48k is an unacceptable cost to this authority, does he agree that this sounds like another Liberal Democrat cost increase for this Council?

Reply:

Any costs that we add will put budget pressures on us when we come to set the budget next February, if I could leave that though hanging across the chamber. I see several potential budget increases here today around some of the questions and motions. The very first thing you must do is to balance the books, before you do anything nice you want to. We must balance the books, and if we don't do that this is what happens in places like Croydon and other places. The ball is in our court and we need to play it cleverly and intelligently.

14. From Cllr Adam Grant to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety (answered by the Leader of the Council in the Portfolio Holder's absence)

What is the current position regarding Local Implementation Plan (LIP) funding from TfL for 2022-23?

Reply:

There is currently just £236k allocated to Bromley for 2022/23, although Bromley keenly awaits further announcements.

The bid to TfL from Bromley was for £2.7M.

Supplementary Question:

What is the position regarding the Local Implementation Funding from TfL for 2022/23?

Reply:

The current situation is that nobody knows, we are waiting to see the final settlement, the final agreement, between TfL, the Mayor and Government. Let's not get into a debate arguing about who is responsible, as we would be here all night, but that is where we are. It is uncertain, and will remain uncertain until the TfL budget is settled.

15. From Cllr Colin Hitchins to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety (answered by the Leader of the Council in the Portfolio Holder's absence)

What proposals are there to improve road safety outside Lessons' Primary School?

Reply:

Cllr Bennett has asked me to advise all that he met with the ward councillors, at Cllr Hitchins request at Leeson' Primary school, on Wednesday June 20th, 2022.

Ward councillors have agreed to talk to the school, in the first instance, to look at their travel plan, and to see whether there are any measures which might help to improve road safety outside the school..

Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Chris Price:

Would you be willing to commit the Council, when we look at this issue in St Paul's Cray, to having a child safety first approach to the crossings outside Leeson's Hill?

Reply:

We already have a child safety first policy outside every school in the borough.

(At this point the time allowed for questions expired – the remaining questions received written replies.)

16. From Cllr Kevin Kennedy-Brooks to the Chairman of Development Control Committee

When being consulted on large Planning applications in industrial or trading areas how do Planning officers assess the economic and employment affect?

Reply:

Planning applications are assessed against relevant economic and employment policies in the development plan which is produced with a detailed evidence base. Economic and employment benefits are usually given positive weight in assessing planning proposals.

17. From Cllr Chloe-Jane Ross to the Chairman of General Purposes and Licensing Committee

All voters should be able to cast their votes at polling stations if they wish. We have heard of disabled residents having difficulty accessing polling stations in the recent local election. Please will the portfolio holder confirm which polling stations were not step free or required temporary step free solutions (such as ramps), how voters requiring step free assistance could request it on arrival to the polling station, and how many complaints were received about polling station inaccessibility for the May 22 election.

Reply:

Yes, all voters should be able to cast their vote. Every polling station must have arrangements to enable disabled voters to cast their vote. Identifying suitable polling stations is a challenge. Nevertheless, all our polling stations are made accessible and compliant. At the recent Local Election in May 2022 all our polling stations had the necessary arrangements, either an access ramp or a threshold ramp or both. At

one of the polling stations there was a last minute change notified to us by the school and assistance was provided on request or as needed.

(A list of which polling stations had what arrangements is set out below.)

In terms of complaints, six complaints were received regarding the accessibility of four of our polling stations. Five of these complaints were at the polling stations and were logged and one was by email.

Polling Station	Ramp provided/Arrangement
<i>23rd Bromley St Augustine Scout Hall</i>	<i>Access Ramp</i>
<i>All Saints (Orpington) Church Hall</i>	<i>Access Ramp/Threshold Ramp</i>
<i>Beckenham Social Club</i>	<i>Access Ramp</i>
<i>Beckenham United Reformed Church Hall</i>	<i>Threshold Ramp</i>
<i>Biggin Hill Children & Family Centre</i>	<i>Access Ramp</i>
<i>Blenheim Children & Family Centre</i>	<i>Access Ramp</i>
<i>Burnt Ash Children & Family Centre</i>	<i>Access Ramp/Threshold Ramp</i>
<i>Castlecombe Children & Family Centre</i>	<i>Access Ramp/Threshold Ramp</i>
<i>Cherry Lodge Golf Club</i>	<i>Access Ramp</i>
<i>Chislehurst Methodist Church Hall</i>	<i>Access Ramp</i>
<i>Coney Hill Baptist Church</i>	<i>Access Ramp</i>
<i>Downe Village Hall</i>	<i>Access Ramp/Threshold Ramp</i>
<i>Elmstead Baptist Church</i>	<i>Access Ramp</i>
<i>Kenilworth Church Hall</i>	<i>Access Ramp</i>
<i>Kings Church (Kings Hall)</i>	<i>Access Ramp</i>
<i>Link Youth Centre</i>	<i>Access Ramp</i>
<i>Mottingham Community Centre</i>	<i>Access Ramp</i>
<i>Neighbourhood Church Beckenham</i>	<i>Access Ramp/Threshold Ramp</i>
<i>Orpington Sea Cadets (TS Whirlwind)</i>	<i>Threshold Ramp</i>
<i>Pratts Bottom Village Hall</i>	<i>Access Ramp</i>
<i>Red Hill Primary School</i>	<i>Access Ramp</i>
<i>Southborough Lane Baptist Church</i>	<i>Access Ramp</i>
<i>St Andrew's Bromley Church Hall</i>	<i>Threshold Ramp</i>
<i>St George's Bickley Church Hall</i>	<i>Access Ramp</i>

<i>St Mary's Bromley Church (Warwick Hall)</i>	<i>Access Ramp/Threshold Ramp</i>
<i>St Nicholas Orpington Church Hall</i>	<i>Access Ramp</i>
<i>St Peter & St. Paul Catholic Primary Academy</i>	<i>Access Ramp</i>
<i>Stewart Fleming Primary School</i>	<i>Access Ramp</i>
<i>Sydenham Lawn Tennis Club</i>	<i>Access Ramp</i>
<i>The Cricketers Public House</i>	<i>Access Ramp</i>
<i>The Sydney Arms</i>	<i>Access Ramp</i>
<i>Stewart Fleming Primary School</i>	<i>Late notice change from school advising we could not use disabled entrance as would mean closing the school - telephone number of Presiding Officer posted at entrance and assistance given on request - to be resolved at future elections</i>

18. From Cllr Adam Grant to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

What restrictions are placed by TfL on the Council in respect of Local Implementation Plan (LIP) funding?

Reply:

The recent allocations made to Bromley have been scheme-specific, although there is scope to approach TfL with change requests.

This page is left intentionally blank

Council

25th July 2022

Questions from Members of the Council for Written Reply

1. From Cllr Mark Smith to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces

In response to a freedom of information request regarding public access along The Drive to Scadbury Park in June 2018, the following information was provided to the FOI requestor:

The route described as The Drive is mainly located within Scadbury Park, although a short length leading to The Lodge off St Pauls Cray Road crosses part of Chislehurst Common where there is a gate.

Any question regarding the Common should be addressed to the Conservators of the Common.

Within the park users of The Drive do not do so by right but as invitees of the Council, as the land owner and signage erected on site stating 'Private Property no Public Vehicular or Pedestrian Right of Way' is Local Authority signage explaining this.

Accordingly the accessibility of public access may be withdrawn at any time, there being gates in place to shut the route, without notice, if necessary.

The exception to this is on the northern access from Perry Street, along Footpath 44, which passes over the route known as The Drive for approximately 150 metres before diverting into Scadbury Park.

Any signage erected within Scadbury Park should only be erected by the Council, or by others with its consent as land owner, and would have the right to remove any unauthorised signs on its land.

Can you confirm that the information provided in 2018 is still operative? If it isn't, can you confirm what has changed?

Reply:

Yes, the information provided in 2018 is still operative.

The made track known as 'The Drive' that cuts across the centre of Scadbury Park is not a public highway, it is unadopted, and the Council has the right to determine who is entitled to its legitimate use, such as residents, essential services, users of the stables and users of the Tree Centre.

2. From Cllr Mark Smith to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management

What is the current population of the borough? How many individual households are there in the borough?

Reply:

According to 2021 Census data, the population of the borough is 330,000. There are 135,800 households with at least one usual resident.

3. From Cllr Sam Webber to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing

Following the Council's response to a written question in February, is there any update on applying for an English Heritage blue plaque to mark David Bowie's connection to the borough?

106 Canon Road or 4 Plaistow Grove were his childhood homes before he moved to Beckenham so might be suitable, or Ravens Wood School which he attended.

Reply:

The Council has made an enquiry with English Heritage. They have advised that Blue Plaques are only considered for people who have been dead for at least 20 years.

4. From Cllr Sam Webber to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

Following reports of serious traffic issues and inconvenience for residents at drop off and pick up times at the Bromley Beacon Academy (on Old Homesdale Road), would the Portfolio Holder and Officers consider reviewing the decision not to apply zig zag lines outside the school or consider adopting other measures here to reduce traffic bottlenecks?

Reply:

The Council will of course investigate any requests made by the school for changes in the parking controls at this location.

5. From Cllr Mike Jack to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces

How many air quality monitors are there in the borough, and where are they sited?

Reply:

There are 32 locations in the Borough where NO₂ is measured using diffusion tubes and 1 Air Quality Monitoring Station at Harwood Avenue for NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. The 32 are located at Homesdale Road, Chatterton Road, Hastings Road, College

Road, London Road, Shortlands Road, Beckenham Road, Worsley Bridge Road, Links Way, Elmers End Road, Anerley Road, Anerley Hill, Hamlet Road, Belvedere Road, Glebe Way, Ridgeway, Crofton Road, Towncourt Lane, High Street Orpington, Cardingham Road, Farnborough Hill, Poverest Road, High Street St Marys Cray, Midfield Way, Ashfield Lane, Park Road, Harwood Avenue, Widmore Road, Blackbrook Lane, Old Hill, Mottingham Road, Page Heath Lane.

There are 3 Nodes as part of the Breathe London Project monitoring NO2 and PM2.5 at the PRUH, Beckenham Beacon and Poverest.

This monitoring is reported in the Annual Status Report (ASR). The ASR for the year 2021 has been drafted and will be presented for information to ECS PDS in September and uploaded to Bromley's website.

Bromley is also a member of the London Air Quality Network which produces the Local Atmospheric Emissions Inventory using monitored air quality across London as well as other data sets to predict pollution levels.

6. From Cllr Alisa Igoe to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

Between its junction with Plaistow roundabout and 75 Burnt Ash Lane, three front garden walls have been recently demolished on the A2212 by drivers who have mounted the pavement. HGV vehicles regularly park on the footway. Why are there no double yellow lines, could these please be installed, as well as physical infrastructure to slow the excessive speeding?

Reply:

I am happy to ask for both these requests to be investigated, but please bear in mind that parked vehicles are very often a good way of reducing traffic speeds.

7. From Cllr McPartlan to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces

I welcome the overdue investment in our parks in the form of the £1million Jubilee fund. There is a limit of £40,000 for each ward. Times that by 22 wards and you have a total of £880,000 that could be given out to our parks. What will happen to the other £120,000?

Reply:

This amount was held back to ensure that additional resources could be diverted to support the projects' delivery if needed. If resources are sufficient, then we will consider additional funding for projects that have been approved. We will ensure that any funding left over is evenly allocated across the borough.

8. From Cllr Price to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contracts Management

Can you tell me the last full year for which the Council have records for claimants being taken to court for non-payment of council tax, where council tax has been reduced to 25% due to low income into the household under the Council Tax Support scheme? And within that year:

Number of Claimants who received court summons for non-payment?

Number of claimants charged costs?

Number of claimants referred to bailiffs?

Reply:

The figures provided are in respect of the financial year 2021/22. They include all recipients of council tax support, not just those in receipt of the maximum 75%. Please note that court costs are automatically charged when a summons is issued.

Number of claimants who received court summons for non-payment

4,321

Number of claimants charged costs

4,321

Number of claimants referred to bailiffs

2,048

9. From Cllr Kathy Bance MBE to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces

Despite being advised at February's full Council meeting that there are no plans to withdraw the cheque-paying options for services, I note that the Green Garden Waste Renewal letters state – Payment by cheque is not available. Can you please advise why this decision has been made?

This raises problems for our elderly and disabled people so what other services will be affected by this change?

Reply:

I note that the answer previously given was in relation to Adult Care services and provided by the finance lead for that section, and not Environment per se.

Cheque payments for GGW were stopped in March 2020, primarily due to the restrictions introduced due to the pandemic, but also in advance of the introduction of a bespoke Direct Debit payment system created specifically for the GGW collection service.

The DD payment platform went live last July 2020 as a convenient streamline payment solution for our 41,000 GGW customers, and particularly with our elderly subscribers in mind, as it ensures yearly subscriptions are taken without the inconvenience of sending a cheque, paying by cash at the Civic Centre main reception or paying online.

Customers wishing to pay by DD can call our Customer Service Centre on 0300 303 8658 with no need to navigate an online system, and a continuous yearly subscription can be set up. Moving to a DD payment solution also ensures the administration costs of the service are controlled, reconciliations better recorded, and audit assurances met.

Prior to the DD solution being implemented, our cheque payment rate was only 1.42%, and to ensure the efficiencies of DD system are realised, we state no cheques on our renewal reminder notices that are sent to customers.

That said, we do still process cheques via the cashiers when customers prefer, with 8 cheques being administered in the period 21/22.

If you would like us to look at any specific concerns your residents may have, please direct them to Jim Cowan, Head of Neighbourhood Management.

10. From Cllr Simon Jeal to the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Enforcement

For each of the last four years, could you please detail:

1. The number of residents who contacted the Council to request pest control services, report infestations or similar pest problems,
2. The type of pest,
3. What assistance or action was provided in response, and
4. The cost (if any) charged to the resident for the service.

Reply:

1. Complaints Received by the Council -

2021/22 - 313

2020/21 - 463

2019/20 - 291

2018/19 - 430

Residents who procured treatments via SDK -

2021/22 - 729

2020/21 - 957

2019/20 - 837

2018/19 - 1162

2. Pest Type data is not recorded by the Council.
3. Officers investigate complaints of infestations where certain activities being carried out by another resident or business may be the cause of infestation. If resolution cannot be obtained, then enforcement action would be taken under the Prevention of Damage by Pests Act 1949.
4. The current schedule of rates can be found on the Council website here, [Pest control services – London Borough of Bromley](#)

11. From Cllr Rebecca Wiffen to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contracts Management

Bromley has been named and shamed by the Living Wage Foundation for being in the worst 25 local authorities for paying employees below the Living Wage. What action is Bromley taking to correct this?

Reply:

The lowest hourly rate in Bromley Council at £11.06 is higher than both the national living wage, minimum wage and the London living wage at £9.50 and £11.05 respectively. The national living wage is a statutory requirement but the London living wage is only voluntary.

The Council having adopted a localised pay arrangement in November 2012 whereby the annual pay award is determined locally by democratically elected councillors is able to recruit, retain and reward staff and exceptional performers and hard to fill posts in particular. The Council remains competitive in the labour markets and the local arrangement allows the Council to flex its pay arrangements at any time without the constraints associated with the national and regional collective bargaining arrangements.

12. From Cllr Will Rowlands to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

How much has been bid by Bromley under the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) funding from TfL in each of the last five financial years and how much has been received?

Reply:

Prior to May 2020, Bromley was allocated an amount of LIP funding calculated by a formula that was not dependent upon a bid. The LIP amount had been £2.176M each year for a number of years, with some additional amounts for special projects such as the Shortlands Liveable Neighbourhood. Since May 2020 normal LIP

funding has not been available, although some related funding streams have been available, such as from the London Streetspace Plan.

A bid was submitted for LIP funding for 2022/23 amounting to £2.7M, but to date only £236k has been allocated to Bromley this year. In 2021/22 boroughs were limited in what they could apply for and Bromley submitted an application for £1.385M and was allocated £902k, plus some additional funding for cycle training.

(Some information is not currently accessible as the Portal is unavailable.)

13. From Cllr Simon Fawthrop to the Portfolio Holder for Adult Care and Health

How many people have in the Borough of Bromley have a death certificate with the primary cause of death being cardio respiratory failure due to air pollution between 2010 and 2022? Can this please be split out by year and by ward where known please?

Reply:

I have been advised by the Director of Public Health that there is no code (ICD-10 code) for cardio-respiratory failure due to air pollution and therefore this information is not available within the mortality statistics

This page is left intentionally blank

LONDON BOROUGH OF BROMLEY

MINUTES

of the proceedings of the special meeting of the
Council of the Borough
held at 7.00 pm on 15 September 2022

Present:

**The Worshipful the Mayor
Councillor Hannah Gray**

**The Deputy Mayor
Councillor Christine Harris**

Councillors

Jonathan Andrews
Yvonne Bear
Nicholas Bennett J.P.
Kim Botting FRSA
Mark Brock
Graeme Casey
Will Connolly
Aisha Cuthbert
Peter Dean
Sophie Dunbar
Robert Evans
Simon Fawthrop
Kira Gabbert
Adam Jude Grant
Colin Hitchins

Alisa Igoe
Julie Ireland
Mike Jack
Simon Jeal
David Jefferys
Charles Joel
Josh King
Jonathan Laidlaw
Andrew Lee
Kate Lymer
Keith Onslow
Tony Owen
Christopher Marlow
Tony McPartlan
Alexa Michael

Chris Price
Chloe-Jane Ross
Will Rowlands
Shaun Slator
Colin Smith
Diane Smith
Mark Smith
Alison Stammers
Melanie Stevens
Harry Stranger
Michael Tickner
Thomas Turrell
Sam Webber
Rebecca Wiffen

The meeting was opened with prayers

In the Chair
The Mayor
Councillor Hannah Gray

34 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Jeremy Adams, Felicity Bainbridge, Kathy Bance, Mike Botting, David Cartwright, Sunil Gupta, Kevin Kennedy-Brooks, Ruth McGregor, Angela Page, Ryan Thomson and Pauline Tunnicliffe.

Councillor Aisha Cuthbert sent apologies for her late arrival.

35 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

**36 To pay tribute to Her Majesty the Queen, Elizabeth II, and
 declare allegiance to His Majesty, King Charles III**

The following motion was moved by Councillor Colin Smith and seconded by
Nicholas Bennett JP –

“The Council, on behalf of all loyal subjects of the London Borough of
Bromley, sends its sincere condolences to His Majesty and his family, on the
death of his beloved mother, Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, our late Queen
of happy and glorious memory.

Members of the Council hereby declare their allegiance to His Majesty on his
accession to the throne and pledge their support to him in upholding the
rights, customs and laws of the Realm and in particular our parliamentary
democracy and constitutional monarchy. We wish his Majesty a long and
happy reign.”

The motion was **CARRIED** unanimously.

37 The Mayor's announcements and communications.

The Mayor reminded Members about the Civic Service on Sunday 18th
September and asked them to inform their residents about the opportunity to
place floral tributes in Queen's Gardens, the Books of Condolences available
at the Civic Centre and various Libraries across the Borough, and the
provision of a large screen in Queen's Gardens to watch the Queen's funeral
on Monday 19th September.

The Meeting ended at 7.59 pm

Mayor

(A)

Council

10 October 2022

Questions from Members of the Public for Oral Reply

1. From Helen Brookfield to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces

What plans does the Council have for refurbishing the toilets in its parks given the very poor state of some of them, for example in Kelsey Park and in Croydon Road Recreation Ground in Beckenham?

This page is left intentionally blank

(B)

Council

10 October 2022

Questions from Members of the Public for Written Reply

1. From Richard Edmonds to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

I am very concerned about dangerous vehicle speeds on College Road, Bromley, which are frequently well in excess of the 30mph limit. We now have a large nursery and playgroup on College Road with a large primary school just round the corner as well as shops and other businesses alongside mixed residential accommodation. Lots of pedestrians use and cross the road together with an increasing number of cyclists.

Enforcement of the current 30mph limit is essential before another serious or fatal accident occurs. Will the Council give this urgent attention?

This page is left intentionally blank

Council**10 October 2022****Questions from Members of the Council for Oral Reply****1. From Cllr Alisa Igoe to the Leader of the Council**

August press releases celebrated the opening of two of the first affordable housing schemes built on Council land, mentioning the “25 apartments off Burnt Ash Lane”. However, the latter, with free car park beneath, remains unfinished and closed and has overrun by a year. Would the Leader please extend his apologies to Plaistow residents and businesses, and those waiting to move in, for this major inconvenience, which has also resulted in a loss of footfall to Plaistow ward shops and services.

2. From Cllr Tony McPartlan to the Leader of the Council:

Does the Leader of the Council really believe that Bromley’s poorest residents will benefit from the 'trickle down' economic policies recently announced by our new Prime Minister and Chancellor?

3. From Cllr Josh King to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

Please can the Portfolio Holder comment on the delays to the completion of the plans for the Elmers End Road parade under the small parades initiative which I understand are due to the main contractor not digging tree pits.

4. From Cllr Chris Price to the Leader of the Council

Would the Leader of the Council like to join me in welcoming the decision by our local NHS partner, Oxleas NHS Foundation, to be recognised as an accredited London Living Wage Employer?

5. From Cllr Will Connolly to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces

Can the Portfolio Holder please report on the Council’s public toilet provision and any areas planned for improvements, including the community scheme provision?

6. From Cllr Jeremy Adams to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management

Since Bromley Council's decision to invest in short-dated UK government bonds in November 2021, three-year gilts have fallen in value by about 9% (as at 26.9.22). Could the Portfolio Holder please confirm the current value of the Council's gilts and update councillors on any plans to invest further in UK government bonds?

7. From Cllr Kathy Bance to the Portfolio Holder for Children, Education and Families

LBB are responsible for the Safeguarding of all Bromley's pupils. Does that mean we have statistics for the numbers of pupils on Free School Meals? If not can we request numbers of pupils on free school meals from all of our schools?

8. From Cllr Simon Jeal to the Portfolio Holder for Children, Education and Families

In 2018 Council officers were looking into arrangements needed for Bromley to establish a Young Mayor (as many other Councils have) could you please explain why this has not progressed?

9. From Cllr Kevin Kennedy-Brooks to the Portfolio Holder for Adult Care and Health Services

During the last Adult Care and Health PDS the Portfolio Holder assured me conversations were taking place as how the Council will support its various community centres amid the cost of living crisis where, despite government support packages, energy prices have soared. What is the latest in terms of progress in discussions, support being considered and those involved in the discussions?

Council**10 October 2022****Questions from Members of the Council for Written Reply****1. From Cllr Mike Jack to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety**

Like a lot of areas in our Borough Chislehurst has a number of residents with mobility issues, which can make getting around a huge challenge. The main reasons are that lack of drop kerbs, positioning of street furniture, uneven surfaces, and steep cambers. In a lot of cases these obstacles put our vulnerable residents in high-risk situations, such as having to use the road or worse not being able to go out at all. I have been told these problems will only be addressed when footpaths are reconstructed and that currently there is no budget available to address these issues

In light of Bromley's Corporate plan where our vision is to make Bromley a fantastic place to live and work, where everyone can lead healthy, safe, and independent lives can you let me know if/when there are plans to make money available across the borough so issues like this can be resolved, giving residents with mobility issues – their own independence and keeping them safe.

2. From Cllr Tony McPartlan to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal Recreation and Housing

Despite the issues with the Zed Pods in Plaistow, it is good to see the Council building and delivering their own affordable homes in Plaistow, Chislehurst and Anerley. The Local Plan 2019 and other subsequent documents highlighted multiple other sites that could be used for this purpose. Please provide an update on all of the proposed sites, detailing what role (if any) each site will play in the future delivery of affordable housing.

3. From Cllr Alisa Igoe to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

Cycle to School Week was 3–7 October. Our excellent cycle training team teach school children Bikeability Levels 1, 2 and 3, with the latter covering road conditions, responding to hazards and challenging traffic scenarios. Could you please list by location both the non-segregated and segregated cycle lanes that have been installed directly linking to Bromley school sites, since beginning of 2018?

4. From Cllr Mark Smith to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

Utility companies are routinely fined if their roadworks overrun without a valid extension. Residents of Chislehurst Ward has been particularly inconvenienced by series of water leaks, have resulted in Thames Water digging up many roads to carry out repairs.

Could he therefore confirm:

How much the Council have received from utility companies in fines in the last twelve months?

How this money will be allocated for the benefit of Chislehurst residents to compensate for the inconvenience of blocked roads and reduced water supplies?

5. From Cllr Chloe-Jane Ross to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing

Has the government contacted Bromley Council regarding hosting one of the new Investment Zones, and if not is this something the Council is looking to pursue?

6. From Cllr Chloe-Jane Ross to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

Is Bromley Council planning to reduce the availability of car park ticketing machines in favour of the Ringo app? If so what provisions are being made for the digitally excluded, and what % reduction of machines is anticipated?

7. From Cllr Kathy Bance to the Portfolio Holder for Children, Education and Families

Please provide statistics for Bromley pupil exclusions for the past 5 years per ward and school order.

8. From Cllr Simon Jeal to the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Enforcement

In each of the past four years, could you please provide data for how many complaints or reports of unsatisfactory living conditions has the Council received from Bromley residents placed into Housing Association and private accommodation, broken down by the Housing Association or private landlord/lettings company they relate to?

9. From Cllr Simon Jeal to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing

How many residents have presented to the Council as homeless each month since the moratorium on evictions implemented by the Government during the pandemic ended, and of these, how many became homeless as a result of receiving a 'section 21' eviction?

10. From Cllr Rebecca Wiffen to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management

The government's Energy Bill Relief Scheme is likely to fall short of enabling charities and local community organisations to pay rising bills over the coming weeks. As a result, not-for-profit local hubs that provide invaluable services to the communities they serve will have to close their doors. What support can Bromley Council provide organisations that find themselves in these circumstances, such as the Sanderson Hall in St Paul's Cray?

11. From Cllr Ruth McGregor to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management

Could you please advise the number of cases of council tax debt referred to external enforcement agents for recovery, and the recovery rates for these, and what proactive steps are taken to facilitate payment of the debt before proceeding with court hearings. Also do you have figures for the number of complaints made against enforcement agents?

12. From Cllr Mark Smith to the Leader of the Council

What steps has the borough taken in the last 12 months to fulfil its obligations in respect of the Armed Forces Covenant it signed up to in April 2013?

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
CSD22108

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: COUNCIL

Date: Monday 10 October 2022

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

Title: BUDGET MONITORING 2022/23 – ADDITIONAL STAFFING CAPACITY FOR CHILDREN’S SOCIAL CARE

Contact Officer: Graham Walton, Democratic Services Manager
Tel: 0208 461 7743 E-mail: graham.walton@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Tasnim Shawkat, Director of Corporate Services and Governance

Ward: All

1. Reason for decision/report and options

- 1.1 At its meeting on 6th October 2022, the Executive is due to consider the attached report summarising the budget monitoring position based on expenditure and activity levels up to the end of July 2022. The report also highlights significant variations which will impact on future years as well as early warnings that could impact on the final year end position.
- 1.2 The Executive will also be considering a report on Additional Staffing Capacity for Childrens’ Social Care (also attached). Subject to the Executive approving the recommendations in these two reports, Council is recommended to agree that £2.4m be drawn down from the 2022/23 contingency to support the time-limited funding for additional children’s social care staff.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

Council is requested to agree that a sum of £2.4m be drawn down from the 2022/23 contingency as detailed in paragraph 3.2.2 of the attached report.

Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children

1. Summary of Impact: See report on Additional Staffing Capacity

Transformation Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy:
2. Making Bromley Even Better Priority
 - (1) For children and young people to grow up, thrive, and have the best life chances in families who flourish and are happy to call Bromley home.
 - (5) To manage our resources well, providing value for money, and efficient and effective services for Bromley's residents.

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Estimated Cost: £2.4m over four years plus £250k one off
2. Ongoing costs: Recurring Cost: Yes, but decreasing over four years.
3. Budget head/performance centre: Children's Social Care
4. Total current budget for this head: £42.4m
5. Source of funding: Core funding

Personnel

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 20 additional social work staff
2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: Not applicable

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement
2. Call-in: Not Applicable: Full Council decisions are not subject to call-in.

Procurement

1. Summary of Procurement Implications: Not Applicable

Property

1. Summary of Property Implications: Not Applicable

Carbon Reduction and Social Value

1. Summary of Carbon Reduction/Sustainability Implications: Not Applicable

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users or customers (current and projected): Impact on approximately 300 young people

Ward Councillor Views

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

Non-Applicable Headings:	Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children/Policy/Financial/Personnel/Legal/Procurement/Property/Carbon Reduction/Customer/Ward Councillors
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	See attached reports.

Decision Maker: EXECUTIVE

Date: Thursday 6 October 2022

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

Title: BUDGET MONITORING 2022/23

Contact Officer: David Bradshaw, Head of Finance
Tel: 020 8313 4807 E-mail: david.bradshaw@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Director of Finance

Ward: Borough Wide

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 This report provides the first budget monitoring position for 2022/23 based on expenditure and activity levels up to the end of July 2022. 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 £8,036k is forecast based on information as at July 2022.
- (c) consider the comments from Chief Officers detailed in Appendix 2;
- (d) note the carry forwards being requested for drawdown as set out in para 3.3;
- (e) note a projected reduction to the General Fund balance of £2,177k as detailed in section 3.4;
- (f) note the full year cost pressures of £8.255m as detailed in section 3.5;
- (g) agree to the release of funding from the 2022/23 central contingency as detailed in paragraphs 3.2.2 to 3.2.23;

- (h) agree to the release of £600k from the Growth Fund reserve for the Local Plan review as detailed in para. 3.9;**
- (i) identify any issues that should be referred to individual Portfolio Holders for further action;**
- (j) note the change in General Fund Earmarked Reserves as detailed in para 3.12.**

2.2 Council are requested to:

- (k) agree a sum of £2.4m be drawn down from the 2022/23 contingency as detailed in paragraph 3.2.2.**

Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children

1. Summary of Impact: None arising directly from this report
-

Corporate Policy

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

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Not Applicable
 2. Ongoing costs: Recurring Cost
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Council wide
 4. Total current budget for this head: £229.8m
 5. Source of funding: See Appendix 1 for overall funding of Council's budget
-

Personnel

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 2,181 fte posts (per 2022/23 Budget) which includes 483 for budgets delegated to schools
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: N/A
-

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 Local Government Act 2000, the Local Government Act 2002 and the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015.
 2. Call-in: Applicable
-

Procurement

1. Summary of Procurement Implications: None arising directly from this report
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): The 2022/23 budget reflects the financial impact of the Council's strategies and service plans which impact on all of the Council's customers (including council tax payers) and users of our services.
-

Ward Councillor Views

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

3. COMMENTARY

3.1 Summary of Projected Variations

3.1.1 The Resources Portfolio Plan included a target that each service department will spend within its own budget. Current projections show an overall net overspend of £8,036k within portfolio budgets and a £6,324k credit variation on investment income, central items and prior year adjustments.

3.1.2 A summary of the 2022/23 budget and the projected outturn is shown in the table below:

	2022/23 Original Budget £'000	2022/23 Latest Budget £'000	2022/23 Projected Outturn £'000	2022/23 Variation £'000
Portfolio				
Adult Care & Health	79,216	79,316	79,910	594
Children, Education & Families (inc. Schools Budget)	49,594	50,721	56,015	5,294
Environment & Community	34,294	35,878	36,913	1,035
Public Protection & Enforcement	2,645	2,645	2,665	20
Renewal, Recreation & Housing	14,502	15,062	15,655	593
Resources, Commissioning & Contracts Management	43,841	46,183	46,683	500
Total Controllable Budgets	224,092	229,805	237,841	8,036
Capital Charges and Insurance	11,399	11,399	11,399	0
Non General Fund Recharges	Cr 1,461	Cr 1,461	Cr 1,461	0
Total Portfolio Budgets	234,030	239,743	247,779	8,036
Income from Investment Properties	Cr 9,166	Cr 8,666	Cr 8,481	185
Interest on General Fund Balances	Cr 2,841	Cr 2,841	Cr 3,841	Cr 1,000
Total Investment Income	Cr 12,007	Cr 11,507	Cr 12,322	Cr 815
Contingency Provision	18,208	10,424	4,915	Cr 5,509
Other Central Items	Cr 8,901	Cr 8,901	Cr 8,901	0
General Government Grants & Retained Business Rates	Cr 48,395	Cr 48,395	Cr 48,395	0
Collection Fund Surplus	Cr 4,100	Cr 4,100	Cr 4,100	0
Total Central Items	Cr 43,188	Cr 50,972	Cr 56,481	Cr 5,509
Total Variation on Services and Central Items	178,835	177,264	178,976	1,712
Prior Year Adjustments	0	0	0	0
Total Variation	178,835	177,264	178,976	1,712

3.1.3 A detailed breakdown of the latest approved budgets and projected outturn for each Portfolio, together with an analysis of variations, is shown in Appendix 3.

3.1.4 Chief Officer comments are included in Appendix 2.

3.2 Central Contingency Sum

3.2.1 Details of the allocations from and variations in the 2022/23 Central Contingency are included in Appendix 4.

3.2.2 Additional staffing capacity in Childrens Social Care - £2.4m

£2.4 million over four years to allow for the initial recruitment of 20 additional Social Worker (SW) posts. We will recruit 20 new posts in year one, and then reduce back down by 5 SWs in

each subsequent year of the additional funding. The initial additional investment will allow a return to lower caseloads, which in turn will assist in making effective interventions with families that can lead to better and safer outcomes and ensure we are not involved in the lives of families for so long. These efficiencies will allow us to work more effectively and so gradually return to the current staffing numbers over the course of the funding.

£700k will be drawn down and used in 2022/23 with the remaining £1.7m set aside in Social Care Staffing Reserve to be utilised in future years.

This is covered in a separate report to the Executive on the same agenda

3.2.3 Temporary increase in Children in Need (CIN) social workers - £250k

A one of) figure of £250k to fund the temporary funding of two short-term teams of Social Workers between June and December 2022 to assist in meeting current/immediate demand to reduce caseloads and to strengthen practice. This resource will allow caseloads to reduce in the short/medium term whilst recruitment activity for the larger financial support package can be activated.

3.2.4 Environment inflation - £1,084k

The 2022/23 ECS revenue budget allowed for general inflation of 4% for all contract budgets. However, actual indexation for the main Environment contracts (total budget c£39m) this year ranges from just over 6% for the Waste Collection and Street Environment contracts, to 8.6% for the Waste Disposal contract. If Executive were to approve additional funding to fully meet these contractual increases, this would require a drawdown of £1,084k from Central Contingency

3.2.5 Libraries - £54k

Similarly, the annual contract indexation for the Libraries contract this year is 5.4%, and if Executive were to approve additional funding to fully meet this contractual increase above the existing budget, a draw down from Central Contingency of £54k would be required.

3.2.6 Energy contract - £1,312k

As agreed by the Executive on 29th June 2022, this relates to the anticipated part year increased cost of the Council's energy contract from October 2022, assuming renewably sourced gas and electricity supplies. The full year additional cost is estimated at c£2.5m.

3.2.7 Car Park income - £500k

In agreeing the revenue budget for 2022/23, Executive approved a Central Contingency provision which includes an allowance of £500k to reflect continuing uncertainties regarding car parking income recovering post-Covid. As set out in this quarter's monitoring for Environment & Community Services, a further shortfall in income of £750k is projected this year and therefore it is requested to now draw down this allowance.

3.2.8 Property Income - £500k

Similarly, an allowance of £500k was made in Central Contingency to reflect continuing uncertainties regarding investment property and rental income. Given that an income shortfall of £675k from investment properties is projected this year, it is requested that this provision is now drawn down.

3.2.9 Legal Support - £170k

Part of the review of Legal services reported in November 2020, it was agreed to include a sum of £170k to be held in Central Contingency for locum costs for additional childcare and adults social care legal support. Demand for these services has continued this financial year and the full provision has now been drawn down.

3.2.10 Planning application backlog - £90k

A backlog in minor planning applications has arisen as a result of the impact of Covid-19, with around 300 cases currently outstanding. This is an issue faced by many local authorities and consequently recruiting temporary planning staff is extremely challenging. Therefore, the Assistant Director of Planning has explored engaging specialist companies who provide an outsourced option. It is estimated that the backlog could be cleared in around 6 months at a cost of c£90k and Executive are requested to approve one-off funding from Central Contingency for this.

3.2.11 Economic Development posts - £109k

A number of posts within the Culture & Regeneration division have historically been part funded by a recharge to the capital programme reflecting the support they provided to a number of regeneration schemes. This support is no longer provided as those staff are now engaged in supporting the Council's post-Covid business support and economic recovery activities. The full year cost of this is £109k and Executive are requested to agree that funding of £109k is drawn down from Central Contingency this year.

3.2.12 Norman Park - £151k

Executive agreed on 22 September 2021 to provide a grant contribution of £200k towards the costs of a new clubhouse at the Norman Park athletic track. This would be part funded from a saving in no longer paying the track management fee, with the balance met from Central Contingency. That grant has now been paid and funding of £151k is required from Central Contingency. This will be repaid to Central Contingency from the track management budget saving.

3.2.13 IT contract procurement - £989k

The Council's existing IT contracts with BT end in December 2023. At its meeting on 22 September, Executive are considering a report on the future provision of the Council's IT services including procurement options for a new contract. As set out in that report, Executive are requested to approve one-off funding from Central Contingency totalling £989k, of which £653k is required this financial year. This funding is in respect of procurement support costs (£346k in 2022/23) plus a further sum this year of £307k for new posts that are being recommended to implement a revised operating and service support model for IT services.

3.2.14 Resources to support GDPR compliance - £80k

To ensure that the Council complies with its statutory obligations and responsibilities under the UK General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), and avoid the potential of financial penalties and enforcement action from the Information Commissioners Office against the Council for non-compliance, additional resources of 2 FTE at a cost of £80k are requested within the central Information Management Team to deal with:

- (1) All subject access requests (SARs) and coordination of all other GDPR requirements
- (2) Advise on compliance and support for service areas in general information requests
- (3) Maintain proactive disclosure logs and publication scheme on the corporate website.

3.2.15 Better Care Fund - £402k

The final Better Care Fund 2022/23 allocation was published in May at a 5.66% increase above 2021/22 levels, which equates to a £402k increase above the 4% assumed in the budget. It is proposed that this allocation is set aside for hospital discharge care packages.

3.2.16 IBCF - £227k

For the first time in recent years, the IBCF allocation had an inflationary increase for 2022/23 of 3% which equates to £227k. It is proposed that this is allocated to help offset cost pressures in the portfolio.

3.2.17 Public health Grant - £427k

The 2022/23 budget included assumed inflation of £214k on the Public Health Grant. The final allocation was £15,612k, which includes a further £427k increase. The financial forecast currently assumes the use of £259k from the Public Health reserve from 2023/24 onwards to fund growth items. This will be reviewed as part of the 2023/24 budget process will any surplus identified potentially reversing some of the 'core' Council funding for growth pressures.

3.2.18 ICS Funding - £3,916k

South East London Integrated Care Board have provided various amounts of funding as detailed below:

- a) Hospital Discharges (£3,308k): This is one-off funding to 'secure the continued provision of social care services in line with presenting need and discharge standards'. It is intended that this is used to fund the cost of hospital discharge packages following the cessation of central funding from NHS England during the Covid-19 pandemic.
- b) LD/Autism (£247k): As part of health and care pandemic recovery arrangements SELCCG awarded each of the six South East London boroughs one-off ringfenced funds to support the development of learning disability and autism services to residents. Funds were to be used to better identify and understand population health needs, enhance day activities and access to employment, reduce waiting times for paediatric support and to raise awareness of autism across universal public services and commercial services . LBB received £247K and through a S256 agreement with SELICB it is planned to spend the funds as follows:

Service/Project	DESCRIPTION	FUNDING To 31st MARCH 2023
Demand/management project	Commission of population health intelligence work to collect, create and analyse data to plan for future demand	£35,000
Day Services equipment	The provision of specialist equipment to three day centres for adults with learning disabilities	£40,000
Employment Development Fund	Pump priming to enable the development of social enterprises and other employment opportunities to support people with learning disabilities	£60,000
Autism waiting times reduction	Commission a dedicated family support/community pediatrics pilot to reduce waiting times for children	£62,000
Autism awareness campaign	Commission an autism awareness campaign aimed at universal services	£50,000

- c) Discharge Transformation (£361k): This funding has been used to enable the continuation of 2021/22 Winter Pressures schemes into the 2022/23 financial year in line with continued discharge demand. The fund will also allow the early start to some schemes for the coming winter.

3.2.19 Kings Funding - £500k

In response to the Covid pandemic LBB, with then SELCCG (now SELICB), jointly commissioned and developed a range of new and innovative multi-agency hospital discharge arrangements. These arrangements have made a significant contribution to hospital performance at the Princess Royal University Hospital reducing hospital lengths of stay. As part of sustaining these discharge arrangements the Kings College Hospital Trust has agreed to contribute funds to the new discharge arrangements at £500K per annum. Funds are to be spent on enhancing the discharge arrangements through an enhanced hospital to home service offer including assisted technology for discharged patients and additional resources to support post discharge welfare checks.

3.2.20 Market Sustainability - £804k

The Department for Health & Social Care (DHSC) has provided funding to support local authorities to prepare their markets for reform of the adult social care system, including the further commencement of Section 18(3) of the Care Act 2014 in October 2023, and to support local authorities to move towards paying providers a fair cost of care. The Council's allocation is £804k, and details of how it is proposed this will be utilised is set out in the Adult Social Care Reform report that will be reported to the October meeting of the Executive.

3.2.21 Charging Reform - £104k

Similar to the grant detailed above, DHSC has provided funding to support to local authorities towards expenditure in funding adult social care charging reform implementation. The grant covers the planning and preparation costs associated with charging reform to recruit additional staff to manage the increased demand for assessments and the implementation of the care account module. The Council's allocation is £104k, and details of how it is proposed this will be utilised is set out in the Adult Social Care Reform report that will be reported to the October meeting of the Executive.

3.2.22 Rough Sleeping initiative - £455k

The Council receives grant funding from the Department of Levelling Up, Homes and Communities (DLUHC) to enable it to undertake work with vulnerable groups, including rough sleepers and ex-offenders. Following a bid round, the Rough Sleepers Initiative (RSI) funding has been allocated to each local authority on an annual basis, however on this occasion the overall initiatives and project work has been agreed for a 3 year period. The funding is ring fixed to the Housing Options Service and will be spent on initiatives, resources and staffing as detailed in the table below:

	£
Employment support officer (ETE)	34,968
Project Support Officer (ex-offenders) (Ex-AFEO)	53,550
Rough Sleeping Team (Co-ordinator, and support workers)	121,260
Private Rented Sector Incentives	80,000
Personalisation Fund	4,000
Flexible Surge Funding	112,500
Temporary Accommodation and Resettlement Worker (6 months)	20,980
Private Rented Sector Officer (6 months)	20,980
Tenancy Sustainment fund	7,000
Total	455,238

3.2.23 Accommodation for Ex-Offenders - £70k

DLUHC has also further funded the Accommodation for Ex-Offenders (AFEO) Scheme for a further six months (1 April 2022 – 30 September 2022), awarding the amount of £70,000 for the role of a Project Support Officer and deposits for securing private rented sector accommodation for ex-offenders. Within the bid submission for RSI-5 funding, Bromley requested and successfully received an additional amount £53,550 for the AFEO Scheme, and this amount was granted for 1 October 2022 – 31 March 2023, and is included in the table above in para 3.2.22.

3.3 Carry Forwards from 2021/22 to 2022/23

3.3.1 After allowing for government grant funding, a net sum of £465k has been carried forward into 2022/23 from underspends in 2021/22. This was approved by the Executive on the 29th June 2022 subject to the funding being allocated to the Central Contingency to be drawn down on the approval of the relevant Portfolio Holder.

3.3.2 The carry forwards being requested are summarised in the table below and details will be reported to the relevant PDS Committee as described above. Details of the brought forward balances are also contained in Appx 4. The figures contained in this report assume that these requests will be agreed:

	£'000
Renewal, Recreation and Housing	561
Adult Care and Health	5,144
Children, Education & Families	680
Resources, Commissioning & Contracts	167
	6,552
Government Grant Income	Cr 6,087
Total Net Carry Forwards Requested for Drawdown this Cycle	465

3.4 General Fund Balances

3.4.1 The level of general reserves is currently projected to reduce by £2,177k to £17,823k at 31st March 2023 as detailed below:

	2022/23
	Projected
	Outturn
	£'000
General Fund Balance as at 1st April 2022	Cr 20,000
Net Variations on Services & Central Items (para 3.1)	1,712
	<u>Cr 18,288</u>
Adjustment to Balances:	
Carry Forwards (funded from underspends in 2021/22)	465
General Fund Balance as at 31st March 2023	<u>Cr 17,823</u>

3.5 Impact on Future Years

3.5.1 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:

	2022/23 Budget £'000	2023/24 Impact £'000
Adult Care & Health Portfolio		
Assessment & Care Management - Care Placements	28,203	821
Learning Disabilities - Care Placements & Care Management	42,273	255
Mental Health - Care Placements	6,265	45
		1,121
Environment and Community Portfolio		
Business Support and Markets	Cr 64	50
Waste Services	20,463	Cr 800
Parking	Cr 8,962	1,000
		250
Renewal, Recreation & Housing		
Supporting people	1,070	Cr 94
Housing Needs - Temporary accommodation	5,990	Cr 214
		Cr 308
Children, Education & Families Portfolio		
SEN Transport	6,505	1,282
Children's Social Care	42,446	5,910
		7,192
TOTAL		<u>8,255</u>

3.5.2 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.

3.5.3 Further details are included in Appendix 5.

3.6 Income from Investment Properties

- 3.6.1 The impact of Covid and changing consumer habits has resulted in pressure on high street retail trading in recent years, with one significant tenant – Arcadia – going into administration resulting in a loss of rent this year of £685k. Although a new lease has recently been agreed for that site, the new reduced rental will only be payable after an initial rent-free period.
- 3.6.2 Generally, rental Income remains under pressure following the impact of COVID on businesses and their ability to pay rents. However, the Council has set aside provision for bad debts against outstanding amounts as at 31 March 2022 to mitigate the financial impact of businesses that may fail over the course of the year.

3.7 Interest on Balances

- 3.7.1 The budget for 2022/23 has been set at £2,841k (2021/22: £3,591k). This reflects an expected reduction in balances available for investment as a result of the utilisation of capital receipts and grants/contributions as well as earmarked revenue reserves. The loss of income from the reduction in balances will be partly offset by anticipated further increases in the Bank of England base rate which will drive improved counterparty rates. New core fixed-interest investments taken out during the first quarter of 2022/23 were at an average rate of 2.15%.
- 3.7.2 Reports to previous meetings have highlighted the fact that options with regards to the reinvestment of maturing deposits had become limited in recent years following bank credit rating downgrades and the prevailing low interest rate environment. Changes to lending limits and eligibility criteria, as well as the introduction of pooled funds and housing associations have alleviated this to some extent.
- 3.7.3 Additionally, the treasury management strategy has previously been revised to enable alternative investments of £100m in pooled investments which generate additional income of approximately £2m compared with lending to banks. and officers continue to look for alternative investment opportunities, both within the current strategy and outside, for consideration as part of the ongoing review of the strategy
- 3.7.4 Owing to base rate increases in May, June and August 2022 counterparty rates have improved considerably and are currently in excess of 3.75%. On this basis, the current projection indicates that outturn will exceed budget by £1m.

3.8 The Schools Budget

- 3.8.1 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 year's Schools Budget.
- 3.8.2 The DSG projected to overspend by £4,254k. This will be added to the £7,142k carried forward from 2021/22. There has also been a prior year adjustment to the Early Years element of the DSG which reduced in year funding by £178k causing an additional pressure. This gives an estimated DSG deficit balance to be carry forward of £11,574k into the new financial year. It should be noted that the DSG can fluctuate due to pupils requiring additional services or being placed in expensive placements. Officers are working on a deficit recovery plan ahead of this being required by the DfE.

3.9 Local plan review - drawdown from the Growth Fund Reserve - £600k

- 3.9.1 In order to prepare a robust evidence base to underpin the new Local Plan, additional budget is necessary alongside existing staffing resource in the Planning Policy and Strategy service. A budget of up to £600,000 is sought from the growth fund, based on the following estimated costs:

- Evidence base - £500,000 – this includes costs of essential evidence including a new Employment Land Review and a Local Plan Viability Study; and contingency to allow for preparation of additional evidence base work that may become necessary as we proceed through the Local Plan process. It also includes costs of additional work to support evidence base work that is being prepared in-house, for example, purchasing any necessary third-party data, ‘critical friend’ work, legal opinions.
- Examination and consultation costs - £100,000 – It is also important to factor in the costs of examination as well, as this can be considerable (depending on the length of the examination process and number of hearing days). The amount sought is based on experience of previous examination costs and factors in potential for specialist support at examination where necessary, for example, it is common to have Counsel support for discussion of technical legal issues.

3.10 Investment Fund and Growth Fund

3.10.1 Full details of the current position on the Investment Fund and the Growth Fund are included in the Capital Programme Monitoring Q1 2022/23 which will be reported to Executive in September 2022. The uncommitted balances stand at £6.5m for the Investment Fund and £12m for the Growth Fund

3.11 Financial Context

3.11.1 The 2022/23 Council Tax report to Executive on 9th February 2022 identified the latest financial projections and a future year budget gap of £19.5m per annum by 2025/26. Since that report, the budget gap will increase due to significant recent financial challenges relating to higher levels of inflation, potential costs of adult social care reform (identified in 2022/23 council tax report) needing to be quantified and potential changes to the statutory override position impacting on funding for Dedicated Schools Grant deficits. An initial update was provided in the Members Finance Seminar in May 2022 and a further update will be provided to a future meeting of the Executive.

3.11.2 As reported, as part of the Council’s financial strategy, a prudent approach has been adopted in considering the central contingency sum to reflect any inherent risks, the potential impact of new burdens, population increases or actions taken by other public bodies which could affect the Council. The approach has also been one of ‘front loading’ savings to ensure difficult decisions are taken early in the budgetary cycle. This has enabled a longer term approach to generate further income from the additional resources available as well as to mitigate against significant risks and provide a more sustainable financial position in the longer term. A significant proportion of the central contingency sum has been utilised towards meeting higher inflation costs and providing one off funding as identified in this report.

3.12 General Fund Earmarked Reserves

3.12.1 Appendix 7 sets out the final position of the Council’s Earmarked Reserves as at 31st March 2022. This amends the figure of £265,407k reported to Executive on 29th June 2022 as part of the Provisional Final Accounts report. The final position was complicated owing to the treatment of Section 31 grants in relation to Business Rates; these monies flow both to and from reserves creating uncertainty and complexity which required some additional time to clarify the correct accounting treatment. Having made the appropriate changes, the confirmed final balance of Earmarked Reserves is £265,929k, some £522k higher than the figure included in the Provisional Final Accounts report. It should be noted that the final figure includes £45,935k of Section 31 grant that will fall out in 2022/23 when it will be used to offset business rates losses which the Council is required to account for in that period. A further

amount of £4,945k is held in the Collection Fund Deferred Costs Reserve; this represents grants received that will be matched against offsetting spend during 2022/23 and 2023/24.

4. IMPACT ON VULNERABLE ADULTS AND CHILDREN

4.1 The 2022/23 budget reflects the financial impact of the Council’s strategies and service plans which impact on all of the Council’s customers and users of our services.

5. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

5.1 The “Making Bromley even Better” objective of being an Excellent Council refers to the Council’s intention to ensure good strategic financial management and robust discipline to deliver within our budgets.

5.2 The “2022/23 Council Tax” report highlighted the financial pressures facing the Council. It remains imperative that strict budgetary control continues to be exercised in 2022/23 to minimise the risk of compounding financial pressures in future years.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

Non-Applicable Sections:	Personnel, Legal, Procurement
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Provisional Final Accounts 2020/21 – Executive 29 th June 2022; 2022/23 Council Tax – Executive 9 th February 2022; Draft 2022/23 Budget and Update on Council’s Financial Strategy 2022/23 to 2025/26 – Executive 12 th January 2022; Treasury Management Annual Investment Strategy 2022/23 and Quarter 3 performance– Council 28 th February 2022; Financial Management Budget Monitoring files across all portfolios.

This page is left intentionally blank

GENERAL FUND - PROVISIONAL OUTTURN FOR 2022/23

Portfolio	2022/23	Budget	2022/23		2022/23	Variation	Variation previously reported
	Original Budget	Variations allocated in year #	Approved Budget	Latest Budget	Projected Outturn		
	£'000	£'000		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Adult Care & Health	79,216	100		79,316	79,910	594	0
Children, Education & Families (incl. Schools' Budget)	49,594	1,127		50,721	56,015	5,294	0
Environment & Community	34,294	1,584		35,878	36,913	1,035	0
Public Protection & Enforcement	2,645	0		2,645	2,665	20	0
Renewal, Recreation & Housing	14,502	560		15,062	15,655	593	0
Resources, Commissioning & Contracts Management	43,841	2,342		46,183	46,683	500	0
Total Controllable Budgets	224,092	5,713		229,805	237,841	8,036	0
Capital, Insurance & Pensions Costs (see note 2)	11,399	0		11,399	11,399	0	0
Non General Fund Recharges	Cr 1,461	0	Cr 1,461	Cr 1,461	Cr 1,461	0	0
Total Portfolios (see note 1)	234,030	5,713		239,743	247,779	8,036	0
Central Items:							
Income from Investment Properties	Cr 9,166	500	Cr 8,666	Cr 8,481	Cr 8,481	185	0
Interest on General Fund Balances	Cr 2,841	0	Cr 2,841	Cr 3,841	Cr 3,841	1,000	0
Total Investment Income	Cr 12,007	500	Cr 11,507	Cr 12,322	Cr 12,322	815	0
Contingency Provision (see Appendix 4)	18,208	Cr 7,784	10,424	4,915	Cr 5,509	0	0
Other central items							
Reversal of net Capital Charges (see note 2)	Cr 9,878	0	Cr 9,878	Cr 9,878	Cr 9,878	0	0
Utilisation/Set Aside of Prior Year Collection Fund Surplus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Homes Bonus Support for Revenue	253	0	253	253	253	0	0
Contribution to social care staffing reserve	0	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700	0	0
Contribution to IT procurement reserve	0	336	336	336	336	0	0
Contribution to xxx	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contribution to xxx	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Levies	1,272	0	1,272	1,272	1,272	0	0
Total other central items	Cr 8,353	2,036	Cr 6,317	Cr 6,317	Cr 6,317	0	0
Prior Year Adjustments							
PY 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PY 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PY 3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Prior Year Adjustments	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total all central items	Cr 2,152	Cr 5,248	Cr 7,400	Cr 13,724	Cr 6,324	0	0
Bromley's Requirement before balances	231,878	465	232,343	234,055	1,712	0	0
Carry Forwards from 2021/22 (see note 3)	0	Cr 465	Cr 465	0	465	0	0
Adjustment to Balances	0	0	0	Cr 2,177	Cr 2,177	0	0
Total all central items	231,878	0	231,878	231,878	0	0	0
Business Rates Retention Scheme (Retained Income, Top-up and S31 Grants)	Cr 42,828	0	Cr 42,828	Cr 42,828	Cr 42,828	0	0
Collection Fund losses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Homes Bonus	Cr 253	0	Cr 253	Cr 253	Cr 253	0	0
New Homes Bonus Topslice	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One off 2022/23 Services Grant	Cr 2,652	0	Cr 2,652	Cr 2,652	Cr 2,652	0	0
Council Tax Support - Collection Fund surplus	Cr 2,662	0	Cr 2,662	Cr 2,662	Cr 2,662	0	0
Funding COVID cost pressures from Earmarked Reserve	Cr 548	0	Cr 548	Cr 548	Cr 548	0	0
Collection Fund Surplus	Cr 4,100	0	Cr 4,100	Cr 4,100	Cr 4,100	0	0
Bromley's Requirement	178,835	0	178,835	178,835	178,835	0	0
GLA Precept	52,751	0	52,751	52,751	52,751	0	0
Council Tax Requirement	231,586	0	231,586	231,586	231,586	0	0

Budget Variations allocated to portfolios in year consists of:

1) Carry forwards from 2021/22	£'000	465	(see note 3)
2) Allocations from the central contingency provision		5,248	(see Appendix 4)
		<u>5,713</u>	

1) **NOTES**

Portfolio Final Approved Budgets analysed over Departments as follows:

	2022/23	Budget	2022/23	2022/23	Variation	Variation
	Original Budget	Variations allocated in year #	Approved Budget	Latest Budget	Projected Outturn	previously reported
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
People Department	144,600	1,227	145,827	145,827	151,715	5,888
Place Department	68,356	3,456	71,812	71,812	73,460	1,648
Chief Executive's Department	21,074	1,030	22,104	22,104	22,604	500
	<u>234,030</u>	<u>5,713</u>	<u>239,743</u>	<u>239,743</u>	<u>247,779</u>	<u>8,036</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 2021/22

Carry forwards from 2021/22 into 2022/23 totalling £465k were approved by Council and the Executive. Full details were reported to the June meeting of the Executive in the "Provisional Final Accounts 2021/22" report.

Comments from the Executive Director of Environment and Community Services

None

Comments from the Director of Corporate Services (Resources, Commissioning & Contract Management Portfolio) including Risk Areas

None

Comments from the Director of Adult Social Care

The start of the financial year has seen a continuation of the pressures experienced during the last financial year, with continuing demand from the hospitals as they attempt to clear waiting lists that developed due the pandemic and continued pressure to discharge people quickly. Whilst we have seen an increase in numbers of people being discharged compared to pre-pandemic, more importantly the needs of individuals needing support has remained high.

The teams have worked hard to clear the backlog of assessments that built as people started wanting services again, with the waiting times reduced to less than two weeks at this point in time. Those with disabilities have again started to attend services as confidence in mixing has increased.

We have seen an upturn in the cost of care, partly due to the increase in the cost of living, but also as providers prepare for the introduction of the Fair Cost of Care, with prices increasing significantly. The work to prepare for the changes in policy are well under way, with an emphasis on mitigating any risk, but this is expected to be a feature in future years as more people fall into government funding.

Comments from the Director of Housing, Planning and Regeneration

£1,116k of growth was included in the housing budget for 2022/23 to reflect the continuing pressures in relation to homelessness and the provision of temporary accommodation. A total of £1,785k savings was also included to mitigate these pressures.

Whilst approaches remain high, the ongoing supply of acquired properties and prevention work has continued to slow the rate of growth in nightly paid accommodation placements. However the number of approaches are starting to rise alongside increased pressure on nightly paid accommodation rates across London and the South East This results in a £422k overspend on temporary accommodation, with a £349k overspend on housing overall. As has been reported work is ongoing to increase the supply of affordable housing to continue to mitigate and reduce the current pressures relating to temporary accommodation particularly in relation to the increased ability to secure leased accommodation within temporary accommodation subsidy rates.

A substantial part of Planning Services' work attracts a fee income for the Council, for example the planning application fees. The fee income and volume of work reflects the wider economic circumstances affecting development pressures in the Borough. There is a risk of income variation beyond the Council's immediate control; however, trends are regularly monitored in order that appropriate action can be taken. Action has successfully been taken to negate the risk of Government Designation for Special Measures due to Planning performance for the current year. However, this is based on the actions identified being implemented to reduce the risk of Government Designation in future years.

There is a risk of substantial planning appeal costs being awarded against the Council by the Planning Inspectorate if the Council is found to have acted unreasonably. For major appeals, which can arise unpredictably, there is often a need for specialist external consultant's advice which creates additional costs.

The key risks in the Renewal, Recreation and Housing Portfolio continue to be:

- i) Increased homelessness and the associated costs particularly relating to the increased demand for placements across London
- ii) Increased rent arrears arising from inflation and increased costs of utilities and so forth
- iii) Reduced vacant housing association properties coming forward for letting
- iv) Increased maintenance and repairs costs in relation to the travellers site required to maintain health and safety standards

- v) Increase in planning applications and need to ensure application processing is sufficiently resourced
- vi) Increases being seen in construction and maintenance costs

Finally, the immediate and ongoing impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic on budgets are only now becoming apparent. Significant losses in income, in particular from commercial rents, are expected as town centres have been severely affected during lockdown restrictions. There is also likely to be an increase in homeless presentations and families requiring temporary accommodation as the current moratorium on evictions is eased later in the year. The full impact in 2021/22 and future years remains difficult to assess and will be largely dependent on the easing of restrictions and recovery of the wider economy.

Comments from the Director of Childrens Services

The Children, Education and Families Portfolio has an overspend of £5,294,000 for the year.

The Education Division has an overspend of £43k. This figure has partially been offset by using one off COVID funding to reduce the in year overspend. The overspend is mainly to do with SEN transport.

Initial analysis indicates that there are a number of causal factors resulting in the forecast overspend position on transport:

An increase in number and complexity of Special Educational Needs and Disabilities - The national increase in EHCPs is widely acknowledged as unsustainable and the rate of increase is accelerating across the country. In Bromley, despite gatekeeping measures, the increase in EHCPs has now reached 17%, (higher than the projected increase of 14% used to produce Growth funding assumptions).

The complexity of children and young people's needs is increasing, particularly Covid-related acute social, emotional and mental health needs, which require specialist provision which is typically costly independent provision outside of Bromley. Transport is often required and although officers seek to minimise costs, transport is often required to meet children's needs.

Transport provider pressures arising from the Covid-19 pandemic - The number of children requiring transport has increased by circa 17%, but this only accounts for part of the increase in costs. The reduced availability of drivers has resulted in more expensive providers having to be used from the call off framework

Immediate management action was taken on the notification of the forecast budget overspend position. A specialist external transport adviser has undertaken a review of SEN transport arrangements, including benchmarking analysis and a full review of processes and eligibility criteria to identify potential savings. This has enabled significant mitigation proposals to be identified as part of the MTFS process, which would offset the forecast pressures on SEN Transport. In addition work has been undertaken by our AD Strategic Performance resulting in predictive work for the next few years. This work has been incorporated into subsequent budget challenge discussions.

There is a current projected overspend in DSG of £4,254k. This will be added to the £7,142k carried forward from 2021/22. This gives us an estimated DSG deficit balance of £11,574k into the new financial year. Although there are some underspends to offset these in early years they do not cover the whole reduction in grant. There has also been increases in SEN placements and top up funding that have had an impact.

We have recently met with representatives from the DfE to set out our deficit recovery plan which they have approved.

The impact of additional legal duties from the SEND Reforms, has led to unsustainable financial pressures on High Needs costs within the DSG. An increase in Government funding (>£5m in 2021/22) is not sufficient to meet the increased costs. We are aware that Bromley is one of the last London Boroughs to incur a deficit in the DSG, with some local authorities having deficits in excess of £20m. The legal framework is heavily weighted in favour of parental preference, which is often for independent day and residential provision. We continue to assess all cases carefully and with a view to carefully balancing the education needs of young people and ensuring the best value for money from specialist education placements. Where it is appropriate to do so we continue to defend our decisions at Tribunal.

In the 2021 calendar year, 476 new EHCPs were issued, up from 274 in 2018 and 352 in 2019. In the first 7 months of 2022 we have issued 214 new EHCP's. We have sought to commission additional local specialist provision, including a new special free school due to open in 2023, but the needs and tribunal challenges are such that we have no choice but to continue placing children in more costly provision to ensure we are not in default of our legal statutory duties.

A review of High Needs Funding Bands has commenced, with oversight from the SEND Governance Board and CEF PDS. This will consider how the funding bands can be simplified and to identify where any savings can be made. We continue to work on increases to local specialist provision, including the special free school and increases in Additionally Resourced Provisions, which are specialist classes within mainstream schools.

In Children's Social Care the overspend is £5,251k.

The ongoing impact of C19 on Children Services continues especially in respect of contacts into our MASH – these continue to remain consistently around 1,100 contacts per month with little sign of a reduction. This compares to around 600 in April 2020 and it is the complexity of need from the families and children that have an added dimension.

There continues to be a high level of demand for support particularly in CWD which has meant a rise in demand for our short break provision. In response we have sought to increase the number of nights available for the number of families requiring this. Whilst These continued pressures have meant an increase in our looked after population in CWD despite the innovative and expensive care packages put in to support with health provision short breaks. The resilience for some families is now being significantly tested following two years of Covid challenges. This is primarily seen in families for children with profound and complex health and challenging sometimes aggressive behaviour.

The risks in the Children, Education & Families Portfolio are:-

Recruitment and retention of permanent staff/ ability to recruit skilled staff for the posts vacant and competitive salaries being paid at this time

Limited supply and increasing costs of residential placements – including the specialist placements for very complex young people. The cost of such placements is high and then with the delay to final hearing families are being retained in these placements beyond the assessment.

Increased complexity of children (SEND).

Shortage of local school places (particularly for Specialist schools).

Increasing High Needs Block expenditure not matched by a commensurate increase in Government Grant.

Adult Care and Health Portfolio Budget Monitoring Summary

2021/22 Actuals £'000	Division Service Areas	2022/23 Original Budget £'000	2022/23 Latest Approved £'000	2022/23 Projected Outturn £'000	Variation £'000	Notes	Variation Last Reported £'000	Full Year Effect £'000
PEOPLE DEPARTMENT								
Adult Social Care								
25,374	Assessment and Care Management	24,473	24,024	24,352	328	1	0	821
117	Direct Services	86	86	86	0		0	0
1,779	Quality Assurance & Safeguarding	1,930	1,930	1,930	0		0	0
39,170	Learning Disabilities	42,009	42,273	42,370	97	2	0	255
8,380	Mental Health	8,198	8,483	8,652	169	3	0	45
885	Placement and Brokerage	914	914	914	0		0	0
Cr 312	Better Care Fund - Protection of Social Care	0	0	0	0		0	0
Cr 920	CCG Support for Social Care	0	0	0	0		0	0
Cr 1,650	COVID grant to support impact of COVID on service ar	0	0	0	0		0	0
72,823		77,610	77,710	78,304	594		0	1,121
Integrated Commissioning Service								
1,222	Integrated Commissioning Service	1,336	1,336	1,336	0		0	0
1,101	Information & Early Intervention							
	- Net Expenditure	1,205	1,205	1,205	0		0	0
Cr 1,101	- Recharge to Better Care Fund	Cr 1,205	Cr 1,205	Cr 1,205	0		0	0
Better Care Fund								
24,175	- Expenditure	25,117	25,602	25,602	0	4	0	0
Cr 24,201	- Income	Cr 25,137	Cr 25,622	Cr 25,622	0		0	0
Improved Better Care Fund								
10,050	- Expenditure	7,503	10,327	10,327	0	5	0	0
Cr 10,050	- Income	Cr 7,503	Cr 10,327	Cr 10,327	0		0	0
1,196		1,316	1,316	1,316	0		0	0
Public Health								
15,197	Public Health	15,475	17,866	17,866	0		0	0
Cr 15,325	Public Health - Grant Income	Cr 15,185	Cr 17,576	Cr 17,576	0		0	0
Cr 128		290	290	290	0		0	0
73,891	TOTAL CONTROLLABLE ADULT CARE & HEALTH	79,216	79,316	79,910	594		0	1,121
2,602	TOTAL NON CONTROLLABLE	434	434	434	0		0	0
5,249	TOTAL EXCLUDED RECHARGES	5,063	5,063	5,063	0		0	0
81,742	TOTAL ADULT CARE & HEALTH PORTFOLIO	84,713	84,813	85,407	594		0	1,121

Reconciliation of Latest Approved Budget

£'000

2022/23 Original Budget

84,713

Carry forwards requests

Improved Better Care Fund

- expenditure

2,597

- income

Cr 2,597

Better Care Fund

- expenditure

83

- income

Cr 83

Public Health Grant

- expenditure

1,964

- income

Cr 1,964

Winter Resilience Funding

- expenditure

400

- income

Cr 400

Shared Lives Transformation Posts

100

Other:

Better Care Fund

- expenditure

402

- income

Cr 402

Improved Better Care Fund

- expenditure

227

- income

Cr 227

Public Health Grant

- expenditure

427

- income

Cr 427

ICS funding:

- Hospital Discharges

- expenditure

3,308

- income

Cr 3,308

- LD/Autism

- expenditure

247

- income

Cr 247

- Discharge Transformation Funds

- expenditure

361

- income

Cr 361

King's funding for SPA

- expenditure

500

- income

Cr 500

Market Sustainability and Fair Cost of Care Fund

- expenditure

804

- income

Cr 804

Charging Reform Implementation Support Grant

- expenditure

104

- income

Cr 104

Latest Approved Budget for 2022/23

84,813

1. Assessment and Care Management - Dr £328k

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

	<u>Current</u> <u>Variation</u> £'000
<u>Physical Support / Sensory Support / Memory & Cognition</u>	
Services for 65 +	
- Placements	663
- Placements (discharge packages)	1,336
- Domiciliary Care / Direct Payments	Cr 20
- Domiciliary Care (discharge packages)	1,972
- CCG funding for discharge packages	<u>Cr 3,308</u>
	<u>643</u>
Services for 18-64	
- Placements	125
- Domiciliary Care / Direct Payments	<u>79</u>
	<u>204</u>
Other	
- Community DoLS	Cr 195
- D2A	Cr 324
	<u>Cr 519</u>
	<u><u>328</u></u>

The 2022/23 budget includes funding for the full year effect of the September 2021 overspend as reported to Members in the September Budget Monitoring report.

Services for 65+ - Dr £643k

Numbers in residential and nursing care continue to be above the budget provision, currently 10 placements above the budget number of 494, with an overspend being projected of £663k for the year. Of this amount £413k relates to costs being incurred for both placements above the Council's guide rates and additional 1-2-1 care required for some service users in some of the residential settings.

The overall position on the domiciliary care and direct payments budgets is a projected underspend of £20k. Domiciliary care is projected to underspend by Cr £54k and direct payments to overspend by £34k.

Due to Covid-19, discharges from hospital continue to follow a revised pathway in unison with health. Based on current levels of activity, the cost of the short term care home placements following discharge is estimated at £1,336k, and domiciliary care packages at £2,118k. South East London Integrated Care Board (ICB) have provided £3,308k of one-off funding for hospital discharge packages in 2022/23 following the cessation of central funding from NHS England which will fund the majority of these costs, with the remaining £246k funded from the existing D2A budget.

As part of the 2022/23 budget setting, savings of £229k were included in the division and at this stage it is expected that this amount will be achieved.

Services for 18-64+ - Dr £204k

Placements for 18-64 age group are projected to overspend by £125k this year based on current service user numbers which are currently 3 above budgeted levels. The overspend for Physical Support service users is £58k (1 placement) and Memory & Cognition £67k (2 placements).

The overall position on the domiciliary care and direct payments budgets is a projected overspend of £79k. Domiciliary care is currently projected to underspend by £13k and direct payments to overspend by £92k.

Community Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (CDoLS) - Cr £195k

There has been no spend on the CDOLs budget yet, resulting in an underspend to date of £195k.

Discharge to Assess (D2A) - Cr £324k

Due to Covid-19, discharges from hospital continue to follow a revised pathway in unison with health. As referred to above, South East London ICS have provided one-off funding for hospital discharge packages in 2022/23 and as a result it is expected that the existing D2A budget will not be fully utilised.

2. Learning Disabilities - Dr £97k

The 2022/23 Learning Disabilities (LD) budget includes funding for anticipated 2022/23 demand-related pressures and the full year effect (FYE) of the 2021/22 overspend but also reductions relating to planned savings.

An overspend of £97k is currently anticipated which mainly relates to the 18-64 age range. The actual FYE of the 21/22 overspends at year end was considerably higher than the growth figure included in the budget, which was based on the September 2021 budget monitoring position; however this has been partly offset by an increase in the number of full cost contributions as well as underspends on Domiciliary Care and Direct Payments budget.

Given the early stage in the financial year a significant element of projected spend is based on assumptions, for example future services for young people transitioning to adult social care services and increased client needs during the year. In view of the relatively high proportion of the forecast based on future assumptions rather than actual data, this position is likely to change as the year progresses.

3. Mental Health - Dr £169k

The 2022/23 budget includes funding for the full year effect of the September 2021 overspend as reported to Members as part of the September Budget Monitoring report.

Placements for 65+ age group are projected to overspend by £113k this year based on current service user numbers of 39.

The overall position on the domiciliary care and direct payments budgets is a projected overspend of £2k. Domiciliary care is currently projected to overspend by £79k and direct payments to underspend by £77k.

Placements for the 18-64 age group are projected to overspend by £106k this year based on current service user numbers of 103, and mainly relates to Supported Living accommodation.

The overall position on the domiciliary care and direct payments budgets is a projected underspend of £52k, with Domiciliary care currently projected to underspend by £119k and direct payments to overspend by £67k.

4. Better Care Fund (BCF) - Nil variation

Other than variations on the protection of social care element, any underspends on Better Care Fund budgets will be carried forward for spending in future years under the pooled budget arrangement with South East London ICB.

The final 2022/23 allocation was published in May at a 5.66% increase above 2021/22 levels, which equates to a £402k increase above the 4% assumed in the budget. It is proposed that this allocation is set aside for hospital discharge care packages.

5. Improved Better Care Fund (IBCF) - Nil Variation

The total amount of funding available in 2022/23 is:

	£'000
2021/22 IBCF allocation - recurrent	4,636
2021/22 IBCF allocation - non-recurrent (extended for 5th year)	1,677
2021/22 Winter Pressures Grant	1,190
Carry forward from previous years	<u>2,597</u>
	<u>10,050</u>

The non-recurrent IBCF funding of £1,677k has been extended for a sixth year and, for the third year running, this will fund a contribution to a 'whole system' reserve that can be called upon in relation to any crisis in the joint health and social care systems.

£1,400k of the carry forward from previous years has been allocated to help mitigate growth pressures in the 2022/23 budget, with a further £400k assumed for the 2023/24 budget.

For the first time in recent years, the IBCF allocation had an inflationary increase for 2022/23 of 3% which equates to £227k. It is proposed that this is allocated to help offset cost pressures in the portfolio, and has been assumed in the figures above.

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 Corporate Services, the Director of Finance and the Director of Commissioning and (where over £100,000) approval of the Portfolio Holder and report use of this exemption to Audit Sub-Committee bi-annually. The Director of Adult Social Care has additional authority in respect of placements.

Since the last report to the Executive, 17 waivers for Adult placements have been agreed for between £50k and £100k and 3 for more than £100k.

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. There have been no virements since the last report to Executive.

Children, Education and Families Portfolio Budget Monitoring Summary

2021/22 Actuals £'000	Service Areas	2022/23 Original Budget £'000	2022/23 Latest Approved £'000	2022/23 Projected Outturn £'000	Variation £'000	Notes	Variation Last Reported £'000	Full Year Effect £'000
EDUCATION CARE & HEALTH SERVICES DEPARTMENT								
Education Division								
-461	Adult Education Centres	Cr 438	Cr 432	Cr 419	13	1	0	0
694	Schools and Early Years Commissioning & QA	747	747	591	Cr 156	2	0	0
2,612	SEN and Inclusion	2,365	2,365	2,493	128	3	0	0
99	Strategic Place Planning	43	43	43	0		0	0
49	Workforce Development & Governor Services	Cr 24	Cr 24	Cr 24	0	4	0	0
6,975	Access & Inclusion	6,781	6,781	7,371	590	5	0	1,282
0	Management Action - draw down from reserves	0	0	Cr 531	Cr 531		0	0
-1,446	Schools Budgets	Cr 1,493	Cr 1,493	Cr 1,494	Cr 1	6	0	0
25	Other Strategic Functions	318	324	324	0		0	0
8,537		8,263	8,275	8,318	43		0	1,282
Children's Social Care								
1,774	Bromley Youth Support Programme	1,732	1,732	1,837	105		0	0
676	Early Intervention and Family Support	1,342	1,432	1,429	Cr 3		0	0
8,150	CLA and Care Leavers	8,280	8,280	7,605	Cr 675		0	1,581
21,406	Fostering, Adoption and Resources	18,720	18,720	21,849	3,129		0	4,329
4,358	Referral and Assessment Service	4,092	4,092	4,564	472		0	0
3,908	Safeguarding and Care Planning East	3,012	3,487	4,734	1,247		0	0
2,779	Safeguarding and Care Planning West	6,105	6,580	7,101	521		0	0
Cr 980	Safeguarding and Quality Improvement	Cr 1,952	Cr 1,877	Cr 1,422	455		0	0
42,071		41,331	42,446	47,697	5,251		0	5,910
50,608	TOTAL CONTROLLABLE FOR EDUCATION, CHILDREN & FAMILIES	49,594	50,721	56,015	5,294		0	7,192
	Total Non-Controllable	1,594	1,594	1,594	0			0
	Total Excluded Recharges	8,761	8,761	8,761	0		0	0
50,608	TOTAL EDUCATION, CHILDREN & FAMILIES PORTFOLIO	59,949	61,076	66,370	5,294		0	7,192
Memorandum Item								
Sold Services								
	Education Psychology Service (RSG Funded)	Cr 94	Cr 94	186	280		0	0
	Education Welfare Service (RSG Funded)	Cr 18	Cr 18	21	39		0	0
	Workforce Development (DSG/RSG Funded)	Cr 30	Cr 30	Cr 30	0		0	0
	Community Vision Nursery (RSG Funded)	64	64	Cr 70	Cr 134		0	0
	Blenheim Nursery (RSG Funded)	98	98	109	11		0	0
0	Total Sold Services	20	20	216	196		0	0

Reconciliation of Latest Approved Budget	£'000
Original Budget 2022/23	59,949
Contingency:	
Additional social workers re caseloads	700
Temporary increase in CIN social workers	250

Carry forwards:

Broadband at Poverest	6
Wellbeing for Education	6
Deed Settlement for Hawes Down Site	
- expenditure	12
- income	-12
Virtual School CIN Grant	
- expenditure	63
- income	-63
Virtual School PLAC Grant	
- expenditure	93
- income	-93
Tackling Troubled Families Grant	
- expenditure	334
- income	-334
EIFS waiting list and volumes	90
MOPAC Choices grant	75

Other:

Latest Approved Budget for 2022/23	61,076
---	---------------

REASONS FOR VARIATIONS

1. Adult Education - Dr £13k

The Adult Education service is currently projecting to overspend by £13k. This is due to an overspend on running costs of £25k that is offset by a small underspend of £12k on the staffing budgets.

2. Schools and Early Years Commissioning & QA - Cr £156k

The in-house nurseries are currently having issues with staffing that has resulted in one of them temporary closing. This has resulted in a staffing underspend across the two nurseries of £201k and an under collection of income of £78k. Once the two figures are netted off, it leaves a net underspend of £123k.

Across the rest of the service there is a £33k underspend relating to staffing

3. SEN and Inclusion - Dr £128k

The staffing in this area is currently forecasting an underspend by £105k. This is due to a number of posts that are currently vacant and are currently expected to be filled during the year.

The Education Psychologists are currently in the process of recruiting to the vacant posts in their team. This is causing the statutory service they are required to provide to be underspent by £47k and the Trading Service they offer to the Schools to be overspent by £280k due to the use of expensive agency staff used to provide the service. This is a net overspend of £233k.

Please note that as from the start of the year, the SEN Transport Service has moved from the SEN Division to the Access & Inclusion Division

5. Access & Inclusion - Dr £590k

The Education Welfare Service Trading Account is currently expected to under collect on its income by £39k due to the loss of a number of school contracts. The provision of the service will need to be reviewed.

There is currently expected to be an overspend of £20k on the cost for maintaining and updating the database for school pupils.

SEN Transport is currently forecast to overspend by £531k. This is due to additional costs of £755k related to the cost of providing the service. This is then offset by forecasted underspends on staffing (£178k) and collection of additional income of £46k. These figures may change due to new routes being in place from the start of the new academic year and during the year as route rationalisation occurs.

6. 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 year's Schools Budget.

There is a current projected overspend in DSG of £4,254k. This will be added to the £7,142k carried forward in the reserves from 2021/22. The prior year Early Year adjustment has reduced our 2021/22 DSG allocation by £178k causing an additional pressure on the DSG. This gives us an estimated DSG reserve of £11,574k at the end of the financial year.

The in-year overspend is broken down as follows:-

There is an underspend of £75k in the Primary Support Team area. This is due to underspends in the staffing budgets.

The Home and Hospital service currently has a pressure of £200k due to the use of agency tutors to support the higher number of students the service is supporting.

There is an underspend of £1,778k from the High Needs Supplementary Grant. This is being used to offset the increase in costs of the SEN Placement budgets. The part of the grant that is shown as spent has been allocated to the schools in Bromley to support them with the additional costs they currently have.

SEN placements are projected to overspend by a total of £5,733k. The overspend is being caused by the Maintained Day (£652k), Independent Day (£3,400k), Alternative Programmes (£482k), Independent Boarding Schools (£332k), Maintained Boarding Schools (£69k), Direct Payment (£105k) and Matrix funding (£693k).

SEN Support for clients in Further Education Colleges is currently expected to overspend by £221k this year. This is due to the cost of placing clients with Independent providers.

The DSG funded element of SEN Transport is projected to overspend by £121k due to the new routes that were established in the last year. The level of spend in this area has been lower in previous years. Due to the current funding regulations LBB are not permitted to increase this budget from the previous year's allocation.

The Early Support Programme, Complex Needs team and Darrick Wood Hearing Unit are all currently projected to underspend. Most of the underspend relates to lower than expected staffing costs. These are then being offset by an overspend in the High Needs Pre-school Service and other Staffing costs to give a net underspend of £71k.

There is also a total small balance of overspends of £24k.

	Variations £'000	High Needs £'000	Schools £'000	Early Years £'000	Central £'000
Primary Support Team	-75	0	0	0	-75

Home & Hospital	200	200	0	0	0
Used of Additional Money	-1,778	-1,778	0	0	0
Other Small Balances	11	0	0	6	5
SEN:					
- Placements	5,733	5,733	0	0	0
- Support in FE colleges	221	221	0	0	0
- Darrick Wood Hearing Unit	-40	-40	0	0	0
- Complex Needs Team	-10	-10	0	0	0
- High Needs Pre-school Service	12	12	0	0	0
- Early Support Programme	-54	-54	0	0	0
- SEN Staff	21	21	0	0	0
- Other Small SEN Balances	13	13	0	0	0
Total	4,254	4,318	0	6	-70

7. Children's Social Care - Dr £5,251k

The current budget variation for the Children's Social Care Division is projected to be an overspend of £5,251k, Despite additional funding being secured in the 2022/23 budget, continued increases in the number of children being looked after together with the cost of placements has continued to put considerable strain on the budget.

Bromley Youth Support Programme -Dr £105k

The BYSP budget is projected to underspend by £105k this year. This is due to an overspend of £90k in staffing and an under collection of income of £121k. These are then offset by an underspend on running costs of £106k.

CLA and Care Leavers - Cr £675k

The service is currently expected to underspend by £675k. This is due to an overspend in staffing of £116k, an under collection of income of £151k and £103k over spend on running costs. These are then offset by a £1,045k underspend on placement costs in the service.

Fostering, Adoption and Resources - £3,129k

The budget for children's placements is currently projected to overspend by £3,035k this year. This amount is analysed by placement type below.

- Community Home's / Community Home's with Education - Dr £1,592k
- Boarding Schools - Dr £18k
- Fostering services (IFA's) - Dr £1,147k
- Fostering services (In-house, including SGO's and Kinship) - Dr £232k
- Adoption placements - Cr £36k
- Outreach Services - Dr £198k
- Transport Costs - Cr £116k

Additionally there are overspends on staffing of £32k and running cost of £62k in this area.

Referral and Assessment Service - Dr £472k

The main projected variance relates to services is a projected overspend on staffing of £350k, with the remaining £122k relating to running costs that in turn mostly relate to No Recourse to Public Funds (NRPF) clients.

Safeguarding and Care Planning East - Dr £1,247k

The budget in this area is currently projected to overspend by £1,247k, and is due to staffing overspends of £420k, PLO cases overspending by £755k and the remaining (£72k) relating to general running costs over spends.

Safeguarding and Care Planning West- Dr £521k

Services for Children with Disabilities is projected to overspend by £73k this year. This is made up of an overspend of £75k in relation to transport, £42k for counselling and £29k for other running costs. These are then offset by an underspend of £73k on staffing.

The remainder of the area is overspent by £448k and is due to a staffing overspend of £311k, Short breaks of £104k and other running costs of £33k

Safeguarding and Quality Improvement - Dr £455k

The projected overspend of £455k in this area mainly relates to staffing (£433k), and this includes the costs of recruiting and retaining social workers across the whole of Children's Social Care. There is additionally a £22k overspend in running costs.

8. 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 exempt from the normal requirement to obtain competitive quotations the Chief Officer has to obtain the agreement of the Director of Corporate Services, the Director of Finance and the Director of Commissioning 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 has been in Children's Social Care there were 14 waivers agreed for placements of between £100k and £150k, 1 between £150k and £200k and 7 for a value of over £200k.

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, there have been no virements processed

Environment & Community Portfolio Budget Monitoring Summary

2021/22 Actuals £'000	Service Areas	2022/23 Original Budget £'000	2022/23 Latest Approved £'000	2022/23 Projected Outturn £'000	Variation £'000	Notes	Variation Last Reported £'000	Full Year Effect £'000
	ENVIRONMENT & COMMUNITY PORTFOLIO							
	Street Scene & Green Spaces							
1082	Arboriculture Management	757	771	771	0		0	0
Cr 164	Business Support and Markets	Cr 64	Cr 64	42	106	1	0	0
6,039	Parks and Green Spaces	6,073	6,214	6,214	0		0	0
200	Street Regulation and Enforcement	1,573	1,573	1,573	0		0	0
18,582	Waste Services	19,654	20,463	19,663	-800	2	0	-800
5,789	Street Environment	5,992	6,112	6,112	0		0	0
1417	Management and Contract Support	231	231	231	0		0	0
32,945		34,216	35,300	34,606	-694		0	-800
	Transport Operations and Depot							
504	Transport Operations and Depot Management	594	594	594	0		0	0
504		594	594	594	0		0	0
	Traffic, Parking and Highways							
248	Traffic & Road Safety	133	133	362	229	3	0	0
Cr 6,967	Parking	Cr 9,462	Cr 8,962	Cr 7,462	1,500	4-8	0	1,000
6,072	Highways (including London Permit Scheme)	8,813	8,813	8,813	0		0	0
-647		-516	-16	1,713	1,729		0	1,000
32,802	TOTAL CONTROLLABLE	34,294	35,878	36,913	1,035		0	200
2,630	TOTAL NON-CONTROLLABLE	6,689	6,689	6,689	0		0	0
2,449	TOTAL EXCLUDED RECHARGES	2,336	2,336	2,336	0		0	0
37,881	PORTFOLIO TOTAL	43,319	44,903	45,938	1,035		0	200

Reconciliation of Latest Approved Budget

£'000

Original Budget 2022/23

43,319

Carry Forward Requests approved from 2021/22

Central Contingency Adjustments

Contract Inflation

Waste Collection & Disposal

810

Street Environment

120

Parks Management & Grounds Maintenance

140

Arboricultural Services

14

1,084

Parking income

500

Other

Latest Approved Budget for 2022/23

44,903

REASONS FOR VARIATIONS

1. Business Support & Markets Dr £106k

Street trading income remains affected by the continuation, under the Business and Planning Act 2020 (Pavement Licences) (Coronavirus) (Amendment) Regulations 2021, of pavement licences. This was a temporary measure, originally introduced during the Covid pandemic but now extended into 2023 with a view to being made permanent, which allows businesses to apply for a pavement licence for a £100 administration fee with no ongoing charges. This is a significant reduction compared to the permanent street trading licence scheme where the fees charged are significantly higher and are subject to periodic renewal. The estimated net impact on the Council this year is a net loss of c£50k.

Market income is anticipated to be under budget by c£56k this year. This continues the trend over the last two years which has seen a decline in the number of market traders following the initial impact of the Covid pandemic.

2. Waste Services Cr £800k

In setting the budget for 2022/23, account was taken of the significant increase in waste volumes collected from residential properties that had occurred since 2020. This was explained mainly as more people working from home following Covid restrictions, as well as an increase in the amount of waste generated from more home deliveries. As 2021 progressed, it appeared that this would be a long term and permanent change in domestic habits with a corresponding long term increase in recycling processing and waste handling costs, and the 2022/23 budget therefore was increased by £800k.

However, it became apparent in the final quarter of 2021/22 that waste volumes had started to moderate and even decline - this trend has been sustained in the first part of this financial year with waste officers reporting that volumes have returned to pre-Covid levels. As a result, the increased budget provision of £800k is not required and results in the budget being underspent.

3. Traffic & Road Safety Dr £229k

As had been reported throughout the last financial year, the situation regarding TfL funding of the Council's LIP capital programme and the staff engaged to deliver schemes continues to remain uncertain. Although the service are retaining vacancies as mitigation against this loss of funding, there is a monthly net funding gap of c£73k on this revenue budget, with the accumulated deficit to the end of August totalling £365k. While a longer term funding settlement for TfL is still awaited, the Council has received interim LIP funding so far this year of £136k, resulting in a net deficit to date of £229k. However, as there is no further funding for the remainder of the year or the amount of funding is insufficient, this variation will increase. The Assistant Director of Traffic & Parking continues to work closely with TfL to understand the situation for future funding and mitigating action will be prepared including a full service redesign.

Parking

4. Income from Bus Lane Contraventions Cr £200k

As has been reported previously, traffic levels have been down compared to pre-Covid levels and this income budget underachieved by £224k in 2021/22. This trend has continued in the first quarter of 2022/23, and projected to be c£200k under budget again this year.

5. Off/On Street Car Parking Cr £50k

Since April 2020, use of on and off street car parking spaces has been severely affected by the impact of the Covid pandemic on town centre activity and changes in commuting habits. These changes have persisted into this financial year with the wider economic uncertainty seemingly contributing to ongoing difficult trading conditions for town centres.

Although the overall budget target has been reduced by £1m since 2020, income from parking is projected to underachieve by a further £750k in 2022/23 based on activity in the first part of this financial year, with income from off street and multi-storey parking continuing to be most affected.

However, in setting the budget for 2022/23, the Executive took into account the risk of possible continuing losses and set aside a further provision of £500k in the Central Contingency budget. Subject to Executive's agreement, this amount has now been drawn down to the Parking income budget. As a result, the deficit on this income budget reduces from £750k to £250k.

Mitigating these income losses, the amount that the Council receives from RingGo fees continues to be buoyant reflecting the increased use of this payment method.

Off/On Street Car Parking income	750
Central Contingency budget adjustment	Cr 500
Revised Off/On Street Car Parking income	250
Less additional RingGo fees	Cr 300
Total variations within Off/On Street Parking	Cr 50

6. Car Parking Enforcement Dr £1,650k

As reported in previous monitoring in 2021/22, since the introduction of enforcement of moving traffic contraventions in October 2021, the actual number of tickets issued has been significantly lower than anticipated. Officers believe that this has been the result of a lower volume of traffic compared to the pre-Covid survey numbers, as well as potential issues with the efficacy of the new cameras. This issue was investigated by officers and have since engaged with the contractor resulting in some improvement in camera performance.

However, the actual number of PCN's issued in 2022/23 - although higher than in 2021/22 - has remained lower than original expectations, which officers believe is due mainly to a reduction in traffic congestion meaning fewer vehicles are contravening yellow box junctions. Therefore, the shortfall for the year at this stage is projected to be £1,650k.

7. Parking Shared Service Cr £250k

There is a net projected underspend of £250k for the Parking Shared Service mainly due to underspends on staffing as a result of vacancies across both boroughs as well as a reduction in the number of agency staff employed.

8. Traffic Committee for London fees Cr £50k

There was an underspend of £57k on this budget in 2021/22 and a similar variation is anticipated this year.

Summary of overall variations within Parking:

	£'000
Bus Routes Enforcement	200
On/Off Street Car Parking (net of Contingency budget adjustment)	Cr 50
Car Parking Enforcement	1,650
Parking Shared Services	Cr 250
Traffic Committee for London fees	Cr 50
Total variation for Parking	<u>1,500</u>

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 Corporate Services, the Director of Finance and the Director of Commissioning and (where over £100,000) approval of the Portfolio Holder and report use of this exemption to Audit Subcommittee bi-annually. Since the last report to the Executive, no waivers over £50k 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.

Public Protection & Enforcement Budget Monitoring Summary

2021/22 Actuals £'000	Service Areas	2022/23 Original Budget £'000	2022/23 Latest Approved £'000	2022/23 Projected Outturn £'000	Variation £'000	Notes	Variation Last Reported £'000	Full Year Effect £'000
	Public Protection							
371	Community Safety	427	427	427	0		0	0
161	Emergency Planning	146	146	156	10	1	0	0
548	Mortuary & Coroners Service	603	603	623	20	2	0	0
1,466	Public Protection	1,469	1,469	1,459	-17	3	0	0
2,546	TOTAL CONTROLLABLE	2,645	2,645	2,665	13		0	0
617	TOTAL NON CONTROLLABLE	6	6	6	0		0	0
836	TOTAL EXCLUDED RECHARGES	811	811	811	0		0	0
3,999	PORTFOLIO TOTAL	3,462	3,462	3,482	13		0	0

Reconciliation of Latest Approved Budget

£'000

Original Budget 2022/23

3,462

Carry Forward Requests approved from 2021/22

Latest Approved Budget for 2022/23

3,462

REASONS FOR VARIATIONS

1. Emergency Planning Dr £10k

This projected overspend relates to the anticipated additional cost of emergency response standby allowances for the year.

2. Mortuary & Coroners Service Dr £20k

Major renovations to the mortuary facilities at the Princess Royal University Hospital have just started and phase 1 will not be completed until December, meaning that post-mortems will instead be conducted in Denmark Hill. With finite facilities at this alternative site, a backlog is anticipated. As bodies will remain in storage for longer, the Council will inevitably incur additional costs.

3. Public Protection Cr £17k

A number of underspends totalling £139k are projected across Public Protection budgets, as follows.

Staffing costs are anticipated to be £39k under budget, with the main variation in respect of Trading Standards.

The cost of the Science Investigation Programme this year is expected to be £23k under budget and, similarly, City of London inspections are projected to be £11k underspent.

Income from licencing of Houses in Multiple Occupation is projected to overachieve this year by £66k.

Officers have commenced an exercise to upgrade the Department's line of business system from Uniform to Idox Cloud. A contract has been awarded recently which will require one-off implementation costs of £122k to be funded. This will be met from the revenue budget underspends already identified this year.

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 Corporate Services, the Director of Finance and the Director of Commissioning and (where over £100,000) approval of the Portfolio Holder and report use of this exemption to Audit Subcommittee bi-annually. Since the last report to the Executive, no waivers over £50k 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, Recreation & Housing Budget Monitoring Summary

2021/22 Actuals £'000	Division Service Areas	2022/23 Original Budget £'000	2022/23 Latest Approved £'000	2022/23 Projected Outturn £'000	Variation £'000	Notes	Variation Last Reported £'000	Full Year Effect £'000
	PLACE DEPARTMENT							
	Planning							
99	Building Control	90	90	334	244	1	0	0
Cr 128	Land Charges	Cr 126	Cr 126	Cr 126	0		0	0
1,707	Planning	1,493	1,703	1,703	0		0	0
1,678		1,457	1,667	1,911	244		0	0
	Culture & Regeneration							
908	Culture	830	1,017	1,017	0		0	0
4,649	Libraries	4,873	4,927	4,927	0		0	0
23	Economic Development	80	189	189	0		0	0
5,580		5,783	6,133	6,133	0		0	0
	Operational Housing							
877	Supporting People	1,070	1,070	926	Cr 144	2	0	Cr 94
6,406	Allocations and Accommodation	4,295	4,295	4,740	445	3	0	Cr 214
Cr 175	Housing Improvement	Cr 30	Cr 30	Cr 47	Cr 17	4	0	0
1,488	Housing Options and Support	2,006	2,006	1,983	Cr 23	5	0	0
1,314	Housing Strategy, Advice and Enabling	1,460	1,460	1,548	88	6	0	0
Cr 1,089	Housing Benefits	Cr 1,539	Cr 1,539	Cr 1,539	0		0	0
8,821		7,262	7,262	7,611	349		0	Cr 308
8,821	Total Controllable	14,502	15,062	15,655	593		0	Cr 308
2,141	TOTAL NON CONTROLLABLE	Cr 883	Cr 883	Cr 883	0		0	0
5,555	TOTAL EXCLUDED RECHARGES	5,627	5,627	5,627	0		0	0
16,517	TOTAL RR & H PORTFOLIO TOTAL	19,246	19,806	20,399	593		0	Cr 308

Reconciliation of Latest Approved Budget

£'000

Original budget 2022/23

19,246

Carry Forward Requests approved from 2021/22

Rough Sleepers Initiative Grant expenditure		228
Rough Sleepers Initiative Grant income	Cr	228
Homelessness Reduction Grant		89
Homelessness Reduction Grant	Cr	89
New Burdens Funding Grant expenditure		124
New Burdens Funding Grant income	Cr	124
Local Plan Implementation		120

Central Contingency Adjustments

Accommodation for Ex-Offenders expenditure		70
Accommodation for Ex-Offenders income	Cr	70
Rough Sleepers Initiative Grant expenditure		455
Rough Sleepers Initiative Grant income	Cr	455
Norman Park grant		151
Libraries contract inflation		54
Resources to address Planning minor applications backlog		90
Funding of Economic Development posts		109
Local London membership subscription		36

Other

Local Plan Review funded from Growth Fund		
- expenditure		600
- income	Cr	600

Latest Approved Budget for 2022/23

19,806

REASONS FOR VARIATIONS

1. Building Control Dr £244k

For the chargeable service, an income deficit of £270k is projected based on actual income so far this year. The Head of Building Control is undertaking a review of fees and charges to ensure the service complies with Building Account Regulations, which requires that the service operates on a full cost recovery basis (i.e. does not make a surplus or is subsidised on an ongoing basis). Revised charges are expected to be introduced later in the year and, assuming they come into force from October, should generate additional income of, say, £26k in the remainder of the year, reducing the projected income deficit for the year to £244k. In accordance with the Regulations, any surplus or deficit in year is charged to or funded from the Building Control Charging Account earmarked reserve, and would leave a total deficit balance of £266k to recover from income in future years.

2. Supporting People Cr £144k

A £144k underspend is currently forecast in the Supporting People area mainly as a result of procurement exercises during 2021/22 and 2022/23 containing costs within inflation that had accumulated in the budget whilst the previous contracts had been fixed for a number of years.

3. Allocations and Accommodation Dr £445k

There is currently a forecast overspend of £1,708k in the Temporary Accommodation before projected savings from increasing the supply of affordable housing. For this round of budget monitoring the number of Households in Temporary Accommodation was 1,073. It is currently expected that this will increase to 1,203 by the end of the financial year, at an average cost of around £6,323 per household per annum.

These figures exclude other schemes like More Homes Bromley, Orchard & Shipman, ex-residential care homes, and the Bromley Private Sector Leasing Scheme. Once these client numbers have been included there are currently over 1,400 households in Temporary Accommodation.

Transformation savings totalling £1,286k have been identified for 2022-23 with the following schemes planned to be completed to provide a longer term alternative to expensive nightly paid accommodation. Meadowship Homes £1,043k, Burnt Ash Lane £91k, Bushell Way £109k and Anerley Town Hall car park £43k. The Full Year Effect of these savings is estimated at around £2.1m.

There is also currently a forecast overspend on salaries of £23k. This is due mainly to the cost of funding two short term posts to meet the additional work load created by the new schemes. There are some vacancies within the service which are partly offsetting this additional cost.

	£'000
Summary of overall variations within Allocations and Accommodation:	
Temporary Accommodation	1,708
Transformation Savings	Cr 1,286
Salaries	23
Total variation for Allocations and Accommodation	<u>445</u>

4. Housing Improvement Cr £17k

In year vacancies during a period of recruitment are expected to result in an underspend of £17k.

5. Housing Options and Support Cr £23k

There are a number of vacancies within the service and some posts are difficult to fill. Temporary posts have been created to try and address this. The current projected underspend is £23k.

The Travellers budget has been realigned during the 2022-23 budget setting process and this should reduce some of the previous variances including the running costs and fee income. The Traveller Site Manager post continues to be difficult to fill and may result in an in-year underspend on salaries.

6. Housing Strategy, Advice and Enabling Dr £88k

There are three posts within the service which are unfunded. Options to address this are being reviewed.

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 Corporate Services, the Director of Finance and the Director of Commissioning and (where over £100,000) approval of the Portfolio Holder and report use of this exemption to Audit Subcommittee 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.

Resources, Commissioning & Contracts Management Portfolio Budget Monitoring Summary

2021/22 Actuals		2022/23 Original Budget £'000	2022/23 Latest Approved £'000	2022/23 Projected Outturn £'000	Variation £'000	Notes	Variation Last Reported £'000	Full Year Effect £'000
	CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S DEPARTMENT							
	FINANCIAL SERVICES DIVISION							
248	Director of Finance & Other	251	251	251	0		0	0
7,349	Exchequer - Revenue & Benefits	6,109	6,109	6,109	0		0	0
477	Exchequer - Payments & Income	2,163	2,163	2,163	0		0	0
1,678	Financial Accounting	657	657	657	0		0	0
799	Management Accounting	1,760	1,760	1,760	0		0	0
	Audit	831	865	865	0		0	0
10,551	Total Financial Services Division	11,771	11,805	11,805	0		0	0
	CORPORATE SERVICES DIVISION							
5,818	Information Systems & Telephony	6,017	6,750	6,750	0		0	0
	Legal Services & Democracy							
407	Electoral	1,079	1,126	1,126	0		0	0
1,339	Democratic Services	1,514	1,548	1,548	0		0	0
167	Mayoral	173	173	173	0		0	0
2,917	Legal Services	2,209	2,379	2,879	500	1	0	0
569	Procurement and Data Management	545	545	545	0		0	0
184	Management and Other (Corporate Services)	220	220	220	0		0	0
11,401	Total Corporate Services Division	11,757	12,741	13,241	500		0	0
	HR AND CUSTOMER SERVICES DIVISION							
1,899	Human Resources	2,210	2,210	2,210	0		0	0
317	Learning and Development	147	147	147	0		0	0
	Customer Services							
1,134	Contact Centre	1,172	1,172	1,172	0		0	0
Cr 139	Registration of Births, Deaths & Marriages	Cr 120	Cr 120	Cr 120	0		0	0
225	CE - Consultation & Communication	305	317	317	0		0	0
3,436	Total HR & Customer Services Division	3,714	3,726	3,726	0		0	0
	CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S DIVISION							
796	Management and Other (C. Exec)	903	903	903	0		0	0
796	Total Chief Executive's Division	903	903	903	0		0	0
	CENTRAL ITEMS							
1,179	CDC & Non Distributed Costs (Past Deficit etc.)	1,284	1,284	1,284	0		0	0
9,475	Concessionary Fares	5,972	5,972	5,972	0		0	0
36,838	TOTAL CONTROLLABLE CE DEPT	35,401	36,431	36,931	500		0	0
675	TOTAL NON CONTROLLABLE	3,242	3,242	3,242	0		0	0
Cr 17,324	TOTAL EXCLUDED RECHARGES	Cr 17,569	Cr 17,569	Cr 17,569	0		0	0
20,189	TOTAL CE DEPARTMENT	21,074	22,104	22,604	500		0	0
	CHILDREN, EDUCATION AND FAMILIES DEPARTMENT							
	Strategy and Corporate Projects							
229	Commissioning	232	232	232	0		0	0
2,126	Strategy, Performance and Engagement	1,831	1,831	1,831	0		0	0
2,355	TOTAL CONTROLLABLE CEF DEPT	2,063	2,063	2,063	0		0	0
300	TOTAL NON CONTROLLABLE	4	4	4	0		0	0
Cr 2,956	TOTAL EXCLUDED RECHARGES	Cr 2,129	Cr 2,129	Cr 2,129	0		0	0
Cr 301	TOTAL CEF DEPARTMENT	Cr 62	Cr 62	Cr 62	0		0	0
	ENVIRONMENT & COMMUNITY SERVICES DEPARTMENT							
	Total Facilities Management							
1,949	Admin Buildings & Facilities Support	1,678	2,990	2,990	0		0	0
280	Investment & Non-Operational Property	311	311	311	0		0	0
364	Strategic & Operational Property Services	962	962	962	0		0	0
1,510	TFM Client Monitoring Team	1,694	1,694	1,694	0		0	0
Cr 1,350	Other Rental Income - Other Portfolios	Cr 1,582	Cr 1,582	Cr 1,582	0		0	0
4,006	Repairs & Maintenance (All LBB)	3,314	3,314	3,314	0		0	0
6,759	TOTAL CONTROLLABLE ECS DEPT	6,377	7,689	7,689	0		0	0
84	TOTAL NON CONTROLLABLE	359	359	359	0		0	0
Cr 4,438	TOTAL EXCLUDED RECHARGES	Cr 4,361	Cr 4,361	Cr 4,361	0		0	0
Cr 1,869	Less: R&M allocated across other Portfolios	Cr 1,628	Cr 1,628	Cr 1,628	0		0	0

1,350	Less: Rent allocated across other Portfolios	1,582	1,582	1,582	0	0	0
1,886	TOTAL ECS DEPARTMENT	2,329	3,641	3,641	0	0	0
21,774	TOTAL RCCM PORTFOLIO	23,341	25,683	26,183	500	0	0

Reconciliation of Latest Approved Budget	£'000
Original budget 2022/23	23,341
Carry Forward Requests approved from 2021/22	
Local Digital Cyber Fund expenditure	100
Local Digital Cyber Fund income	-100
Audit Support	34
Members IT	34
	<u>68</u>

Central Contingency Adjustments

Energy contract (part year)	1,312
Local election May 2022	47
Legal Support – children's and adults social care	170
Inflation	12
IT contract procurement	653
Resources to support GDPR compliance	80

Other Budget Movements

Latest Approved Budget for 2022/23	<u>25,683</u>
---	----------------------

REASONS FOR VARIATIONS

1. Legal Services Dr £500k

The Legal services overspent by £596k in 2021/2, which was largely due to increased spending on counsel fees. The indications this year are that demand for use of counsel is similar, particularly in respect of childcare cases. The Assistant Director for Legal Services has provided the following narrative:

Legal services is a demand led service and in recent years there has been an upward trend in childcare cases issued by the local authority, and the courts are listing more hearings per case. This has therefore increased spend on counsel, however, the legal budget for counsel has not increased to accommodate for this upward cost pressure. Although the in-house team carry out advocacy to mitigate spend on counsel, they are required to focus on case work.

The court bundle lists indicate that in year 2019-20 there were circa 380 hearings. In 2020/21, there was an increase to circa 510 hearings which, whilst not unprecedented, is a significant rise on the previous year. In 2021/22, the figure was circa 420. Between April 2021 and April 2022, to counter external spend, the team has carried out circa 116 hearings in-house, and the team continues to face complex and lengthy cases (for example, an ongoing case ran for 14 days in court and on another case, the Local Authority were requested by the Judge to appoint a senior counsel). The team has also had to deal with an increasing number of DOLS (Deprivation of Liberty) cases. As an example, there have been 15 hearings on one young person's matter. The court identified an issue with cases having a large number of CMH (Case Management hearings). In May 2021, 30 LBB cases were so flagged with one case having had 17 hearings at that point and another 14.

The Planning Litigation and Licensing Legal team has also overspent on the budget for counsel's fees. These cases involve planning inquiries before an Inspector, advice concerning planning enforcement action, civil litigation including judicial and statutory review in the Administrative and Planning Court, an application to the Court of Appeal and criminal litigation including attendance at the Crown Court. Some of these cases are complex necessitating the instruction of senior Counsel to ensure the best outcome. In particular, an application for an injunction (and subsequent committal proceedings) in respect of breaches of planning control for land at the junction of Sevenoaks Road and Wheatsheaf Hill, Halstead has attracted a high profile where the service had to instruct a junior and senior counsel to represent the Council in court. It should be noted that the in-house team do not have right of audience at High Court, Court of Appeal and Crown Courts and therefore need to instruct counsel.

Due to the increased instructions to legal services on contracts, contract disputes, housing, regeneration, education capital projects and commercial property-related matters arising, the Legal commercial team has had to engage locum lawyers in order to meet the increased demand, thereby putting pressure on the staffing budget.

The Director of Corporate Services and Governance has issued a new procedure for instructing counsel for service directors to agree. This includes putting in measures to control expenditure on counsel and giving service departments more ownership of expenditure relating to their cases. The Director of Corporate Services and Governance will also oversee a review of Legal services to look at the work of the service, budget and resourcing requirements.

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 Subcommittee 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.

Allocation of Contingency Provision for 2022/23

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	
	£	£	£	£	£	£
General						
Provision for Unallocated Inflation	3,977,000		2,462,000	515,000	2,977,000	Cr 1,000,000
Increase in Cost of Homelessness/Impact of Welfare Reforms	1,825,000			500,000	500,000	Cr 1,325,000
Provision for increase in employer national insurance-outsourced services	910,000			0	0	Cr 910,000
General Provision for Risk/Uncertainty	3,500,000			1,000,000	1,000,000	Cr 2,500,000
Provision for Risk/Uncertainty Relating to Volume & Cost Pressures	2,871,000			0	0	Cr 2,871,000
Growth for Waste Services	187,000			0	0	Cr 187,000
Universal Credit roll out - Claimant Fault Overpayment Recoveries	750,000			0	0	Cr 750,000
Deprivation of Liberty	118,000			0	0	Cr 118,000
Building Infrastructure Fund	2,000,000			2,000,000	2,000,000	0
Provision for potential loss of car park income	500,000		500,000	0	500,000	0
Property income recovery/rent variations	500,000		500,000	0	500,000	0
Legal support - children and adults social care	170,000		170,000	0	170,000	0
Provision of agency workers contract saving	Cr 260,000			Cr 260,000	Cr 260,000	0
Planning Application backlog	0		90,000	0	90,000	90,000
Economic Development posts	0		109,000	0	109,000	109,000
Norman Park	0		151,000	0	151,000	151,000
Local London Membership	0		36,000	0	36,000	36,000
Local election	0		47,000	0	47,000	47,000
IT contract procurement	0		989,000	0	989,000	989,000
SARS	0		80,000	0	80,000	80,000
Additional social workers re caseloads (£2m to a reserve)	0		2,400,000	0	2,400,000	2,400,000
Temporary increase in CIN social workers (COVID related)	0		250,000	0	250,000	250,000
Adult Care & Health Portfolio						
Better Care Fund						
Grant Related Expenditure			402,000	0	402,000	402,000
Grant Related Income		Cr	402,000	0	Cr 402,000	Cr 402,000
Improved Better Care Fund						
Grant Related Expenditure			227,000	0	227,000	227,000
Grant Related Income		Cr	227,000	0	Cr 227,000	Cr 227,000
Public Health Grant						
Grant Related Expenditure			427,000	0	427,000	427,000
Grant Related Income		Cr	427,000	0	Cr 427,000	Cr 427,000
ICS funding						
Grant Related Expenditure			3,916,000	612,000	4,528,000	4,528,000
Grant Related Income		Cr	3,916,000	Cr 612,000	Cr 4,528,000	Cr 4,528,000
King's funding for SPA						
Grant Related Expenditure			500,000	0	500,000	500,000
Grant Related Income		Cr	500,000	0	Cr 500,000	Cr 500,000
Market Sustainability and Fair Cost of Care Fund						
Grant Related Expenditure			804,000	0	804,000	804,000
Grant Related Income		Cr	804,000	0	Cr 804,000	Cr 804,000
Charging Reform Implementation Support Grant						
Grant Related Expenditure			104,000	0	104,000	104,000
Grant Related Income		Cr	104,000	0	Cr 104,000	Cr 104,000
Children, Education and Families						
SEND Transport Growth	1,000,000			1,000,000	1,000,000	0
Renewal, Recreation & Housing						
Property Valuation	100,000			100,000	100,000	0
Planning Appeals - change in legislation	60,000			60,000	60,000	0
Accommodation for Ex-Offenders						
Grant Related Expenditure			70,000	0	70,000	70,000
Grant Related Income		Cr	70,000	0	Cr 70,000	Cr 70,000
	18,208,000		0	7,784,000	4,915,000	12,699,000
Grants included within Central Contingency Sum						
Rough Sleeping Initiative						
Grant Related Expenditure	104,000		455,000	0	455,000	351,000
Grant Related Income	Cr 104,000		Cr 455,000	0	Cr 455,000	Cr 351,000
Homeless Prevention Initiatives						
Grant Related Expenditure	424,000			424,000	424,000	0
Grant related Income	Cr 424,000			Cr 424,000	Cr 424,000	0
Tackling Troubled Families						
Grant Related Expenditure	628,000			628,000	628,000	0
Grant related Income	Cr 628,000			Cr 628,000	Cr 628,000	0
TOTAL CARRIED FORWARD	18,208,000		0	7,784,000	4,915,000	12,699,000
						Cr 5,509,000

Allocation of Contingency Provision for 2022/23 (continued)

Item	Carried Forward from 2021/22	Allocations				Total Allocations/Projected for Year	Variation to Original Contingency Provision
		Previously Approved Items	New Items Requested this Cycle	Items Projected for Remainder of Year			
	£	£	£	£	£	£	
TOTAL BROUGHT FORWARD	18,208,000	0	7,784,000	4,915,000	12,699,000	Cr 5,509,000	
Items Carried Forward from 2021/22							
Adult Care & Health Portfolio							
Social Care Funding via the CCG under S75 Agreements							
Improved Better Care Fund							
- Expenditure	2,597,185		2,597,185		2,597,185	0	
- Income	Cr 2,597,185		Cr 2,597,185		Cr 2,597,185	0	
Better Care Fund 2021/22							
- Expenditure	82,975		82,975		82,975	0	
- Income	Cr 82,975		Cr 82,975		Cr 82,975	0	
Public Health							
- Expenditure	1,964,209		1,964,209		1,964,209	0	
- Income	Cr 1,964,209		Cr 1,964,209		Cr 1,964,209	0	
Winter Resilience Funding							
- Expenditure	400,000		0		400,000	(1) 0	
- Income	Cr 400,000	Cr 400,000	0		Cr 400,000	0	
Renewal, Recreation & Housing Portfolio							
Rough Sleepers Initiative							
- Expenditure	227,635		227,635		227,635	0	
- Income	Cr 227,635		Cr 227,635		Cr 227,635	0	
New Burdens Funding Grant							
- Expenditure	123,919		123,919		123,919	0	
- Income	Cr 123,919		Cr 123,919		Cr 123,919	0	
Homelessness Reduction Grant							
- Expenditure	89,000		89,000		89,000	0	
- Income	Cr 89,000		Cr 89,000		Cr 89,000	0	
Children, Education and Families Portfolio							
Virtual School CIN Grant							
- Expenditure	62,806		62,806		62,806	0	
- Income	Cr 62,806		Cr 62,806		Cr 62,806	0	
Virtual School PLAC Grant							
- Expenditure	92,669		92,669		92,669	0	
- Income	Cr 92,669		Cr 92,669		Cr 92,669	0	
Tackling Troubled Families Grant							
- Expenditure	334,051		334,051		334,051	0	
- Income	Cr 334,051		Cr 334,051		Cr 334,051	0	
Deed Settlement for Hawes Down Site							
- Expenditure	12,119		12,119		12,119	0	
- Income	Cr 12,119		Cr 12,119		Cr 12,119	0	
Resources, Commissioning and Contracts Portfolio							
Local Digital Cyber Fund							
- Expenditure	100,000		100,000		100,000	0	
- Income	Cr 100,000		Cr 100,000		Cr 100,000	0	
General							
Shared Lives Transformation posts	100,000	100,000	0	0	100,000	(1) 0	
Members IT	34,000		34,000	0	34,000	0	
Local Plan Implementation	120,000		120,000	0	120,000	0	
Audit Support	34,000		34,000	0	34,000	0	
Broadband at Poverest	6,103		6,103	0	6,103	0	
EIFS waiting list and volumes	90,000		90,000	0	90,000	0	
MOPAC Choices grant	75,000		75,000	0	75,000	0	
Wellbeing for Education	5,821		5,821	0	5,821	0	
Total Carried Forward from 2020/21	464,924	100,000	364,924	0	464,924	0	
GRAND TOTAL	18,672,924	100,000	8,148,924	4,915,000	13,163,924	Cr 5,509,000	

Notes:

(1) Portfolio Holder for Adult Care and Health, 22nd March 2022

Description	2022/23 Latest Approved Budget £'000	Variation To 2022/23 Budget £'000	Potential Impact in 2023/24
Housing Needs - Temporary Accommodation	5,990	Cr 214	The full year effect of Temporary Accommodation is currently estimated to be £1,929k. This will be reduced by planned transformation savings totalling £2,143k which have been identified for 2023-24 to provide a longer term alternative to expensive nightly paid accommodation. This estimate only takes into account the projected activity to the end of this financial year and not any projected growth in client numbers beyond that point.
Assessment and Care Management - Care Placements	28,203	847	The full year impact of the current overspend is estimated at £821k. Of this amount £257k relates to residential and nursing home placements for 65+ and £564k for 18-64's. Domiciliary care & direct payments for both age groups is broadly on budget overall. This is based on client numbers as at the end of May.
Learning Disabilities - including Care Placements, Transport and Care Management	42,273	97	The full year effect (FYE) is estimated at a net overspend of £255k. This figure is below than the in-year overspend as demand-related growth pressures, for example transition and increased client needs, have only a part year impact in 2022/23 but a greater financial impact in a full year. Given the early stage in the financial year and the uncertainties that remain in relation to the delivery of savings and the transition cohort, the FYE is likely to change as the year progresses and things become clearer.
Mental Health - Care Placements	6,265	169	A full year overspend of £45k is anticipated on Mental Health care packages, with residential, nursing and supported living placements £33k overspent and domiciliary care and direct payments £12k overspent.
Supporting People	1,070	Cr 144	The full year effect of Supporting People is currently estimated to be a credit of £94k. This is a result of the estimated savings from retendering of the contracts that has taken place.
Children's Social Care	42,446	1,874	The overall full year effect of the Children's Social Care overspend is a net £5,910k, analysed as Residential Care, Fostering and Adoption of £4,329k and on Leaving Care costs of £1,581k.
SEN Transport	6,505	1,282	The current full year effect for SEN Transport - based on the current routes - is £1,282k.
Waste Services	20,463	Cr 800	The previously approved budget increase in respect of increased waste volumes is no longer required resulting in a full year budget reduction of £800k.
Moving Traffic Contraventions		1,650	The actual number of PCN's issued in 2022/23 has remained lower than original expectations, which officers believe is due mainly to a reduction in traffic congestion meaning fewer vehicles are contravening yellow box junctions. The full year reduction in income is estimated at c£1m.

SECTION 106 RECEIPTS

Section 106 receipts are monies paid to the Council by developers as a result of the grant of planning permission where works are required to be carried out or new facilities provided as a result of that permission (e.g. provision of affordable housing, healthcare facilities & secondary school places). The sums are restricted to being spent only in accordance with the agreement concluded with the developer.

The major balances of Section 106 receipts held by the Council are as follows:

31st March 2022 £000	Service	Income £000	Expenditure £000	Transfers to/(from) Capital £000	Actual as at 31st March 2023 £000
<u>Revenue</u>					
233	Highway Improvement Works				233
30	Road Safety Schemes				30
8	Local Economy & Town Centres				8
70	Parking				70
0	Education				-
1,445	Healthcare Services				1,445
10	Community Facilities				10
443	Other				443
2,239		0	0	-	2,239
<u>Capital</u>					
5,078	Education				5,078
20	Highways				20
2,452	Housing				2,452
686	Local Economy & Town Centres				686
0	Other				-
8,236		0	0	-	8,236
10,475		0	0	0	10,475

This page is left intentionally blank

EARMARKED GENERAL FUND BALANCES
2021/22

Description	Balance at 31/03/2021	Expenditure	Income		Balance at 31/03/2022
			Contributions	Interest	
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
EARMARKED BALANCES					
LPSA Reward Grant	76				76
Technology Fund	1,298	100			1,198
LAA Pump Priming Grant	155				155
Town Centre Improvement Fund (LABGI)	55				55
Investment to Community	296	37			259
R & R Redundancy Reserve	116				116
Works to Property	100				100
Planning Services Charging Account	93	70	23		46
Government Grants	9,981	9,981	8,092		8,092
Invest to Save	18,227		285		18,512
One off Member Initiatives	823	142			681
Infrastructure Investment Fund	559	147			412
Commissioning Authority Programme	365				365
Health & Social Care 'Promise Programme'	3,953				3,953
Housing Strategy Account	25				25
Community Right to Bid & Challenge	46				46
Winter Pressures	2,010				2,010
Refurbishment of War Memorials	13				13
Key Health & Social Care Initiatives	1,700				1,700
Integration of Health & Social Care Initiatives	1,614				1,614
Collection Fund Surplus Set Aside	31,791		7,064		38,855
Healthy Bromley Fund	3,815	233			3,582
Glaxo Wellcome Endowment	86	21			65
Cheyne Woods and Cyphers Gate	138				138
Public Halls Fund	5				5
Future Repairs of 145, High Street	79		12		91
Parallel Fund	2,903			117	3,020
Health & Social Care Integrated Commissioning Fund	3,030				3,030
Financial Planning & Risk Reserve	10,000				10,000
Bromley Welfare Fund	492	160	600		932
Payment in Lieu Reserve for Temporary Accommodation	264		107		371
Business Rates Risk Reserve	4,200				4,200
Crystal Palace Park Improvements	26				26
Various Joint Schemes and Pump Priming Investments	3,710		1,303		5,013
Transition Fund	2,559				2,559
Environmental Initiatives	453	25			428
Planning/Planning Enforcement	15	15			0
Apprenticeship Scheme	152	73			79
Civic Centre Development Strategy	257				257
Professional Advice for Future Schemes	139	17			122
Utilisation of New Homes Bonus	3,868		708		4,576
Future Pensions Risk on Outsourcing	1,244		247		1,491
West Wickham Leisure Centre & Library Redevelopment	623				623
Income Equalisation Reserve	5,310			1,676	6,986

Transformation Fund	1,245	21			1,224
Investment Fund	6,142	12			6,130
Growth Fund	21,376	137			21,239
Capital Funding for Property Disposal/Feasibility Works	78				78
Biggin Hill Airport Project Transformation Programme	76	61			15
	343	93			250
Housing Investment Fund	32,409	1,238	1,242		32,413
High Street & Parks Improvement Fund	71				71
Contribution to YES Funding for 2019/20	45				45
Day Centre Rent Relief	6				6
Housing Invest to Save	3,409				3,409
Health Facilities Fund	993				993
Health & Social Care Transformation Fund	1,500				1,500
Housing feasibility and viability	128	20			108
Website Update	150	77			73
Carbon Neutral Initiatives Fund	875				875
Walnuts Development	70	39			31
Hospital Discharge Funding	1,677		1,677		3,354
IT Services Procurement	197	197			0
COVID recovery Fund	10273		2,770		13,043
New Reserves Set Up in 2021/22					0
Platinum Jubilee Fund			1,000		1,000
Capital Fund			2,900		2,900
For Approval this cycle					
CCG Contribution to Children Education and Families			814		814
Sub-Total	197,727	12,916	28,844	1,793	215,448
Schools	2,550		257		2,807
DSG Reserve (new in 2020/21)	-1,139	6,003			-7,142
Insurance Fund	4,384	448			3,936
Sub-Total	203,522	19,367	29,101	1,793	215,049
Business Rates Adjustment Account 2020/21	63,407	63,407			0
Collection Fund Deferred Costs Reserve (new in 2020/21)*	2,662		2,283		4,945
Business Rates Adjustment Account 2021/22 **			45,935		45,935
TOTAL	269,591	82,774	77,319	1,793	265,929

* This Reserve represents grants received and accrued for in 2020/21 & 2021/22, which will be used to fund costs that will accrue for during 2022/23 & 2023/24.

** Although the Council is required to account for this balances as Reserve in 2021/22, it is important to note that equivalent and offsetting spend will be incurred during 2022/23.

Decision Maker: EXECUTIVE

For Pre-decision scrutiny by Children, Education and Families PDS
Committee on 4th October 2022

Date: 6 October 2022

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Key

Title: ADDITIONAL STAFFING CAPACITY FOR CHILDREN'S SOCIAL CARE

Contact Officer: E-mail: richard.baldwin@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Richard Baldwin, Director of Children's Services

Ward: All

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 Current demand for support to vulnerable young people across Bromley has been gradually rising since 2018. The Covid-19 pandemic has accelerated this demand, and we now have sustained levels of demand that are significantly higher than previously.
- 1.2 This continues to place pressure on many parts of Children's Social Care, but particularly on our "Front Door" services and "Safeguarding" service where the majority of our Child in Need cases and Child Protection cases are held.
- 1.3 Currently caseloads average 21 children per Social Worker (SW). The Bromley "Caseload Promise" which was an essential element of our pledge to Social Workers to provide them with the right environment in which to deliver good quality practice put a limit on cases of between 12-15 children. In order to maintain the quality of practice and ensure that we maintain can retain and attract good quality staff we wish to make a targeted investment in additional staff for a four-year period that will assist us in meeting the increased need over this period, whilst also allowing for an anticipated gradual reduction in demand as we move forward and are able to work more effectively utilising the additional staff.
- 1.4 This proposal seeks investment of £2.4 million over four years to allow for the initial recruitment of 20 additional SW posts. We will recruit 20 new posts in year one, and then reduce back down by 5 SWs in each subsequent year of the additional funding. We feel that the initial additional investment will allow a return to lower caseloads, which in turn will assist in making effective interventions with families that can lead to better and safer outcomes and ensure we are not involved in the lives of families for so long. These efficiencies will allow us to work more effectively and so gradually return to the current staffing numbers over the course of the funding.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- (1) Subject to approval by the Council, Executive is asked to endorse and support the proposal of the time-limited funding for these additional staff (£2.4m).**
- (2) Executive is also asked to approve the use of £250k of Contingency monies to fund the short-term support to the Safeguarding Service. This is a one-off request.**
- (3) We propose the additional funding in the main part of this request to cover a period of four years. This will be achieved by the following measures -**
 - Anticipating a gradual reduction of demand over the next four years which will allow between 5-10 posts to be absorbed into existing agency SW posts and/or vacancies as they arise.**
 - The additional capacity will also allow for more effective working of cases ensuring that periods of intervention can be reduced, and cases closed sooner. This means that we should be able to reduce the overall number of open cases across the service by between 65-70 each year for the next four years.**
 - Therefore, the number of posts should be able to reduce by 5 posts per year over the duration of the four years to bring staff funding back into line with present capacity at the end of the four years.**

Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children

1. Summary of Impact: We anticipate that these measures will strengthen the delivery of services to vulnerable young people across the Borough and assist in meeting the current increased demand. The proposal also strengthens the Council's ability to attract and retain good quality staff.
-

Transformation Policy

1. Policy Status: Not Applicable:
 2. Making Bromley Even Better Priority:
 - (1) For children and young people to grow up, thrive, and have the best life chances in families who flourish and are happy to call Bromley home.
 - (4) For residents to live responsibly and prosper in a safe, clean, and green environment great for today and a sustainable future.
 - (5) To manage our resources well, providing value for money, and efficient and effective services for Bromley's residents.
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Estimated Cost: 2.4 million over four years plus £250k one off
 2. Ongoing costs: Recurring Cost: yes, but decreasing over the course of four years
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Children's Social Care
 4. Total current budget for this head: £42.4m
 5. Source of funding: Core funding
-

Personnel

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 20 additional Social Work staff
 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 or customers (current and projected): This proposal would impact on approx. 300 young people.
-

3.2 Drivers (Demand)

- (1) Post-pandemic we are seeing an increase in referrals into Children's Social Care (figures provided below). The majority of referrals relate to children's mental health and the impact of witnessing Domestic Abuse. The average waiting time figures from CAMHS also confirm and highlight the rise in concerns for young people's mental health and well-being.
- (2) Complexity of concern; We have continued to maintain strong gatekeeping to prevent unnecessary receptions into the care system. Our numbers of Children Looked After has not changed significantly throughout the last four years. However, those children that are coming into care are presenting with a greater level of complexity. There continue to be children with concerns of neglect, physical abuse, and sexual abuse, but these children are more recently presenting with over-laying, additional concerns such as mental health which appears to be linked to the impact of the pandemic.

3.3 Data (This is set out in the table below)

- (1) The table below sets out some of the key data which highlights the rise in referrals and cases over recent years. The March 2020 date is significant in that it is the last full month prior to lockdown and thus provides a good benchmark between pre- and post-pandemic levels of need.
- (2) The "per 10,000" figure provides a helpful way showing comparisons with other Local Authorities (LAs) (more fully set out in the second table), but also shows the rise in demand of the number of children open to Children's Social Care for every 10,000 children in each LA. (i.e.; if you took a sample cohort of 10,000 children in Bromley at present, 536 of them would be open to CSC).
- (3) The final line on the table shows the impact this has on caseloads. As you will be aware the Bromley "caseload promise" is to stay between 12-15. Limiting caseloads means that we get higher quality, more effective practice. High caseloads were one of the key concerns in the Ofsted inspection of 2017. Nationally a caseload of 15 is now recognised as being appropriate.

	Mar-18	Mar-20	Mar-22
No. of Referrals	170	273	427
Referral Rate (Per 10,000)	320.4	391.3	536.55
Caseloads within the Safeguarding Service	14.5	15.2	21.1

- (4) In 2018 we ranked 9th out of the 11 "Statistical Neighbour" Local Authorities for our referral rates (i.e.; 9th lowest rate). By 2021 we had risen to 5th, and our 2022 figure shows a further rise from the 2021 figure.
- (5) This data shows that the rise is not just recent but is indicative of a gradual change and rise in demand over a longer period.
- (6) It is also interesting that Sutton (as a near South London neighbour) are now 3rd highest, indicative that other LAs are experiencing similar pressures and possibly faring less positively than us.

3.4 Mitigation (Steps/Actions already in Place to address these pressures;

- (1) We have secured an additional £500k from the CCG for 2022/23 to cover Residential costs.
- (2) We have kept/retained all the existing checks and balances in systems:
 - a. Practice Assurance Stocktakes (independent audits of practice to ensure thresholds, decision making and planning for children remain appropriate).
 - b. Practice Improvement Board; independently chaired to oversee all aspects of practice and decision making.
 - c. Safeguarding Partnership Board; independently chaired by Jim Gamble (renowned Child Protection expert)
 - d. Data Mondays; weekly analysis of performance and data.
 - e. Continued screening and gatekeeping of cases being referred into the service via the MASH.

3.5 We have also added the Following Over-sight;

- (1) Dip sampling of cases; to ensure we have a broader view of quality of practice (i.e.; greater volume of cases reviewed)
- (2) DCS meets weekly with Managers from the Safeguarding Service to review caseloads and closure of cases across this service area.
- (3) We have added short term capacity into the Safeguarding Service, focusing on
 - a. Closing cases
 - b. Moving cases in Early Help (whole services)
- (4) The increased demand in recent months has meant 35-40 cases coming into the Service each week, reducing the effectiveness of additional teams
- (5) These pressures are being experienced across all LAs

3.6 The Proposal;

3.6.1 This proposal will seek to bring caseloads back down to a level of between 12-15 cases per Social Worker, which is in line with the Bromley Caseload Promise and in line with accepted best practice across the profession.

3.6.2 The figure of 12-15 also mirrors practice in Camden who recently achieved an "Outstanding" grading in their recent Ofsted inspection (June 2022).

- (1) The financial support to assist in managing demand will be used to fund 20 additional permanent Social Work posts.
- (2) There are currently 50 permanent Social Worker posts in the Safeguarding Service. There are 1,067 children open across the service (as of 03/07/2022), meaning that the average caseload is 21.3 per Social Worker, with some Social Workers having caseloads in the mid-20s. This has an impact on the effectiveness and quality of practice.
- (3) These measures mean that we will be able to bring caseloads down to 14/15 and remain in line with the Bromley Caseload Promise.
- (4) The annual cost of a permanent Social Worker is £58k per year (with on-costs). This means that the cost in year one would be £1.16 million (part year effect £667k) and would then reduce by £290k each subsequent year. The figure requested also anticipates some additional headroom to cover anticipated additional staff cost rises over the duration of the request.

This means the total size of the first part of the request will be £2.4 million.

Additional Staffing costs;					
	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27
Costs of Additional staff;	677	1,160	1,160	1,160	1,160
Cost Reduction (Reduction of Staff)		-290	-580	-870	1,160
Draw on Resources	677	870	580	290	0

- (5) The second part of this request is to seek agreement for an additional spend of £250k from the contingency to fund two teams of Social Workers (x10) for six months.
- (6) These Social Workers will be deployed to move a large number of Child in Need cases to closure or to “step down” into the Early Help service where continuing support may be required, but necessarily require a Social Worker to support this.

4 IMPACT ON VULNERABLE ADULTS AND CHILDREN

- 4.1 The report seeks to strengthen the quality of practice for vulnerable young children by ensuring that current caseloads can be reduced and ensure a more consistent level of good practice across the Division.

5 TRANSFORMATION/POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The additional staff will be employed according to existing job descriptions and person specifications.

6 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.2 Please see main report. The proposal seeks temporary funding of £2.4 million over a four-year period to assist in reducing caseloads for Children’s Social Workers. The funding will come from the Council contingency sum.
- 6.3 There is also a request for £250k as a one off to cover short term costs in the safeguarding service. This will also be found from the contingency sum
- 6.4 Costs of staffing will reduce year on year as over four years and will reduce the cost burden to zero.

7. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 HR are already engaged in preparing for a potential increase in recruitment activity.

8. CUSTOMER IMPACT

- 8.1 This proposal would impact on approx. 300 young people.

Non-Applicable Headings:	Legal Implications, Procurement Implications, Property Implications, Carbon Reduction and Social Value Implications, Ward Councillor Views
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	None

Agenda Item 7

Report No.
CSD22109

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: COUNCIL

Date: Monday 10 October 2022

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Key

Title: CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - 1ST QUARTER
2022/23

Contact Officer: Graham Walton, Democratic Services Manager
Tel: 0208 461 7743 E-mail: graham.walton@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Tasnim Shawkat, Director of Corporate Services and Governance

Ward: (All Wards);

1. Reason for decision/report and options

- 1.1 At its meeting on 6th October 2022, the Executive is due to consider the attached report summarising the current position on capital expenditure and receipts following the first quarter of 2022/23 and seeking the Executive's approval to a revised capital programme. Subject to the Executive approving the recommendations, Council is recommended to approve increases to the capital programme.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

Council is requested to approve the total increase of £8478k to the Basic Needs capital scheme, £849k to the Capital Maintenance scheme, and £2,443k to the Disabled Facilities Grant capital scheme as set out in paragraphs 3.5.1 to 3.5.3 of the attached report.

Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children

1. Summary of Impact: Not Applicable
-

Transformation Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy
 2. Making Bromley Even Better Priority (delete as appropriate):
(5) To manage our resources well, providing value for money, and efficient and effective services for Bromley's residents.
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Estimated Cost: Increase of £11,770k over four years 2022/23 to 2025/26
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Capital Programme
 4. Total current budget for this head: £194.2m over four years 2022/23 to 2025/26
 5. Source of funding: Capital grants, capital receipts and earmarked revenue contributions.
-

Personnel

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: Full council decisions are not subject to call-in
-

Procurement

1. Summary of Procurement Implications: Not Applicable
-

Property

1. Summary of Property Implications: Not Applicable
-

Carbon Reduction and Social Value

1. Summary of Carbon Reduction/Sustainability Implications: Not Applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users or customers (current and projected): Not Applicable
-

Ward Councillor Views

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

Non-Applicable Headings:	Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children/Policy/Financial/Personnel/Legal/Procurement/Property/Carbon Reduction/Customer/Ward Councillors
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	See attached report

Decision Maker: Executive
Council

Date: Executive 21st September 2022
Council 10th October 2022

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

Title: CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING – 1ST QUARTER 2022/23

Contact Officer: Sean Cosgrove, Principal Accountant
Tel: 020 8313 4312 E-mail: sean.cosgrove@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Peter Turner, Director of Finance
Tel: 020 8313 4338 E-mail: peter.turner@bromley.gov.uk

Ward: All

1. Reason for report

This report summarises the current position on capital expenditure and receipts following the first quarter of 2022/23 and seeks the Executive's approval to a revised capital programme.

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

2.1 **The Executive is requested to:**

- (a) note the report, including a total re-phasing of £4,482k from 2022/23 into future years, and agree a revised capital programme
- (b) approve the following amendments to the Capital Programme:
 - (i) increase of £8,478k to the Basic Needs capital scheme (para 3.5.1)
 - (ii) addition of £383k of SCA grant and of £466k of Salix grant to the Capital Maintenance scheme (see para 3.5.2)
 - (iii) increase of £2,443k to the Disabled Facilities Grant capital scheme (para 3.5.3)

2.2 **Council is requested to:**

- (a) approve the total increase of £8,478k to the Basic Needs capital scheme, £849k to the Capital Maintenance scheme, and £2,443k to the Disabled Facilities Grant capital scheme (see paras 3.5.1 to 3.5.3)

Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children:

1. Summary of Impact: None arising from this report.

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy: capital programme monitoring and review 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. Effective 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. For each of our portfolios and service priorities, the Council reviews its main aims and outcomes through the AMP process and identifies those that require the use of capital assets. The 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".
2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: total estimated increase of £11,770k over the four years 2022/23 to 2025/26, due to the increase of £8,478k to the Basic Needs capital scheme, £383k of SCA grant, £466k of Salix grant, and increase of £2,443k to the Disabled Facilities Grant capital scheme.
2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable (insert further details)
3. Budget head/performance centre: capital programme
4. Total current budget for this head: total £194.2m over four years 2022/23 to 2025/26
5. Source of funding: capital grants, capital receipts and earmarked revenue contributions

Personnel

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

Legal

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

Procurement:

1. Summary of Procurement Implications: None arising from this report.

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 the proposed changes to the capital programme following a monitoring exercise carried out after the first quarter of 2022/23. The base position is the programme approved by the Executive on 9th February 2022, as amended by variations approved at subsequent Executive meetings. Should the changes proposed in this report be approved, the total capital programme 2022/23 to 2025/26 would increase by £11,770k, due to:

- an increase of £8,478k to the Basic Needs capital scheme for 2022/23 and 2023/24
- the addition of the SCA grant (£383k) and Salix grant (£466k) to the Capital Maintenance scheme for 2022/23
- the increase of £2,443k to the Disabled Facilities Grant capital scheme for 2022/23.

3.2 As indicated in the table below, a further £54,356k will be included to the programme owing to underspends against the 2021/22 capital budgets which are being re-phased into the current year. These underspends accrued owing to slippage that was largely caused by the Covid-19 pandemic. Whilst this change is the rephasing of already agreed capital spend, it does have the effect of increasing the total capital spend in the 2022/23 to 2025/26 planning period.

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

	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	Total
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Programme approved by Executive 09/02/22	64,497	39,329	12,928	775	117,529
Variations approved at subsequent Executive meetings (Appx A)					
Operational estate maintenance programme - final year not previously included (ERC)	0	0	0	5,257	5,257
Increase to Crystal Palace Subway scheme (RRH)	456				456
Croydon Road Recreation Ground bandstand restoration (ECS)	236				236
North Block solar PV installation (ECS)	100				100
Next steps for Crystal Palace Park regeneration (RRH)		4,500			4,500
Sub-total - approved programme prior to Q1 monitoring	65,289	43,829	12,928	6,032	128,078
Variations requiring the approval of Executive:					
Basic Needs (CEF)	4,170	4,308			8,478
SCA grant (CEF)	383				383
SALIX grant (CEF)	466				466
DFG (RRH)	2,443				2,443
Variations not requiring the approval of Executive:					
net underspend from 21/22 rephased into current year	54,356				54,356
net rephasing from 22/23 into future years	Cr 4,482	3,016	1,425	40	0
Sub-total - total amendments to the capital programme	57,336	7,324	1,425	40	66,126
Total revised capital programme	122,625	51,153	14,353	6,072	194,204
Less: Further slippage projection (memorandum)	Cr 50,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	Cr 5,000
Assumed new schemes (to be agreed)	0	3,500	3,500	3,500	10,500
Projected programme for capital financing forecast (Appx C)	72,625	69,653	32,853	24,572	199,704

3.4 Variations approved at subsequent Executive meetings (£5,292k net increase)

- (i) At its meeting held on 9th February 2022 the Executive approved a variation of £456k for an increase in the Crystal Palace subway scheme.
- (ii) At its meeting held on 30th March 2022 the Executive approved variations totalling £336k, made up of £236k for the restoration of the Croydon Road Park bandstand, and £100k to install solar panels on the roof of North Block at the Civic Centre site.
- (iii) At its meeting held on 29th June 2022 the Executive approved a variation of £4,500k to progress the Crystal Palace Park regeneration.

3.5 Variations requiring the approval of the Executive (£11,770k net increase)

3.5.1 *Basic Needs grant (overall increase of £8,478k - £5,018k increase to the budget in 2022/23 and £4,308k increase to the budget in 2023/24)*

A grant of £4,170k for High Needs Provision will be received for 2022/23 and a further £4,308k for 2023/24 and therefore approval is sought to add this to the Basic Needs capital scheme. The Council will receive the funding to create new places for children with Education Health and Care Plans in schools, academies, and alternative provision. The funding will enable the Council to meet the need for specialist and alternative provision places and ensure that existing facilities meet pupil needs. This could be by contributing to the cost of creating an extending existing school or by improving accessibility, such as installing ramps, handrails, or ceiling hoists. The funding is part of the government's commitment to ensuring pupils with SEND receive the specialist support they need to get an excellent education.

3.5.2 *SCA grant and Salix grant (total £848k increase to the budget in 2022/23)*

Two smaller grants - £383k from the SCA grant and £466k from the Salix grant - will also be received for 2022/23, and approval is also sought to add these sums to the Capital Maintenance scheme.

3.5.3 *Disabled Facilities Grant (£2,443k increase to the budget in 2022/23)*

The Disabled Facilities Grant (DFG) is provided for the provision of adaptations to disabled people's homes to help them to live as independently and safely as possible. The capital allocation for 2021/22 totals £2,443k. The funding will enable additional schemes to provide physical improvements to clients' home environments and to assist with creating safer and healthier homes and reducing admissions to hospital. The Executive is requested to agree the addition of £2,443k to the DFG capital scheme to reflect this grant allocation.

3.6 Scheme re-phasing

3.6.1 The 2021/22 capital outturn was reported to the Executive on 29th June 2022. The final capital outturn for the year was £19.3m compared to a revised budget of £73.6m. The variation of £54.4m was re-phased from 2021/22 into 2022/23.

3.6.2 In the first quarter monitoring exercise, slippage of £4,482k has been identified and this has been re-phased from 2022/23 into future years 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

3.7 Details of the receipts forecast in the years 2022/23 to 2025/26 have been provided by the Assistant Director – Property and are included in Appendix E to this report, which will be considered under part 2 proceedings of the meeting (see also Appendix C.) Actual receipts from asset disposals totalled £10.1m in 2021/22 and this was lower than the estimated figure reported to the Executive in February 2022 (£11.8m).

- 3.8 The latest estimate for 2022/23 is £1.0m lower than was reported in February 2022 (excluding “other” capital receipts). The estimate for 2023/24 is £4.7m lower than reported in February 2022, and the estimate for 2024/25 is £4.7m higher than reported in February 2022 - this is due to a rephrasing of the receipt concerned. No receipts yet to be identified are currently assumed in later years.

Financing of the capital programme

- 3.9 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, as noted above, reflect assumptions on the level and timing of disposals. Total balances would reduce from £51.1m (General Fund £20.0m and capital receipts £31.1m) at the end of 2021/22 to £22.6m by the end of 2025/26 (General Fund £20.0m and capital receipts £2.6m). It is therefore likely that any significant future capital schemes not funded by grants/contributions or revenue, may have to be funded from external borrowing.

	Balance 01/04/22	Estimate 31/03/26
	£m	£m
General Fund	20.0	20.0
Capital receipts	31.1	2.6
	51.1	22.6

- 3.10 The total shortfall in financing over the period to the end of 2025/26 is £44,757k. In response to these pressures and the additional threat of inflation, a detailed review of the capital forward plan and of the Council’s operational property is being conducted. This work is ongoing and will consider, *inter alia*, how the capital programme will be financed in the long-term. The outcome of this review will be reported to members in due course.

Investment Fund and Growth Fund

- 3.11 To help support the achievement of sustainable savings and income, the Council has set aside funding in the Investment Fund earmarked reserve (formerly known as the Economic Development and Investment Fund) to contribute towards the Council’s economic development and investment opportunities. To date, total funding of £84.5m has been placed in the Investment Fund earmarked reserve, with a further £20.3m of capital receipts earmarked to supplement this, and £39.2m placed in the Growth Fund earmarked reserve.
- 3.12 Appendix D provides a detailed analysis of the Funds dating back to their inception in September 2011. To date, schemes totalling £119.5m have been approved (£98.3m on the Investment Fund, and £27.2m on the Growth Fund), and uncommitted balances as at the end of June 2022 stand at £6.5m for the Investment Fund and £12.0m for the Growth Fund.

Feasibility works – property disposals

- 3.13 At its meeting on 24th May 2017, Executive agreed to the creation of a new earmarked reserve, with an initial allocation of £250k from the Growth Fund, for feasibility works to be commissioned against specific sites to inform the Executive of sites’ viability for disposal or re-development and potential scheme optimisation, together with an appraisal as to worth.
- 3.14 Members requested that an update from Strategic Property be included in quarterly capital monitoring reports, and the latest update is provided in Appendix F.

Section 106 receipts

- 3.15 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, the balance of which stood at £8,236k as at 30th June 2022, are held as a receipt in advance on the Council’s balance sheet and will be used to finance

capital expenditure from 2022/23 onwards. The current position on capital Section 106 receipts (excluding commitments) is shown below:

Agreed service area	Balance 31/03/22	Receipts Q1 22/23	Expenditure Q1 22/23	Balance 30/06/22
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Housing provision	2,452	0	0	2,452
Education	5,078	0	0	5,078
Highways	20	0	0	20
Local economy	686	0	0	686
Other	0	0	0	0
Total	8,236	0	0	8,236

3.16 The Council's budgets are limited and, where a developer contribution can be secured, 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

3.17 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 are due to be submitted to the relevant PDS committees:

- Upgrade of Core Network Hardware
- Replacement of Storage Area Network
- Rollout of Windows 7 and Office 2000
- Replacement of MD110 Telephone Switch
- Windows Server 2003 Replacement Programme
- Early Education for Two-Year-Olds
- 30 Hour Funded Childcare IT Solution
- Performance Management/Children's Services IT scheme
- Bromley My Time Investment Fund
- Relocation of Exhibitions - Bromley Museum
- Norman Park Athletics Track

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 assume approval of the revised capital programme recommended in this report.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Legal, Personnel & Procurement Implications, Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children
Background documents: (access via Contact Officer)	Capital Programme Monitoring Q3 2021/22 and Capital Strategy 2022 to 2026, (Executive 09/02/22). Capital Programme Outturn 2021/22 (Executive 29/06/22).

APPENDIX A - VARIATION SUMMARY

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - September 2022 - SUMMARY OF VARIATIONS FROM APPROVED PROGRAMME

Variations on individual schemes	Date of meeting	Revised 2022/23 £'000	Revised 2023/24 £'000	Revised 2024/25 £'000	Revised 2025/26	Revised 2026/27	Total £'000	Comments / reason for variation
Current approved capital programme								
Programme approved by Executive 24/11/2021	Exec 09/02/22	64,497	39,329	12,928	775		117,529	
Operational estate maintenance programme - final year not previously included (ERC)	Exec 09/02/22				5,257		5,257	
Increase to Crystal Palace Subway scheme (RRH)	Exec 09/02/22	456					456	
Croydon Road Recreation Ground bandstand restoration (ECS)	Exec 30/03/22	236					236	
North Block solar PV installation (ECS)	Exec 30/03/22	100					100	
Next steps for Crystal Palace park regeneration (RRH)	Exec 29/06/22	0	4,500				4,500	
Approved programme prior to Q3 monitoring		65,289	43,829	12,928	6,032	0	128,078	
Variations in the estimated cost of approved schemes								
<i>(i) Variations requiring the approval of the Executive</i>								
Basic Needs (CEF)		4,170	4,308				8,478	
SCA grant (CEF)		383					383	
SALIX grant (CEF)		466		0	0	0	466	
DFG (ACH)		2,443					2,443	
		7,461	4,308	0	0	0	11,769	
<i>(ii) Variations not requiring approval</i>								
net underspend from 21/22 rephased into current year		54,356					54,356	
net rephasing from 22/23 into future years		Cr 4,482	3,016	1,425	40		0	
		49,874	3,016	1,425	40	0	54,356	
TOTAL AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL PROGRAMME		57,336	7,324	1,425	40	0	66,126	
Add: Proposed new schemes								
None this cycle		0	0	0	0	0	0	
Sub-total - new schemes		0	0	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL REVISED CAPITAL PROGRAMME		122,625	51,153	14,353	6,072	0	194,204	
Less: Further slippage projection (memorandum - already reported)		Cr 50,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	5,000	0	
Add: Estimate for further new schemes		0	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	14,000	
TOTAL TO BE FINANCED		72,625	69,653	32,853	24,572	8,500	208,204	

This page is left intentionally blank

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - September 2022 - SUMMARY OF VARIATIONS FROM APPROVED PROGRAMME - SCHEME REPHASING

Variations on individual schemes	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	TOTAL	Comments/reason for variation
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	
Rephasing of schemes						
PCT learning disability reprovion programme - Walpole Road	Cr 594	594			0	The Department of Health capital was transferred to LBB for uses associated with the reprovion of NHS Learning Disability (LD) Campus clients and the closure of the Bassetts site including the day centre there. The budget has remained unspent due to the impacts of the pandemic and wanting to progress building enhancements in consultation with the recently appointed Astley day care provider. Commissioners and the Housing, Planning & Regeneration team have been in consultation regarding the LD day centre at Astley. The Council's property refurbishment proposals include significant works there to bring the fabric of the building up to standard. It is also intended that approximately £500k will be used to fund building enhancements to improve the future operation of the day centre. It is logical for the building refurbishment works to be undertaken at the same time as the building enhancement works to ensure best use of resources and therefore spend timescales will largely be dependent upon the rollout of the Council's refurbishment programme. Estimated timescales are that the spend would occur during 23/24. It is also intended that approximately £94k of the £594k capital sum will be used to enhance the short breaks service at 118 Widmore Road so that the building can better accommodate dual usage as a bed based short breaks service with day activities.
Affordable Housing - unallocated	Cr 2,226	1,000	1,226		0	Work is ongoing with housing association partners to identify suitable approved housing development schemes.
Winter maintenance - gritter replacement	Cr 319	160	159		0	Due to difficulties currently being experienced with the supply of specialist vehicles, we have decided to postpone any purchases that we intended to make this year. This is based on information from our usual supply chain and framework organisation.
Modular build - York Rise	Cr 1,100	1,100			0	
Legal case management system	Cr 171	90	40	40	0	We have entered into contract with Iken for the Case Management System and will also enter into contract with Bundledocs for the bundling software. The contract and associated implementation expenditure will be phased as shown.
Customer Services IT system replacement	Cr 72	72			0	£72k rephased from 22/23 into 23/24 - propose to seek Member approval to use this for further web/customer developments currently under investigation.
TOTAL REPHASING ADJUSTMENTS	Cr 4,482	3,016	1,425	40	0	

This page is left intentionally blank

APPENDIX C - FINANCING

CAPITAL FINANCING STATEMENT - EXEC 21/09/22 - ALL RECEIPTS

(NB. Assumes all capital receipts - see below)

	2020-21		2021-22		2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29
	Estimate £'000	Actual £'000	Estimate £'000	Actual £'000	Estimate £'000	Estimate £'000	Estimate £'000	Estimate £'000	Estimate £'000	Estimate £'000	Estimate £'000
<u>Summary financing statement</u>											
Capital grants	11,122	8,394	13,622	3,591	29,100	5,902	1,226	0	0	0	0
Other external contributions	10,314	5,192	4,308	10,725	Cr 2,361	2,200	2,200	2,200	2,200	2,200	2,200
Usable capital receipts	1,365	1,103	3,034	4,217	15,318	40,548	19,177	8,569	7,489	3,540	3,540
Internal borrowing	0	0	0	0	16,395	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revenue contributions	8,266	5,056	12,679	753	14,173	100	100	100	0	0	0
Borrowing (external)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total expenditure	31,067	19,745	33,643	19,286	72,625	48,750	22,703	10,869	9,689	5,740	5,740
Financing required					72,625	69,653	32,853	24,572	8,500		
Financing shortfall					0	20,903	10,150	13,703	Cr 1,189		
<u>Usable capital receipts</u>											
Balance brought forward	24,439	24,439	25,263	25,263	33,979	29,476	24,315	6,582	6,047	6,047	11,413
New usable receipts	3,995	1,927	11,750	10,073	10,815	51,287	1,444	8,529	7,489	8,906	0
	28,434	26,366	37,013	35,336	44,794	80,763	25,759	15,111	13,536	14,953	11,413
Capital financing	Cr 1,365	Cr 1,103	Cr 3,034	Cr 4,217	Cr 15,318	Cr 40,548	Cr 19,177	Cr 8,569	Cr 7,489	Cr 3,540	Cr 3,540
Repayment of internal borrowing	0	0	0	0	0	Cr 15,900	0	Cr 495	0	0	0
Balance carried forward	27,069	25,263	33,979	31,119	29,476	24,315	6,582	6,047	6,047	11,413	7,873
<u>Internal Borrowing</u>											
Balance brought forward	0	0	0	0	0	Cr 16,395	Cr 495	Cr 495	0	0	0
Capital financing	0	0	0	0	Cr 16,395	0	0	0	0	0	0
Repaid from new capital receipts	0	0	0	0	0	15,900	0	495	0	0	0
Balance carried forward	0	0	0	0	Cr 16,395	Cr 495	Cr 495	0	0	0	0
<u>General Fund</u>											
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	47,069	45,263	53,979	51,119	49,476	44,315	26,582	26,047	26,047	31,413	27,873
<u>Anticipated Capital Financing Requirement (CFR)</u>											
Non housing	Cr 1,000	25,700	14,900	29,800	20,000	20,000					
Housing	0	0	10,000	0	10,000	10,000					
Total CFR	Cr 1,000	25,700	24,900	29,800	30,000	30,000					
Movement in CFR	Cr 10,600	16,100	Cr 800	4,100	5,100	0					
<p>The future transfer of land from the General Fund to the HRA does not result in a capital receipt, as the HRA is not a separate legal entity but the effect would be similar in that it would mean that the Council can incur more capital expenditure without needing to borrow. Although the accounting arrangements are 'technical' in order to meet statutory accounting requirements the effective transfer of land has the same impact as generating a capital receipt of an equivalent value and therefore the equivalent value can be used to fund future capital schemes.</p>											
<p><u>Assumptions:</u> New capital schemes - £3.5m p.a. from 2022/23 for future new schemes. Capital receipts - includes figures reported by Property Division as shown in Appendix E Current approved programme - as recommended to the Executive 24/11/21 Internal borrowing to fund until capital receipts pay back - Site G, depot improv.</p>											

This page is left intentionally blank

Investment Fund		£'000
Revenue Funding:		
Approved by Executive 7th September 2011		10,000
Approved by Council 27th February 2013		16,320
Approved by Council 1st July 2013		20,978
Approved by Executive 10th June 2014		13,792
Approved by Executive 15th October 2014		90
Approved by Executive 26th November 2014 (Transfer to Growth Fund)	Cr	10,000
New Home Bonus (2014/15)		5,040
Approved by Executive 11th February 2015 (New Homes Bonus)		4,400
Approved by Executive 10th June 2015		10,165
Approved by Executive 2nd December 2015 (New Homes Bonus)		141
Approved by Executive 10th Feb 2016 (New Homes Bonus)		7,482
Approved by Executive 6th December 2017		3,500
Approved by Executive 21st May 2018		2,609
		<u>84,517</u>
Capital Funding*:		
Approved by Executive 11th February 2015 (general capital receipts)		15,000
Approved by Executive 2nd December 2015 (sale of Egerton Lodge)		1,216
Approved by Executive 7th November 2017 (Disposal of 72-76 High St)		4,100
		<u>20,316</u>
Total Funding Approved:		<u>104,833</u>
Property Purchase		
Approved by Executive 7th September 2011 (95 High St)	Cr	1,620
Approved by Executive 6th December 2012 (98 High St)	Cr	2,167
Approved by Executive 5th June 2013 (72-76 High St)	Cr	2,888
Approved by Executive 12th June 2013 (104 - 108 High St)	Cr	3,150
Approved by Executive 12th February 2014 (147 - 153 High St)	Cr	18,755
Approved by Executive 19th December 2014 (27 Homesdale)	Cr	3,938
Approved by Executive 24/03/15 (Morrisons)	Cr	8,672
Approved by Executive 15/07/15 (Old Christchurch)	Cr	5,362
Approved by Executive 15/07/15 (Tilgate)	Cr	6,746
Approved by Executive 15/12/15 (Newbury House)	Cr	3,307
Approved by Executive 15/12/15 (Unit G - Hubert Road)	Cr	6,038
Approved by Executive 23/03/16 (British Gas Training Centre, Thatcham)	Cr	3,666
Approved by Executive 15/06/16 (C2 and C3)	Cr	6,394
Approved by Executive 14/03/17 (Trinity House)	Cr	6,236
Approved by Executive 01/12/17 (54 Bridge Street, Peterborough)	Cr	3,930
	Cr	<u>82,869</u>
Other Schemes		
Approved by Executive 20th November 2013 (Queens' Garden)	Cr	990
Approved by Executive 15th January 2014 (Bromley BID Project)	Cr	110
Approved by Executive 26th November 2014 (BCT Development Strategy)	Cr	135
Approved by Executive 2nd December 2015 (Bromley Centre Town)	Cr	270
Approved by Executive 15th June 2016 (Glades Shopping Centre)	Cr	400
Approved by Executive 11th January 2017 (Disposal of Small Halls site, York Rise)	Cr	46
Approved by Executive 10th July 2019 (Modular Homes at York Rise site)	Cr	3,500
Approved by Executive 2nd August 2019 (Provision of Housing in Burnt Ash Lane)	Cr	3,286
Approved by Executive 10/02/21 - property acquisition scheme	Cr	6,000
Valuation for 1 Westmoreland Rd	Cr	5
Valuation for Biggin Hill - West Camp	Cr	10
Growth Fund Study	Cr	170
Crystal Park Development work	Cr	200
Civic Centre for the future	Cr	50
Strategic Property cost	Cr	258
Total further spending approvals	Cr	<u>15,430</u>
Uncommitted Balance on Investment Fund		6,534

* Executive have approved the use of specific and general capital receipts to supplement the

Growth Fund:		£'000
Funding:		
Approved by Executive 26th November 2014 (Transfer from Investment Fund)		10,000
Approved by Executive 2nd December 2015		6,500
Approved by Executive 23rd March 2016		6,000
Approved by Executive 15th June 2016		7,024
Approved by Executive 22nd March 2017		4,000
Subject to approval by Executive 20th June 2017 (Provisional final accounts 2016/17)		3,311
Approved by Executive 21st May 2018		2,319
Total funding approved		<u>39,154</u>
Schemes Approved and Committed		
Approved by Executive 24th March 2015 (Housing Zone Bid (Site G))	Cr	2,700
Approved by Executive 24th March 2015 ((Site G) - Specialist)	Cr	200
Approved by Executive 18th May 2016 (Feasibility Studies and Strategic Employme	Cr	180
Approved by Executive 18th May 2016 (Broadband Infrastructure Investment)	Cr	50
Approved by Executive 20th Jul 2016 (BID - Penge & Beckenham)	Cr	110
Approved by Executive 1st Nov 2016 (19-25 Market Square)	Cr	10,705
Approved by Executive 1st Nov 2016 (63 Walnuts)	Cr	3,804
Approved by Executive 22nd March 2017 (Council 10th April 2017) - Bromley Town Centre Public Realm improvement Scheme	Cr	2,844
Approved by Executive 7th November 2017 - Bromley Town Centre and Public Realm	Cr	464
Approved by Executive 17th October 2018 (Bromley Town Centre - Mirrored Canopies & Shops)	Cr	415
Approved by Executive 22nd March 2017 - Project Officer cost Bromley Town Centre Public Realm improvement Scheme	Cr	40
Approved by Executive 22nd March 2017 - Community Initiative	Cr	15
Approved by Executive 24th May 2017 - Feasibility Works/Property Disposal Renewal Team Cost	Cr	250
	Cr	310
Approved by Executive 28th November 2018 (Housing Development Feasibility)	Cr	100
Approved by Executive 27th March 2019 (West Wickham BID)	Cr	75
Approved by Executive 21st May 2019 (Specialist advice for setting up local Housing company)	Cr	100
Noted by Executive 12th February 2020 - £1.5m of s106 to replace Growth Fund allocation for Bromley Town Centre capital scheme		1,500
Approved by Executive April 1st 2020 - Consultancy services for advice on urban design scheme	Cr	50
	Cr	800
Noted by Executive May 2020 - £2m of s106 to replace Growth Fund allocation for Bromley Town Centre capital scheme		2,000
Approved by Executive 30th June 2021 - £116k for 2 year FTC Planning Officer	Cr	116
Approved by Executive 20th Oct 2021 - Professional Services: Civic Centre Development	Cr	500
Approved by Executive on 9th February 2021 - Operational Maintenance Programme Manager	Cr	65
Total further spending approvals	Cr	<u>20,393</u>
Schemes approved, but not yet committed		
Approved by Executive 26th November 2014 (for Biggin Hill and Cray Valley)	Cr	6,790
Uncommitted Balance on Growth Fund		<u>11,971</u>

APPENDIX F - FEASIBILITY WORKS

Location	Estimated Feasibility / Viability Cost (£'000)	Description	September 2022 status
West Wickham Leisure Centre		HRA/Regen opportunity	Awaiting condition reports
Feasability of re-purposing of High Street assets	100	Works to value Council's stake in potential variations to lease	Detailed proposals awaited from tenant
The Walnuts Centre		Regen opportunity	In detailed negotiations with developer prior to seeking Executive approval
Old Town Hall/Civic Centre		Reduction and refurbishment of Council office space	Subject to output of Accommodation Review
Depots Review - disposal options		Env Services programme	Works to clarify scope ongoing
Libraries (Chislehurst model roll out)		Regen opportunity	

This page is left intentionally blank

COUNCIL

10TH OCTOBER 2022

MOTIONS

(A) Air Quality

To be moved by Cllr Julie Ireland and seconded by Cllr Chloe-Jane Ross

New research has linked air pollution to lung cancer - with particulate matter (PM2.5) being found to trigger cell mutations that turn dormant cells cancerous. This goes some way to explaining why people who have never smoked get lung cancer.

The research was by the Francis Crick Institute and University College London, who presented the findings on 10 September 2022.

This discovery underlines the importance of monitoring PM2.5 as well as NO2. It adds to the weight of evidence about just how much long term damage is being done to the health of all of us, but particularly to our children who are breathing in these particulates that will stay in their bodies for the rest of their life.

We ask Bromley Council to take these urgent steps:

- Make a formal commitment to improving air quality in the whole Borough, whether urban or rural, and to contribute to the national efforts to improve air quality for everyone in the UK
- Extend current air quality monitoring in the borough to include formal reporting on particulate matter (PM2.5 and PM10)
- Make impact on air quality a material consideration when making changes to highways, road layouts and junctions
- Make impact on air quality a material consideration for all planning applications

This page is left intentionally blank