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5. Minutes of the Extraordinary Council Meeting held on 9th November, 2017. 19 - 22

6. To receive any announcements from the Chair of Council, the Mayor, Members of the Cabinet or the Head of Paid Service.

7. Questions from the public in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 13:-

   None received for this meeting.

A. Items where the Public and Press may not be excluded.

   For Decision


9. Questions by Elected Members in accordance with Council Procedure Rules 15.2 and 15.3:-

   (i) Questions on Notice to the Executive:-

       None received for this meeting.

   (ii) Questions without Notice to the Executive and the Chairs of the Audit Committee, Elections and Democratic Structures Committee, Health and Wellbeing Board and Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee.

   For Information

10. To receive the minutes of the following Joint Authorities. 75 - 158

    A. Sheffield City Region Combined Authority held on 11th and 18th September, and 30th October, 2017.

    B. Sheffield City Region Local Enterprise Partnership Board held on 11th September, 2017.

    C. South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority held on 18th September and 16th October, 2017.

    D. Sheffield City Region Combined Authority/South Yorkshire Pensions Authority Joint Local Pension Board held on 5th October, 2017.
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DONCASTER METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL

COUNCIL

THURSDAY, 21ST SEPTEMBER, 2017

A MEETING of the COUNCIL was held at the COUNCIL CHAMBER, CIVIC OFFICE on THURSDAY, 21ST SEPTEMBER, 2017, at 6.00 pm.

PRESENT:

   Chair - Councillor George Derx
   Vice-Chair - Councillor Majid Khan
   Mayor - Ros Jones
   Deputy Mayor - Councillor Glyn Jones


APOLOGIES:

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Joe Blackham, Bev Chapman, Kenneth Keegan, Nikki McDonald, Chris McGuinness, Sue McGuinness, David Nevett, Kevin Rodgers and Dave Shaw.

33 Recent Death of Former Councillor Barbara Hedley

Prior to the commencement of formal business, Elected Members, Officers and members of the public, observed a minute’s silence as a mark of respect and remembrance in relation to the recent death of former Councillor Barbara Hedley, who passed away on 11th August, 2017.

34 Declarations of Interest, if any

Councillor Andy Pickering declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in Agenda Item No. 7, by virtue of being a proprietor owner of a Licensed Premises’.

Councillors Pat Haith, Charlie Hogarth and Cynthia Ransome declared a Non-Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in Agenda Item No. 11, by virtue of being Members of the South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority.

Councillors Susan Durant and John Mounsey declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in Agenda Item No. 13, by virtue of being Members of the South Yorkshire Pensions Authority.

Councillors David Hughes and Sue Wilkinson declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in Agenda Item No. 13, by virtue of being Members of the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel.
RESOLVED that the minutes of the Council Meeting held on Thursday, 13th July, 2017, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member, be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

To receive any announcements from the Chair of Council, the Mayor, Members of the Cabinet or the Head of Paid Service

The Chair of Council, Councillor George Derx, made the following announcement:-

“The Council is unable to bring its financial plan for the period 2017 to 2021, the current Mayoral term, to this Council meeting this evening as initially intended, due to uncertainties in the budgets and financial forecasts, in particular those related to the Pension Fund.

It is unlikely that greater clarity can be gained on these matters until the middle of November. The Council’s budget also needs to take account of any changes in the Government’s Budget, which will be announced on 22nd November.

A financial plan cannot therefore be finalised and proposed by the Mayor until the middle of December and thus, a late December meeting is needed allowing time for the proper circulation of papers etc.

Therefore, can Members please note that the Full Council meeting scheduled on 23rd November, 2017, will now be held on Thursday, 21st December, 2017 at 2.00 pm.”

The Mayor of Doncaster, Ros Jones, made the following announcement:-

“On Monday, the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority met to consider proposals to proceed with new consultation to progress Devolution in the region. It followed the Judicial Review brought by Derbyshire County Council against the Sheffield City Region in respect of the previous consultation exercise.

At the meeting, both Doncaster and Barnsley indicated that we did not wish to proceed with that new consultation.

In the last few days, I’ve been asked why Doncaster does not want to be part of Sheffield City Region. It is a fair question, but it is not a case of Doncaster not wanting to be part of the Sheffield City Region. We’ve always played a full and supportive role in the region. It is a question of what is the right form of Devolution for people and businesses in Doncaster over the next 30, 40 or 50 years.

What will deliver the most economic benefits, particularly once we have left the EU? How do we make sure our region is represented at the top level along with London, Greater Manchester and the West Midlands, so that Yorkshire receives the investment it deserves and requires?

We all know how dramatically things have changed since 2015. In addition to Brexit, Bassetlaw and Chesterfield have now pulled out of their plans to join the Sheffield City Region as full members, leaving just the four South Yorkshire Authorities.
We believe that Sheffield City Region’s deal is too small in this new landscape. In contrast, wider Yorkshire Devolution represents a bigger, stronger, more powerful option, and a world famous brand that we can capitalise on. That approach has a great deal of support both locally and regionally. 17 of the 20 Yorkshire Councils have said they want it to go forward.

Doncaster Chamber has already asked local businesses for their views and had a good response. Most supported a Yorkshire Devolution model. Trade Unions, politicians from all Parties in this Council and our local MPs, have also indicated their support for a Yorkshire deal. We will also be talking to local residents, to hear their views.

My view is that a wider Yorkshire Devolution deal can deliver transformational economic change in our region, tackle major transport issues and provide a better footprint for public sector reform. I believe that would be good for Doncaster and everyone in Yorkshire.

We will therefore work hard to convince Government of the benefits of developing a wider Yorkshire Devolution deal and make the case for Doncaster to be part of it.”

The Deputy Mayor, Councillor Glyn Jones, made the following announcement:

“In the absence of Councillor Chris McGuinness who covers Community Safety, I’m sure colleagues would like to join me in sending the Council’s best wishes and unreserved support to the Police Officer who was seriously injured in the line of duty on Tuesday morning.

We need to state that we greatly value the contribution that the Police and other emergency services make to Doncaster, safeguarding our communities often in extremely difficult circumstances, and putting their personal safety at risk.”

Questions from the public in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 13:-

(A) Question from Ms. Louise Harrison, 101 Elmfield Road, Hyde Park, Doncaster, DN1 2AZ, to the Mayor of Doncaster, Ros Jones.

“South Yorkshire Women’s Aid is a vital service. Many of Doncaster Council’s own agencies refer clients to it. Nevertheless, DMBC has still stated that it has no money to fund the service after December. However, in DMBC’s statement of accounts 2016/17, it states that it has £97 million in ‘usable’ reserves, £20 million being ‘unallocated’. The Department of Education also awarded DMBC £3.1 million for DV services, of which SYWA received none. You also have a pot of around £1 million of grant under spends for the stronger families programme. Therefore, will DMBC use these monetary resources to fund SYWA?”

The Mayor of Doncaster, Ros Jones, gave the following reply:

“Thank you for your question Ms. Harrison.

Domestic Violence is wholly unacceptable and can have a devastating impact on victims and their children.
Since 2010, Doncaster Council has been forced to cut more than £200 million from its annual revenue budget and faces further significant funding cuts in the coming years. Notwithstanding this, the Council has prioritised tackling Domestic Violence as a key issue and spends in excess of £1m per year on related services, including:-

- An Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy (IDVA) Service and coordination of Doncaster’s Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference;
- A Women's Refuge and dispersed homes with support services;
- A Floating Support Service, helping people in their own homes; and
- A Domestic Violence Helpline.

Following the decision by the Trustees of Doncaster Women’s Aid to close the organisation, local people wanted to set up a new successor charity. We supported that aim and provided a one-off grant of £30,000 and assistance from Council Officers.

However, as with all independent charities in Doncaster, South Yorkshire Women's Aid must plan to exist without reliance on funding from Doncaster Council, which unfortunately is simply not in a position to provide financial assistance to every VCS organisation facing financial pressures.

In terms of the specific funds that you have identified, the majority of the £97 million detailed in the Council’s 2016/17 statement of accounts, is already ring-fenced for specific purposes. This leaves £15 million general fund uncommitted reserves at the end of March 2017. We currently estimate that by the end of March 2018, this will have reduced to £10 million, which would support the Council for less than two weeks.

In March 2017, the Council identified a potential call on general uncommitted reserves of up to £9.5 million. These reserves are therefore not available to fund SYWA on an ongoing basis.

With regards to the Growing Futures Project, the Department for Education has not awarded the Council £3.1 million for current services. However, the Council has identified £3.1 million funding for the Doncaster Children’s Trust to maintain current programmes. This includes the previously Government funded Growing Futures project which focuses on support for children and young people. We also support the delivery of perpetrator programmes aimed at men who commit domestic violence, in order to reduce the number of repeat incidents.

Where delivered by external providers, services are commissioned through an open and transparent process in line with the Council's legal obligations.

At the end of March 2017, the Council held £1.2 million in earmarked reserves for the Stronger Families Programme, to provide an integrated approach to supporting families with additional needs. A significant element of the funding is performance based and as such, the level of funding is difficult to forecast. However, at current income levels, the earmarked reserve is forecast to be fully drawn down in the next financial year. Any reduction in these reserves will have
a detrimental impact on the programme and thus impact on families in Doncaster.

I was disappointed to learn that at the present time, South Yorkshire Women’s Aid has submitted only a very limited number of funding bids, which even if successful, the trustees do not believe would be sufficient to keep the organisation running. Notwithstanding this, I would like to see South Yorkshire Women’s Aid continue its work.

The Council is therefore continuing to meet with the Trustees and I will work with them to sustain South Yorkshire Women’s Aid, if they are able to develop a credible plan for the future financial sustainability of the organisation.”

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 13.10, Ms. Harrison asked the Mayor, the following supplementary question:-

“How many people here in this Chamber have visited the new Women’s Aid? Who is going to pay for the next funeral of a woman who dies or commits suicide? We are asking for no more than £30-60,000.”

In response, the Mayor gave the following reply:-

“I reiterate what I have said; we will meet with Women’s Aid in the next couple of weeks. If they provide a sustainable plan, we will work along with them.”

(B) Question from Mr. Steve Merriman, 10 Cedric Avenue, Conisbrough, Doncaster, DN12 3PB, to the Mayor of Doncaster, Ros Jones.

“NHS – Accountable Care Systems

John Major and particularly Tony Blair, used PFI to boost private sector profitability and saddle the public sector with unsustainable debt. Complicated contracts and narratives designed to allay public opinion were used to disguise profit extraction for the private sector.

STPs and Accountable Care Systems are being similarly engineered. It is not difficult to conclude, that the man leading their introduction, Simon Stevens, Head of NHS England, has one ambition - to hand over a newly packaged NHS to his former colleagues in the USA Health Insurance Industry.

By default, DMBC is colluding in this; why?”

The Mayor of Doncaster, Ros Jones, gave the following reply:-

“Thank you for your question Mr Merriman.

The role of Doncaster Council and its health and care partners is to secure the best health and wellbeing for Doncaster people from the public resources entrusted to us.

I cannot comment on the motivation or ambition of other individuals or your conclusion. I do not agree with your assertion that the Council is colluding in this.
However, what is clear to me is that there are always opportunities to improve health and care. Where these improvements could lead to better quality of care or patient experience of care, the Council and its partners would be foolish to ignore them.

As yet, the Council and Team Doncaster partners are unaware of any proposals for service change arising from the Accountable Care System. Any proposal for service change would be subject to our usual decision making processes and major NHS service change proposals are also considered by the Overview and Scrutiny process.

Finally, our over-riding concern is about the impact any proposal has on Doncaster people.”

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 13.10, Mr. Merriman asked the Mayor, the following supplementary question:--

“The PFI was sold as the only game in Town. Now, STPs and ACS are being marketed in the same way. Do you believe that ACS will look to improve the health of your children and grandchildren?”

In response, the Mayor gave the following reply:--

“I will always seek to improve the health and care of the residents of Doncaster.”

Question from Mr. Doug Wright, on behalf of ‘Keep Our NHS Public Doncaster and Bassetlaw’, 15 Chantry Close, Cantley, Doncaster, DN4 6RX, to the Mayor of Doncaster, Ros Jones.

“South Yorkshire and Bassetlaw (SYB) Accountable Care System

The current plans for the South Yorkshire and Bassetlaw (SYB) Accountable Care System ensures that control of the Council’s Better Care Fund is taken away from the Council and given to a myriad of unelected SYB Regional Officers/Committees.

We believe that paragraphs 6 and 7 of the current Memorandum of Understanding, shows how the SYB are illegally taking decisions away from the Council without their authorisation and consultation with the general public.

Following our consultations with the public, will the Mayor agree to oppose both the South Yorkshire and Bassetlaw (SYB) Accountable Care System and Memorandum of Understanding, and consider taking legal advice to protect the future health of our Doncaster people?”

In response, the Mayor gave the following reply:--

“Thank you for your question Mr Wright.

The Better Care Fund is a programme spanning both the NHS and Local Government which seeks to join-up health and care services, so that people can manage their own health and wellbeing, and live independently in their
communities for as long as possible. It is run by NHS England, the Department of Health and the Department for Communities and Local Government.

The South Yorkshire and Bassetlaw Accountable Care System has no control or input into the Doncaster Better Care Fund Plan, which was submitted to the national Better Care Fund team on the 11th September.

Sections 6 and 7 of the Memorandum of Understanding concern the direction of travel and key milestones’ and ‘governance, accountability and assurance’. The Memorandum is clear that Local Authorities and Clinical Commissioning Groups are not delegating any powers to the South Yorkshire and Bassetlaw Accountable Care System.

The Council notes the Memorandum of Understanding and there is support 'in principle' for the direction of travel.

We do have concerns in relation to the projected funding gap of £571 million within the plan over the next 5 years and the implications of this on the care, health and wellbeing of local people.

Our ambition is to improve health outcomes for all residents, reduce health inequalities and focus on ensuring the availability of services closer to home. These are the issues that resonate with our residents.

We are keen to see the importance of Place Plans reflected in the Accountable Care System. We know that only through collaborations, partnerships and adequate funding matched to need within and across communities, will there be a significant shift in the health outcomes for our population.

Therefore, Council’s efforts and focus must be located in working constructively with partners locally, to address the wider determinants of health.

We must ensure that prevention and early intervention remain at the forefront of activity, as well as improving pathways and services across a range of social and medical services for those that need it.

We welcome the opportunity to draw in additional funding to local places to aid the transformation in health outcomes we want to achieve for our residents.

We also welcome the opportunity to share learning across the different places within South Yorkshire and Bassetlaw, and will be working collaboratively to achieve this.

Given the importance of place, whilst supportive of the direction of travel and the ambition, each local area must be free to decide its position on proposals or service changes that have a bearing on their residents.

As such, Doncaster Council may in future, decide to take its own position on proposals or service changes that have a bearing on our citizens and place specifically, while remaining committed 'in principle', to the overall vision described in the Memorandum of Understanding.
The Council welcomes the opportunity to engage with the Accountable Care System to represent the needs and views of Doncaster. We would welcome further dialogue to recognise the unique role of Elected Councillors and their health & wellbeing responsibilities within the existing oversight and assurance arrangements.

A meeting to discuss this further would be beneficial at the earliest opportunity.”

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 13.10, Mr. Wright asked the Mayor, the following supplementary question:-

“Thank you. I have a petition here disagreeing with what you are saying. In noting the Memorandum you are in effect agreeing it. This is not good, bad or indifferent. I came to the Council 9 months ago and asked the same question as to how this will affect 308,000 residents of Doncaster and still I have no answer. Will you hold an Extraordinary Meeting to discuss this issue which is going to be established as the new Shadow Health Body in April next year?”

In response, the Mayor gave the following reply:-

“I always want to ensure that the residents of Doncaster get the best possible care. I have no problem in referring your question to Overview and Scrutiny.”

38 New Business Rates Relief Schemes

The Mayor of Doncaster, Ros Jones, presented a report to Council detailing the new Relief Schemes announced by the Government in the Spring Budget. These schemes were aimed at supporting local businesses affected by the rise in their Business Rates bills as a result of the 2017 revaluation of non-domestic properties.

Members noted that as a result of the Relief Schemes, up to 115 local pubs would receive £1000 reduction on their Business Rates bill for 2017/18. This scheme was for one year only and had been designed in line with Government guidance and eligibility criteria, and it ensured that the Council would be fully reimbursed by Government for any relief awarded.

The Mayor informed Council that the Local Discretionary Relief Scheme would support businesses in the Borough who faced the steepest increase in their bills, with the Council given the responsibility to design the scheme as it saw fit. Doncaster Council’s proposed scheme would look to limit the increase in Business Rates payable to 7.5% for eligible businesses in 2017/18, with up to 312 local businesses benefiting from this proposal. The total relief awarded of up to £437,000, would fall within the Government funding.

This funding would run for the next four years, but would reduce year on year. Future proposals for the following three years of the scheme would be presented to future Council meetings.

The Mayor informed Council that she felt the proposals would deliver a sensible approach which would look to support businesses in Doncaster and recommended the report to Council for approval.
RESOLVED that

(1) the Pubs Relief Scheme, as detailed at Appendix 1 of the report, be approved; the scheme being designed in line with the Government guidance and eligibility criteria to ensure that the Council is fully reimbursed for the relief awarded;

(2) the Local Discretionary Relief Scheme, as detailed at Appendix 2 of the report, be approved; the proposed scheme will limit the increase in the amount of Business Rates payable in 2017/18 to 7.5% for qualifying businesses. Up to 312 local businesses would receive relief under this option. The proposed scheme criteria is in line with the Government’s intentions in providing funding for the relief and is also based on representations from the Federation of Small Businesses and criteria in other published Local Authority Discretionary Schemes; and

(3) the Local Discretionary Relief Scheme be set for 2017/18 only and that further proposals for each of the following three years, be presented to future Council meetings.

39 State of the Borough Assessment

Mayor Ros Jones informed Council that she was very pleased to present Doncaster’s first State of the Borough Assessment which looked to provide a single, overall assessment of how the Borough was changing and what the quality of life was for its residents, using the following indicators:

- Demographic information about Doncaster’s population;
- Key quality of life indicators; and
- Case studies on the real life experiences of residents and communities.

It was outlined that all these points would look to put into context the important work undertaken by the Council, and with its partners in Team Doncaster.

The Mayor reported that she felt it was fitting that the Council received and reviewed the document, alongside the Doncaster Growing Together Strategy, as it formed an evidence base for the ambitious reforms that the Council would be driving. It was noted that the findings were already being used to focus on the issues that mattered most to the Borough and its residents.

The State of the Borough Assessment had of course identified areas of success along with challenges that needed collectively addressing with the following points highlighted to Council:

Doncaster Learning

Whilst the majority of Doncaster’s 5 year olds were experiencing a good level of education and a foundation for a fulfilling life, further progress was needed when it came to GCSE attainment in order to close the gap with comparators and persistent absence in Secondary Schools was still relatively high which was an ongoing concern.
Doncaster Working

Over the past year, Doncaster’s employment rate had hit an 11 year high and Doncaster had reached the UK Top 10 for growth in private sector jobs. However, despite these positives, wage rates still needed to increase further as they remained significantly lower than the national average.

Doncaster Living

Whilst life expectancy was increasing, it still remained lower than many of its comparators. Additionally, whilst it was pleasing to see that progress had been made in increasing the number of houses available, it was still a priority to reduce the number of homeless people within the Borough.

Doncaster Caring

The rate of permanent admissions to hospital had reduced alongside an increase in the number of people the Council had helped to remain in their own homes and live independently. Additionally, Council noted that since its peak in 2012, the number of children referred to Social Services had reduced.

The Mayor communicated to Council the importance of collective working by Team Doncaster in order to improve the quality of life for people in Doncaster and that by working together and growing together, success would be achieved.

Council noted that the document would be a ‘go-to’ document for all to use, including the Public, Team Doncaster and both Members and Officers of the Council. It would be publically available for all those people who wished to engage and would be built on each year, in order that the depth of information continued to develop and grow. The development of the document gave the opportunity to consider the whole picture and obtain an overall sense of the ‘state of Doncaster’. Therefore, the Mayor recommended the report to Council for approval in order to use its content and the insight it provided to improve the quality of life in Doncaster.

Following consideration of the report, the Chair of Council afforded Members in the Chamber the opportunity to comment on the report.

Members commended the report and felt that it was a good plan which was well presented and welcomed in advance of the positivity it was hoped it would bring to the Borough.

RESOLVED that

(1) State of the Borough assessment be noted; and

(2) the State of the Borough Assessment be used to inform priorities to improve quality of life in Doncaster in line with its constitutional role to inform the policy and budget setting process.
Prior to consideration of the report, the Chair of Council welcomed Jon Gleek, Head of Research, Evaluation and Intelligence, to the meeting to present a short video introducing Doncaster Growing Together.

Mayor Ros Jones introduced the report and outlined the background behind the Strategy. The Mayor reported that Doncaster had made a lot of progress over the last few years and with a growing economy, over 10,000 new jobs had been created between 2013 and 2015, and with a number of exciting new developments in the pipeline, this would bring even more jobs to Doncaster. However, the journey of recovery for the economy, families and public services in Doncaster was a long one, and this was reflected in the report with a delivery programme leading up to 2021.

The Doncaster Growing Together Strategy was the next step on the improvement journey for Doncaster and was so called as its central aim was to grow the local economy and Doncaster as a place, and develop public services in order that all of Doncaster’s local people and communities benefited. It was a confident and bold ambition for Doncaster’s future, but one that would confirm its recovery.

The Mayor reported that the Doncaster Growing Together Strategy was a partnership strategy based on collaboration from a wide range of public services, voluntary and community sector organisations, and the wider business community in Doncaster. It proposed new ways of working whereby public services would work together and target their attention and resources on the issues that mattered the most, and most importantly, it was noted that Doncaster’s citizens would play a key role.

Elected Members across the Council had played a key part in the development of the Doncaster Growing Together Strategy, with it having been considered in detail by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee as well as discussions at a dedicated Members Seminar and in a series of engagement sessions.

The four themes contained within the report mirrored those within the State of the Borough Assessment, these being:-

- Doncaster Learning – The aim of Doncaster Growing Together was to prepare children and young people for a fulfilled life, infusing their education with powerful life experiences;

- Doncaster Working – This theme would look to enable people to pursue their ambitions and contribute in the societies in which they lived, working in a job with purpose and meaning;

- Doncaster Living – Doncaster Growing Together would look to create an environment that was vibrant and be full of opportunity where people enjoyed living and were able to make the most of the opportunities it provided; and

- Doncaster Caring – This looked to develop a collective responsibility to care for the most vulnerable people within society and would transform the way the Council supported vulnerable children, families and adults, and elderly people as well as those with disabilities, veterans and any other individuals facing disadvantage.
Members noted that Doncaster Growing Together; the Four Year Borough Strategy, set out a clear and deliverable programme for the Borough, which would help to drive it forward, benefiting local people throughout the Town.

Members welcomed the Doncaster Growing Together Borough Strategy and felt that it was a positive move for the Borough, and the ambition and drive within it was what the Town needed.

Following the Mayor’s recommendation of the Doncaster Growing Together Strategy to Council for approval, the Chief Executive paid tribute to the work undertaken by Lee Tillman, Assistant Director, Strategy and Performance and his staff, who had been instrumental in the production of this Strategy.

**RESOLVED** that the Doncaster Growing Together Strategy and Programme, along with the draft prospectus document, be approved.

**Independent Remuneration Panel Appointments**

The Council considered a report that sought approval for the appointment of two new Members to the Council’s Independent Remuneration Panel.

It was reported that the Council had a duty to have an Independent Remuneration Panel which comprised of a minimum of three Members, none of whom could be a member of the Local Authority, or of its Committees, or an employee of the Council in order to make recommendations with regard to the allowances and expenses for Elected Members and Co-Optees of the Council.

It was noted that following the resignations of Edward Laud, Derek Morris and Rosemary Young, the Panel currently only had two remaining members, Keith Marriott (Panel Chair) and Ranjan Talukder, and would therefore be inquorate. As a result of a recent recruitment exercise, applications to serve on the Panel had been received from Stuart Highfield and Sue Williams. Profiles of both applicants were detailed within Appendix A to the report for Members’ information, and further to interviews held with the applicants by the Governance and Member Services Manager, it was felt that both individuals possessed the skills and attributes required to join the Panel.

It was also proposed within the report to give delegated authority to the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services to appoint one additional Panel member. This would increase the pool of Panel members to a total of five, which would greatly increase flexibility to ensure that all Panel meetings were quorate and enable the review to be carried out in line with the estimated timescales prescribed within the report.

**RESOLVED** that

1. Stuart Highfield and Sue Williams be appointed as Members of the Independent Remuneration Panel;

2. it be noted that Keith Marriott and Ranjan Talukder continue to be Members of the Independent Remuneration Panel;
(3) the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to approve 1 further appointment to the Panel in order to increase the pool of Independent Remuneration Panel Members to a total of 5 individuals, to ensure the required quorum can be maintained throughout the review; and

(4) the Chair of the Independent Remuneration Panel be paid £150 for drafting and presenting the Panel’s report and recommendations to Council on levels of Members’ Allowances.

To consider the following Motion, written notice of which has been given by Councillor John Gilliver and Seconded by Councillor John McHale, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16.1:-

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16.1, a Motion was submitted by Councillor John Gilliver and Seconded by Councillor John McHale:-

“This Council calls upon the Minister of State for Policing and the Fire Service, Nick Hurd MP, to re-introduce Fire Safety Inspections following the tragic fire at Grenfell Towers and to look into a better funding settlement for South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service in the light of increased fire calls and fire deaths over the last 7 years.

The effects on South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Service have been disproportionate due to a combination of the inadequacy of the fire formula and the ‘blanket’ approach to fire sector cuts. Since 2010, the County of South Yorkshire has lost five Fire Appliances and two Aerial Appliances. This has meant that during a recent fire call to a high rise block in Doncaster, another Aerial Ladder Appliance had to be sent for from Sheffield which was over 20 minutes away.

This Council calls upon South Yorkshire Fire Authority, in light of Grenfell and other high rise incidents, to reconsider with immediate effect the position of the Doncaster Aerial Ladder Platform to reinstate a full time dedicated crew.”

The Chair afforded all Members in the Chamber, the opportunity to speak on the Motion.

An amendment to the Motion was MOVED by Councillor Jonathan Wood and Seconded by Councillor R Allan Jones, in that the first paragraph read as follows:-

“This Council calls for the reintroduction of Fire Safety Inspections following the tragic fire at Grenfell Towers and do this by considering a number of funding measures to include the release of reserves.”

A vote was taken on the amendment to the Motion proposed by Councillor Jonathan Wood, which was declared as follows:-

For – 13
Against – 32
Abstain – 0

On being put to the meeting, the amendment to the Motion was declared LOST.
A vote was then taken on the Motion which was declared as follows:-

For – 36
Against – 1
Abstain – 8

On being put to the meeting, the Motion was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED that this Council calls upon the Minister of State for Policing and the Fire Service, Nick Hurd MP, to re-introduce Fire Safety Inspections following the tragic fire at Grenfell Towers and to look into a better funding settlement for South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service in the light of increased fire calls and fire deaths over the last 7 years.

The effects on South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Service have been disproportionate due to a combination of the inadequacy of the fire formula and the 'blanket' approach to fire sector cuts. Since 2010, the County of South Yorkshire has lost five Fire Appliances and two Aerial Appliances. This has meant that during a recent fire call to a high rise block in Doncaster, another Aerial Ladder Appliance had to be sent for from Sheffield which was over 20 minutes away.

This Council calls upon South Yorkshire Fire Authority, in light of Grenfell and other high rise incidents, to reconsider with immediate effect the position of the Doncaster Aerial Ladder Platform to reinstate a full time dedicated crew.

Questions by Elected Members in accordance with Council Procedure Rules 15.2 and 15.3:-

A. Questions on Notice

No questions on notice had been received for this meeting.

B. Questions Without Notice

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 15.2, the Chair of Council sought questions from Elected Members during Question Time:-

A. Questions to Ros Jones, Mayor of Doncaster

Councillor Andy Pickering asked the following Question:-

(Q) “Following Councillor Julie Dore’s intemperate remarks in relation to our Chief Executive Jo Miller, Councillor Dore used words like ‘betrayal’... ‘a serious failure of trust’... ‘we do deals together’... ‘we don’t go behind closed doors’...and most surprisingly... ‘the worst case of political vandalism in her 17 years in Local Government’.
Would the Mayor agree with our view that Jo Miller is guilty of none of the scurrilous allegations and that in fact, the HS2 manoeuvrings by Sheffield City Council surrounding the Meadowhall route suggests that those allegations appear to be the stock in trade of Councillor Dore herself and in fact, Jo Miller simply has done the right thing by the people of Doncaster in removing the grip of Sheffield and a discredited Leader?”

The Mayor of Doncaster, Ros Jones gave the following response:-

(A) “Thank you for your question Councillor Pickering. The Chief Executive has always acted in a professional manner; Jo Miller has always acted in the best interests of the people of Doncaster, helping to drive the Borough forward. It is inappropriate to try and bring someone into disrepute and Jo Miller will continue to take Doncaster further forward as she already has.”

Councillor Phil Cole asked the following Question:-

(Q) “Mayor Jones, if we’re talking about discredited Leaders, can I refer to our Prime Minister, Teresa May, who has sadly continued the pay cap on Public Service workers that has been in place since 2010. Do you agree that this pay cap should be scrapped and people in the Public Services finally be fairly paid?”

The Mayor of Doncaster, Ros Jones, gave the following response:-

(A) “Thank you Councillor Cole. I absolutely agree with you that our hard working Public Service staff deserve to be fairly paid. They have carried the burden of austerity personally through the below inflation salary cap, and also in their everyday roles, as the Government cuts budgets for delivering services. Through all of this, they continue to work tirelessly and provide vital services for local people.

The 1% pay cap has now been in place for seven years. Between 2010 and 2016, Public Service workers had seen their pay rise by just 4.1%, but the cost of goods and services had increased by 17.7% in that period.

The average Public Service worker is now thousands of pounds worse off than if their pay had matched inflation. So I agree that the Government should lift the pay cap for all workers and stop tying the hands of the pay review bodies.

However, I must stress they should also promise to meet pay increases with additional funding, to avoid imposing further cuts to our vital Public Services.”

B. Questions to the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Glyn Jones, Cabinet Member for Housing and Equalities

There were no questions put to the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Glyn Jones, Cabinet Member for Housing and Equalities.
C. **Questions to Councillor Nigel Ball, Cabinet Member for Public Health, Leisure and Culture**

There were no questions put to Councillor Nigel Ball, Cabinet Member for Public Health, Leisure and Culture.

D. **Questions to Councillor Joe Blackham, Cabinet Member for Highways, Street Scene and Trading Services**

In the absence of Councillor Joe Blackham, Cabinet Member for Highways, Street Scene and Trading Services, the Chair of Council informed Members that any questions for Councillor Joe Blackham should be submitted in writing to the Executive Office after the meeting and a response would be provided.

E. **Questions to Councillor Rachael Blake, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care**

There were no questions put to Councillor Rachael Blake, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care.

F. **Questions to Councillor Nuala Fennelly, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Schools**

Councillor Cynthia Ransome asked the following Question:-

(Q) “I’d like to ask a question in terms of education, particularly in relation to our Secondary Schools. How is it acceptable for them to finish at 2.30 pm in the afternoon? Are they getting a good standard of education by doing this and how are we preparing our young people for their working lives?”

Councillor Nuala Fennelly gave the following response:-

(A) “Thank you for your question Councillor Ransome; I totally agree with you, but we don’t have a lot of control over the Academies as they set their own timetables. I will however write to the Regional Schools Director of the Academies and put this question to him.”

G. **Questions to Councillor Chris McGuinness, Cabinet Member for Communities, Voluntary Sector and the Environment**

In the absence of Councillor Chris McGuinness, Cabinet Member for Communities, Voluntary Sector and the Environment, the Chair of Council informed Members that any questions for Councillor Chris McGuinness should be submitted in writing to the Executive Office after the meeting and a response would be provided.
H. **Questions to Councillor Bill Mordue, Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Economic Development**

There were no questions put to Councillor Bill Mordue, Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Economic Development.

I. **Questions to Councillor Jane Nightingale, Cabinet Member for Customer and Corporate Services**

There were no questions put to Councillor Jane Nightingale, Cabinet Member for Customer and Corporate Services.

J. **Questions to Councillor Austen White, Chair of the Audit Committee**

There were no questions put to Councillor Austen White, Chair of the Audit Committee.

K. **Questions to Councillor Phil Cole, Chair of the Elections and Democratic Structures Committee**

There were no questions put to Councillor Phil Cole, Chair of the Elections and Democratic Structures Committee.

L. **Questions to Councillor Rachael Blake, Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board**

There were no questions put to Councillor Rachael Blake, Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board.

M. **Questions to Councillor Kevin Rodgers, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee**

There were no questions put to Councillor Kevin Rodgers, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee.

---

**To receive the Minutes of the following Joint Authorities:**

**RESOLVED** that the Minutes and Briefing Note of the following Joint Authorities, be noted:

A. Sheffield City Region Combined Authority held on 12th June and 17th July, 2017.

B. Sheffield City Region Combined Authority Transport Committee held on 8th May, 2017.

C. Sheffield City Region Local Enterprise Partnership Board held on 12th June and 17th July, 2017.

D. South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority held on 26th June (Annual), 26th June (Ordinary) and 24th July, 2017 and Section 41 Briefing Note for September, 2017.
E. Sheffield City Region Combined Authority/South Yorkshire Pensions Authority Joint Local Pensions Board held on 20th July, 2017.

F. South Yorkshire Pensions Authority held on 15th June (Annual) and 15th June (Ordinary), 2017.

G. South Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel held on 2nd June and 7th July, 2017.

CHAIR: ___________________________ DATE: ___________________
DONCASTER METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL

EXTRAORDINARY COUNCIL

THURSDAY, 9TH NOVEMBER, 2017

An EXTRAORDINARY MEETING of the COUNCIL was held at the COUNCIL CHAMBER - CIVIC OFFICE on THURSDAY, 9TH NOVEMBER, 2017, at 1.00 pm.

PRESENT:

Chair - Councillor George Derx
Vice-Chair - Councillor Majid Khan
Deputy Mayor - Councillor Glyn Jones


APOLOGIES:

Apologies for absence were received from The Mayor of Doncaster Ros Jones and Councillors Lani-Mae Ball, Nigel Ball, Iris Beech, Rachael Blake, Bev Chapman, Phil Cole, Tony Corden, Jane Cox, Neil Gethin, Sean Gibbons, David Hughes, Eva Hughes, Jane Kidd, Tina Reid and Sue Wilkinson.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST, IF ANY.

Councillor Kevin Rodgers declared an interest in agenda item 4 by virtue of being a Member of Yorkshire Devolution Movement.

DONCASTER DEVOLUTION PROPOSAL - THE HOLDING OF A COMMUNITY POLL.

Council received a report seeking approval to hold a “Community Poll” seeking the views of the Doncaster Electorate about the next stages in Devolution proposal.

In introducing this item Deputy Mayor, Councillor Glyn Jones stated that:-

“Today the Council is discussing regional devolution and the potential for holding a borough-wide poll of residents in Doncaster. As you know, regional devolution is a vitally important issue. It has been discussed a number of times in this Chamber and with Elected Members over the last two years.

Devolution will impact on our residents, businesses and our borough for the next 30 years or more, so we must aim to get the best possible deal for Doncaster. Colleagues
will recall that in 2015 when the Government was pursuing ‘City Region’ devolution deals, Doncaster Council agreed to be a part of the Sheffield City Region proposal.

However, since then, a number of things have changed:

- The UK has voted for Brexit
- Chesterfield and Bassetlaw no longer want to become full members of the Sheffield City Region
- The Government has agreed new devolution models; and
- Yorkshire Councils have brought forward proposals for a wider Yorkshire devolution agreement.

We are clear that Doncaster must not be left out of the devolution process, something that Council has supported.

However, given the changing circumstances, the Mayor and Council colleagues have indicated that they would like the opportunity to explore a wider Yorkshire devolution agreement.

Indeed, in addition to cross-party support within Doncaster Council, proposals for a wider Yorkshire agreement are backed by Doncaster Chamber of Commerce, the CBI, Institute of Directors, TUC and our MPs.

In a recent survey, 70% of local businesses also said they would prefer to ultimately be part of a Yorkshire devolution deal.

Of course, the one group of people who have not had the chance to express their preferred option moving forward, are Doncaster’s residents and they are the most important stakeholder of all.

Unfortunately the Mayor is unable to attend Council today. She has asked me to pass on her apologies. However, she has asked me to reiterate her support for a Community Poll.

Given the cost, it is not something we would do over every issue. However, this is an important change which will impact Doncaster and change governance arrangements in our region.

We therefore need to be very clear about Doncaster’s position moving forward and feel confident that it has the support of local residents and businesses.

As a Council, we will do our best to achieve their ambitions. We’ve already heard from businesses, trade unions and politicians on the issue. Now we need to hear from local people.

I can also confirm to colleagues that this morning Barnsley Council has unanimously approved a similar poll of its residents with the support of their Labour, Conservative and Independent Councillors so I recommend this report to Council”.

The Chair of Council, Councillor George Derx, then afforded all Members in the Chamber the opportunity of commenting on the report and the following issues were
A number of Members expressed the view that Doncaster residents should be given clear information to enable them to make a clear informed judgement in respect of the question. Some of the areas of clarification that may assist the public included:-

- Understanding the powers and functions of a city region;
- Understanding the relationship between the Council and a city region;
- Clarification on whether the City Region would lead to the Council relinquishing any of its powers; and
- What would need to happen to enable the Council to formally withdraw from the earlier decision to support the Sheffield City Region deal understanding the mechanisms for taking forward the wider Yorkshire deal if that was agreed as the preferred option.

Members also discussed the value of the Community Poll in gauging public opinion. Whilst recognising the Poll was not binding on the Council, concerns were raised regarding the extent to which the outcome of the Poll would inform a future decision if for example there was a low response rate.

On behalf of the Conservative Group, Councillor Jonathan Wood proposed the following amendment to the Motion which was seconded by Councillor Nick Allen, a copy of which was tabled at the meeting:-

“based on a 50% turnout a promise be made by Councillors to respect the will of the people and vote to see the peoples opinion through and vote accordingly as Councillors”

At this point, the Chair of Council, Councillor George Derx then adjourned the meeting for 15 minutes in order to allow discussions to be held to clarify the wording of the motion.

The meeting reconvened at 2.00 p.m.

Following discussions, on behalf of the Conservative Group, Councillor Jonathan Wood withdrew the original wording of the amendment and clarified the revised wording of the amendment to the Motion which was seconded by the Deputy Mayor Councillor Glyn Jones:-

“to give effect to the result of the peoples poll and act as Councillors accordingly”.

A vote was taken on the amendment proposed by Councillor Jonathan Wood, which was declared as follows:-

For – 39
Against – 0
Abstain – 1

On being put to the meeting, the amendment to the Motion proposed by Councillor Jonathan Wood was declared CARRIED.
The Chair afforded all Members in the Chamber, the opportunity to speak on the Substantive Motion and invited the Deputy Mayor to respond.

In responding to the amendment the Deputy Mayor confirmed it had always been the intention to use this information to gauge public opinion and seek the best deal for Doncaster. He reiterated the exercise would be a Poll and not an election and confirmed that residents on the electoral register would be given the opportunity to vote. The Council would also welcome any views put forward by businesses or other groups and organisations to help inform any future decision.

In regard to other key issues raised the Deputy Mayor confirmed the Council would ensure that the public were provided with fair and balanced information in respect of the issues around devolution before being asked to indicate their preference.

In respect of the Council’s previous decision to be a member of the Sheffield City Region there was now a will from a significant number of local authorities in the region to press forward with a wider Yorkshire deal. The Government had previously made it clear it would not preclude South Yorkshire from being part of a wider Yorkshire deal. It was reiterated that as a region Yorkshire’s size and footprint has a strong reputation and brand through its size, scale and economic footprint and would potentially offer greater opportunities for Doncaster. The Council was seeking to push forward with this proposal to maximise benefits for Doncaster and the wider region.

A vote was taken on the Substantive Motion was declared as follows:-

For – 39
Against – 0
Abstain – 0

On being put to the meeting, the Motion was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED that Council:-

(1) agrees to the holding of a Community Poll seeking the views of the Doncaster electorate about the next stages in any Devolution proposal;

(2) approves the proposed Poll question as set out at Appendix A of the report,

(3) gives delegated authority to the Council’s Returning Officer to make the necessary arrangements to carry out such a poll; and

(4) pledges to give effect to the result of the people’s poll and act as Councillors accordingly.

CHAIR: ___________________________ DATE: ______________________

A. 4
To the Chair and Members of COUNCIL

MAYORS DRAFT BUDGET PROPOSALS 2018/19 – 2020/21

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This report launches the Mayor’s budget proposals for 2018/19 to 2020/21. Our budget plan is linked to the Doncaster Growing Together Plan, which is also informed by the State of the Borough Assessment. The Doncaster Growing Together Plan aims to continue to grow the local economy and place and to develop public services in a way that ensures all of Doncaster’s people and communities benefit. It is a partnership strategy, requiring collaboration from across the whole of the Council and from a wide range of public services, voluntary and community organisations and the business community. It is designed to target partners’ attention and resources on the issues that matter most to Doncaster’s present and its future.

2. The Council continues to face the significant challenge of setting a balanced budget with reducing funding and increasing costs, whilst continuing to invest in the borough and protecting the most vulnerable in our communities. The Council is estimating having to find £16.9m of savings in 2018/19 and £43.3m for the period 2018/19 to 2020/21. This increases the overall savings required from 2017/18 to £64.9m a year by 2021.

3. The £43.3m budget gap arises due to expected government grant reductions of over £9m a year from 2018/19, by 2020/21. On top of the grant reductions, the Council is facing significant expenditure pressures, estimated at £14.5m in 2018/19 and increasing to over £34m by 2020/21. This includes pay and price inflation; with £3m set aside for Adults, Health & Wellbeing in 2018/19 for Adult Social Care contracts including the impact of the Government National Living Wage. Further details on the budget gap are provided in Appendices A and B. The service specific budget pressures amount to £5.4m in 2018/19 and are detailed in Appendix C; this includes providing £2.2m for Adults, Health & Wellbeing pressures in 2018/19.
### Explanation of the Budget Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017/18 £m</th>
<th>2018/19 £m</th>
<th>2019/20 £m</th>
<th>2020/21 £m</th>
<th>Total 2018/19 - 2020/21 £m</th>
<th>Total Incl. 2017/18 £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Reduction Government Grants</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Exit Strategies</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Inflation</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Inflation</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Budget Pressures</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Gap</strong></td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td><strong>41.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>64.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of One-off Reserves</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjusted Funding Gap</strong></td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td><strong>43.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>64.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Whilst the financial circumstances that we face are not of our making, it is our responsibility to ensure we propose a robust, clear and balanced budget and that we face up to and deliver changes to our services to the best of our abilities in these very challenging circumstances. Although the reductions are lower than previous years the savings are more challenging to achieve, whilst continuing to deliver high quality services. We are committed to being a council that promotes growth and prosperity for its residents. We must ensure that services are targeted and make a difference to those people who need them most, making the most of technology, re-designing our services so they are fit for the future and working in partnership with our local communities, voluntary, charity and faith sectors to deliver services together as detailed in our Doncaster Growing Together Plan.

5. This report summarises the draft saving proposals to close the remaining £43.3m gap for 2018/19 – 2020/21; these are detailed in paragraphs 20 to 26 and Appendix D. This includes the Adults, Health and Wellbeing Transformation Programme, which focuses on helping people to look after their own health and wellbeing, but making sure that high quality health and social care is available if they need it, further details are provided in paragraph 22.

6. The draft savings proposals include an increase in Council Tax of 1.99% in 2018/19, which will generate £1.97m and is required in order to meet the budget gap and deliver a budget in line with the financial strategy. This will increase the council tax by 47p per week (31p Band A). Although the Council Tax system is disproportionate across the country, it is not something we can resolve overnight and the Council is aiming to improve the position by continuing to utilise the Government Social Care “precept”. The Council Tax proposals include a further increase through the Government’s 2% Social Care “precept” which equates to £1.98m of additional income for Doncaster. This will contribute towards the pressures for Adults, Health & Wellbeing including price inflation, pay inflation, investment in the care ladder and growth in the number of clients from projected changes in the population. The 2% Social Care “precept” will also increase council tax by 47p per week (32p Band A). The current council tax bill is £1,237.81 Band D (£825.21 Band A), overall this will increase the council tax to £1,287.20 per annum Band D (£858.13 Band A) which means an additional £49.39 for Band D council tax per annum or 94p per week (£32.93 for Band A per annum or 63p per week).

7. Doncaster continues to have one of the lowest Council Tax rates in comparison to other Metropolitan Districts and Unitary Authorities (the 9th lowest in 2017/18) as shown in Appendix F.

8. The analysis, at Appendix G, shows the current position regarding earmarked reserves. The balance on the uncommitted General Fund reserve for 2018/19 is estimated at £9.3m; this will reduce further to £8.6m in 2019/20.
EXEMPT REPORT

9. Not applicable.

RECOMMENDATIONS

10. Council is asked to note the Mayor’s budget plan for 2018/19 to 2020/21 including the draft budget proposals to close the budget gap on the 21st December 2017, in preparation for approval at Council on the 5th March 2018.

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR THE CITIZENS OF DONCASTER

11. The Council will continue to care for and protect the most vulnerable in society but it is inevitable that as the Council becomes a leaner organisation that citizens will see services delivered in new and different ways.

BACKGROUND

Medium-term Financial Forecast (MTFF)

12. The MTFF includes all the budget changes that are outside of the Council’s control, as detailed in paragraphs 2 and 3; this has identified that the Council needs to make significant savings of £16.9m in 2018/19. Further details are provided in Appendices A and B, which shows details of the MTFF for 2017/18 to 2020/21.

13. In addition to the government funding reductions, the Council is also facing significant budget pressures. These include rising pay costs and increasing pension contributions, estimated at £3.5m in 2018/19 and £7.5m a year by 2021. The additional costs of contract inflation estimated at £5.5m in 2018/19 and £20.9m a year by 2021; this mainly provides £3m for the Adult Social Care contracts including the impact of the National Living Wage. It also provides the funding necessary to meet growth in the services and other service pressures. This includes providing £2.2m in 2018/19 for Adult Social Care to meet the increasing costs of supported living placements, more direct payments and the impact of an ageing population across all services.

14. The Council is currently forecasting a £3m overspend for the 2017/18 financial year; which needs to be managed and reduced to begin the 2018/19 financial year on a sustainable basis. We are also putting aside circa £2.0m each year for other service pressures, which will include providing additional funding for some of the areas that are overspending in 2017/18. A summary of the pressures for 2018/19 to 2020/21, is provided below and further detail in Appendix C.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pressures</th>
<th>2018/19 £m</th>
<th>2019/20 £m</th>
<th>2020/21 £m</th>
<th>Total 2018/19 to 2020/21 £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults Transformation Programme:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>1.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Payments</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>1.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported Living</td>
<td>1.183</td>
<td>1.150</td>
<td>0.436</td>
<td>2.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>0.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Aiming High / Short Breaks</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-CYP: Education Services Grant</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove Early Help savings duplicated</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Protection Lead Officers</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Examiners</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Management</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Service Pressures – to be considered and specific pressures identified.</td>
<td>1.682</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>5.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.434</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.551</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.464</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.449</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. The pensions actuary have reported a considerable improvement in the financial position of the pension fund deficit; Doncaster’s deficit is estimated to have changed from a £160m deficit to a slight surplus. This is mainly due to a rise in UK equities and foreign equities and a fall in the pound. An estimated reduction in the general fund deficit pension budget has been included in the MTFF for 2020/21, when the next tri-annual valuation in 2020 will take effect. The amount included takes into account the protection that is expected to be put in place.

16. The proposals have also been updated to include an estimate of the potential additional cost based on the recent Local Government pay offer (subject to consultation). The actual increase to the pay bill is over £6.2m by 2019/20 (6.8%). The additional cost for 2018/19 will be funded from a mixture of New Homes Bonus additional funding and other funding. The 2019/20 additional cost will be mainly funded from reserves and some New Homes Bonus; the reserves will be replaced in 2020/21 with reductions in the pension deficit budgets, subject to hedging in place.

17. The MTFF details the funding reductions and pressures up to 2020/21; this clearly demonstrates the importance of increasing income by raising the Council Tax, Social Care “precept” and other income from fees and charges. As government grants significantly reduce and the Council becomes more reliant on the income it generates, it must take every opportunity over the next 3 years to raise its income base through the individual rates and overall volume i.e. the number of council tax and business rates properties.

18. The next Government Spending Review will take place in 2020, we have included assumptions for 2020/21 and have based the government grant reductions on the current trajectory.

**Autumn Budget 2017 Announcement**

19. The Autumn Budget 2017 included a number of announcements, which will affect the Council budget, although further details are required to understand the full impact. These include:

- Business rates – changing the indexation from the Retail Price Index (RPI) to the main measure of inflation Consumer Price Index (CPI); legislating retrospectively to address the so-called “staircase tax”; continuing the £1,000 business rate discount for public
houses per the conditions; and increasing the frequency with which the Valuation Office Agency (VOA) revalues non-domestic properties by moving to revaluations every three years following the next revaluation, currently due in 2022. The government will consult on the implementation of these changes in the spring. Local government will be fully compensated for the loss of income as a result of these measures.

- Local authorities can increase the council tax premium from 50% to 100% on empty properties. It is expected that this change will be implemented from 2020/21 at the earliest and the additional income is estimated at circa £0.3m.
- £45 million additional funding in 2017/18 to tackle around 900,000 potholes across England; based on previous allocations this could equate to circa £0.25m for the Council.
- £42 million additional funding for the Disabled Facilities Grant in 2017/18, supporting people to stay in their own homes, Doncaster has been allocated £0.17m.
- Plans to raise housing supply to a net additional 300,000 homes per year by the mid-2020s. This will have an impact on the ‘homes for all programme’ of Doncaster Growing Together, particularly the Housing Delivery theme. A range of measures to stimulate house building across the country have been announced:
  - £1.5 billion Home Building Fund for SME’s to build more homes;
  - £630 million Small Site Fund for remediation and infrastructure;
  - £2.7 billion to extend the Housing Infrastructure Fund;
  - £1.1 billion Land assembly fund to assemble fragmented pieces of land that are viable to build on;
  - £400 million available to Regeneration estates.
- Housing Revenue Account (HRA) borrowing caps will be lifted for councils in areas of high affordability pressure, so they can build more council homes. Local Authorities will be invited to bid for increases in their caps from 2019/20, up to a total of £1 billion by the end of 2021/22.

Draft Saving Proposals

20. The process of identifying and delivering savings is robust but flexible so that options can be identified and plans can be amended as and when required. This strategy will enable the Council to become a more efficient, leaner organisation with a greater understanding of the costs of delivering services and a sound financial base position.

21. The following draft saving proposals have been discussed over several months with both members and managers, further details are provided in Appendix D:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Savings</th>
<th>2018/19 £m</th>
<th>2019/20 £m</th>
<th>2020/21 £m</th>
<th>Total 2018/19 to 2020/21 £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults Transformation Programme:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin and business support</td>
<td>-0.342</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Safety</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>-0.172</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Journey</td>
<td>-0.200</td>
<td>-0.715</td>
<td>-0.161</td>
<td>-1.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Opportunities</td>
<td>-0.328</td>
<td>-0.336</td>
<td>-0.145</td>
<td>-0.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Care</td>
<td>-0.588</td>
<td>-0.490</td>
<td>-0.386</td>
<td>-1.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing related support services</td>
<td>-0.719</td>
<td>-0.719</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-1.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Trust</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.250</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Care - Older People</td>
<td>-0.862</td>
<td>-0.611</td>
<td>-0.502</td>
<td>-1.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings</td>
<td>2018/19 £m</td>
<td>2019/20 £m</td>
<td>2020/21 £m</td>
<td>Total 2018/19 to 2020/21 £m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Care - Working Age</td>
<td>-0.400</td>
<td>-1.537</td>
<td>-1.274</td>
<td>-3.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronger Communities</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.200</td>
<td>-0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported Living</td>
<td>-0.900</td>
<td>-0.443</td>
<td>-0.418</td>
<td>-1.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Trust (VFM)</td>
<td>-2.000</td>
<td>-2.000</td>
<td>-0.500</td>
<td>-4.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Rates earmarked reserve</td>
<td>-0.700</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Rates Income</td>
<td>-0.989</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>-1.072</td>
<td>-2.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioning</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax 1.99% Increase</td>
<td>-1.967</td>
<td>-2.061</td>
<td>-2.161</td>
<td>-6.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax Base Growth</td>
<td>-0.788</td>
<td>-0.819</td>
<td>-0.852</td>
<td>-2.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax Collection Fund</td>
<td>-0.208</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council-wide - Reduce Senior Management</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees &amp; Charges</td>
<td>-0.350</td>
<td>-0.350</td>
<td>-0.350</td>
<td>-1.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Contingency</td>
<td>-0.427</td>
<td>-0.099</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>-0.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government's 2% Social Care “precept”</td>
<td>-1.976</td>
<td>-2.071</td>
<td>-2.171</td>
<td>-6.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Debt Levy</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Councils</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>-0.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension</td>
<td>-0.180</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>-0.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>-0.250</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
<td>-0.287</td>
<td>-0.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield City Region Levy</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Fee</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Services</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.200</td>
<td>-0.200</td>
<td>-0.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>-0.118</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-CYP: Management Restructure</td>
<td>-0.500</td>
<td>-0.300</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets Rationalisation</td>
<td>-0.423</td>
<td>-0.493</td>
<td>-0.200</td>
<td>-1.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways (general fund)</td>
<td>-0.500</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.500</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways and Streetscene</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.500</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Travel Training Scheme</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Building Control</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation &amp; Enforcement</td>
<td>-0.200</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTE)</td>
<td>-0.335</td>
<td>-0.335</td>
<td>-0.335</td>
<td>-1.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Contract</td>
<td>-0.200</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.300</td>
<td>-0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Savings</strong></td>
<td><strong>-16.897</strong></td>
<td><strong>-14.248</strong></td>
<td><strong>-12.203</strong></td>
<td><strong>-43.348</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. As detailed in paragraph 5, the Adults Health and Wellbeing Transformation Programme is committed to helping people to use their strengths and those of local communities to keep their independence for as long as possible, which is ultimately the right thing to do for most individuals. If more people are supported to live in their own homes, there will be less need for long term or traditional care, which in turn is expected to contribute significantly to the delivery of £4.3m savings in 2018/19 and £12.5m by 2020/21. The programme also focuses on making sure that high quality health and social care is available if they need it. There will be investment in services and additional funding provided for growth, of £2.2m in 2018/19 and £5.9m by 2020/21. The savings required in this area are significant and as such their delivery is key to the achievement of the Council’s MTFF. The main savings initiatives are: -
a. Residential Care (Older People) – The number of people in long term care will continue to reduce as a result of helping more people over the age of 65 to continue to live in their own homes. Taking into account the additional funding for increased demand due to an ageing population, the 2018/19 saving equates to a further net reduction of 36 places. Due to the phasing of the reduction, £0.3m one-off improved Better Care Fund (iBCF) funding will be used in 2018/19 and the full-year effect of the changes will not be felt until 2019/20.

b. Housing related support service – The Council and its partners are reviewing (discretionary) housing related support services, with a view to the transition of current service users to more appropriate forms of support. This is planned to save £0.7m in each year 2018/19 and 2019/20, which represents 55% of the net budget.

c. Supported Living – The ambition is to help people in supported living to live more independently as part of the community and therefore need less traditional social care, including fewer care hours. Existing service users will also be encouraged to move to individual budgets (Direct Payment, Individual Service Fund or other option) to support choice and control. This is planned to reduce costs by £0.9m in 2018/19 and £1.8m by 2020/21. There will also be significant investment in supported living to facilitate the increase in demand due to the shift from long term residential care.

d. Homecare – The savings are expected to be achieved through new ways of working and the introduction of initiatives to support people to keep their independence for longer, including an increased focus on rehabilitation and re-ablement. People will be encouraged to source their own support through better information, advice and guidance and to make best use of assistive technology solutions. This will reduce the demand for care hours, providing savings for customers as well as the Council. Overall savings equate to £0.59m in 2018/19 and £1.46m by 2020/21. The 2018/19 saving is equivalent to 64 clients (approximately 39,600 hours). Due to the time it will take to change homecare, £0.5m in one-off iBCF funding will be used in 2018/19 and the full-year effect of the saving will be delivered in 2019/20.

e. The financial picture above highlights the significant pressure on the iBCF one-off funding in 2018/19 and the critical need to deliver the savings in preparation for 2019/20, when the one-off funding will reduce considerably.

23. The draft budget proposals include a £0.5m pressure for LO-CYP in relation to the Education Services Grant (ESG) and £0.5m savings from the Functional Review in 2018/19 and £0.3m in 2019/20. Further details are provided below:

- £0.5m pressure – In 2017/18 the ESG reduced by £1.76m in total, £1.36m of this relating to LO-CYP services. School improvement service remodelling achieved savings of £0.55m against this cut, leaving £0.81m to be delivered; this was partly offset in 2017/18 by transitional ESG received for April to August 2017 of £0.52m. Achieving this saving on an on-going basis remains a challenge due to the level of future savings required and the amount of savings already delivered in 2017/18 through the management and early help restructures. Therefore £0.5m has been included in the budget proposals as a pressure.

- Functional Review savings – In total the LO-CYP’s management review delivered general fund staff savings of £0.89m, in addition to Early Help restructure savings of £0.78m and school improvement service remodelling savings of £0.55m for 2017/18. These savings totalled £2.2m and reduced the overall general fund staffing budgets for LO-CYP from £7.1m to £4.9m, an overall reduction of 31%. LO-CYP’s Functional Review is currently anticipated to be able to meet the 2018/19 savings target of £0.5m. It is envisaged that the general fund staffing budget will be reduced to £4.2m at the end of 2018/19, which is a further reduction of 14%. Further savings of £0.3m
are also required for 2019/20 against the functional review, which the service are anticipating being identified following the review and directorate process efficiencies.

24. The Council has negotiated a set of savings with the Children’s Trust. These are aimed at bringing the cost that the Council pays for the Children’s Trust more into line with benchmarked costs over a 3-year period. The Council is budgeting for savings of £2m in each of 2018/19 and 2019/20 and a further £0.5m in 2020/21. The Children’s Trust is setting itself the same overall £4.5m target but on a more ambitious timescale starting with £3.1m in 2018/19. This is with the intention of the Children’s Trust being able to save enough to set aside some reserves, which it needs to do as its reserves are under £0.1m. The Council will still be funding the costs of the pay award in the Children’s Trust, inflation on the costs of children looked after, additional funding for the increasing numbers of children in the care system and on-going investment in a number of specific projects aimed at improving the care of children but at reduced costs. Council officers have seen the detail of the changes and savings that the Children’s Trust plans to implement and these are summarised in Appendix D.

25. Fees and charges increases are expected to generate £0.35m in 2018/19 (and future years); this is based on the principle that charges are raised by RPI (3.9% in September 2017).

26. Where specific grants cease or reduce, it is assumed that the activities associated with the specific grant will cease and the Council will no longer incur expenditure in these areas, i.e. there will be exit strategies for all grant reductions. Further details are provided at Appendix E.

Post Reductions

27. A review of the 2018/19 to 2020/21 budget proposals has been undertaken, which has identified 153 f.t.e. potential post reductions within the council (this includes 17.5 f.t.e. post reductions due to grant exit strategies). This is an initial estimate calculated on the draft budget proposals and includes 63 f.t.e’s for 2018/19, 68 f.t.e’s for 2019/20 and 22 f.t.e’s for 2020/21. Further work will be undertaken with managers as the savings proposals are developed further to refine this figure prior to the budget meeting in March 2018. The post reduction by individual budget proposals are provided in Appendix D. To achieve the savings the Council will initially look to delete vacant posts, then seek volunteers, then redeployment with compulsory redundancy being the last resort.

Grants to Third Sector Organisations

28. The 2018/19 grants proposed to third sector organisations (£0.7m) are detailed in Appendix F. The Council’s strategy is to more clearly commission and contract service activity, which provides greater certainty and continuity of provision of service for both the service provider (voluntary sector) and service users.

Financial Strategy

29. The financial strategy and 2018/19 budget is informed by the State of the Borough Assessment and the Doncaster Growing Together (DGT) Prospectus:

   a. **Doncaster Learning** – ensuring we prepare our young people for fulfilling lives, with bold reforms that will broaden their horizons and ambitions, bringing our education system and business community together to give our young people more exposure and opportunities to flourish. The key budget proposals in relation to this area are LO-CYP management restructure and the previous year’s ESG reduction, which has created a pressure in 2018/19.

   b. **Doncaster Working** – developing the economy through continued inward investment, targeting higher skilled jobs and more emphasis on supporting existing businesses to grow. Ensuring local people can connect to opportunities is a key aim here. A key
budget proposal in relation to this area is the additional income from business rate growth; this is based on more developments in the borough and increased inward investment.

c. **Doncaster Caring** – supporting our most vulnerable residents, whether children, adults, disabled people, families, older people. The emphasis here is on joining up social and health care and support and on shifting our focus to prevention and support that enables people to enjoy life with their families and communities. The key budget proposals in relation to this area are the Adults Transformation programme budget proposals and the Children’s Trust saving.

d. **Doncaster Living** – developing Doncaster as an attractive and secure place to live, including meeting housing needs, including for vulnerable people, developing town centres and the arts culture and leisure offer and using physical activity, including cycling to improve population health and well-being. A key budget proposal for this area is the Highways and Streetscene proposal for 2019/20.

e. The Doncaster Growing Together programme includes 5 principles for action:

i. We will deliver value – this covers all areas of the financial strategy, including the following specific aims in particular: -

- reducing the number of buildings and concentrating our services in buildings that are cost-effective and are as multi-use as possible, e.g. Assets savings.
- being as productive as possible which may involve redesigning some services, pushing for more commercial value for money processes and encouraging modern forms of service delivery. Our people are our greatest resource and we have to ensure that they are supported to deliver the best possible services for local people, e.g. Admin and business support (Adults Transformation Programme).
- being a modern digital authority both internally and externally, with all services on-line. Providing a modern, high quality and efficient integrated front office with resulting improved service delivery through redesigned business processes, improved technology, mobile working and higher skilled staff. Utilising the resulting business intelligence to become a more intelligent and proactive organisation focused on assisting Doncaster as a place and its people to thrive, e.g. Customer Journey (Adults Transformation).
- focused on reducing high cost services and ensuring we provide affordable services, e.g. Children’s Trust saving.
- ensuring that our services fully recover their costs where possible and that there are no subsidised services without a clear decision to do so.

ii. Keep it simple – ensuring our financial strategy and budget plan is understood by all and focused on what we can do, not what we can’t do.

iii. Be ambitious – we want to help modernise and shape our services to encourage a culture that increases productivity, flexibility and ability to adapt to change as part of every-day business. We need to change the way we work to deliver services in a motivating and effective way, at the same time improving services for the public, e.g. Streetscene Streetlamp initiative phase 2.

iv. Do it together – we will work better with our partners, the voluntary sector, communities and businesses to commission and procure local services that make a real difference. We want well-managed services where our residents are at the heart of what we do. We are committed to delivering services in-house if
they deliver best value, e.g. joining up commissioning and creating a people department.

v. Expect contribution – in all four policy areas, the strategy and programme emphasise the need for contribution from Doncaster citizens, who need to play a key role in the next stage of journey. We will help our communities and our residents to get the services that they really need and are right for them. That means the Council wants to know what works best for individuals and wants to help residents find the services that best suit their needs. We want to enable people and communities to help themselves and improve self-sufficiency, e.g. Adults Transformation Programme.

30. The Council will contribute significantly to the Doncaster Growing Together programme but equally will need to be ready for the future demands placed upon it. A Connected Council theme will identify the internal improvements required to ensure this happens, guided by five principles for action contained within Doncaster Growing Together.

31. The financial strategy should also be read in conjunction with other Council strategy documents including Capital Programme, HRA budget, Treasury Management Strategy and ICT Strategy.

HRA

32. Rents will reduce by 1% in 2018/19 which is the third year of four that this reduction will apply. The Government have announced that post 2020 rent increases can return to CPI plus 1%, rent increases for future years will be considered as part of budget setting.

33. HRA resources have been identified to fund the installation of sprinklers in all nine high rise blocks and to fund other fire safety measures which have been identified.

34. Full service for Universal Credit (UC) began on 11 October 2017, it is estimated that full roll out will take up to 5 years with 7,500 tenants affected and an additional £23.8m of rent income to collect each year. Additional resources have been identified to prepare for the full roll out of UC and to assist tenants who are affected.

Capital

35. The capital programme for 2018/19 to 2020/21 includes a number of projects that will assist the Council to deliver on-going revenue savings. For example, providing one-off capital funding for the property investment company to be used to buy assets to increase Council income returns and contribute towards the Appropriate Assets savings target.

36. The capital programme is a multi-year rolling programme that is reviewed every quarter through the quarterly Finance and Performance Report.

37. The Council is investing in the following major capital programmes:
   a. £14m in a new, single, Central Library, Museum, Art Gallery and Archives for the Borough;
   b. Continued investment in a range of projects in the urban centre aligned with the Urban Centre Master Plan which will attract more businesses into the borough and additional business rate income £21m;
   c. Investment in major transport schemes, mainly using grants from the Sheffield City Region Investment Fund (SCRIF). This includes additional investment in the DN7 project and West Moor Link Dualling Road £26m;
   d. 65 new Council owned affordable homes will be completed or acquired in 2018/19 through the Council’s Affordable Housing building programme, investing £6.7m in 2018/19.
Reserves

38. A summary of earmarked reserves is shown at Appendix G, these have recently been reviewed and £1.4m reallocated in the quarter 2 finance and performance improvement report. The uncommitted general fund reserves are expected to reduce to £9.3m by 2018/19; this takes into account the quarter 2 projected overspend of £3m, potential additional investment required in the Children’s Trust £0.3m and one-off expenditure requirements, e.g. £0.3m for the Tour de Yorkshire. It is also expected that £0.7m will be utilised in 2019/20 to fund the estimated additional cost of the recent Pay Offer (subject to consultation) thereby reducing the reserves to £8.6m. This one-off saving in 2019/20 will be replaced with on-going reductions in the pension deficit budget from 2020/21 onwards.

39. It is estimated that the 153 post reductions, detailed at paragraph 27, could cost circa. £1.5m (based on 30% Voluntary Early Retirement/Voluntary Redundancy post reductions). The anticipated balance of the VER/VR earmarked reserve is £3.5m as at 31st March 2018; therefore it is expected that the balance of £2m will not be required over the period. It is proposed to transfer this balance to the Service Transformation Fund in the quarter 3 Finance and Performance Improvement Report. This will provide some necessary one-off funding required to deliver the on-going savings in the future and increases the current unallocated balance of the Service Transformation Fund from £1m to £3m.

40. A full risk assessment of the Council’s level of reserves is carried out each financial year, when setting the budget and updating the financial plan. This will be presented to Council when Council formally approves the 2018/19 Revenue Budget at its meeting in March 2018.

Council Tax Capping & Referenda

41. Authorities are required to seek approval of their electorate in a referendum if any proposed Council Tax increase exceeds the principles set by Parliament. The Government will confirm the Council Tax Referendum Cap for 2018/19 as part of the provisional Financial Settlement in mid-December 2017 but it is expected to be 5.0% for those authorities that have decided to implement up to the maximum 3.0% adult social care “precept”.

42. Full details of the calculation will be presented as part of the Council Tax setting report to Council in March 2018.

OPTIONS CONSIDERED

43. A menu of options for the savings have been produced and considered over the preceding months.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDED OPTION

44. The budget proposals seek the appropriate balance in meeting the savings whilst still delivering on the key priorities; protecting front-line services where possible in particular children’s social care services.
IMPACT ON THE COUNCIL’S KEY PRIORITIES

45. These are detailed in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We will support a strong economy where businesses can locate, grow and employ local people.</td>
<td>Council budget therefore impacts on all priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mayoral Priority: Creating Jobs and Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mayoral Priority: Be a strong voice for our veterans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mayoral Priority: Protecting Doncaster’s vital services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We will help people to live safe, healthy, active and independent lives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mayoral Priority: Safeguarding our Communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mayoral Priority: Bringing down the cost of living</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We will make Doncaster a better place to live, with cleaner, more sustainable communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mayoral Priority: Creating Jobs and Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mayoral Priority: Safeguarding our Communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mayoral Priority: Bringing down the cost of living</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We will support all families to thrive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mayoral Priority: Protecting Doncaster’s vital services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We will deliver modern value for money services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We will provide strong leadership and governance, working in partnership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS

46. The additional savings proposals outlined in this report are underpinned by the Council’s comprehensive risk management strategy that helps to minimise risk. The Council’s Strategic Risk Register is reviewed and updated on a quarterly basis and each service has formally documented its key risks and the actions taken to mitigate those risks in service plans. Key risks in relation to the 2018/19 budget include:

a. 2017/18 projected overspend position of £3.0m. This includes the projected overspend for the Doncaster Children’s Services Trust; key pressures include Out of Authority placements, 18+ accommodation and CIC transition accommodation.

b. Potential shortfall on the delivery of the savings, which are increasingly more challenging to deliver. In particular, the Adults Transformation Programme which will deliver significant service changes and savings. There is significant pressure on the iBCF allocation in 2018/19 and ongoing as detailed in paragraph 22. In addition, risks surrounding the interrelationship between Council funding and spend on Adult Social Care, taking into account the iBCF 2015 settlement allocation. The iBCF will need careful managing, including reducing on-going cost pressures and delivering alternative proposals to contain costs within the available funding.

c. Risks around the Medium-term Financial Strategy budget assumptions, including:

i. An estimate has been included for price inflation; there is a risk that the actual costs could be greater given the rising inflation (CPI 3.1% for November 2017). Price inflation is only provided for specific contracts and there is a cash freeze assumed for all other non-pay budgets.
ii. An estimate has been included for budget pressures based on experience in previous years; the service pressures will be further developed as we produce the draft budget proposals for the budget meeting in March.

iii. There are a number of one-off grants decreasing or ending over the next 3 years, which require expenditure to reduce or cease completely retrospectively, i.e. iBCF one-off funding.

d. Future budget pressures, e.g. Apprentices – any proposals to increase Apprentice pay to the national minimum wage could have a significant impact, Highways – additional funding may be required post 2021/22 for highways, estimated at circa £0.35m.

e. Council will consider the risk assessment of the level of reserves at its meeting on 5th March 2018.

f. There is a risk that the Council does not deliver the planned level of capital receipts that are required to fund items identified in the capital programme.

g. The 2020/21 budget is outside the current spending review period, the 2020 Government Spending Review will determine the funding available. Therefore there is a risk that the actual funding available may differ to the estimated figures included.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

47. The Council must set a balanced budget ensuring that resources are sufficient to meet its proposed spending plans. The Chief Financial Officer is required to advise the Council of the adequacy of its reserves and the robustness of estimates used in preparing its spending plans.

48. The Local Government Finance Act 1992 places a duty on Local Authorities to set an amount of Council Tax on or before 10th March, in the financial year preceding that for which it is set.

49. The Localism Act 2011 introduced a new Chapter into the Local Government Finance Act 1992, which makes provision for Council tax referendums to be held if an authority increases its Council tax by an amount exceeding principles determined by the Secretary of State.

50. The Council Tax (Demand Notices) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2016 allow Local Authorities to increase Council Tax by 5% (3% on adult social care and 2% on all other expenditure) without the need to hold a referendum on the increase.

51. The Council will need to be satisfied that the budget set will ensure the Authority is able to discharge its statutory duties.

52. Under the general principles of public law, the Council must also act fairly when making budgetary changes or changes to services which potentially involve the reduction or removal of a previously enjoyed benefit. Acting fairly includes consulting fairly with those affected, conscientiously taking into account the results of the consultation and, where appropriate, having due regard to equality impact.

53. Some of the proposals outlined within the budget will affect service users and other individuals, particularly those with protected characteristics within the meaning of the Equality Act 2010. In appropriate cases, the budget may only be implemented by further decision making by either Cabinet or other duly authorised decision taker. That decision will need to be taken in full consideration of the Council’s duties under the Equalities Act 2010 after full consideration of an appropriate due regard statement.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

54. These are contained within the body of the report.

HR IMPLICATIONS

55. The implications of some of the proposals contained within the 2018/19 to 2020/21 Budget are that a number of post reductions will be required to deliver the required efficiencies. Timely and meaningful consultation must take place with affected staff and trade union representatives with appropriate formal notifications. Every effort is made to manage post reductions through vacancies and volunteers and to redeploy at-risk employees into alternative employment, ensuring appropriate support and development mechanisms are made available. However, in some instances when all other avenues have been exhausted, there may be the need to make compulsory redundancies following the statutory procedure.

TECHNOLOGY IMPLICATIONS

56. Technology is as ever an evolving key essential enabler to support the delivery of all services and the key strategic budget themes outlined in this report. Robust and effective ICT governance arrangements will continue to be needed to ensure the delivery of the key priorities. A four year technology plan (2017-21) aligned with the Council’s 4 year Medium Term Financial Forecast has been developed to ensure the resources, expertise and capacity within services is available. This will be monitored and continuously reviewed via the Council’s ICT Governance Board.

57. There will also of course remain the on-going maintenance and support of all current technology as well as upgrades, responses to changes in legislation and continuous service changes and transformation. This includes the further dimension of on-line services, which allow customers to self-serve 24/7 and require constant monitoring, support, continuous development and improvement.

58. The Council’s technical infrastructure providing desktop, internet and system connectivity, landline and mobile phone services to all buildings will also need to be maintained and changed or developed as required. This includes St Leger Homes, Doncaster Children’s Services Trust and many schools. Increased partnership working including integration with health will also mean significant technical developments.

59. Finally, just as significant is ensuring all staff have the required digital skills to successfully embrace all the new and more efficient ways of working required. Therefore, close working between all services and the ICT and Digital Teams will be essential.

EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

60. The Council must consider and have due regard to the three aims of the general equality duty when developing and implementing the Council’s Medium Term Financial Strategy. A due regard statement will be produced for individual proposals as required and an overall summary included in the budget report due to be considered and approved in March 2018.
CONSULTATION

61. Directors and Cabinet have considered the draft budget proposals at several meetings between May and December 2017. Key dates in the budget timetable leading up to Council approving the budget on the 5th March 2018 are detailed below:

- Government’s Autumn Budget – 22nd November, 2017
- Labour Budget Group – 27th November, 2017
- Council – 4 year budget plan – 21st December, 2017
- OSMC consultation – January 2018
- Union consultation – January 2018
- Council – LCTS report – 25th January, 2018
- Cabinet – Council reports – 20th February, 2018
- Council – 5th March, 2018

62. This report has significant implications in terms of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings, Land &amp; Occupiers</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.C.T.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime &amp; Disorder</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights &amp; Equalities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment &amp; Sustainability</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Programme</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Appendix A

### Explanation of Budget Gap 2017/18 to 2020/21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>17/18 £m</th>
<th>18/19 £m</th>
<th>19/20 £m</th>
<th>20/21 £m</th>
<th>17/18 to 20/21 £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline Income:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Retained Business Rates 2% increase in the multiplier £1.0m/£1.0m/£1.0m/£1.0m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Top Up increases per 4-year offer £1.0m/£1.2m/£1.4m and £0.7m for 2020/21 which is outside the offer period</td>
<td>-9.9</td>
<td>-6.0</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
<td>-27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Revenue Support Grant reductions per 4-year offer £11.9m/£8.1m/£8.1m and £8.1m for 2020/21 which is outside the offer period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Grant Reduction:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Housing Benefit &amp; Council Tax Support Admin Subsidy £0.1m/£0.3m/£0.2m/£0.1m</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Education Services Grant £1.8m in 2017/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New Homes Bonus £0.1m/£0.5m/£0.4m/£1.0m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Grant Increase:</strong></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Extended Rights to Free Transport £0.1m in 2017/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved Better Care Fund (iBCF) £1.3m/£5.9m/£5.0m and £2.0m for 2020/21 which is outside the offer period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• S31 grant - Business Rate Inflation Compensation - Top Up £0.5m in 2018/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staffing Budget Pressure:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pay Inflation – estimate based on recent LG circular £0.7m/£1.9m/£1.9m/£1.0m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increments £1.4m/£0.2m/£1.2m/£0.2m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Living Wage Foundation £0.2m/£0.2m/£0.5m/£0.6m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employers Pension - funding required for deficit repayment (£0.9m)/£0.2m/£0.2m/£0.3m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employers Pension - Future Service Contribution Rate (FSR) phased increase to 15.5% in 2019/20 £0.9m/£0.8m/£0.2m</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employers Pension - no longer a deficit position (£8.2m) in 2020/21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employers Pension - increase FSR £3.5m in 2020/21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Auto Enrolment from 01.10.17 £0.2m in 2017/18 and £0.2m in 2018/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prices Changes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adult Social Care Contracts £2.0m/£3.0m/£3.0m/£3.0m</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td>-5.1</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
<td>-20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other inflation £3.3m/£2.5m/£2.1m/£2.0m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Levying Bodies</strong></td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Budget Pressures:</strong></td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>-18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Full details are shown in Appendix C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding Gap</strong></td>
<td>-23.6</td>
<td>-14.9</td>
<td>-14.9</td>
<td>-11.5</td>
<td>-64.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detailed Medium Term Financial Forecast (MTFF)

The medium-term financial forecast for 2017/18 – 2020/21 is provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017/18 £m</th>
<th>2018/19 £m</th>
<th>2019/20 £m</th>
<th>2020/21 £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained Business Rates</td>
<td>4,17</td>
<td>44.057</td>
<td>45.026</td>
<td>46.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Up*</td>
<td>1,17</td>
<td>32.805</td>
<td>34.011</td>
<td>35.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Support Grant*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36.150</td>
<td>28.131</td>
<td>20.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Baseline Income</strong></td>
<td>113.012</td>
<td>107.168</td>
<td>101.451</td>
<td>95.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Grants</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63.688</td>
<td>63.447</td>
<td>65.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Grant</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24.437</td>
<td>23.802</td>
<td>23.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax Income</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.432</td>
<td>100.432</td>
<td>100.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer &amp; Client Receipts</td>
<td>49.023</td>
<td>49.023</td>
<td>49.198</td>
<td>49.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>65.667</td>
<td>65.667</td>
<td>65.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Benefit</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>86.546</td>
<td>86.546</td>
<td>86.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>502.805</td>
<td>496.085</td>
<td>491.506</td>
<td>483.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Council Expenditure Including Public Heath (Funded)</strong></td>
<td>494.136</td>
<td>504.832</td>
<td>496.085</td>
<td>492.211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Changes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017/18 £m</th>
<th>2018/19 £m</th>
<th>2019/20 £m</th>
<th>2020/21 £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in Housing Benefit (nil impact on reductions required)</td>
<td>-7.814</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant decreases exit strategies in place (one-off)</td>
<td>-0.358</td>
<td>-4.946</td>
<td>-2.770</td>
<td>-2.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant decreases exit strategies in place (on-going)</td>
<td>-0.933</td>
<td>-1.474</td>
<td>-0.706</td>
<td>-0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.412</td>
<td>3.546</td>
<td>4.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prices Changes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.310</td>
<td>5.470</td>
<td>5.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levyng Bodies</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure funded from additional income included above</td>
<td>21.620</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Pressures</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.146</td>
<td>5.434</td>
<td>4.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings to be identified</td>
<td>-2.027</td>
<td>-16.897</td>
<td>-14.953</td>
<td>-12.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Budget Proposals</td>
<td>-13.787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Budget</strong></td>
<td>502.805</td>
<td>496.085</td>
<td>491.506</td>
<td>483.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of one-off Uncommitted Reserves</td>
<td>-2.027</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Budget (Total Income plus one-off uncommitted reserves)</strong></td>
<td>504.832</td>
<td>496.085</td>
<td>492.211</td>
<td>483.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Budget Requirement (including Baseline Income)</strong></td>
<td>213.444</td>
<td>207.600</td>
<td>201.883</td>
<td>195.491</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Top-Up Adjusted in 2020/21 by £12m to compensate for nil RSG in this year due to implementation of 100% Business Rates Retention.
Reduction in Government Grants

Central Government Grant Settlements

1. Over the last seven years, public finances have been placed under unprecedented strain due to Government action in response to national and global economic events. This is expected to continue for the foreseeable future. There have been three Spending Review announcements in 2010, 2013 and 2015 covering in total the years 2011/12 – 2019/20 aimed at removing the Government’s budget deficit and bringing the Government’s finances back into surplus. To summarise the position: -

   a. The public spending choice for the Government was essentially about the balance between tax increases and spending cuts; the outcome is heavily slanted towards the latter with Government funding to Councils falling substantially. In the Autumn Statement November 2016, the government remains committed to returning the public finances to balance, however due to the weaker growth outlook and the period of uncertainty, while the UK negotiates a new relationship with the EU the government will no longer seek to reach a fiscal surplus in this Parliament.

   b. In the 2016-17 Finance Settlement Government announced the opportunity for Councils to accept a multi-year settlement offer to 2019/20. As part of the move to a more self-sufficient local government, these multi-year settlements can provide the funding certainty and stability to enable more proactive planning of service delivery and support strategic collaboration with local partners. The Government have said that Councils should also use their multi-year settlements to strengthen financial management and efficiency, including by maximising value in arrangements with suppliers and making strategic use of reserves in the interests of residents. The Council accepted this offer in October 2016.

   c. The Government’s Budget Statement of 16th March 2016 indicated that the Government is planning an additional £3.5billion of efficiency savings from departmental budgets in 2019/20. The Chief Secretary to the Treasury, with the support of the Paymaster General, will lead an efficiency review of all departmental spending which will report in 2018. However the Government made it clear that acceptance of the 4 Year Offer would mean that the Council would not suffer any further cuts to Revenue Support Grant over the period 2016/17 – 2019/20.

2. Prior to the General Election in June 2017, the Government consulted on changes to the local government finance system (including a review of the formula used) to pave the way for the implementation of 100% business rate retention from either 2019/20 or 2020/21. As part of this process Revenue Support Grant will be phased out. In order to do this, the Government proposed new legislation in the Local Government Finance Bill. The Local Government Finance Bill was dropped from the parliamentary timetable ahead of the General Election and it was not reintroduced in the Queen’s Speech and so it will not form part of the Parliamentary timetable for this session.

3. The Government remain committed to local government taking greater control of their income, as outlined in the Conservative Party Manifesto. DCLG are engaging Ministers on the options for future reform without an immediate Bill. Further information will be provided in the March 2018 budget report. At this stage the MTFF does not take account of any devolution proposals.
Retention of Business Rates

4. The Business Rates Retention scheme whereby 50% of local business rates income is retained locally (Doncaster retains 49% and passes on 1% to the South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority) and 50% is passed to Government has been in operation since 2013/14.

5. The local retention of business rates model calculates the difference between each Council’s individual business rate baseline and their calculated baseline funding level and either a top-up or a tariff will be paid to Councils from Government. Doncaster Council will receive top-up funding of £34.011m for 2018/19. The emphasis of these reforms is to move local government funding away from a needs based system to one based on business rates and incentivising growth in the Council Tax Base (through the operation of the New Homes Bonus).

6. Full revaluations are carried out every five years and the last revaluation took place on 1st April 2017. As a revaluation should not affect the total tax raised, if valuations rise nationally then there should be a corresponding fall in the multiplier. As valuations did rise nationally, the multiplier fell in 2017/18 – the small business multiplier is 46.6p (down from 48.0p) and the higher multiplier 47.9p (down from 49.3p). This revaluation led to the revision of tariffs and top-ups. In general terms if the rateable value of businesses in a Council’s area increased relative to the national average, central Government assumptions are that it can raise more income from Business Rates so Government reduced its top-up funding or increased the tariff it must pay. The opposite applies if the rateable value of businesses in a Council’s area reduces relative to the national average. Doncaster’s top-up increased from £27.197m to £32.805m in 2017/18 as a result of the rateable value for our area decreasing.

7. For information, the breakdown of total rateable value of Business Rates by category, based on the 2017 list, is shown in the chart below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rateable Value (£m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Shops</td>
<td>£62.6, 27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Warehouse</td>
<td>£49.4, 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Offices</td>
<td>£16.8, 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Pubs</td>
<td>£8.0, 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Unclassified/Other</td>
<td>£9.6, 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Restaurant</td>
<td>£3.3, 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Garage/Vehicle</td>
<td>£7.0, 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>£12.6, 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>£14.0, 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure</td>
<td>£7.4, 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>£9.2, 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>£33.3, 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure</td>
<td>£7.4, 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rateable Value (£m)</td>
<td>Total RV £233.5m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specific Grants

8. The Council receives a number of specific grants which are non-ring fenced and can be redirected to other areas of service provision as required. It also receives some specific grants that are ring fenced and can only be used for the specific purpose set out in the grant conditions. Specific grants are much fewer than in previous Spending Review periods as Government has rolled in excess of £5 billion of these grants into the baseline income for Business Rates Retention. The largest specific grant is Public Health and this is shown separately in the MTFF. In addition to Public Health, further details of the main specific grants (ring fenced and non-ring fenced) are provided below. The following table details the amounts announced for 2017/18 and the assumptions for 2018/19 - 2020/21:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Issued By</th>
<th>2017/18 £m</th>
<th>2018/19 £m</th>
<th>2019/20 £m</th>
<th>2020/21 £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non Ring-fenced</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Rights to Free Transport</td>
<td>DfE</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Reform &amp; Community Voices</td>
<td>DH</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority Data Sharing</td>
<td>DWP</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Burdens Grant</td>
<td>DWP</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Benefit Initiation (RBI)</td>
<td>DWP</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Credit</td>
<td>DWP</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Social Care Grant</td>
<td>DCLG</td>
<td>1.520</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Homelessness Support Grant</td>
<td>DCLG</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Better Care Fund (iBCF) (March 2015)</td>
<td>DCLG</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>7.176</td>
<td>12.185</td>
<td>14.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Improved Better Care Fund (iBCF) (March 2017)</td>
<td>DCLG</td>
<td>7.046</td>
<td>4.316</td>
<td>2.136</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 31 grants relating to Retained Business Rates</td>
<td>DCLG</td>
<td>3.767</td>
<td>3.767</td>
<td>3.767</td>
<td>3.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troubled Families Grant</td>
<td>DCLG</td>
<td>1.718</td>
<td>1.718</td>
<td>1.718</td>
<td>1.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Issued By</td>
<td>2017/18 £m</td>
<td>2018/19 £m</td>
<td>2019/20 £m</td>
<td>2020/21 £m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ring-fenced</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) - Central Element (Includes Early Years)</td>
<td>DfE</td>
<td>27.351</td>
<td>27.351</td>
<td>27.351</td>
<td>27.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Premium Grant (Children in Care Element)</td>
<td>DfE</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>0.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Education Services Grant</td>
<td>DfE</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEND Implementation Grant</td>
<td>DfE</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying Put Implementation Grant</td>
<td>DfE</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional recurrent Children's Services Trust Costs</td>
<td>DfE</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Services Grant</td>
<td>DfE</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Improvement &amp; Brokerage Grant</td>
<td>DfE</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Fund (Local Sustainable Transport)</td>
<td>DfT</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikeability</td>
<td>DfT</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Service Operator's Grant - Local Authority Bus Subsidy Ring-Fenced (Revenue) Grant</td>
<td>DfT</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care Act Grant (Social Care in Prisons)</td>
<td>DH</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>0.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Housing Payments (DHPs)</td>
<td>DWP</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>0.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Benefit Subsidy Admin Grant</td>
<td>DWP</td>
<td>1.203</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>0.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Living Fund</td>
<td>DWP</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>0.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Private Finance Initiative (PFI) (Schools - fixed for the 25 years duration of PFI scheme)</td>
<td>DCLG</td>
<td>3.478</td>
<td>3.478</td>
<td>3.478</td>
<td>3.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax Support Admin Subsidy</td>
<td>DCLG</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Infrastructure Grant</td>
<td>DERFA</td>
<td>2.385</td>
<td>2.385</td>
<td>2.385</td>
<td>2.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum Seekers (Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children)</td>
<td>HO</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Domestic Violence Advisors (IDVA) Grant</td>
<td>HO</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult and Community Learning from Skills Funding Agency</td>
<td>BIS</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>0.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambition SCR</td>
<td>BIS</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) Payments</td>
<td>BIS</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Electoral Registration</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERDF &amp; ESIF - Launchpad</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERDF &amp; ESIF - SCR Growth Hub</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERDF &amp; ESIF - Technical Assistance</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Lottery Fund</td>
<td>HLF</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Teacher Training (ITT)</td>
<td>NCTL</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>0.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Justice Board</td>
<td>YJB</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>0.504</td>
<td>0.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Specific Grants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>63.688</td>
<td>63.447</td>
<td>65.029</td>
<td>63.769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. The final Financial Settlement for 2018/19 (expected February 2018) and subsequent grant announcements may result in additional cuts to specific grants over and above those previously identified; where this is the case it is assumed that the activities will cease and the Council will no longer incur expenditure in these areas, i.e. there will be exit strategies for all grant reductions. Exit strategies are required for the following grant reductions and therefore these are not included in the budget gap, further details are provided at Appendix E:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Issued By</th>
<th>Exit strategy 2017/18</th>
<th>Exit strategy 2018/19</th>
<th>Exit strategy 2019/20</th>
<th>Exit strategy 2020/21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>One-off</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Social Care Grant</td>
<td>DCLG</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Homelessness Support Grant</td>
<td>DCLG</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Improved Better Care Fund (iBCF) (March 2017 announcement)</td>
<td>DCLG</td>
<td>-2.730</td>
<td>-2.180</td>
<td>-2.136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 31 grant - Business Rate Inflation Compensation - Top Up</td>
<td>DCLG</td>
<td>-0.493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambition SCR</td>
<td>BIS</td>
<td>-0.358</td>
<td>-0.163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERDF &amp; ESIF - Launchpad</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERDF &amp; ESIF - SCR Growth Hub</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERDF &amp; ESIF - Technical Assistance</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-going</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) - Central Element (Includes Early Years)</td>
<td>DfE</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Education Services Grant</td>
<td>DfE</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEND Implementation Grant</td>
<td>DfE</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional recurrent Children's Services Trust Costs</td>
<td>DfE</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikeability</td>
<td>DfT</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access To Work</td>
<td>DWP</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Living Fund</td>
<td>DWP</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Made Easy (City Deal) from Skills Funding Agency</td>
<td>BIS</td>
<td>-0.115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Justice Board</td>
<td>YJB</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Health Grant</strong></td>
<td>DH</td>
<td>-0.618</td>
<td>-0.635</td>
<td>-0.619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Exit Strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.291</td>
<td>-6.420</td>
<td>-3.476</td>
<td>-2.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 year Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>-13.395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Further information on other significant specific grants is provided below:

a. Improved Better Care Fund (iBCF) – the Government is providing £1.5 billion additional funding for local authorities to spend on adult social care by 2019/20, to be included in an iBCF. The Government has said that it recognises that authorities have varying capacity to raise council tax. The additional funding for the iBCF will be allocated through a separate grant to local government, using a methodology which provides greater funding to those authorities which benefit less from the additional council tax flexibility for social care. This additional funding commenced in 2017/18, and is subject to grant conditions. This is separate to the Better Care Fund currently received which is shown under other income below.
b. New Homes Bonus (NHB) is a grant that was paid for 6 years by Government based on the amount of extra Council Tax revenue raised for new-build homes, conversions and long-term empty homes brought back into use. There is also an extra payment for providing affordable homes. NHB is funded by reducing the baseline funding available for Councils and as a consequence Doncaster is worse off because the amount deducted is significantly more than the grant received.

i. In December 2015 the Government issued a Consultation Paper ‘New Homes Bonus: Sharpening the Incentive’ with the purpose of cutting the amount of grant it has to pay out as NHB. The Government response to the consultation was contained in the Provisional Settlement announcement on 15th December 2016. It reduced the number of years for which NHB is paid from the current 6 years to 5 for 2017/18 and 4 for 2018/19 onwards and introduced a national baseline for housing growth of 0.4% which has to be exceeded before any NHB becomes available.

ii. The NHB for the Council is estimated at £4.448m for 2018/19, which is £0.498m less compared to 2017/18, mainly due to the reduction in years from 5 to 4 and the 0.4% baseline.

iii. The net grant loss is significant at £24.493m. The position is reasonably comparable with other Metropolitan Districts who also fare badly from the redistribution of grant funding, due to the relatively high levels of grant funding received and high levels of deprivation. The DCLG led evaluation of the NHB published in December 2014 concluded that the most negative impacts of the NHB were seen in authorities in the north of England and Yorkshire and the Humber. The NHB is therefore being utilised to assist with the loss in grant. Housing growth is being progressed utilising alternative funding streams. The updated estimated grant figures are set out in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NHB Estimate (Housing Growth) £k</th>
<th>NHB Estimate (Reimbursement Grant) £k</th>
<th>Total Grant Receipt £k</th>
<th>Grant Reduction £k</th>
<th>Net Grant Loss £k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>1,412</td>
<td>1,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>3,054</td>
<td>2,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>1,879</td>
<td>5,312</td>
<td>3,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>2,658</td>
<td>6,729</td>
<td>4,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>3,478</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>3,702</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>4,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>5,051</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>5,211</td>
<td>10,518</td>
<td>5,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>4,946</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>5,119</td>
<td>8,868</td>
<td>3,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>4,448</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>4,448</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22,998</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>24,348</td>
<td>44,393</td>
<td>24,493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) funds the schools budget (funding for schools and services that are provided centrally to pupils, early years and high needs budgets). Further information on the estimated 2018/19 Block allocations including Academies will be provided in the March 2018 budget report.

d. PFI Schools - the Council entered into a PFI agreement with Government to rebuild Mexborough and Thomas Wharton Secondary Schools. The rebuilds were completed during 2008/09 and the Government will pay an annual grant of £3.478m for 25 years towards costs incurred, the final payment will be made in 2033/34.
Public Health

11. The Health and Social Care Act 2012 provided the statutory basis for Local Authorities to assume their new Public Health responsibilities from 2013/14. From this date the majority of Public Health functions transferred to the Council although some specialist elements of Public Health such as children’s services 0-5, cancer screening etc. were retained by the NHS. Children’s Public Health commissioning responsibilities for 0-5 year olds transferred from NHS England to Local Authorities on 1st October 2015 and this joins up that already done by Local Authorities for children & young people 5-19.

12. The ring fence on public health spending will be maintained in 2018/19 and Government will consult on options to fully fund local authorities’ public health spending from their retained business rates receipts, as part of the move towards 100 per cent business rate retention. For 2018/19 the Council will have a reduction in the Public Health Grant of £0.635m.

The Collection Fund

13. All Council Tax receipts and Business Rates receipts are paid into and separately accounted for in the Collection Fund. Any surplus or deficit must be shared amongst the preceptors and utilised in budget setting in the following financial year. For Council Tax the preceptors are Doncaster Council, South Yorkshire Police Authority and South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority. For Business Rates the preceptors are Doncaster Council, Central Government and South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority.

Council Tax

14. A breakdown of the 2017/18 Council Tax income and assumptions are provided below. This is the 2018/19 baseline starting position: -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax (Band D)</td>
<td>£1,237.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band D Equivalent Properties</td>
<td>79,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax Income</td>
<td>£97.905m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection Fund (Council Tax) Surplus</td>
<td>£2.527m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Council Tax Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>£100.432m</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. The assumed collection rate for Council Tax in 2017/18 is 98% - this was increased from 97% in 2016/17. Although the short term collection rate, e.g. the amount of 2016/17 debt collected in 2016/17, is around 95%, the long term collection rate, e.g. the amount of 2016/17 debt collected in 2017/18 and subsequent years, is around 99%.

16. All changes to Council Tax, including setting the collection rate, are policy decisions and are therefore detailed in the budget savings at Appendix D.

Business Rates

17. The MTFF assumes an increase of 2% per annum in the multiplier which is built into the Retained Business Rates and Top Up lines. Although the multiplier is based on the Retail Price Index (RPI) for September, which for September 2017 was 4.0%, the Chancellor has previously capped any increase at 2%.

18. The net Retained Business Rates income is reduced for losses on collection and losses due to appeals of approximately 1.5% and 2% respectively.

19. Any changes announced by the Chancellor that affect Retained Business Rates are accompanied by a section 31 grant to compensate Councils for any loss of income – these are shown in the Specific Grants section.

20. All other changes to Retained Business Rates, including setting the loss on collection, loss on appeals and growth, are policy decisions and are therefore detailed in the budget savings at Appendix D.
Other Income

21. Other income includes Continuing Health Care Contributions and Section 256 and Section 75 Agreements with the NHS, income from Other Local Authorities as well as income from charges made to Schools (including Academies), Housing Revenue Account, St Leger Homes and Children’s Services Trust.

22. A significant Section 75 agreement is the Better Care Fund; this is where the Council has entered into a pooled budget arrangement with Doncaster Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) for the provision of integrated health and social care services for people in the Doncaster area. The Council and the CCG have an annual agreement in place for funding these services, with partners contributing funds to the agreed budget in line with funding allocations, taking responsibility for its own deficit or surplus. Further information will be provided in the March 2018 budget report.

23. The following table sets out the Other Income for 2017/18. This is the 2018/19 baseline starting position:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>2018/19 £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External Recharge Income – includes charges to Schools including Academies (including for the Schools PFI), to the Capital Programme, to the Housing Revenue Account, to St Leger Homes and to the Children’s Services Trust</td>
<td>30.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS Contributions – includes income from Continuing Health Care Contributions and Section 256 and Section 75 Agreements with NHS (Better Care Fund &amp; Pooled Budgets)</td>
<td>13.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading Services Income</td>
<td>15.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions from Other Public Bodies - includes contributions from Rotherham MBC in respect of Waste PFI credits and the Coroners Service, contributions from the Home Office for Prison Libraries, from the Police &amp; Crime Commissioner for Community Safety and recoupment from Other Local Authorities where their children are placed in Doncaster Council maintained schools</td>
<td>1.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions Towards Expenditure – includes service charges and various cost recovery charges including recovery of Court costs by Local Taxation Services</td>
<td>2.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Interest</td>
<td>0.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contributions - S106 &amp; S38 agreements</td>
<td>0.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributions - includes external income from alarm monitoring for housing associations and from energy companies in relation to feed in tariffs for solar panels</td>
<td>0.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>65.667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Housing Benefit

24. The 2017/18 estimated cost of £86.546m for Housing Benefit was based on an assumed 12,800 caseload for tenants in public sector accommodation and on an assumed 11,000 caseload for tenants in the private sector. At this stage, the estimates for the 2018/19 estimated cost is the same as 2017/18. Further information will be provided in the March 2018 budget report.
Staffing

Pay

25. Funding has been set aside to respond to the recent local government circular on a national pay award. It is estimated that pay will increase by over 5% over the next 2 years and that increments will be paid every other year for all staff except social workers who will continue to receive increments annually.

26. The Living Wage Foundation is based on the rate announced every November. The rate for November 2017 which becomes effective for 2018/19 is £8.75 per hour. It is assumed this will rise by around 3.9% per annum thereafter.

Pension

27. The assumptions on the pension contributions detailed below include the future service rate increasing to 14.9% for the period 2017/18 to 2019/20. The council has planned to phase in this increase over 3 years: 14.0% in 2017/18, 15.2% in 2018/19 and 15.5% in 2019/20 (an average of 14.9% per annum).

28. The actuarial valuation used for the period 2017/18 – 2019/20 showed Doncaster’s Pension Fund deficit as £160m. The Pension deficit payment is based on the key membership analysis and recovering the £160m deficit over the next 18 years from 2018/19. The deficit figures include allowance for short term pay growth of 1.25% per annum for 4 years up to 2019/20.

29. The latest information from the actuary now shows that Doncaster’s Pension Fund is no longer in deficit and has moved into surplus. Work is on-going to safeguard the surplus until the next valuation period; therefore the MTFF assumes that the pension deficit budget can be reduced from 2020/21.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing</th>
<th>2017/18 £’m</th>
<th>2018/19 £’m</th>
<th>2019/20 £’m</th>
<th>2020/21 £’m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay Inflation – estimate based on the current national Pay Offer (subject to consultation)</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>1.868</td>
<td>1.931</td>
<td>1.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increments</td>
<td>1.350</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>1.191</td>
<td>0.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Wage Foundation</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>0.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employers Pension Contribution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers Pension deficit saving phased</td>
<td>-0.920</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Service Rate Contribution Rate (to 15.5% in 2019/20)</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Pension deficit budget for estimated position with protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-5.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Service Rate Contribution Rate (1% increase from 2020/21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Enrolment (from 01.10.17)</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2.412</td>
<td>3.546</td>
<td>4.059</td>
<td>-2.470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Price Inflation

30. The Government’s Summer Budget of 8th July 2015, by introducing a National Living Wage for those aged 25 and over of £7.20 from 1st April 2016 with the expectation that it will rise to £9.35 from 1st April 2020, has had a very significant impact on the costs of Adult Social Care contracts. The estimated cost increases for 2018/19 are based on the announcement in the 2017 autumn statement that the rate will be £7.83 from 1st April 2018.
31. A proportion of Council expenditure is tied up in contracts, which have inflation increase assumptions built into the terms and conditions, e.g. Adult Social Care, Doncaster Children’s Services Trust, Highways and Waste Contracts. The financial strategy assumes that these cost increases will need to be built into future projections in full. There are also a small number of areas of general expenditure on services and goods, where a general inflation factor has been estimated, based upon what is known of the market pressures and various indicators of inflation such as RPI projections, for example repairs and maintenance of buildings.

32. Dependent on the contract, inflationary increases are generally based on either the Consumer Price Index (CPI), Retail Price Index (RPI) or Retail Price Index excluding mortgage interest payments (RPIX). The table below shows an annual comparison of the different indices and various months that are commonly used in contracts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CPI</th>
<th>RPI</th>
<th>RPIX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2017</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2016</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2017 estimate</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2018 estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. The cost of price inflation for 2017/18 was £3.748m, including £1.965m for Adult Social Care contracts. The various inflation indicators shown in the table above have nearly doubled since last year. It is assumed that £3.000m will be needed in 2018/19 for Adult Social Care contracts and a further £2.008m needed for other inflation. This would only leave £0.462m to cover any unforeseen items/changes in 2018/19. Further information will be provided in the December 2017 budget report.

Services and Other Budget Pressures

Levying Bodies

34. For 2018/19 it is assumed that an additional £0.100m will be required for increases in drainage levies charged by the Environment Agency and Drainage Boards.

Budget Pressures

35. The service pressures are estimated at £5.434m for 2018/19 and £13.449m for the period 2018/19 to 2020/21; these are detailed at Appendix C. All service pressures are robustly challenged to ensure that they are absolutely necessary for on-going delivery of Council services.
## Draft Budget Proposals 2018/19 to 2020/21 - Detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017/18 Pressure</td>
<td>AH&amp;Wb</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>The Council is facing pressures on its services as a result of an ageing population and a greater demand from working age adults (mainly physical disabilities). Based on local population forecast data it is estimated that this increased demand will cost circa. £0.4m per annum. For 18/19 This includes £208K for Older People, £162K for Working Age Residential and £35k for Home Care and Direct Payments. Doncaster’s population aged over 65 is expected to grow by almost 7% between 2017 and 2021 from 57,900 to 61,700. In addition to this it is anticipated that the number of 18-64 people supported by the council will increase by at least 12 over the same period.</td>
<td>-0.395 0.446 0.405 0.441 0.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18 Pressure</td>
<td>AH&amp;Wb</td>
<td>Direct Payments</td>
<td>Client numbers with Direct Payments have increased from 610 in April 17 to 766 in September 17, and Direct Payments are expected to continue to grow by roughly 1-2 per week ongoing. Growth of £309k in 18/19 would fund 37 clients at the current average cost of £8.3k. Direct Payments offer individuals a wider range of choice, and will be offered to service users early in the customer journey. It will be a better option then Day Service, Home Care and Supported Living for many service users. Gross exp £10.5m, gross inc £3.6, net £6.9m</td>
<td>0.220 0.309 0.461 0.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18 Pressure</td>
<td>AH&amp;Wb</td>
<td>Supported Living</td>
<td>The Council is working with the market to invest in new Supported Living options (e.g. Extra Care, Shared Lives, Short Stay). This will support the shift out of residential care and help delivery of the Working Age Residential Care saving. This investment will not be incurred until the savings in Supported Living and Working Age Residential have been clearly specified. £1.183m equates to 72,000 hours and 2,390 sleep-ins or roughly 25 service users.</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18 Pressure</td>
<td>AH&amp;Wb</td>
<td>Transitions</td>
<td>The investment of £265k pa is planned to support young people transitioning from children’s services into adults services. For 2017/18 4 children have transitioned/are transitioning to Adults. One is now fully funded by CCG and the full year cost for the other 3 is c. £460k. Best interest guidelines are being followed alongside consideration of the most cost efficient placement. In 2018/19 a further 4 children are expected to transition currently costing the Council £661k. We will be working with the individuals and their families to develop appropriate support packages which provide the necessary support and maximises their independence. There is a risk that the £265k growth will not be sufficient and this will be monitored closely.</td>
<td>0.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19 Pressure</td>
<td>Council-Wide</td>
<td>Data Protection Lead Officers</td>
<td>The new General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) is due to take effect from 25 May 2018 and will introduce significant changes to the current data protection rules in the Data Protection Act 1998 which the Council must comply with. The Council is proposing to recruit four permanent Data Protection Lead Officers (F&amp;CS, AHWB, L&amp;O and R&amp;E) to assist the one Council Data Protection Officer and other members of the working group already established to implement the changes across the Council, ensure DCST, SLHD and relevant Schools also meet their duties as key partners and to also maintain these arrangements successfully thereafter.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19 Pressure</td>
<td>Council-Wide</td>
<td>Medical Examiners</td>
<td>Appointment of Medical Examiners by Local Authorities for implementation of medical certificates of cause of death reforms from April 2019. It is anticipated that this additional cost will be funded from a new grant in 2019/20, this is included in the medium-term financial plan (MTFP).</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18 Pressure</td>
<td>Council-Wide</td>
<td>Other Service Pressures</td>
<td>£2m provided general service pressures each year - 2018/19 figure adjusted for some specific pressures identified (AHWb pressures additional).</td>
<td>0.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19 Pressure</td>
<td>Council-Wide</td>
<td>Treasury Management</td>
<td>Additional funding required for increased treasury management costs resulting from additional borrowing for the capital programme.</td>
<td>-2.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18 Pressure</td>
<td>LOCYP</td>
<td>Additional Aiming High / Short Breaks</td>
<td>Aiming High/Short Break placements/activity - continuing pressures on this budget. Short Breaks Task Group is currently reviewing this area and financial modelling across next 5 years indicates return to a balanced budget by 2019/20. The financial modelling carried out by the Short Breaks task group indicates all the growth budget is required in 2018/19 to balance the budget, and that in 2019/20 growth budget of £59k is required.</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19 Pressure</td>
<td>LOCYP</td>
<td>LO-CYP: Education Services Grant</td>
<td>The Education Service Grant (ESG) was cut from April 2017, with savings to LOCYP required of £1.36m from 2017/18, in addition to those already identified under phase 2 of LOCYP: restructure savings required from 2018/19. Through the LOCYP management review £0.55m savings were identified, through changes to school improvement, from April 2017. The remaining ESG cut of £813k was allocated to LOCYP as an unallocated cut for 2017/18, partly offset by transitional grant for April-August 2017. Whilst the functional review is currently anticipated to be able to meet the remaining restructure savings targets and Early Help cut of £170k, the achievement of the additional ESG cut is not expected to be possible in full due to the level of cuts required and the cuts already made in 17/18 through the Management and Early Help restructures. The allocation of £500k will reduce the saving required for LOCYP to £313k, from 2018/19, which the service will review further and anticipate potential savings could be realised through remodelled business support, additional digital savings and directorate efficiencies which will need to be identified for 2018/19.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19 Pressure</td>
<td>LOCYP</td>
<td>Remove Early Help savings duplicated</td>
<td>Early help saving duplicated with the Children’s Trust saving - reduce previous years saving. The remaining Early Help cut of £370k is funded from Service Transformation Fund (STF) in 2017/18. The saving is to be reduced by £200k in 2018/19, as duplicated with Children’s Trust saving, and the balance of £170k is expected to be achieved via LOCYP’s functional review.</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Draft Budget Proposals 2018/19 to 2020/21 - Detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018/19 Saving</td>
<td>AH&amp;Wb</td>
<td>Admin and business support (AHWb)</td>
<td>Savings are planned to be achieved by streamlining and automating directorate administration. The saving of £342k equates to a reduction of 15 posts. The full savings are not possible until the planned changes in the Customer Journey and Community Led Support ways of working are fully implemented. We estimate c. 8 posts will be reduced. £171k from iBCF will be used to manage the delivery of this target over the next two years. Present net budget £690k (approx. 33 posts)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.342</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.342</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19 Saving</td>
<td>AH&amp;Wb</td>
<td>Community Safety</td>
<td>The Community Safety service will explore internal savings at a local level to deliver this proposal from all areas of the budget, including a blend of post reductions and exploration of commercial and external funding opportunities with the Alarm Receiving Centre, which is now on a footing to provide CCTV and alarm monitoring. The Council will continue to explore possible alternative shared service options with other local authorities and the Police. An Options Appraisal will be undertaken. The reduction to grants set out in Appendix G includes a £20k reduction in 2018/19 to the Doncaster Rape and Sexual Abuse Counselling Service (DRASACs) as a result of them now receiving direct funding from the Police and Crime Commissioner (further details in Appendix G). Present net budget: £800k.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>-0.172</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.192</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposal Narrative - 2017/18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017/18 Saving</td>
<td>AH&amp;Wb</td>
<td>Customer Journey</td>
<td>Increased use of information advice &amp; guidance and a redesigned community model that helps individuals to find new and better ways to meet their needs will reduce the number of individuals requiring social care services. Improvements that make better use of technology, that streamline, automate and focus our work will also make it possible to undertake our business with fewer staff resources. Savings of £1.076m, equating to 31 posts (13% of establishment) are planned to be achieved by changing the way we work. These staff savings can only be achieved when the new Customer Journey and Community Led Support ways of working are fully implemented. A more modest target of £200k (6 posts) is planned for 18/19, with the biggest reduction of £715k (21 posts), planned for 2019/20. Present net budget: £8.1m (staffing 235 FTEs)</td>
<td>-0.469</td>
<td>-0.200</td>
<td>-0.715</td>
<td>-0.161</td>
<td>-1.076</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18 Saving</td>
<td>AH&amp;Wb</td>
<td>Day Opportunities</td>
<td>The service is being modernised to give service users better choice and control, to give them the option for individualised and more meaningful activities closer to where they live and access to employment. Most day opportunity users will be expected to take a direct payment (separate investment money set aside) to pay for a wider range of activities tailored to their individual needs. If service users choose to take up these opportunities, closer to where they live, the current Council’s staff costs and transport costs will reduce. Total savings of £809k (£566k staffing / £243k transport) are planned to be achieved by the promotion of new Day Opportunities. The savings for the first year are £328k (£230k staffing / £98k transport). The Day Opportunities programme is already underway. The savings are spread evenly over the planned period. Present gross exp £2.9m, gross inc £0.5m, net £2.4m. (staffing 95 FTEs)</td>
<td>-0.253</td>
<td>-0.328</td>
<td>-0.336</td>
<td>-0.145</td>
<td>-0.809</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18 Saving</td>
<td>AH&amp;Wb Home Care</td>
<td>New ways of working across the social care service will make savings in home care costs possible. Customers will be encouraged to make best use of assistive technology, and people will be encouraged to source their own support through, for example, the Information, Advice and Guidance resource called Your Life Doncaster. More people will be helped to stay independent for longer by increasing the focus on rehabilitation and reablement. All these initiatives will reduce the demand for care hours, providing a saving for customers as well as the Council. Since the beginning of 2017/18 the number of packages paid for directly by the council have reduced from 1,277 per week to 1,057 per week @ August 17. This is mainly due to service users moving to direct payments as part of the new CCaSH arrangements. This was a planned outcome and additional budget has been set aside (see below) to cover the transfer of costs from homecare budgets to direct payment budgets. In addition to the transfer of costs to direct payments, work has also been undertaken to review the care plans of around 400 individuals. This is likely to have reduced homecare costs but the revised packages of care are still being agreed and costed so finalised figures are not yet available. The gross home care reduction over in 2018/19 is £0.588m, which equates to a reduction of 64 clients (approximately 39,600 hours). It is unlikely that this can be achieved in full by the end of 2018/19, so £0.3m iBCF home care funding has been allocated in 2018/19. Gross exp £10m, gross inc £3.4m, net £6.6m.</td>
<td>-0.724</td>
<td>-0.588</td>
<td>-0.490</td>
<td>-0.386</td>
<td>-1.464</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19 Saving</td>
<td>AH&amp;Wb</td>
<td>Housing related support services</td>
<td>The council and relevant partners are reviewing (discretionary) housing related support services with a view to the transition of current service users to more appropriate forms of support. There are currently 12 related contracts covering 58 units and 610 packages of support (including floating support and hostels) that mainly relate to mental health, children, homelessness and learning disabilities. The saving of £1.438m, spread over 2 years, represents 55% of the current net budget of £2.6m. The plan is to work towards the following notional targets over the 2 years based on spend levels: Children &amp; Young People (4 contracts) £0.388m, Complex Lives (3 contracts) £0.661m, Mental Health (3 contracts) £0.300m, Learning Disability (1 contract) £0.063m, Domestic Abuse Support (1 contract) £0.026m, Total £1.438m. This area of work originated with historical Supporting People arrangements (plus other minor areas) and many of the contracts are considered to be quite traditional in approach. More efficient or entirely new ways of working are being investigated for the benefit of the people concerned in addition to releasing savings. The AHWB directorate is working with colleagues in other parts of the council and with wider Doncaster partners, to make sure that the risks to individuals are minimised and that where necessary suitable alternatives are available for the people concerned. Present gross exp £3.7m, gross inc £1.1m, net £2.6m.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.719</td>
<td>-0.719</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-1.438</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18 Saving</td>
<td>AH&amp;Wb</td>
<td>Leisure Trust</td>
<td>This proposal is linked to the Get Doncaster moving, where we want more people to be physically active not only through organised sport but making healthy choices in everyday activities such as active travel. There will be more capital investment for leisure, which will assist DCLT to deliver the general revenue efficiencies from 2019/20 and therefore reduce revenue subsidy for taxpayer.</td>
<td>-0.250</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.250</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.250</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Considerable progress has already been made over the last 2 years in enabling older people to remain independent in their own homes, resulting in fewer people needing residential care. We began 17/18 with 850 DMBC funded clients and the aim was to reduce to 798 by March 18 (52 less), but based on quarter 2 figures we are now forecasting 64 less by the year end, i.e. DMBC client numbers reduce to 786.

To deliver the savings in 2018/19 a further net reduction of approximately 36 places is required. This will deliver £327k of savings with staggered reductions over the course of 2018/19, which equates to £654k in a full year. This plus the additional £208k funding highlighted for demographics (see below) will deliver the required £862k in a full year. However, due to the gradual reductions expected in 2018/19 iBCF funding will be required to cover the £327k gap next year.

The total savings of £1.975m planned between 2018/19 and 2020/21 equate to 14% of the net budget.

Present gross exp £28.6m, gross inc £14.6m, net £14.0m

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017/18 Saving</td>
<td>AH&amp;Wb</td>
<td>Residential Care - Older People</td>
<td>Considerable progress has already been made over the last 2 years in enabling older people to remain independent in their own homes, resulting in fewer people needing residential care. We began 17/18 with 850 DMBC funded clients and the aim was to reduce to 798 by March 18 (52 less), but based on quarter 2 figures we are now forecasting 64 less by the year end, i.e. DMBC client numbers reduce to 786. To deliver the savings in 2018/19 a further net reduction of approximately 36 places is required. This will deliver £327k of savings with staggered reductions over the course of 2018/19, which equates to £654k in a full year. This plus the additional £208k funding highlighted for demographics (see below) will deliver the required £862k in a full year. However, due to the gradual reductions expected in 2018/19 iBCF funding will be required to cover the £327k gap next year. The total savings of £1.975m planned between 2018/19 and 2020/21 equate to 14% of the net budget. Present gross exp £28.6m, gross inc £14.6m, net £14.0m</td>
<td>-1.418</td>
<td>-0.862</td>
<td>-0.611</td>
<td>-0.502</td>
<td>-1.975</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2017/18 Saving

AH&Wb Residential Care - Working Age

The saving can be achieved through the transition of people from residential settings into more appropriate, more independent support options, including supported living, extra care and shared lives. This change would be beneficial for the individuals concerned and result in more efficient personalised services.

We have reviewed the majority of clients, and evidence indicates that there are 72 people who would be better served by such alternative provisions. To achieve £3.211m we need to reduce the current 193 client base by 72 individuals, at an average cost of £44,500.

In 18/19 we are planning to achieve savings of £400k; which equates to 9 clients in total. However because not all theses individuals will move at the start of the financial year, we will need to support approximately 15-20 people to move on to alternative provisions in 18/19 to achieve these savings.

There is £2.8m investment available in Supported Living, including £1.2m next year, to fund alternative provisions.

There is also money available for demographic changes (£162k) and transitions from childrens services (£265k) to fund the rising demand for Working Age Residential and Supported Living services.

The investment in Supported Living will only be incurred when there is confidence that the residential reductions can be achieved.

Present gross exp £10m, gross inc £0.8m, net £9.2m

2018/19 Saving

AH&Wb Stronger Communities

The saving is planned for 2020/21 and relates to Council staff reductions enabled by an alignment of teams to the community led support model and enablement agenda, leading to productivity improvements.

The saving of £200k is 9% of the net budget and equates to a reduction of approximately 7 FTEs.

Present gross exp £2.99m, gross inc £0.75m, net £2.24m
### Proposal Narrative - 2018/19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Service/ Saving Proposal</th>
<th>Proposal Narrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018/19 Saving</td>
<td>AH&amp;Wb</td>
<td>Supported Living</td>
<td>The ambition is to help individuals to live more independently in communities and therefore require less traditional social care, including fewer care hours. Existing service users will also be encouraged to move to individual budgets e.g. Direct Payment (DP), Individual Service Fund (ISF) etc. to support increased choice and control. The Supported Living service is largely delivered through 4 Contracts (Living Ambitions, Lifeways, St Anne’s and Mencap) which are due to be re-let on the 1st of September 2018. This is an opportunity to move away from the conventional methods of support, and promote the strengths based approach (including support options such as extra care, shared lives and short stay). The Council will also look for efficiency savings in this area and examine alternative ways of delivering the in-house provision. A saving of £1.761m (12% of net budget) is planned by giving the current 295 users of the service greater independence and choice and control over the support they receive. The saving planned for 2018/19 is £900k. Any shortfall on these savings will be off-set by a reduction in the £1.2k investment planned for Supported Living in 2018/19. Forecast spend for 2018/19 is £14.2m, funding approximately 295 clients. Average cost per client is c. £48k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19 Saving</td>
<td>Children’s Trust</td>
<td>Children’s Trust</td>
<td>The Children’s Trust have put forward a range of savings to achieve the overall £4.5m target and these have been reviewed by Council officers. They represent a package of options that should not reduce the quality of services offered. The Children’s Trust is a separate company and it is their decision and responsibility to make the savings necessary to meet the agreed contract price and it is not the Council’s decision as to what these savings initiatives are. The main changes relate to changes in the care ladder to try to ensure that a slightly larger proportion of children are not at the high cost end of the care ladder. There are also a number of business support efficiencies, reduced use of agency staff and some restructuring of services. The Children’s Trust did not adopt terms and conditions changes when the council did and is considering its options, as it has to, in light of the proposed national pay award. The Children’s Trust is also in the process of implementing the changes to guardianship and responsibility order payments arrangements previously agreed with the Council and this will contribute to the savings target in 2018/19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19 Saving</td>
<td>Council-Wide</td>
<td>Business Rates earmarked reserve</td>
<td>A reserve was created due to the risks around the volatility of Business Rates income mainly due to the impact of the revaluation and appeals. This has now stabilised and therefore it is possible to release the reserve over 4 years. The current balance is £2.8m therefore this will provide a £0.7m saving over 4 years (2018/19 to 2021/22), with the final year being outside this medium-term financial plan. An alternative on-going saving will need to be identified for 2022/23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18 Saving</td>
<td>Council-Wide</td>
<td>Business Rates Income</td>
<td>Business rates growth - 2% per annum increase in multiplier already included in the 1st March 2016 Council approved MTFF. Additional growth has been identified for future years based on known and expected developments, e.g for 2018/19 new build at the Iport, several new supermarkets across the borough and new developments at Quora Retail Park Thorne (two retail units, hotel and fast-food unit). An additional £1m growth in 2020/21 generated by the additional Business Rate Incentive one-off funding. The Fellowes unit at the I-port is part of the incentive scheme and is now generating business rates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposal Narrative - 2017/18

#### Council-Wide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council-Wide</strong></td>
<td><strong>Commissioning</strong></td>
<td>The commissioning of services from external organisations, by the Council and health partners, will be brought together. As we move towards the full integration of health and social care services in the future. This is expected to deliver efficiencies as we reduce duplication and do more joint commissioning.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council-Wide</strong></td>
<td><strong>Council Tax</strong> 1.99% Increase</td>
<td>Council Tax increase 1.99% a year (Doncaster Council's charge for a Band A property estimated at £96.04 - an increase of £19.43)</td>
<td>-1.880</td>
<td>-1.967</td>
<td>-2.061</td>
<td>-2.161</td>
<td>-6.189</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council-Wide</strong></td>
<td><strong>Council Tax Base Growth</strong></td>
<td>Council Tax base growth - estimate based on additional net (i.e. new properties less demolitions) 750 band D equivalent properties per annum (e.g. 1,125 band A properties are equivalent to 750 band D properties). This will be reviewed as part of the Council Tax Base calculation for 2018/19 - this should be available w/c 15th Dec.</td>
<td>-0.859</td>
<td>-0.788</td>
<td>-0.819</td>
<td>-0.852</td>
<td>-2.459</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council-Wide</strong></td>
<td><strong>Council Tax Collection Fund</strong></td>
<td>Collection Rate loss on collection reduced from 3% to 2% in 2017/18 and remaining at 2% for future years. Collection Fund surplus - increase in distribution of the Council's share of the accumulated surplus in the Collection Fund from £2.527m to £2.855m in 2018/19. As the accumulated surplus is one-off, the amount taken out from 2019/20 onwards needs to be managed down to a sustainable level. Pressure in 2018/19 to fund proposed new scheme for council tax discounts/exemptions for care leavers up to age 25 estimated at £120k.</td>
<td>-0.666</td>
<td>-0.208</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council-Wide</strong></td>
<td><strong>Council-wide - Reduce Senior Management</strong></td>
<td>Considerable savings have been delivered from 2015/16 to 2017/18 of £0.7m; these savings have been front loaded. Overall senior management numbers have reduced by 7 posts over this period to 54 in 2017/18, this is a reduction of 13%. Leadership posts are currently 1% of overall staff numbers. These savings are on top of earlier savings and reductions in posts from 2011 - 2015 of 33%. The 2019/20 saving will be achieved by reducing the number of Senior Management posts across the Council following reviews of activity and reshaping of services.</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council-Wide</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fees &amp; Charges</strong></td>
<td>General fees and charges increases - the overall policy for 2018/19 is to increase the charges by RPI (3.9% for September 2017) with some higher charges to ensure the Council is not subsidising the charges.</td>
<td>-0.243</td>
<td>-0.350</td>
<td>-0.350</td>
<td>-0.350</td>
<td>-1.050</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council-Wide</strong></td>
<td><strong>General Fund Contingency</strong></td>
<td>The funding was set aside for inflation in previous years, this is now factored into the budget plan. Therefore the funding can be released over the next 3 years.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.427</td>
<td>-0.099</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>-0.622</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18 Saving</td>
<td>Council-Wide</td>
<td>Government’s 2% Social Care “precept”</td>
<td>Estimate for the Government’s 2% Social Care “precept” for next 3 years.</td>
<td>-1.889</td>
<td>-1.976</td>
<td>-2.071</td>
<td>-2.171</td>
<td>-6.218</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19 Saving</td>
<td>Council-Wide</td>
<td>Metropolitan Borough Debt Levy</td>
<td>South Yorkshire County Council was abolished in 1986 and its 4 metropolitan boroughs (Doncaster, Barnsley, Rotherham and Sheffield) became unitary authorities. The SYCC debt was allocated out to the 4 Councils and, as at 01/04/17, Doncaster’s share of the debt was £8.3m. The final year of the levy is 2020/21. The principal repayment increases every year but the interest payment is expected to fall faster than principal repayment in 2018/19.</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19 Saving</td>
<td>Council-Wide</td>
<td>Parish Councils</td>
<td>LCTS Parish Council Grant reductions - current grant is £252k. 10% reductions were implemented in 2015/16 and 2016/17 but not 2017/18. Remainder of grant profiled to reduce annually from 2018/19 by 20%, 30% and 30% reducing to zero in 2020/21.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>-0.252</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18 Saving</td>
<td>Council-Wide</td>
<td>Pension</td>
<td>A reduction in pensions paid to former employees. The number of former employees falls every year. The budget in 2017/18 is £5.3m.</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>-0.180</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>-0.380</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18 Saving</td>
<td>Council-Wide</td>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>Procurement savings target (Regeneration &amp; Environment/Finance &amp; Corporate Services &amp; Education). Proposals are currently being reviewed and include the Waste Collection contract for example.</td>
<td>-0.250</td>
<td>-0.250</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
<td>-0.287</td>
<td>-0.664</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19 Saving</td>
<td>Council-Wide</td>
<td>SCR Levy</td>
<td>Reduction in the Sheffield City Region levy</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18 Saving</td>
<td>F&amp;CS</td>
<td>Corporate Services</td>
<td>Savings target for reducing Corporate Services in line with the overall Council reduction and improved efficiency. Savings from more streamlined activity, specific savings to be identified in preparation for delivery in 2019/20.</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.200</td>
<td>-0.200</td>
<td>-0.400</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19 Saving</td>
<td>F&amp;CS</td>
<td>Audit Fee</td>
<td>Reduction in the annual audit fee</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19 Saving</td>
<td>F&amp;CS</td>
<td>Revenues &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>We are monitoring the impact from the introduction of Universal Credit and are aiming to reduce staffing by removing vacant posts.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.118</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.118</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/19 Savings</td>
<td>LOCYP</td>
<td>LO-CYP: Functional Review</td>
<td>A functional review of the LO-CYP structure is underway and will contribute towards phase 2 restructure target of £0.8m. The functional review, including staff consultation, and identification of savings is expected to be completed by March 2018. The functional review is anticipated to meet the £500k restructure saving as well as the remaining Early Help cut of £170k for 2018/19. The remaining £300k restructure saving for 2019/20 is expected to be found through further saving to be identified through the review and directorate process efficiencies.</td>
<td>-0.850</td>
<td>-0.500</td>
<td>-0.300</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.800</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17 Saving</td>
<td>R&amp;E</td>
<td>Assets</td>
<td>These figures represent the final years of a £4.8m savings programme centred around reducing the running costs and increasing income related to the Council's asset portfolio. This will be achieved through a reduction in the number of assets, either through disposal or lease; reducing the running costs of the retained buildings through a review of contracts; reducing staff related to buildings and through increased income from leasing assets/ space. The Council is also working very closely with partners across the public sector to share space where possible and increase utilisation of operational buildings. The profile of savings has been reviewed.</td>
<td>-0.289</td>
<td>-0.423</td>
<td>-0.493</td>
<td>-0.200</td>
<td>-1.116</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18 Saving</td>
<td>R&amp;E</td>
<td>Highways (general fund)</td>
<td>The Highways general fund 2018/19 saving of £500k will be achieved by the following, (a) Asset Maint - £75k - Reduction in routine maintenance (patching) £60k and Carriageway reactive maintenance £15k. (b) Safer Roads - £10k - Reduction in road safety works £5k, Educational Materials £5k. (c) Network Management - £20k - Increase in network management fee £20k. (d) Highways Operations £40k - Increase in Trading income £30k and Increased Mechanisation £10k. (e) There will also be a transfer from the Capital Local Transport Plan (LTP) of £355k to ensure the full saving is achieved. The 20/21 saving will be met through Asset Maint £75k, Safer Roads £10k, Network Management £30k, Highways Operations £20k and a further transfer from the Local Transport Plan £365k.</td>
<td>-0.500</td>
<td>-0.500</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.500</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18 Saving</td>
<td>R&amp;E</td>
<td>Highways and Streetscene</td>
<td>The Highways Operations and Streetscene saving of £500k for 2019/20 will be achieved by:-  (a) Highways Operations - £210k - Smartlight Phase 2 (through reduction in spend on materials, equipment, testing and energy)  (b) Street Scene - £290k through:-  (i) Service Devolution - Partnership Working £34k  (ii) Woodland Improvement Project £35k (Branching out to other woodlands)  (iii) Service Commercialisation - Maximise Trading income £90k (Charge for services including city jet, fly tipping, gum removal)  (iv) Service Transformation - 7 day working £131k (Posts to be deleted)</td>
<td>-0.500</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.500</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.500</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19 Saving</td>
<td>R&amp;E</td>
<td>Independent Travel Training Scheme</td>
<td>Independent Travel Training Scheme - savings will be delivered through training young people and vulnerable adults to travel independently and thereby reducing expensive forms of transport e.g. taxis. More details to be added on why we provide transport.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18 Saving</td>
<td>R&amp;E</td>
<td>Planning and Building Control</td>
<td>The 2018/19 are assumed to be achievable through increased planning application income. Income levels can be volatile due to the large sums paid in relation to major developments. Increasing the budgeted income relies on several major developments taking place each year.</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18 Saving</td>
<td>R&amp;E</td>
<td>Regulation &amp; Enforcement</td>
<td>The Regulation &amp; Enforcement team employs 218 FTEs and its focus is on compliance, robust enforcement and the provision of advisory functions across a wide range of services (eg licensing, parking, littering, fly-tipping) which protect the health and wellbeing of residents, employees and visitors to the borough. Specific proposals are being worked on but indicatively the target will be achieved through (detail to be updated by the service):- (a) Service efficiencies - including out of hours and full service review and restructure (£125k) (b) Review of provision of all non-statutory services offered - Work on-going to rag rate and review all work which will achieve the saving (£15k) (c) Cost Recovery/Commercialisation - Generate more income from through working with other LAs and partner organisations (£60k).</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>-0.200</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.200</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18 Saving</td>
<td>R&amp;E</td>
<td>South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTE)</td>
<td>SYPTE savings, a £335k saving equates to 2.5% reduction in our levy payment. This will mainly be delivered from demand-led reductions (concessionary fares for adults) and use of reserves, there will not be any policy changes in 2018/19.</td>
<td>-0.675</td>
<td>-0.335</td>
<td>-0.335</td>
<td>-0.335</td>
<td>-1.005</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposal Narrative - 2017/18 - 2020/21

|----------|-------------|--------------------------|----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| 2017/18 Saving | R&E | Waste Contract | Various changes to be implemented alongside the new waste collection contract which starts in October 2017. 18/19 saving to be achieved by:-  
(a) Introduction of a charge to residents for replacement bins - Total saving will be £220k (approved in the 2017/18 budget and implemented during 17/18, balance of saving (£110k) will be achieved in 18/19) based on 5,000 black bins and 4,500 green bins per year. Replacing recycling boxes remains free.  
(b) Non infectious clinical waste to now be collected with domestic collection rather than separate collection which makes a total saving on both collection and disposal costs of £75k (implemented in 17/18, balance of saving (£40k) will be achieved in 18/19).  
(c) Fridges/Freezers no longer to be collected for free, residents to pay for collection now generating a total saving of £35k (implemented in 17/18, balance of saving (£15k) will be achieved in 18/19). Fridges/Freezers can be deposited at the Waste & recycling centres for free.  
(d) Removal of the free collection of asbestos saves £15k, (implemented in 17/18, balance of saving (£7.5k) will be achieved in 18/19). Asbestos can still be deposited at the Armthorpe Waste & Recycling centre for free; from 2018/19 this will be limited to 5 * 25kg bags.  
(e) Increasing charge for bulky collections saves £55k (implemented in 17/18, £27.5k acheived in 18/19). The £300k saving in 20/21 will be met through the new waste collection contract and the diversion of further waste to the PFI facility to take advantage of lower gate fees. | -0.200 | -0.200 | 0.000 | -0.300 | -0.500 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
### Draft Budget Proposals 2018/19 to 2020/21 - Detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant Exit Strategy</td>
<td>AH&amp;Wb</td>
<td>Adult Social Care Grant</td>
<td>One-off Adult Social Care grant of £1.520m in 2017/18. Only one-off expenditure will be funded from the grant in 2017/18 e.g. transformation costs.</td>
<td>-1.520</td>
<td>-1.520</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Exit Strategy</td>
<td>AH&amp;Wb</td>
<td>Flexible Homelessness Support Grant</td>
<td>The Flexible Homelessness Support Grant is ring-fenced for two years 2017/18 and 2018/19. The government has not stated whether it will continue after 2018/19 or if it will continue to be ring-fenced.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.228</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.228</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Exit Strategy</td>
<td>AH&amp;Wb</td>
<td>Independent Living Fund</td>
<td>Independent Living Fund - expenditure will be reduced to meet the funding reduction.</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Exit Strategy</td>
<td>AH&amp;Wb</td>
<td>New Improved Better Care Fund (iBCF)</td>
<td>The new iBCF grant announced in the March 2017 budget is a 3 year grant and reduced year on year; it is being used to fund pressures in AH&amp;Wb.</td>
<td>-2.730</td>
<td>-2.180</td>
<td>-2.136</td>
<td>-7.046</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Exit Strategy</td>
<td>AH&amp;Wb</td>
<td>Public Health Grant</td>
<td>The Public health grant for 2018/19 is £23.8m, a reduction of £0.63m from the 2017/18. 2018/19 savings will be made through reductions in the contract value of recently tendered public health commissioned services and by committing £0.24m of the public health reserve. For information, the total value of commissioned services for 2018/19 is £17.7m. Savings for 2019/20 (estimated grant reduction is £0.61m) will exhaust the public health reserve and require developing options for the recommissioning of NHS health checks and sexual health services.</td>
<td>-0.618</td>
<td>-0.635</td>
<td>-0.619</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-1.254</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Exit Strategy</td>
<td>Children’s Trust</td>
<td>Youth Justice Board</td>
<td>Youth Justice Board - actual grant reduction to be announced. Expenditure will be reduced to meet the funding reduction. The grant reduction may be staggered over 3 years but it is expected that DCST would be able to make the £150k total saving in 2018/19 if required, plans are still being finalised.</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>-0.150</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Exit Strategy</td>
<td>Council-Wide</td>
<td>Business Rates Inflation Compensation - Top Up Section 31 grant</td>
<td>2017 Revaluation correction to formula. Treated as one-off in 2017/18 and built into MTFF from 2018/19.</td>
<td>-0.493</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.493</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Exit Strategy</td>
<td>F&amp;CS</td>
<td>ERDF &amp; ESF</td>
<td>ERDF &amp; ESF grant ceasing. Technical Assistance which funds posts in Finance &amp; Corporate Services ceases at 30.09.18.</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Exit Strategy</td>
<td>LOCYP</td>
<td>Additional recurrent Children's Services Trust Costs</td>
<td>The agreed funding from DfE for LOCYP’s Commissioning and Performance teams is £120k in 17/18, dropping to £100k in 18/19 &amp; then back down to the original funding amount of £80k plus inflation in 19/20. The ongoing grant of £80k funds posts in LOCYP’s Commissioning and Performance structure, and the additional allocation's for 2017/18 and 2018/19 are to be used to fund one-off spend only.</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Exit Strategy</td>
<td>LOCYP</td>
<td>LO-CYP: Transitional Education Services Grant</td>
<td>The Education Service Grant (ESG) was cut from April 2017, however a transitional one-off grant of £516k was paid for the period April-August 2017. This is linked to the 2018/19 pressure on LO-CYP: Education Services Grant.</td>
<td>-0.516</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.516</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Exit Strategy</td>
<td>LOCYP</td>
<td>SEND Implementation Grant</td>
<td>SEND Implementation Grant is funding fixed term contracts which will end March 2018 upon cessation of grant.</td>
<td>-0.231</td>
<td>-0.231</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Exit Strategy</td>
<td>R&amp;E</td>
<td>Ambition SCR</td>
<td>Ambition Sheffield City Region (SCR) - funding is due to end in March 2018. Alternative funding is being sought to meet this grant reduction.</td>
<td>-0.358</td>
<td>-0.163</td>
<td>-0.163</td>
<td>inc in launchpad / growth hub below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Exit Strategy</td>
<td>R&amp;E</td>
<td>Launchpad &amp; Growth Hub</td>
<td>Launchpad &amp; Growth Hub are funded from ESIF and these grants cease at 31 March 2019.</td>
<td>-0.322</td>
<td>-0.322</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix F

**Council Tax Comparators**  
(Metropolitan Districts & Unitary Authorities Band D Council Tax)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Windsor &amp; Maidenhead</td>
<td>961.46</td>
<td>32 Warrington</td>
<td>1,315.90</td>
<td>63 Central Bedfordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Trafford</td>
<td>1,183.58</td>
<td>33 Poole</td>
<td>1,320.57</td>
<td>64 Bury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bracknell Forest</td>
<td>1,194.39</td>
<td>34 St Helens</td>
<td>1,324.72</td>
<td>65 Blackpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dudley</td>
<td>1,216.92</td>
<td>35 Cheshire East</td>
<td>1,324.92</td>
<td>66 Sheffield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Stoke-on-Trent</td>
<td>1,218.96</td>
<td>36 East Riding of Yorkshire</td>
<td>1,327.10</td>
<td>67 South Tyneside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Telford &amp; Wrekin</td>
<td>1,222.10</td>
<td>37 Wiltshire</td>
<td>1,334.63</td>
<td>68 Sefton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Thurrock</td>
<td>1,226.61</td>
<td>38 Tameside</td>
<td>1,345.79</td>
<td>69 Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td>1,231.57</td>
<td>39 Luton</td>
<td>1,355.98</td>
<td>70 Salford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>1,237.81</td>
<td>40 Bournemouth</td>
<td>1,357.65</td>
<td>71 Rochdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>1,244.93</td>
<td>41 Barnsley</td>
<td>1,358.72</td>
<td>72 North Tyneside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Swindon</td>
<td>1,251.29</td>
<td>42 Wokingham</td>
<td>1,359.27</td>
<td>73 Stockton-on-Tees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Wigan</td>
<td>1,252.46</td>
<td>43 South Gloucestershire</td>
<td>1,359.62</td>
<td>74 Redcar &amp; Cleveland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>1,257.86</td>
<td>44 Knowsley</td>
<td>1,360.46</td>
<td>75 Brighton &amp; Hove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Shropshire</td>
<td>1,259.51</td>
<td>45 North Lincolnshire</td>
<td>1,361.75</td>
<td>76 Isle of Wight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>1,264.76</td>
<td>46 Calderdale</td>
<td>1,364.04</td>
<td>77 Wolverhampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Milton Keynes</td>
<td>1,265.74</td>
<td>47 Herefordshire</td>
<td>1,376.50</td>
<td>78 Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>North Somerset</td>
<td>1,265.81</td>
<td>48 Torbay</td>
<td>1,376.93</td>
<td>79 Middlesbrough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Southend-on-Sea</td>
<td>1,265.94</td>
<td>49 West Berkshire</td>
<td>1,378.91</td>
<td>80 Coventry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>1,268.04</td>
<td>50 Cheshire West and Chester</td>
<td>1,379.02</td>
<td>81 Oldham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Kingston-upon-Hull</td>
<td>1,268.17</td>
<td>51 Darlington</td>
<td>1,379.30</td>
<td>82 Newcastle-upon-Tyne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Solihull</td>
<td>1,269.13</td>
<td>52 Kirklees</td>
<td>1,382.93</td>
<td>83 Liverpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Slough</td>
<td>1,274.54</td>
<td>53 Blackburn with Darwen</td>
<td>1,383.15</td>
<td>84 Stockport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>1,276.20</td>
<td>54 Bolton</td>
<td>1,384.66</td>
<td>85 Hartlepool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>1,279.12</td>
<td>55 Rotherham</td>
<td>1,394.48</td>
<td>86 Rutland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>1,279.87</td>
<td>56 Wirral</td>
<td>1,395.59</td>
<td>87 Bristol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sandwell</td>
<td>1,283.64</td>
<td>57 Cornwall</td>
<td>1,398.70</td>
<td>88 Northumberland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Bath &amp; North East Somerset</td>
<td>1,284.33</td>
<td>58 Southampton</td>
<td>1,406.68</td>
<td>89 Walsall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>1,294.82</td>
<td>59 Plymouth</td>
<td>1,407.47</td>
<td>90 Nottingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Medway</td>
<td>1,296.56</td>
<td>60 North East Lincolnshire</td>
<td>1,415.26</td>
<td>91 Gateshead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Derby</td>
<td>1,298.17</td>
<td>61 Bedford</td>
<td>1,417.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Halton</td>
<td>1,312.27</td>
<td>62 Leicester</td>
<td>1,421.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate</td>
<td>Grant Recipient</td>
<td>Service Provided/Update</td>
<td>2017/18 Budget</td>
<td>2018/19 Budget</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A,H&amp;WB</td>
<td>Citizens Advice Bureau (Mexborough/ North East)</td>
<td>The two CAB’s provide advice services facing a range of issues such as debt, homelessness prevention, immigration, employment, benefit and consumer issues. They also act as a referral and sign-posting organisation to more specialist advice across a range of public sector services and other voluntary organisations. They also raise other funding streams to benefit the residents of Doncaster. (Savings of £130k have been made in 2010/11 and a further £32k in 2015/16. There is a £40,380 recharge to the HRA for Corporate &amp; Democratic Core services)</td>
<td>152,150</td>
<td>152,150</td>
<td>No change proposed for 2018/19. However, in year, a briefing paper will be developed in consultation with the incumbent provider setting out proposals for future service delivery including how the service will be commissioned and tendered going forward. This is in line with the policy to more clearly commission and contract service activity, which provides greater certainty and continuity of provision of service for both the service provider (voluntary sector) and service users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-CYP</td>
<td>Doncaster Community Arts (DARTS ) Teacher in Role Project (funded from the DSG)</td>
<td>Through targeted support for Y3/4 pupils by using creative drama based approaches to improve writing skills. Working in role will provide exciting and purposeful contexts for children to develop key skills in reading &amp; writing. This project aligns very closely with Doncaster LA’s Raising Achievement and Aspirations Strategy which has the development of wider literacy skills as a key priority.</td>
<td>45,176</td>
<td>22,588</td>
<td>This grant for £67,764 will fund targeted support for Y3/4 pupils by using creative drama based approaches to improve reading and writing skills for the 2017/18 academic year, with funding provided through School Forum (Dedicated Schools Grant) agreement on 15th February 2017 and cabinet report 15 August 2017. Payments will be made termly with 2 payments in 2017-18 and 1 payment in 2018-19 financial years. No further grant funding for the 2018/19 academic year has been proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-CYP</td>
<td>Partners in Learning (funded from the DSG)</td>
<td>The transfer of services to Partners in Learning for the academic year 2016/17, set out in the 19th July 2016 Cabinet report “Deployment of School Improvement Functions to Partners in Learning Teaching School Alliance 2016/17”, enabled the continued delivery of a cohesive and robust delivery of school improvement in line with DfE’s requirement for cessation of the LA’s duty by September 2017.</td>
<td>182,488</td>
<td>91,244</td>
<td>The Standards and Effectiveness Partner (StEP) function was transferred, along with funding for the 2016/17 academic year. The grant of £273,732 relates to the 2017/18 academic year and is a 1 year continuation, needed to ensure the effective transfer of the function, with the grant amount based on the number of maintained schools as at 1st September 2017. Funding has been provided through School Forum (Dedicated Schools Grant) agreement on 7th December 2016. Payments will be made termly with 2 payments in 2017-18 and 1 payment in 2018-19 financial years. No further grant funding for the 2018/19 academic year has been proposed. (The grant of £309,624 shown in the 2017/18 budget report was based on an estimate of maintained schools for September 2017, which was higher than actual, and also showed the full 17/18 academic year total in the 17/18 budget column)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate</td>
<td>Grant Recipient</td>
<td>Service Provided/Update</td>
<td>2017/18 Budget</td>
<td>2018/19 Budget</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-CYP</td>
<td>Partners in Learning (funded from the DSG)</td>
<td>Partners in Learning is an inclusive teaching school alliance working with schools from all phases. Their vision is to create a sustainable, inclusive and productive partnership utilising the expertise from across the alliance which will lead to the improvement of teaching and learning and improved outcomes for pupils across all schools within the Teaching School Alliance.</td>
<td>124,000</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>This 2 year grant will fund the core membership of all Doncaster schools for the 2017/18 academic year, and 50% funding of the core membership for the 2018/19 academic year, with funding provided through School Forum (Dedicated Schools Grant) agreement on 7th December 2016. This funding is intended to create a completely inclusive model for Doncaster, where all schools have the opportunity to benefit equally from the Teaching School offer and support the development and sustainability of PiL with reduced capacity within the LA to support school improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-CYP</td>
<td>Expect Youth (previously known as Strategic Youth Alliance)</td>
<td>Expect Youth is a new, non-profit venture, consisting of a range of partners actively engaged in the youth agenda to act as a capacity building and innovation body for people and organisations who create positive activities and personal development opportunities for young people in Doncaster. The funding will be used to support local youth provision through capacity building, the provision of seed funding and the development of a diverse program for young people ranging from social engagement to social enterprise.</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>Grant funding of £475k to be paid over 3 years was agreed in the 18th October 2016 Cabinet report &quot;Strategic Youth Alliance&quot;. A Grant payment of £250k was made in 2016/17, and further payments of £150k in 2017/18 and £75k in 2018/19 will be made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A,H&amp;WB</td>
<td>Doncaster Community Arts (DARTS)</td>
<td>Through active participation in a huge range of different art forms, Darts enables people of all ages and abilities from different backgrounds to build their confidence and skills to play a crucial role in the cultural, economic and social regeneration of their communities.</td>
<td>43,500</td>
<td>43,500</td>
<td>No change proposed for 2018/19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A,H&amp;WB</td>
<td>Doncaster Victim Support</td>
<td>Doncaster Victim Support will provide victims or witnesses of crime with support and information to deal with the harmful effects of their experiences within 48 hours of receiving a referral. The grant pays for a contribution to rent of the premises, utilities, postage, stationery, cleaning, volunteer expenses and recruitment, staff recruitment and locum cover. Trained volunteers work as restorative justice workers under the supervision of the Restorative Justice co-ordinator to deal with low level crime and neighbour disputes.</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>No change proposed for 2018/19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A,H&amp;WB</td>
<td>Doncaster Rape and Sexual abuse Counselling Centre (DRASAC)</td>
<td>DRASAC receive this grant as a contribution towards their provision of specialist counselling service for victims of sexual abuse. This includes children from the age of 5 yrs. This is a historic voluntary sector grant which has been reduced over recent years– services for sexual abuse have never been commissioned by Doncaster Council.</td>
<td>27,520</td>
<td>27,520</td>
<td>No change proposed for 2018/19.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Grants to 3rd Sector Organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Grant Recipient</th>
<th>Service Provided/Update</th>
<th>2017/18 Budget</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A,H&amp;WB</td>
<td>Doncaster Rape and Sexual abuse Counselling Centre (DRASAC)</td>
<td>DRASAC receive this grant as a contribution towards their two independent Sexual Violence Advocates. (ISVA).</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>DRASAC now receive funding direct from the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) to fund the county wide ISVA service which pays for 2 ISVA salaries at Doncaster. DRASAC has offered to take a £20k reduction in 18/19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A,H&amp;WB</td>
<td>Borough Wide Day Centres Age UK</td>
<td>Commissioning of a mobile day care service that delivers a wide range of day care opportunities to the people of Doncaster. Funded from Better Care Fund (BCF).</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>No change proposed for 2018/19. This service will be in scope of the Alternative Day Service Modelling. In year, Age UK Doncaster are looking to introduce a charging model whereby people who have a direct payment and or self-funders will be able to purchase the service directly. The grant funding will therefore cease as at 31 March 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A,H&amp;WB</td>
<td>Changing Lives</td>
<td>Support Service for women with mental health problems at Women's Centre</td>
<td>105,408</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Proposal to merge the funding £105,408 &amp; £156,033 with MIND funding below to commission a community based crisis support service, with a £240k commitment over year 1 &amp; a £200k commitment for year 2. This is in line with the policy to more clearly commission and contract service activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A,H&amp;WB</td>
<td>MIND</td>
<td>Services for people with a mental health problems.</td>
<td>156,033</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Proposal to merge the funding £105,408 &amp; £156,033 as with Changing Lives above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-CYP</td>
<td>Doncaster Skills Academy (Doncaster Chamber)</td>
<td>The grant will provide the match funding for the Edge Foundation Grant, which will support continued growth of ‘bridging the gap’ activities for years 10-13 in every Secondary school (targeting 18,000 learners). The investment will facilitate engagement with businesses, support the development of resources and toolkits and promote the new opportunities that are being created for young people in Doncaster. The grant will only be provided if the Edge Foundation Grant is successful and a funding agreement would be put in place with clear monitoring on outcomes; if the application is unsuccessful DMBC will explore – with partners – other opportunities for enhancing ‘bridging the gaps’ activities.</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>The grant of £150k will be spread over 2017/18 and 2018/19 (£75k per annum). The grant will be funded from general council reserves.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Grants to 3rd Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017/18 Budget</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,269,275</td>
<td>737,002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Reserves (to be reviewed at year-end)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimated Balance at 31/03/18 £’m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Balances</td>
<td>-8.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Social Care Transformation Fund</td>
<td>-7.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Transformation Fund</td>
<td>-4.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve for future severance costs</td>
<td>-3.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNDR - Contingency against Risks and Volatility</td>
<td>-2.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Rates Incentive Scheme</td>
<td>-1.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Underspend to Extend Stronger Families Programme</td>
<td>-1.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Office Major Repairs &amp; Maintenance Sinking Fund</td>
<td>-1.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S106 Open Spaces Revenue unapplied contribution</td>
<td>-0.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Section 278</td>
<td>-0.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teesland Section 278</td>
<td>-0.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>-0.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coppice School</td>
<td>-0.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Contribution to the Capital Programme (pre-work/development costs)</td>
<td>-0.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St James Baths</td>
<td>-0.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues &amp; Benefits - Discretionary Hardship</td>
<td>-0.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S106 Interest balances</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Discharge Team (IDT)</td>
<td>-0.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERP - Phase 2</td>
<td>-0.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Spaces Community Order</td>
<td>-0.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP Inward Investment Loan</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilapidation Costs on Vacated Buildings</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway to Traineeships (SFA)</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWP Fraud &amp; Error Reduction Incentive Scheme</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match Funding for European Structural Investment Fund</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Ridge School</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match Funding for Edge Funding Doncaster Skills Academy</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT - Schools Centralised Infrastructure Sinking Fund</td>
<td>-0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Support the Introduction of the Apprenticeship Levy</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight management</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Aeration Maintenance Costs</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Needs Strategic Planning</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonnades Tenants Repairs Fund</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Capacity Funding Grant used for DN7 Project</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum Service - In year - donations, disposals &amp; healthy lifestyles</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S106 Planning and Other Revenue unapplied contribution</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35.353</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SHEFFIELD CITY REGION COMBINED AUTHORITY

AMP TECHNOLOGY CENTRE, WAVERLEY, ROTHERHAM, S60 5WG

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 11 SEPTEMBER 2017

PRESENT:

Councillor Chris Read, Rotherham MBC (Chair)
(Vice Chair)

Councillor Julie Dore, Sheffield CC
Councillor Simon Greaves, Bassetlaw DC
Mayor Ros Jones CBE, Doncaster MBC
Councillor Ann Syrett, Bolsover DC
Sir Nigel Knowles, SCR LEP Chair

Matthew Ackroyd, KPMG
Ruth Adams, SCR Exec Team
Joe Battye, Derbyshire CC
Fiona Boden, SCR Exec Team
Steve Edwards, SYPTED
James Henderson, Sheffield CC
Councillor Chris Furness, Peak Park NPA
Andrew Gates, SCR Exec Team
Matt Gladstone, Barnsley MBC
Lee Hickin, Bolsover DC
Claire James, SCR Executive Team
Sharon Kemp, Rotherham MBC
Councillor Tony King, Derbyshire CC
Mark Lynam, SCR Exec Team
Christine Marriott, SCR Exec Team
Martin McCarthy, South Yorkshire Joint Authorities
Jo Miller, Doncaster MBC
Michael Rich, Chesterfield BC
Dave Smith, SCR Exec Team
Mike Thomas, SCC / SCR Exec Team
Craig Tyler, Joint Authorities Governance Unit
Eugene Walker, S.151 Officer

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor T Gilby, Councillor G Baxter,
Councillor S Houghton CBE, Councillor L Rose OBE, H Bowen, D Bunton, A Frosdick,
J Mothersole, D Swaine, N Taylor and D Terris
Appointment of Chair

RESOLVED, that Cllr Chris Read be appointed Chair for the meeting.

1 VOTING RIGHTS FOR NON-CONSTITUENT MEMBERS

It was agreed there were no agenda items where non-Constituent Members should not have voting rights.

2 APOLOGIES

Members’ apologies were noted as above.

3 ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

4 URGENT ITEMS

None.

5 ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE ABSENCE OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS

RESOLVED, that item 20 – Housing Infrastructure Fund Annex B will be considered in the absence of the public and press.

6 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS IN RELATION TO ANY ITEM OF BUSINESS ON THE AGENDA

None.

7 REPORTS FROM AND QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS

None received.

8 RECEIPT OF PETITIONS

None received.

9 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

None received within the required time limit.

10 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 17TH JULY

RESOLVED, that the minutes of the meeting held on the 17th July 2017 are agreed to be an accurate record of the meeting.

11 DEVOLUTION

Item deferred.
12 ANNUAL GOVERNANCE STATEMENT

A report was received requesting Members’ consideration and approval of the Authority’s Annual Governance Statement (AGS) for 2016/17 (provided at Appendix A to the report) and Governance Improvement Plan (GIP) for 2017/18.

Members were reminded of the statutory requirement for the Authority to review its systems of governance and internal control at least once each year, and to publish an AGS with its Statement of Accounts, in addition to the requirement to have in place a GIP which highlights any identified governance issues, their current status and timelines for completion.

It was confirmed the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) guidance had been duly followed in compiling the AGS and GIP.

Mayor Jones requested the GIP be improved with the addition of further information to demonstrate that quarterly performance reporting of schemes would include the monitoring of adherence to agreed timescales and projected spend. It was confirmed officers would adopt this requirement.

RESOLVED, that the Combined Authority:

1. Approves the Annual Governance Statement (AGS) for 2016/17.
2. Approve the Governance Improvement Plan (GIP) for 2017/18.

13 APPROVAL OF THE STATUTORY FINANCIAL ACCOUNTS FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 2016/17

A report was received to provide an overview of the papers which CA Leaders are asked to consider before approving the final set of the Combined Authority group accounts for the financial year 2016/17 as required under statute.

Appended to the report was the ISA 260 – External Auditor’s Report and Letter of Representation, for which explanations of the External Auditor’s unqualified audit opinion on the Authority’s financial statements and unqualified opinion on the value for money assessment were provided.

It was noted the final version of the audited accounts for 2016/17 would be published before the 30th September deadline once these have been formally signed off by the External Auditor.

Members were advised the ISA260 document had been presented to the SCR Audit Committee for consideration and duly recommended for endorsement by the CA.

RESOLVED, that the Combined Authority:

1. Notes that the ISA 260 report was presented to the CA Audit & Risk Committee on 31 August, and is recommended to CA Leaders.
2. Approves the final set of CA Group accounts for the financial year 2016/17.

14 Q1 PERFORMANCE

Members were presented with a report providing the Quarter 1 forecast outturn position for the Combined Authority’s revenue budget and capital programme, including information for the CA’s subsidiary bodies, as well as regional programmes being delivered by partners on behalf of the CA.

Mayor Jones highlighted the forecast net underspend of £1m against the English National Concession Travel Scheme (ENCTS) and noted this was the second year a significant underspend had been experienced. It was requested officers take account of this matter in setting future years’ budgets.

Members requested more information regarding the funding of 44 low emission buses at a value of £1.32m (referenced as a Q1 capital programme variation request) including the timetable for delivery and confirmation of where these buses will be located. S Edwards offered to supply this information.

Regarding the reference to the challenges of defraying LGF capital grant in line with Central Government targets, Cllr Syrett observed it is already September and effectively half way through the financial year and requested that plans to address any underspends be sorted out.

RESOLVED, that the Combined Authority:

1. Notes the Quarter 1 forecast outturn position for the Combined Authority’s revenue budget and capital programme.

2. Approves the revenue budget and capital programme variations.

3. Notes the target date of 30 September 2017 for the Members’ voluntary liquidation of SYITA Properties Ltd.

15 SUSTAINABLE URBAN DEVELOPMENT - INTERMEDIATE BODY STATUS UPDATE

A report was received to update Leaders following the 12th June CA’s approval of the SCR Sustainable Urban Development (SUD) strategy that will enable the investment of £8.4m ERDF, from the 2014-20 ESIF Programme, towards projects that support Low Carbon development and Climate Change Adaptation (flood alleviation).

Members were advised that to deliver the SUD, the SCR Combined Authority is required to sign a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), as the Managing Authority (MA), to secure Intermediate Body (IB) status within the ESIF Programme and thereafter select projects for the SUD in respect of Local Strategic Fit.
Members expressed a preference for the convenience of utilising existing forums (i.e. SY Leaders’ meetings) to transact SCR SUD Board activity, rather than convene additional meetings.

RESOLVED, that the SCR Combined Authority:

1. Notes the contents of the report and approves the establishment of the SCR SUD Board consisting of the four South Yorkshire Leaders or their nominated representatives and the Managing Director of the SCR Exec Team.

2. Notes that the existing ESIF Sub-Committee will also become the ESIF SUD Sub-Committee

3. Notes that the SCR Executive Team is prohibited from sponsoring any projects seeking SUD funding

4. Notes, that the SCR Exec Team has submitted the legal documents required to secure IB status as well as the draft call for projects.

16 DELEGATED AUTHORITY REPORT

RESOLVED, that Members note the contents of the report providing confirmation of decisions made under CA delegation that have been acted upon in the last period.

17 FUTURE MEETING DATES

RESOLVED, that Members note the Combined Authority meeting date schedule for 2017/18.

18 RESOLUTION RECORD - TRANSPORT EXECUTIVE BOARD

RESOLVED, that the resolution record summary from the SCR Transport Executive Board be noted and resolutions endorsed.

19 HOUSING INFRASTRUCTURE FUND

A report was received to provide an update on a number of current national funding opportunities focussed on supporting housing growth. It was reported the availability of these national funds represent a change in the national funding landscape; with grant funding available from national Government to support housing and regeneration in way which has not been the case for a number of years. It was suggested this therefore represents an opportunity for the SCR to attract funding to support its housing growth and wider economic ambitions, whilst noting that funds will be allocated on a national competitive basis. With this opportunity comes a clear expectation from Government of the role of the CA.

The report provided full details on the background to these current funding opportunities and the work undertaken by officers to date.

Members were asked to note a specific request for the Combined Authority to delegate authority to the Head of Paid Service to sign off ranked bids for the
Forward Funding element of the Department for Communities and Local Government National Housing Infrastructure Fund.

Cllr Dore commented on problems caused by the government continually making ‘new’ announcements on funding for housing initiatives and suggested a complete review of how the ‘minefield’ of how the sector is funded is required.

RESOLVED, that the Combined Authority:

1. Endorses the proposed approach to meeting Government’s expectations of the Combined Authority in relation to the current housing focussed opportunities on offer via the Department for Communities and Local Government and Highways England.

2. Delegates authority to the Head of Paid Service, in consultation with the Executive Members of the Housing Executive Board, sign off for the Forward Funding element of the Department for Communities and Local Government National Housing Infrastructure Fund.

RESOLVED, that the contents of Appendix B to the report received at agenda item 19 are noted.

CHAIR
SHEFFIELD CITY REGION COMBINED AUTHORITY

AMP TECHNOLOGY CENTRE, WAVERLEY, ROTHERHAM, S60 5WG

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 18 SEPTEMBER 2017

PRESENT:

Councillor Chris Read, Rotherham MBC (Chair)
(Vice Chair)

Councillor Graham Baxter MBE, North East Derbyshire DC
Councillor Julie Dore, Sheffield CC
Councillor Simon Greaves, Bassetlaw DC
Councillor Sir Steve Houghton CBE, Barnsley MBC
Mayor Ros Jones CBE, Doncaster MBC

Councillor Trevor Ainsworth, Derbyshire CC
Joe Battye, Derbyshire CC
Fiona Boden, SCR Exec Team
Huw Bowen, Chesterfield BC
Steve Davenport, SYPTE
Andrew Gates, SCR Exec Team
Mark Lynam, SCR Exec Team
John Mothersole, Sheffield CC
Jo Miller, Doncaster MBC
Dave Smith, SCR Exec Team
Daniel Swaine, Bolsover DC / NE Derbyshire DC
Neil Taylor, Bassetlaw DC
Diana Terris, Clerk / Barnsley MBC
Craig Tyler, Joint Authorities Governance Unit
Paul Woodcock, Rotherham MBC

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor T Gilby, Councillor L Rose OBE,
Councillor A Syrett, D Bunton, A Frosdick, S Kemp and E Walker
Appointment of Chair

RESOLVED, that Cllr Chris Read be appointed Chair for the meeting.

1 APOLOGIES

Apologies were noted as above.

2 ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

3 URGENT ITEMS

None.

4 ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE ABSENCE OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS

None.

5 VOTING RIGHTS FOR NON-CONSTITUENT MEMBERS

It was confirmed that voting rights could not be conferred on non-constituent Members in respect of agenda item 10 – Devolution Update as this matter regards the constituent Local Authorities only.

It was agreed there were no additional agenda items for which the non-Constituent Members should not have full voting rights.

6 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS IN RELATION TO ANY ITEM OF BUSINESS ON THE AGENDA

None received.

7 REPORTS FROM AND QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS

None received.

8 RECEIPT OF PETITIONS

None received.

9 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

None received.

10 DEVOLUTION UPDATE

A paper was received to provide an update on the Sheffield City Region (SCR) Devolution Deal. The paper included an analysis of the options available to take the process forward and recommended that the City Region continues to progress its
existing Deal and launch a public consultation before the 21st September in order to ensure that the powers and functions are in place for the Mayoral Combined Authority (MCA), prior to the election of its first Mayor in May 2018.

D Smith informed Members of correspondence received from the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) Secretary of State (sent to Leaders and all Yorkshire MPs) which affirms the government’s position on the matter of the SCR Devolution Deal. It was reported the government remains committed to a SCR deal and is not prepared to consider any deal which cuts across the SCR deal, nor will the government consider any proposal for a Yorkshire deal that includes one or more of the South Yorkshire councils. Furthermore, the government has no intention of seeking any further legislation to redress this position.

Members were invited to summarise their respective thoughts and positions.

Cllr Dore requested confirmation regarding what powers the Mayor would have if no consensus decision is reached on a way forward. D Smith confirmed that, as the matter stands, the outcome would be ‘option 3’ as referenced in the covering report. The elected Mayor would chair and be a voting member of the Combined Authority and have an equal say over future constitutional and devolution matters, but with few other powers. It was further noted that under this option the cost of the election and the costs associated with setting up and running the Mayor’s office would have to be borne by the constituent authorities, at an estimated cost of £1m.

Cllr Dore recapped past discussions on the matters considered and decisions taken by Leaders in respect of maintaining a focus on economic regeneration that have brought the Authority to this point in time and highlighted some of the SCR’s notable successes.

Cllr Dore indicated the SCR has an offer of first mover advantage’ and noted the government’s assertion that no deal can be better the one presented to the SCR.

Cllr Dore suggested the South Yorkshire districts’ power would be diluted should they ever become part of a wider Yorkshire deal and noted that a South Yorkshire deal could be theoretically expanded in the future through the joining of further constitutional Members.

Cllr Dore further suggested the Leaders owe it to the people of South Yorkshire to undertake the public consultation exercise and that the action did not commit the Authorities to proceeding further.

Cllr Read indicated agreement with Cllr Dore’s sentiment and noted he still wants to see the devolution of all available powers to the SCR and supports the recommendations as tabled.

Cllr Houghton thanked officers for their report and noted Barnsley had taken consideration of all aspects contained within, together with the intervention received from the Secretary of State.

Cllr Houghton suggested these were important decisions that would last for 30 years and we therefore need to be ensure we are content with those decisions.
Continued support for the principles of devolution was noted but it was suggested that much has changed from when the SCR’s devolution process began, including the government’s consideration of larger regional deals and different forms of deals.

Cllr Houghton commented on the supportive positions received from the Leaders of other Yorkshire districts regarding Barnsley being part of a wider Yorkshire deal, acknowledging the Secretary of State’s current reluctance to consider a deal of this nature but noting there was still opportunity to convince the Secretary otherwise.

Cllr Houghton proposed a Yorkshire Mayor would be ‘second only on the national stage to the London Mayor’ and Barnsley wants to be part of that model of governance.

Cllr Houghton indicated his willingness to consider interim arrangements for South Yorkshire on the way to achieving a Yorkshire-wide deal.

Cllr Houghton suggested there are currently some unknowns regarding how much of the Devolution Deal funding might be diverted to fund projects such as HS2 and Supertram and therefore the financial position regarding the proposed deal is not as was originally presented. It was also suggested the advent of Brexit contributes further unknowns that need to be given appropriate consideration in respect of whether a deal for the South Yorkshire geography is the best option.

Cllr Houghton suggested that the government’s pushing through of a Mayor for the SCR with no effective powers would be a mistake and urged their reconsideration on the matter.

Cllr Houghton indicated he has communicated Barnsley’s position to local business leaders and received their endorsement for exploring a deal over a wider footprint.

In summary, Cllr Houghton proposed it would be disingenuous to carry on with the exercise as matters currently stand and better for Barnsley to be part of a wider Yorkshire deal involving a ‘coalition of the willing’.

Cllr Jones indicated support for Cllr Houghton’s comments and noted similar support for exploring the benefits of a deal over the widest geography possible. It was indicated to the meeting that feedback from Doncaster businesses shows 52% of businesses in favour of a Yorkshire deal.

Cllr Jones proposed that a Yorkshire deal would be the right deal for Doncaster.

The Chair noted that given 2 of the voting members were in favour of the recommendations, and 2 against; with no Chair’s casting vote the recommendations are deemed to have been lost.

CHAIR
SHEFFIELD CITY REGION COMBINED AUTHORITY

THE AMP TECHNOLOGY CENTRE, WINTERLEY, ROTHERHAM, S60 5WG

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 30 OCTOBER 2017

PRESENT:

Councillor Tricia Gilby, Chesterfield BC (Chair)
Councillor Jim Andrews BEM, Barnsley MBC
Councillor Graham Baxter MBE, North East Derbyshire DC
Councillor Julie Dore, Sheffield CC
Councillor Simon Greaves, Bassetlaw DC
Mayor Ros Jones CBE, Doncaster MBC
Councillor Chris Read, Rotherham MBC
Councillor Lewis Rose OBE, Derbyshire Dales DC
Councillor Ann Syrett, Bolsover DC
Councillor Chris Furness, Derbyshire Dales
Councillor Simon Spencer, Derbyshire CC
Sir Nigel Knowles, SCR LEP Chair
Fiona Boden, SCR Exec Team
Huw Bowen, Chesterfield BC
Steve Davenport, SYPTE
Mel Dei Rossi, SCR Exec Team
Andrew Frosdick, Monitoring Officer
Andrew Gates, SCR Exec Team
Lee Hickin, Bolsover DC
Sharon Kemp, Rotherham MBC
Mark Lynam, SCR Exec Team
John Mothersole, Sheffield CC
Jo Miller, Doncaster MBC
Andrew Shirt, Joint Authorities Governance Unit
Dave Smith, SCR Exec Team
Neil Taylor, Bassetlaw DC
Diana Terris, Clerk / Barnsley MBC
Mike Thomas, SCC / SCR Exec Team
Eugene Walker, S.151 Officer
Lyndsey Whitaker, SCR Exec Team

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor S Houghton CBE, R Adams and C Tyler
1 **APOLOGIES**
Members’ apologies were noted as above.

2 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**
None.

3 **URGENT ITEMS**
None.

4 **ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE ABSENCE OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS**
None.

5 **VOTING RIGHTS FOR NON-CONSTITUENT MEMBERS**

   It was confirmed that voting rights could not be conferred on non-Constituent Members in respect of agenda item 11 – ‘Devolution/Mayoral Election’ as this matter regards the constituent Local Authorities only.

   It was agreed that there were no additional agenda items for which the non-Constituent Members should not have full voting rights.

6 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS IN RELATION TO ANY ITEM OF BUSINESS ON THE AGENDA**
None received.

7 **REPORTS FROM AND QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS**
None received.

8 **RECEIPT OF PETITIONS**
None received.

9 **PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

   The Monitoring Officer reported that one question had been received from Mr Nigel Slack. Mr Slack had asked the Combined Authority (CA):

   “With the clear conflict of interest between his position as Chair of the Combined Authority and his advocacy for the ‘One Yorkshire’ devolution proposals, will the CA insist that Councillor Houghton resign his role as Chair and elect a new Chair for the period up to the Mayoral Election?”

   The Monitoring Officer replied that Councillor Houghton had informed him of his intention to resign from the role as CA Chair at the CA meeting arranged for 11th
December 2017. The appointment of a new CA Chair would then be agreed at the CA meeting scheduled for 29th January 2018.

It was noted that a written reply would be sent to Mr Slack after today’s meeting.

10 MINUTES OF THE CA MEETINGS HELD ON 11TH AND 18TH SEPTEMBER

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the CA meetings held on 11th and 18th September 2017 were agreed to be an accurate record of the meetings.

11 DEVOLUTION/MAYORAL ELECTION

A report was received informing the CA that an election date was presently set in legislation for the 3rd May 2018. The Combined Authority (CA) now had a legal duty to appoint a Combined Authority Returning Officer (CARO).

It was noted that, in law the CARO is personally and independently responsible for the conduct of the election and must plan and prepare on the basis of the current legal position. The appointment was required at this time to provide sufficient time for the CARO to safely plan and to make all the necessary arrangements for the election with the minimum of risk.

The CA were made aware that, in seeking this decision it was not intended to imply a settled policy position within the CA over the issue of the Mayoral Election. It continued to be the case that the Constituent Members of the CA are divided between those who wish the election to go ahead and those who do not. The CARO is nevertheless required to plan and prepare for an election so long as this remains the legal position. Should the election be deferred then the CARO would act accordingly.

In assisting to manage the overall costs of the election and consistent with local practice in local elections, it was recommended that the CARO does not attract a fee for the conduct of the election.

Councillor Andrews requested a recorded vote be taken on the recommendations set out within the report. Mayor Jones seconded Councillor Andrews’ request for a recorded vote.

The Monitoring Officer advised Members that, for the request to be moved, and in accordance with the requirements of procedural Standing Order 15.1 (d), three Members were required to support Councillor Andrews’ request for a recorded vote.

Following discussion, the recommendations were put to a vote by show of hands. Two Constituent Members voted in favour of the recommendations; no Constituent Members voted against the recommendations and two Constituent Members abstained from voting.

The recommendations were therefore approved.

RESOLVED – That the Combined Authority:-
1. Appoint the Combined Authority’s Head of Paid Service, as the Combined Authority Returning Officer (CARO) in respect of the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority Mayoral Election.

2. Agreed that no fee is payable to the CARO in fulfilling their role.

12 Q2 FINANCE REPORT

A report was received updating Members on the position of the CA’s revenue budgets and Capital Programme as at the end of Quarter 2, 2017/18.

The report highlighted that there was a need for the Authority to identify any funding available to support the costs of the Mayoral Election from its reserves, without affecting the Authority’s ability to meet ongoing expenditure and to cover its financial risks.

A number of budget variations were also recommended within the paper, which were noted and agreed by Members.

RESOLVED – That the Combined Authority:-

1. Noted the contents of the paper, including:
   - Forecast drawdown on unallocated reserves of £655k to support CA/LEP activity;
   - Forecast revenue budget underspend of £1.2m on SYPTE activity;
   - Forecast CA/LEP Capital Programme underspend of £23.6m against approved budget; and
   - Forecast underspend of £541k on the Local Transport Capital Programme.

2. Agreed the budget variation recommendations summarised in section 2 of the report.

3. Noted that further approvals for project level capital expenditure were sought within the ‘Programme Approvals’ report on today’s agenda.

13 17/18 LGF PROGRAMME PERFORMANCE POSITION AT Q2

A report was received to provide the CA with an overview of the Local Growth Fund performance position as at Quarter 2 and sought Members approval to a range of actions to mitigate the risk of in-year slippage of the programme.

The report highlighted actions which would be recommended to the LEP Board to help address two significant problems:

   - The over-commitment of the programme over its life, which peaks at £34.29m by 2020; and
   - The 2017/18 in-year forecast underspend and the potential associated loss of grant.

RESOLVED – That the Combined Authority:-
1. Considered and approved delegated Authority to the Head of Paid Service, in conjunction with the Section 73 Officer to approve the requested changes and enter into the contractual arrangements required as a result of the approvals. Noting that this would be considered on a case by case basis when actions to reduce the over commitment and over programming are confirmed by each Authority.

2. Noted that the LEP Board would be asked to consider and approve publishing an open call for a reserve pipeline of projects which could deliver in the short to medium term.

14 FINANCIAL APPROVALS

A report was presented confirming and seeking endorsement of the CA Financial Approvals which had progressed through the Appraisal Framework.

RESOLVED – That the Combined Authority:-

1. **Change Requests**

1.1 Considered and approved the category 1 to category 4 changes as detailed in Appendix A to the report.

1.2 Considered the category 5 changes and approved delegated authority for the Head of Paid Service and Chief Financial Officer to approve individual change requests on a case by case basis, subject to satisfactory resolution to the over programming and over commitment of the programme.

2. **Business Case Approvals**

2.1 Considered and approved progression of Worksop Site Delivery – Phase 2a Mantonwood to Full Approval and Award of Contract at a cost of £1.246m to the SCR CA, subject to the conditions set out in the Appraisal Panel Summary Table attached at Appendix B to the report.

2.2 Considered and approved progression of Knowledge Gateway to Full Approval and Award of Contract at a cost of £4.115m to the SCR CA, subject to the conditions set out in the Appraisal Panel Summary Table attached at Appendix C to the report.

3. **Housing – SCR Pilot Housing Fund**

3.1 Considered and approved the Housing Fund mirroring the arrangements in operation for the Business Investment Fund with a delegated approval to Statutory Officers (or delegates) of up to £2m per individual investment.

3.2 Noted that the membership of the Housing Advisory Board would be reported to a future meeting of the Combined Authority.
4. **Access Fund for Sustainable Travel**

4.1 Considered and approve entering into the contractual arrangements required to deliver the Access Funds for the Sustainable Travel Programme.

5. **Delegated Authority**

5.1 Considered and approved delegated Authority to the Head of Paid Service, in conjunction with the Section 73 Officer, to enter into the contractual and financial arrangements required as a result of the above approvals.

15 **HEALTH LED EMPLOYMENT TRIAL GRANT ACCEPTANCE**

A report was presented requesting approval from the CA to accept £7.558m from the Work and Health (DWP / Dept. of Health) Innovation Fund. The report also recommended that the CA approve the entering into of a Partnership Agreement with NHS Sheffield Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) in order for them to procure and contract the appropriate provider(s) to deliver the SCR Health Led Employment Trial on behalf of the CA.

Members noted that the Sheffield City Region was one of only two city regions that had been awarded such funding and as such, the trial would be part of national evaluation.

RESOLVED – That the Combined Authority:-

1. Delegate authority to the Chief Financial Officer to accept the Innovation Funding from the Work and Health Unit, subject to due diligence on any conditions of award.

2. Delegate responsibility to the Head of Paid Service to mobilise the SCR Health Led Employment Trial and to agree the appropriate terms with suppliers and to enter into the necessary contractual arrangements required to deliver the trial within the available funding.

3. Approve the establishment of and entering into of a Partnership Agreement with Sheffield Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) in order for the SCR Health Led Employment Trial to be procured as an NHS contract, as stipulated by the Work and Health Unit on terms to be agreed by the Head of Paid Services.

16 **TRANSPORT STRATEGY REFRESH**

A report was presented seeking approval from the CA on the draft SCR Transport Strategy in preparation for statutory consultation.

Members were reminded that the Transport Act and Local Transport Act 2008 placed a statutory obligation on the CA to produce a Local Transport Plan. The refreshed Transport Strategy would form part of the Local Transport Plan for the SCR.
Following public consultation the Transport Strategy would be further refined. The refreshed Transport Strategy was currently scheduled for publication in April 2018, with adoption by the SCR CA thereafter.

Members’ requested a minor number of changes within the draft Transport Strategy; these were acknowledged by Officers.

RESOLVED – That the Combined Authority:-

1. Approves the draft SCR Transport Strategy for consultation, subject to minor amendments requested by Members’ at today’s meeting.


17 ONE PUBLIC ESTATE & LAND RELEASE FUND: FUNDING BID PROPOSAL

A report was submitted requesting the Combined Authority to approve the submission of a bid from the Sheffield City Region (SCR) to the national One Public Estate (OPE) programme for a minimum of £681,000 and to the DCLG Land Release Fund for a minimum of £950,000.

Members were informed that the final details of the bid content and partners in the bid were still being finalised up to the submission date.

A summary of the SCR projects currently receiving OPE funding along with a full list of the potential bid schemes were noted by Members.

RESOLVED – That the Combined Authority:-

1. Considered and endorsed the outline bids from Sheffield City Region partners in response to the latest round of national funding for One Public Estate and the Land Release Fund.

2. Delegate approval for sign off of any final bid document to the Head of Paid Service and Chief Finance Officer of the Combined Authority.

3. Approve delegations to the Head of Paid Service, such that if approved the bid can be operationalised including to contract with third parties for the delivery of all approved One Public Estate and Land Release Fund activity included in the SCR bid.

18 DELEGATED AUTHORITY REPORT

A report was presented updating the CA on delegations made in CA approved recommendations that have been acted upon in the last period.

RESOLVED – That the Combined Authority note the contents of the report providing confirmation of decisions made under CA delegation that have been acted upon in the last period.
EGM OF SYITA PROPERTIES LTD SHAREHOLDER - TO APPROVE COMPANY WIND UP

A report was presented outlining the need for the CA in its capacity as Shareholder of SYITA Properties Ltd to convene an extraordinary general meeting to resolve to wind up the company.

RESOLVED – That the Combined Authority adjourned its meeting in order to convene a Shareholders extraordinary meeting and at that meeting resolved to put the company SYITA Properties Ltd into voluntary liquidation.

CHAIR
SHEFFIELD CITY REGION LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP BOARD
NOTES OF MEETING HELD ON 11 SEPTEMBER 2017

Attendees: Sir Nigel Knowles (Chair), Councillor Julie Dore, Nigel Brewster, Councillor Simon Greaves and Martin McKervey

In attendance: Ruth Adams, Fiona Boden, Andrew Gates, Matt Gladstone, James Henderson, Martin McCarthy, Ben Morley, Michael Rich, Dave Smith, Craig Tyler and Sarah Want

Apologies: Gavin Baldwin, Councillor Graham Baxter MBE, Professor Sir Keith Burnett, Councillor Tricia Gilby, Councillor Sir Steve Houghton CBE, Mayor Ros Jones CBE, Julie Kenny CBE, Councillor Chris Read, Councillor Lewis Rose OBE, Councillor Ann Syrett, Huw Bowen, Dorcas Bunton, Sharon Kemp, Jo Miller, John Mothersole, Daniel Swaine, Neil Taylor and Diana Terris

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Welcome and Apologies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apologies were noted as above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Chair commented on the disappointing number of public sector Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>members present and informed the meeting something needs to be done to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>improve levels of attendance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regarding the current recruitment process for private sector Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>members, D Smith informed the meeting that a very positive response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>had resulted in the receipt of 21 applications of which 8 have been</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shortlisted for interview. It is expected all interviews will have</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>taken place by the end of the week.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr Dore requested consideration be given to the inclusion of union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>representation on the LEP Board in the interests of providing an</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>additional dimension to debate, noting this is standard practise for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other LEPs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was noted alternate models of public sector representation on the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board, seeking evidence of best practice nationally, may be explored.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Declarations of Interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>Notes of Last Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The notes of the last LEP Board meeting held on 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; July were agreed to be an accurate record of the meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>Inclusive Industrial Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Board was presented with a paper providing an update on the development of the Sheffield City Region Inclusive Industrial Strategy (formerly the Strategic Economic Plan).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The report included a draft of the proposed strategy and outlined the next steps for consulting widely on the content of the strategy and a timescale for completion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was noted the development of the Strategy is recommended to be overseen by an Inclusive Industrial Strategy Commission to act as an advisory group, inclusive of representation from the SCR universities to provide additional foresight in respect of longer term issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was confirmed the version of the Strategy to be used for the public consultation is expected to be finalised shortly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Brewster highlighted the Strategy’s long term timeline and suggested shorter term milestones (i.e. 3 years) were needed to ensure achievement could be measured and monitored.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Brewster sought assurances that the Strategy’s ambition to strengthen the region’s supply chain capabilities includes and captures the wider aspects of supply chain businesses. It was confirmed the importance of this matter had been appropriately recognised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Brewster welcomed usage of the term ‘inclusive’ in the Strategy’s title suggesting this recognises the Strategy is not ‘exclusive’ to people who make things.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Dore asked how the Strategy will link to the government’s Industrial Strategy initiative and sought an assurance this Strategy won’t go ‘on the shelf’ as can often happen with strategy documents. Cllr Dore also suggested the Strategy needs a short c.6 page executive summary addressing the why, what, where, how, when and who questions that will give the Strategy more relevance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Board was informed officers are mindful of the government’s Industrial Strategy and a version of the SCR Strategy had been shared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with colleagues in the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy. Synergies will be drawn between common themes in the 2 documents as they evolve.

The Chair suggested statements such as ‘we need more housing’ are too bland and underlying matters of this nature should be couched in terms of a plan setting out what we need to do to resolve our issues.

The Board was provided with more information regarding how the strategy defines urban centres and informed these are not just the 4 main SY conurbations but include other towns across the whole SCR geography.

M McKervey welcomed the proposal for the Inclusive Industrial Strategy Commission and asked whether the region’s ‘big business brains’ who are not currently engaged with the LEP might be engaged. The Chair also requested that input from the local MPS be captured.

It was noted the need to capture the thoughts and expertise from various partners and sectors has been duly recognised and the Strategy’s public consultation will therefore be designed to ensure this degree of input can be captured, through traditional and more interactive means, and engage various sector groups.

Regarding the Commission, it was confirmed the ability to benefit from bringing in additional expertise where required will be designed into the process.

The Chair recommended the undertaking of more events akin to the LEP’s past, successful Yorkshire Insider events.

It was suggested the Strategy should include a policy note to explicitly confirm what is and isn’t contained within its remit

S Want suggested there was an opportunity to further shape up the Strategy’s allusions to research and innovation, noting the draft is due to be tabled at the SCR Science and Innovation Board to enable further discussion on this matter.

It was decided that subject to additional comments and changes, the LEP Board agrees to proceed to consult on the draft Inclusive Industrial Strategy, with a view to a final version being endorsed before the end of 2017.

It was agreed that the local authority officers and the SCR Executive Team review the proposed set of metrics to ensure an appropriate scale of ambition is set.

The Board also agreed to the forming of an Inclusive Industrial Strategy Commission to act in an advisory capacity to the Strategy’s development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>Devolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Board was informed an extra ordinary meeting of the SCR Combined Authority had been called for Monday 18th September, at which Leaders will consider the next steps for mayoral devolution, including mayoral powers and plans for public consultation and a decision will be taken by the constituent authorities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Board discussed how new mayoral powers could help deliver the ambitions of the Inclusive Industrial Strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was acknowledged there are some areas of discord between the constituent districts regarding support for the current SCR deal and the currently unknown potential for a new future deal covering a wider geography.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The private sector Board members reasserted their support for the current SCR deal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6</th>
<th>Horasis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A report was presented to provide the Board with an update on the Horasis China conference – including the core objectives, partner engagement and information on confirmed attendees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Board was reminded the event is ‘not about the SCR’ but rather provides the region with an opportunity to deliver a fringe programme showcasing the region’s potential for development and its investable assets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chair noted the Chinese community’s great interest in snooker and the opportunity to include a trip to the Crucible within the fringe programme. A Gates confirmed he would check if this was included.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7</th>
<th>ESIF - Reallocation of Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A report was tabled seeking the Board’s views in respect to maximising the use of ERDF funds within the SCR.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was noted there are two issues to be considered. Firstly, whether the SCR should seek to secure additional funding from other LEP areas who are unable to utilise their full ERDF allocations. Secondly, where the SCR is likely to be unable to spend all its ERDF allocation in one Category of Region the funding is reallocated to the other Category of Region to ensure the SCR as a whole maximises its existing ERDF allocation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The board considered the options available and agreed the importance of maximising the availability of ESIF funding with the SCR whether that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
involves the securing of funds from other LEP areas or the reallocation of resources between the SCR's two Category of Regions.

| 8 | Transport Executive Board Resolution Record (for information) |
|   | Provided for information. |

| 9 | Any Other Business |
|   | M McKervey informed the Board that the new Chief Executive of TfN should be announced soon. |
SOUTH YORKSHIRE FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY

18 SEPTEMBER 2017

PRESENT:  Councillor L Burgess (Chair)
           Councillor A Atkin (Vice-Chair)
           Councillors: S Ayris, A Buckley, M Clements, T Damms,
                        P Haith, M Maroof, C Ransome, J Satur and Dr A Billings
           CFO J Courtney, DCFO M Blunden, S Booth and AM S Helps
                        (South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Service)
           A Brown, N Copley, M McCarthy, M McCoole, L Noble and
                        D Cutting (Barnsley MBC)
           M Buttery (Office of the South Yorkshire Police and Crime
                        Commissioner)

           Apologies for absence were received from
           Councillor C Hogarth, Councillor C Rosling-Josephs and
           T/ACO M Mason

1 APOLOGIES

   Apologies for absence were noted as above.

2 ANNOUNCEMENTS

   None.

3 URGENT ITEMS

   None.

4 ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE ABSENCE OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS

   None.

5 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS IN RELATION TO
   ANY ITEM OF BUSINESS ON THE AGENDA

   Councillor Ayris declared a non-pecuniary interest, following his appointment at the
   Authority’s AGM, as a Trustee to the HOPE Charity.

6 REPORTS BY MEMBERS

   Councillor Haith referred to the South Yorkshire Dementia Alliance Closing
   Conference that she had attended, which had been well attended. Delegates had
   been informed of the Herbert Protocol, trips and falls, and the smoke alarm testers.
South Yorkshire Dementia Alliance had indicated that any residual funds would be utilised to purchase additional fire alarm testers, to be distributed within South Yorkshire.

Councillor Atkin referred to the SYFR Recruits Passing Out Parade on 1 September 2017 that he had attended with a number of other Members. He had visited the Watches at all Rotherham Fire Stations over recent weeks, where he had spent approximately 2 to 3 hours; the main area of concern had been in relation to firefighter pay. Councillor Atkin had attended the recent RMBC full Council Meeting, where a resolution had been passed to raise the pay cap; he had spoken on behalf of firefighters at that meeting, to state that firefighters deserved a pay increase.

Councillor Ransome commented that she had also attended the SYFR Recruits Passing Out Parade, which had been an excellent event; one of the recruits is a grandson of a retired firefighter.

Councillor Burgess supported the comments received from Members who attended the Passing Out Parade. She had welcomed the opportunity to talk to the new recruits and gave thanks to the organisers for the well conducted ceremony.

Councillor Burgess and CFO Courtney had met with the Rt Hon Nick Hurd MP, Policing and Fire Minister, and South Yorkshire MPs on 11 September 2017 to raise SYFR funding issues; a follow up meeting would be held with AMFRA Members in October 2017. On 15 September 2017 Councillor Burgess had attended a meeting with AMFRA Members, which CFO Courtney had attended on-line, in preparation for the meeting with the Minister in October, where a number of issues had been discussed in particular the forthcoming inspections of fire and rescue authorities.

Councillor Burgess had also attended the Barnsley Fire Station open day on 16 September 2017, which had been a fantastic event and it was wonderful to observe the firefighters and services from across South Yorkshire showcasing the brilliant work of the Authority, the engagement with families and the wide range of support offered to residents and communities of South Yorkshire. Councillor Burgess gave thanks to Barnsley Fire Station and the officers across South Yorkshire who had enabled the event to be held.

7 RECEIPT OF PETITIONS

None.

8 TO RECEIVE ANY QUESTIONS OR COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC, OR COMMUNICATIONS SUBMITTED BY THE CHAIR OR THE CLERK AND TO PASS SUCH RESOLUTIONS THEREON AS THE STANDING ORDERS PERMIT AND AS MAY BE DEEMED EXPEDIENT

None.
AM Helps provided Members with an update on a recent SYFR campaign, led by CFO Courtney which was specifically targeted to partners to increase the number of referrals made to SYFR to support the most vulnerable in South Yorkshire.

Members noted that the four main themes for fatal fires were social isolation, mental health issues, substance misuse and hoarding. The campaign specifically focused on health, social care and housing partners to enable them to become Safe and Well referral partners and link up with SYFR to enable interventions to be made.

AM Helps stated that all Members had been provided with the Safe and Well campaign leaflets; he encouraged Members to convey the information when attending surgeries or when engaging with partners at their local authorities.

Councillor Haith commented that the Safer Stronger Doncaster Partnership would show the ‘Fire Safe Together’ video as part of its agenda on 28 September, and she would also raise the other campaigns undertaken by SYFR.

Councillor Burgess stated that it was good to see the strong partnership arrangements in place at Doncaster.

Councillor Ayris queried whether the video was available on the SYFR website.

AM Helps stated that the video was available on the SYFR website, a link to the video would be sent to Members via email.

Councillor Ransome queried whether the presentation would be given to the next meeting of the Safe and Well Board in Doncaster.

AM Helps confirmed that the presentation would be given to the next Safe and Well Board meeting in Doncaster.

Councillor Burgess reminded Members that it was incumbent on all Members to encourage partnership working through the various Community Safety and other forums.

RESOLVED – That Members:

i) Received the presentation.

ii) Be provided with a link to the ‘Fire Safe Together’ video.

iii) Noted that the presentation would be given to the next Safe and Well Board meeting in Doncaster.
Councillor Ransome referred to the information in respect of the amount of income derived from Safety Solutions UK Limited, and queried how the information would be provided to the public.

L Noble stated that Members had been provided with the information requested via e-mail, and that it was also included on today’s Member Briefing for completeness.

Councillor Haith queried whether the SYFR firefighter promotion process would be concluded by the end of September 2017.

DCFO Blunden confirmed that the SYFR firefighter promotion process would conclude by the end of September 2017 for crew and watch manager promotions.

Councillor Burgess stated that CFO Courtney and herself would meet in London with HMIC FRS who are leading on the development of inspections for the fire and rescue service, together with the Chairs and Chief Fire Officers from other fire and rescue authorities. It was understood that the national inspections would be undertaken every two years; Members would be provided with further details on the inspection as soon as these were available.

Councillor Ransome queried whether Members had been provided with the reasoning for the 25% overspend of the total transport expenses, at a total cost of £7,000.

L Noble confirmed that Members had been provided with the information via email on 28 July 2017.

Councillor Buckley referred to the Police and Fire Collaboration projects and, in particularly the joint Fleet Management/Workshops Business Case. It had been intended to bring this issue to the Performance and Scrutiny Board in September, but this had not been possible for a variety of reasons. Councillor Buckley would meet with T/ACO Mason in order to discuss the Board’s scrutiny work programme.

Councillor Burgess stated that there would be issues around SYP and SYFR collaboration that would be useful for the Performance and Scrutiny Board to consider. She thanked Councillor Buckley for his involvement in the matter.

Councillor Burgess suggested that the Performance and Scrutiny Board could consider the Emergency Services Mobile Communications Program (ESMCP).

RESOLVED – That:-

i) The minutes of the Authority meeting held on 24 July 2017 be agreed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

ii) Members be informed of the details of the inspection programme as soon as further information was available.
iii) Councillor Buckley to meet with T/ACO Mason, to discuss the Performance and Scrutiny Board’s scrutiny work programme.

iv) The Performance and Scrutiny Board to consider SYP and SYFR collaboration, and the Emergency Services Mobile Communications Program (ESMCP).

11 GRENFELL TOWER UPDATE

AM Helps stated that, following the Grenfell Tower fire, SYFR Business Fire Safety (BFS) had allocated a team of inspectors to carry out Risk Inspections of all local authority high rise buildings across South Yorkshire; a total of 43 local authority high rise buildings had all been inspected. The general issues highlighted from the inspections had all been unrelated to cladding, but had related to basic fire safety issues that had been resolved with local action plans:

- Damaged doors.
- Issues with emergency lighting.
- Broken glazing in the means of escape.

Members noted that to date, SYFR had received 12 proformas from the National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) for cladding failures, which had been within the first tranche; the proformas had been returned following inspection and nothing further had been received since last reported to the Authority. BFS had commenced inspecting the 44 privately owned high rise buildings across South Yorkshire; three quarters of those buildings had been inspected and the remainder had been diarised for inspection with the responsible persons.

SYFR had been supporting the local authorities with reassurance messages through Tenants and Residents Associations (TARA) and arrangements with the publication of the direction of travel; BFS had attended 9 TARA meetings in Sheffield together with meetings held with DMBC and St Ledger Homes, to provide updates and advice regarding the ongoing work to their high rise buildings.

Members noted that since the Grenfell Tower fire, SYFR had attended two high rise building fires; both fires had been followed up by BFS and the necessary actions had been dealt with through an Action Plan with responsible persons. SYFR had received 15 Freedom of Information (FOI) requests in relation to fire safety arrangements in high rise buildings. As further information had started to be received from the NFCC, a review of Approved Document B would be undertaken. SYFR had started to receive the test results which were being shared with local authorities. SYFR was reviewing the cladding failures both nationally and locally which would be shared with partners.

SYFR had met with NHS colleagues and Fire Safety Advisors to make clear and to discuss SYFR priorities together with the request from the NHS, in order to prioritise and outline both expectations. All of the information obtained from the Fire Safety Managers would be linked with operational crews to ensure that it was plugged into the operational response.
Councillor Damms requested that Members be provided with a note of today’s update.

AM Helps stated that he would provide M McCoole with the notes, to enable a verbatim record to be included within the minutes, and for circulation to Members.

Councillor Atkin queried what was classed as a high rise building, and whether SYFR would inspect both high and low rise buildings.

AM Helps stated that a building over 6 floors was classed as a high rise building. Priority would be given to inspecting local authority high rise buildings, followed by private high rise buildings, with the intention to then inspect low rise buildings consisting of less than 6 floors, on a risk assessment basis across South Yorkshire. Most low rise buildings were brick built, and therefore only a small proportion had external cladding. The inspections of high rise buildings formed part of SYFR day to day business.

Councillor Clements queried whether SYFR intended to inspect office blocks.

AM Helps commented that the high rise accommodation for industry or office use formed part of SYFR’s normal risk based annual inspection programme; such buildings were lower risk buildings by virtue that there was no-one sleeping in them.

Dr Billings referred to the new building developments in Sheffield, in particular around student accommodation. He queried whether SYFR advice had changed for new buildings following the Grenfell Tower fire.

AM Helps stated that SYFR would have been consulted when the planning applications had been submitted. SYFR advice had been consistent for many years around the need to install sprinklers into buildings, which was the greatest protection for buildings against fires. There was no legislation in many of the buildings to mandate sprinkler installation. It was the responsibility of the local authorities to monitor the building stage of premises, which SYFR would inspect upon completion.

Councillor Atkin referred to a question he had received in relation to the ‘stay put’ policy. He requested that AM Helps reiterated that SYFR had a ‘stay put’ policy.

AM Helps stated that the ‘stay put’ policy had been in place for 40/50 years nationally. The outcome of the Grenfell Tower fire enquiry would determine whether there would be a national change to this policy, but currently SYFR considered that the ‘stay put’ policy was fit for purpose.

Councillor Maroof appreciated the excellent response provided by SYFR to South Yorkshire tenants soon after the Grenfell Tower fire. Many questions had been received from landlords, who were not responsible landlords, and he queried whether complete co-operation had been received from those landlords, and if not whether SYFR would be willing to ‘name and shame’ them.
AM Helps commented that SYFR were currently working on the private residential high rise buildings. No problems had been encountered in accessing those buildings or working with the responsible persons.

Councillor Burgess requested AM Helps provide Members with information specifically broken down into the four local authority areas in relation to residential, NHS and private sector buildings, to enable Members to respond to any questions raised.

RESOLVED – That Members:-

i) Noted the update.

ii) Be provided with information specifically broken down into the four local authority areas in relation to residential, NHS and private sector buildings.

12 2017/2018 BUDGET MONITORING REPORT

A report of the Director of Support Services was presented which was the second in a series of reports that Members would receive during the financial year, to inform them as to the likely financial performance for the year ended 31 March 2018.

S Booth highlighted the significant changes which included the current forecast in the overall operating overspend for the financial year 2017/18 of £0.248m which was 0.5% of the budget, principally with regard to the fact that the offer of the 2% pay award had been factored into the report, and had subsequently been rejected at this stage and had also been built in as part of the move towards the Operational Resource Team (ORT) for the additional firefighters that would be required to ensure SYFR could maintain operational service delivery. There was a slight change in the capital programme overall of £97k, which included a number of significant changes with regard to Property Services with £0.5m slippage overall, which was principally around the fact that a report had been provided to the Authority in May 2017 that set out how the design and scope of works would be reviewed particularly around CPC stations; the work was now concluding and would be presented to the Service’s Executive Team around the new scopes of works and designs. Advice was awaited from quantity surveyors who were evaluating the estimates put forward by the potential contractor. In relation to ICT, there had been an additional £0.5m which substantially related to the Emergency Services Mobile Communications Project (ESMCP) that was wholly Government funded. In relation to reserves, taking into account the overall position that was forecast as of today, the expectation was to increase SYFR reserves by £1.241m.

Councillor Ayris expressed his disappointment that both the Authority and the Audit and Governance Committee reports presented today did not refer to the issues surrounding the Parkway Fire Station that DCFO Blunden had recently reported to Sheffield CC Members. He queried whether the figures, and the overspend reported, included the issues around the additional expenditure required at Parkway Fire Station.
S Booth stated that Parkway Fire Station had been built 2/3 years ago; SYFR had been informed of latent defects with regard to the building and proceedings had been initiated with BAM, the constructors, who had brought in both their construction director and sub-contractor on site over recent weeks. Discussions were underway to determine how these latent defects would be addressed, which would determine the extent to which BAM, or their sub-contractors, were responsible for correcting those defects. Until the conclusion of the discussions, and the extent to which this may lead to further legal proceedings was known, it was impossible to estimate the financial impact to the Authority.

Councillor Ayris queried whether a report would be presented to the Authority on completion of the discussions.

S Booth stated that either a report could be submitted to the Authority, or the detail could be included within the financial reporting process. It was the expectation for BAM to take on the responsibility for the majority, if not all, of the latent defects identified.

Councillor Ayris referred to the budgets that had been set on 13 February 2017, and he queried when the additional 15 wholetime firefighters had been recruited during the year.

DCFO Blunden stated that, whilst it was possible to predict when people would leave SYFR, it was impossible to guarantee that the individuals would leave at a particular point. It had been identified that an additional 15 wholetime firefighters were required, as part of the ongoing recruitment over the next 3 years, to ensure that crews consisting of 5 firefighters would be on each appliance from January 2018. Members noted the discussions held at the recent Corporate Advisory Group in respect of the budget and forecasting.

S Booth added that the forecast for the 15 new wholetime firefighters was from December 2017 and was a part year effect.

Councillor Ayris referred to the projected underspend for indirect employee costs of £0.049m. He expressed concern in respect the injury pensions ceasing due to a change in circumstances.

CFO Courtney referred to the pensions guidance, which recommended that where an injury pension was payable, it should be periodically reviewed. The Authority had agreed several years ago, due to the financial situation, to review all individuals in receipt of ill health pension awards. The process had now concluded, and it had been determined that the conditions of a small number of people had improved to such an extent that they no longer qualified for an ill health pension.

Councillor Ayris referred to SYFR intending to work with a rating specialist to ensure that it only paid an appropriate rateable value for the premises it owned and occupied; he queried whether the cost had been built into the budget.

S Booth stated that SYFR had not yet contracted a rating specialist, and therefore the cost had not been included into the budget. SYFR had previously worked with GVA Grimley on the 2010 list. Rating specialists tended to work on a percentage
fee taken from any refund generated as a result of appealing the rateable value, therefore there was no requirement to build in a cost.

Councillor Ayris expressed concern that SYFR was installing fewer smoke alarms than previously.

AM Helps reported that SYFR completed approximately 20k Home Safety Checks (HSC) per year; there had been a significant underspend in the budget for smoke alarms for a number of years. The HSC policy would shortly be reviewed, with the aspiration to introduce heat alarms into areas where smoke alarms were inappropriate, at an additional expense. The figures did not reflect a reduction in activity in the area; the future aspiration was to install more increased safety equipment for the most vulnerable.

Councillor Ayris queried whether the delayed property schemes had genuinely resulted from a capacity issue, and whether there would have been an overspend in the budget if those schemes had taken place.

S Booth assured Members that he was attempting to tighten up and review all processes and procedures for the capital programme. He would need to be assured that accurate designs, detailed scope of works and accurate cost estimate for the works had clearly been identified before letting any contracts; it was important to undertake a diligent process but this had led to a delay in the capital programme delivery. He could not foresee whether there would have been an overspend if this had not been undertaken.

S Booth stated that it was appropriate to assure himself that a diligent process and procedure had been undertaken. He assured Members that the issues identified in the past through external and internal audit would hopefully not happen again in the future.

Councillor Burgess thanked S Booth for the response provided. She stated that it was important that Members asked such questions, and that, ultimately, the accountability and responsibility rested with the Authority. In doing so, it was also important that Members supported the Service to ensure that it provided the best possible efficient and effective service for the people of South Yorkshire.

Councillor Ransome highlighted that people did not tend to check that the batteries worked in their smoke alarms.

AM Helps stated that it had been recognised within the industry a number of years ago that smoke alarm batteries were the weakness in the system. The vast majority of smoke alarms were sealed units with the batteries encased, with a lifespan of 5 to 10 years depending on the type of detector. There had been a change in the message conveyed centrally from fitting and installing smoke alarms to testing and maintaining them; 92% of homes were believed to have had smoke alarms fitted.
Councillor Haith referred to the recent Stakeholder Planning Board, where the implications for the database for Safe and Well had been discussed; she queried whether this had been included in the ICT communications and whether there would be an extra cost implication.

AM Helps stated that a number of recommendations had been identified from the review that was currently underway. The implications for the database for Safe and Well was not contained within the paper at the present time.

Councillor Atkin queried whether officers would agree that any company or business predicting only a 0.5% overspend mid-year was doing a good job. He suggested that Members should be reassured of the budget moving forward; capital programmes always tended to slip. Following a recent visit to Aston Park Fire Station, which was a CPC station, the firefighters had indicated that they were looking forward to their new accommodation; firefighters based at Maltby Fire Station had now moved into the new fire station.

S Booth stated that a contribution of £1.2m would be made to reserves, and therefore there would be a £248k surplus.

Dr Billings queried whether the planned surplus had resulted from a specific figure of what the reserves should be, and if so, how close the figure was to reaching that point.

S Booth stated that when the budget had been set on 13 February 2017, there had been a planned surplus which would be a contribution to the reserve. Discussions had recently commenced through the Corporate Advisory Group, with a view to re-prioritising reserves, to request Members to reconsider the reserves strategy and potentially put in place various principles to be adopted. It was expected to conclude those discussions and have a clear and concise reserves strategy for Authority approval in February 2018, as part of the budget setting process.

Dr Billings requested that Members be provided with copies of the slide presentation made at the Corporate Advisory Group.

L Noble confirmed that Members had been provided with copies of the slide presentation, but would provide an additional copy via the OPCC’s Chief Executive.

Councillor Ransome requested an explanation in relation to the transport insurance that had reduced by £71k, the increased cost on services of £90k and other miscellaneous of £27k.

S Booth highlighted that the Authority contributed to approximately £150k as part of recognising the claims against insurance; there would also be some claims yet to be made, to which there was a budget provision of £150k. He had been working with the BMBC insurance officers who had re-let a contract for SYFR insurance services. As part of the risk assessment process, claims history and outstanding claims, he believed that the amount could be reduced this year. The increase of services of £90k related to the Joint Head of Estates and the additional procurement undertaken around the internal reviews that were largely in respect of procurement. A General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) Review had been
undertaken by the NCC Group that had reported back on a series of actions to ensure SYFR was compliant with the regulations by May 2018. Members noted that the provision of £27k had been included within the projections for expenditure on repairs and improvements to the Lifewise Centre.

RESOLVED – That:-

i) Members noted and considered the projected revenue overspend of £0.248m for the financial year ended 31 March 2018.

ii) Following the conclusion of discussions with BAM on the later defects identified at Parkway Fire Station, that either a report be submitted to the Authority or the detail be included within the financial reporting process.

13 EQUALITY AND INCLUSION ANNUAL REPORT

A report of the Chief Fire Officer and Chief Executive was submitted to present the SYFR Equality and Inclusion Report 2017, to inform Members of the progress within the 2016/17 year and to celebrate some of the positive work that the organisation was taking forward in relation to equality in a way that was accessible to the public of South Yorkshire.

DCFO Blunden highlighted the equality objectives for 2016/17:-

**Objective 1 – Improving Diversity at SYFR**

The SYFR Recruits Passing Out Parade had been held on 1 September 2017. The minority groups within the new recruits totalled 41.66%, which although this did not compare to the 100% challenge set by CFO Courtney, the figure had significantly improved on the 25% achieved during the recruitment campaign in 2016. SYFR continue to aspire to 100% and will make every effort to achieve this.

**Objective 2 – Improving Engagement with Diverse Staff**

SYFR had won a number of awards for the work undertaken with diverse staff during the last 12 months.

**Objective 3 – Promoting Staff Wellbeing and Fair Treatment**

A variety of information and promotional activity continued to be undertaken by SYFR Occupational Health in relation to stress and mental health awareness. Fitness testing continued to be undertaken as part of good mental and physical health, and the recruitment of the Fitness Advisor has had a positive impact on SYFR. All staff now undertook a statutory fitness test every 6 months; only 4 operational staff fell within the ‘not fit’ category, and the Fitness Advisor was working with them in terms of a remedial plan to involve diet and general lifestyle.

**Objective 4 – Knowing Our Communities**

Over the last 12 months SYFR had ensured that the Authority was well sighted on the issues that the prevention and protection area of the business was undertaking
in relation to working with communities to identify those at the highest risk of fire; a significant amount of work had been undertaken to address the issue.

**Objective 5 – Improve Targeting and Engagement with High Risk and Excluded Groups**

A Fire Deaths and Serious Injury (FDSI) database had been developed and designed to capture and analyse all information regarding fire deaths and serious injuries within South Yorkshire, which had become a national project.

**Objective 6 – Removing Barriers and Improving Access to Services**

Members noted the significant progress made and that SYFR had won a range of awards during 2016/17:-

- Pakistan Muslim Centre (PMC) awarded SYFR an ‘Outstanding Community Recognition’ Award.
- The inaugural South Yorkshire LGBT+ Awards had named SYFR ‘employer of the year’.
- The South Yorkshire, Dementia Fire & Home Safety Project had been awarded the organisation category at the Doncaster local Dementia awards ceremony.

The SYFR Stronger Safer Communities Reserve (SSCR) fund had supported a range of projects which aimed to improve access to services for a range of groups including ‘Breaking Beats’, Crisis Skylight, Pitsmoor Adventure Playground and The Real Junk Food Project.

Members noted the work undertaken in relation to Objective 7 – Actively Consider and Promote Equality and Inclusion within all Procurement Activity, Objective 8 – Embed Equality and Inclusion within Strategy and Engagement Worksteams and Objective 9 Improving Diversity and Opportunity in Recruitment and Promotion within Emergency Response.

Councillor Ayris queried the engagement of the unions on the Annual Report.

DCFO Blunden stated that the FBU, Unison and FOA had been consulted on all documents in relation to equality and inclusion, which formed part of his regular meetings with the unions. However the unions had not been specifically consulted on the report presented today.

Councillor Haith queried how the ‘have a go days’ were advertised.

DCFO Blunden referred to the wide ranging methods of reaching individuals which included social media, minority groups, advertisements placed in gymnasiums and through the local press. He had commissioned SYFR to undertake a piece of work to identify the reason why some of female candidates that had attended the ‘have a go days’ had not progressed through the recruitment process to interview, to enable improvements to be made.
Councillor Haith highlighted a typographical error on page 45 of the report. She requested that a glossary of acronyms be included onto the SYFR internet.

DCFO Blunden stated that he would provide L Noble with a glossary of acronyms to be included onto the SYFR internet.

Dr Billings referred to the outcomes from the recruitment table within the report. He queried whether some of the individuals had featured within more than one category, and whether some of the totals had been double counted.

DCFO Blunden confirmed that none of the totals had been double counted. The categories had been separated out into the 3 distinct categories of female, BME and LGBT to ensure that the success rate for each category was made clear; no female individuals had formed part of the BME and LGBT categories.

Dr Billings requested sight of the Diversity in the Community Handbook.

DCFO Blunden stated that he would provide Dr Billings with a copy of the Diversity in the Community Handbook.

Councillor Clements referred to the conversations that he had had with some of the trainers involved in the recruitment exercise at the SYFR Recruits Passing Out Parade on 1 September 2017, who had indicated that females had dropped out of the recruitment process after failing to reach the fitness standard. He queried that if SYFR could recruit a high proportion of males from the standard distribution graph for men, how SYFR could fail to recruit an equally significant proportion of females from the standard distribution graph for women.

DCFO Blunden commented that he had commissioned SYFR’s HR to undertake a piece of work to ascertain the location of potential female candidates in order that they could be targeted with the correct message about the role of a firefighter. Members noted that two female candidates who had passed the fitness test on the last recruitment course, had decided not to progress further as they did not want to partake in firefighting which only equated to 4.5% of the firefighter role. The next SYFR recruitment campaign would have a distinctively different approach. SYFR would draw on the information provided from other fire and rescue services, to ascertain their successes in respect of female recruitment. DCFO Blunden would brief Members once the information was available.

Councillor Haith queried how SYFR would address the continuing absence of women in senior operational management in South Yorkshire.

DCFO Blunden stated that there were only two ways to address talent within SYFR - either through external recruitment or to ensure that talent was developed internally. Members noted that the current Assistant Chief Fire Officer advertisement would provide an opportunity for the Authority, should the appropriate candidate apply. It was necessary to ensure internally that where talent had been identified from firefighter level, that appropriate opportunities were provided for individuals to be exposed to the next role up and to ensure that they were mentored and developed throughout the Service; a number of female operational staff were currently being developed in this way.
Councillor Burgess gave thanks for the work undertaken and she added that Members were assured that the issue was being taken seriously. She suggested that the Performance and Scrutiny Board should undertake a more detailed review into equality and inclusion, which was a fundamental issue for the organisation.

RESOLVED – That Members:-


ii) Proposed or raised any required amendments, additions or issues.


iv) Agreed that the Equality and Inclusion Report 2017 be made public on the SYFR internet.

v) Noted that a glossary of acronyms be included onto the SYFR/FRA internet.

vi) Noted that Dr Billings would be provided with a copy of the Diversity in the Community Handbook.

vii) Would be briefed on the information provided from other fire and rescue services to ascertain their successes on female recruitment.

viii) Agreed that the Performance and Scrutiny Board should undertake a more detailed review into equality and inclusion.

14 AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2016/17

A report of the Clerk to the Fire and Rescue Authority was presented to enable Members to consider the Audit and Governance Committee Annual Report 2016/17.

Members noted that, in support of good governance, the Audit and Governance Committee produced an Annual Report for the Authority which outlined the role of the Audit and Governance Committee, the responsibilities undertaken by its Members and the programme of work.

RESOLVED – That Members:-

i) Considered the Annual Report of its Audit and Governance Committee.

ii) Agreed to publish the Annual Report onto the Authority’s website.

15 PROGRESS REPORT ON IMPROVEMENTS TO THE PROCUREMENT AND PROPERTY FUNCTIONS

A report of the Chief Fire Officer and Chief Executive was presented to provide Members with an update on progress to improve in this area against a background
of adverse Internal Audit reports and External Auditor qualified Value for Money (VFM) Conclusions that were outlined in a paper to the Authority meeting in June 2017.

Councillor Ayris queried the length of appointment for the interim Head of Procurement and Supply Chains, whether it was a permanent position and the cost implications.

S Booth stated that Michael Wood had been appointed as the interim Head of Procurement and Supply Chains initially for a 6 month period, and this will be subject to review; Mr Wood comes with an extremely credible employment history in this area. His remit and scope of works included the review of resources available within procurement, the structure, grades and skill set etc. moving forward.

Councillor Ayris queried what Rider Levitt Bucknall, the delivery partner, had delivered together with the costs involved and whether those costs had been built into the capital and revenue programmes.

S Booth reported that SYFR worked with Rider Levitt Bucknall, to act as cost consultants on a number of schemes, and prior to his appointment that had been procured through a framework agreement. A Programme Board had been established, and chaired by the interim Head of Procurement, to hold the third parties to account to ensure that they delivered in accordance with the contract in place. Currently, Rider Levitt Bucknall was contracted in relation to the capital programme to provide the cost consultancy reviews in relation to each scheme in place; Rider Levitt Bucknall’s costs had been factored into the capital programme figures.

Councillor Ayris requested an update in relation to CIPFA Property.

S Booth stated that he had instigated a review with CIPFA Property, who were expected to be on site on 19 September, to ensure that SYFR Property Services were fit for purpose. CIPFA Property would be on site 3 days this week to carry out the initial health check review, at a cost of £3k.

Councillor Ransome queried the qualifications of the interim Head of Procurement.

S Booth stated that M Wood was a fully qualified member of the Chartered Institute of Procurement Specialists.

Councillor Ransome queried whether CIPFA, Rider Levitt Bucknall and M Wood had been in post previously when the issues had come to light in respect of procurement compliance.

S Booth commented that the M Wood had been appointed on a 6 month contract as the interim Head of Procurement and Supply Chains, Rider Levitt Bucknall had been contracted for individual projects within the capital programme and had worked on the Maltby Fire Station scheme as cost consultants/quantity surveyors. SYFR intended to manage its capital programme as a programme, rather than
8 individual projects to enable one set up, one client management, economies of scale and the transfer of knowledge to enable the supply chain to be managed more efficiently than previously which was hoped to achieve a better value for money. SYFR had now contracted Rider Levitt Bucknall for a number of schemes within the capital programme.

Councillor Ransome expressed her concern with regard to the SYFR procurement training with BMBC. She queried why BMBC officers had been deemed the most appropriate to deliver this.

S Booth commented that he had built a professional relationship with Chris Arnold at BMBC, who was a very experienced public and private sector procurement specialist, with a proven track record across various sectors. He considered therefore that the decision for C Arnold to undertake a peer review was sensible, appropriate and would be free of charge. C Arnold was building a professional relationship with M Wood, the interim Head of Procurement and Supply Chains. Following the Best Practice Review Day held recently in BMBC, M Wood had identified that BMBC had developed their intranet extremely well, which afforded the ability for any officers within BMBC to undertake a procurement exercise in a compliant way with full information and advice in a very user friendly format, which SYFR sought to replicate. SYFR hoped to implement this in a shorter timescale with the expertise provided by C Arnold and M Wood.

Councillor Ransome queried whether C Arnold had been in post at BMBC two years ago.

N Copley stated that C Arnold had been appointed at BMBC on an interim basis 9 months ago, and had taken up the role on a full time basis very recently.

Councillor Burgess referred to the work of the Collaboration Board with SYP and the appointment of the Joint Head of Estates. She requested that Members be provided with the job description of the Head of Estates.

RESOLVED – That Members:-

i) Noted the contents of the report.

ii) Continued to monitor the approach being taken by SYFR to strengthen the governance and control framework, to improve the service offer and value provided by the in-house Property Services and Procurement functions.

iii) Noted that they would be presented with updated Contract Standing Orders at the next Authority meeting, for consideration and approval.

iv) Noted that they would be presented with a draft Procurement Strategy for approval to commence consultant.

v) Be provided with the job description of the Joint Head of Estates.
16 HOPE CHARITY CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT

A report of the Chief Fire Officer and Chief Executive was presented to recommend an amendment to the HOPE Charitable Incorporated Organisation (CIO) Constitution, which currently nominated the Chair of the Authority as an ‘ex officio’ Trustee to include, in the alternative, the Vice Chair.

RESOLVED – That Members:

i) Noted the report and the suggested amendments to the HOPE Constitution.

ii) Approved the amendment of the HOPE Charitable Incorporated Organisation (CIO) Constitution to add the Authority’s Vice Chair as an additional ex officio Trustee.

17 SPRINKLER FUND PROJECT APPROVAL

A report of the Chief Fire Officer and Chief Executive was presented to seek approval for the release of funds in support of the following two match funded projects:-

- Autism Plus.
- Berneslai Homes.

Councillor Ransome queried whether Berneslai Homes was an ‘arms length’ organisation of BMBC. She considered that the funding request received from Berneslai Homes was a large amount for just one group, and that smaller groups may encounter problems in finding match funding.

AM Helps referred to the event held to promote the Sprinkler Fund Project, which had been very much geared towards local authority housing, charities and partners. It was intended to achieve the best value for South Yorkshire and to use the initiative to ensure that this became business as usual for the major housing providers that could afford it possibly more than others. The benefit from providing funding to Berneslai Homes would be that 141 dwellings and attached storage spaces would have the sprinkler system installed. Conversations were ongoing with SCC and DMBC, who were considering similar bids moving forward.

Councillor Ransome stated that she appreciated that more people would be reached through the housing associations, but that the housing associations were very well provided for by the local authorities. She suggested that many private properties within the county, that were in very poor states of repair, could benefit from the funding.

Councillor Burgess highlighted that local authorities did not provide funding to their respective housing organisations and that funding was generated from council house rental fees. She stated that Members were correct to ask the questions, to ensure that the funding was allocated appropriately. Members noted that a large proportion of public sector organisations had been represented at the Sprinkler Fund Project event.
Councillor Ayris queried whether BMBC would make a financial contribution to Berneslai Homes.

N Copley stated that he was not aware that BMBC would make a financial contribution to Berneslai Homes.

Councillor Maroof queried whether the Government would make any contributions to the Sprinkler Fund Project during this time of austerity. He suggested that the Government should intervene at a time when the local authorities and members of the public required the implementation of such safety measures. He suggested that the Government were failing those people most at risk, and that the local authorities should raise such points directly with Government.

CFO Courtney stated that all deliberations had taken place prior to the Grenfell Tower fire. Since 2007, when SYFR had first become involved in the Callow Mount Sheffield Project, the Service had campaigned for sprinklers in high rise buildings and in any premises used to house vulnerable people. Members noted that, during the first years of the Authority’s Stronger, Safer Communities Reserve (SSCR) Fund, it had been important to demonstrate that the investment had delivered against SYFR’s commitment to make the people of South Yorkshire safer. At the point it had been determined to increase the fund and go through further rounds of bidding, consideration had been given as to how SYFR could establish a process to demonstrate that there was benefit to the people of South Yorkshire from a fire safety point of view. Members had been consulted on the allocation of a significant proportion of funding to sprinkler projects; the criteria required for anyone submitting an application included the ability to clearly demonstrate that it would benefit the most vulnerable people in society. SYFR was fitting fewer smoke detectors, due to fewer people being available to install them. SYFR was working with other organisations to ensure that the smaller number of detectors installed produced greater benefit by ensuring that they were installed into the homes of vulnerable people. He envisaged that the NFCC representatives at every fire and rescue service within the country would be having the exact same conversation with Government around issues post-Grenfell, with a view to changing the legislation of sprinkler systems, to potentially provide additional funding to support the installation of sprinklers as part of the outcome of the Grenfell review. CFO Courtney added that both Autism Plus and Berneslai Homes, who housed genuinely vulnerable people had submitted their applications, and that by contributing to the cost of those sprinklers collectively would deliver on the original aspiration to make the people of South Yorkshire safer. He stated that he was sure that other organisations within South Yorkshire would also be successful in securing match funding towards the cost of making vulnerable people safer in the places that they lived.

Councillor Damms stated that the funding provided to Berneslai Homes would specifically target vulnerable people, and that he supported the proposal.

Councillor Atkin referred to Councillor T Fox, a former Member of the Authority, who had been the sprinkler advocate for the LGA. Members noted that the Authority had first provided retrospective funding following the incident at Callow Mount Sheffield, and had been the first in the country to do so. He hoped that the
Government would take note of the recommendations from the Grenfell Tower fire and conclude that tower buildings should be retrospectively fitted with sprinklers.

Councillor Burgess stated, that following consultation with M McCarthy, she did not need to declare an interest as a BMBC Member, as Berneslai Homes was an ‘arms length’ organisation to BMBC.

RESOLVED – That Members agreed to fund the following Fire Sprinkler Projects from the Stronger Safer Communities Reserve Fund.

18 ANNUAL REPORT APRIL 2016/17 ON REGULATION OF INVESTIGATORY POWERS ACT 2000 (RIPA)

A report of the Chief Fire Officer and Chief Executive was submitted in order to satisfy the statutory guidance relating to the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (RIPA) that required the Authority to receive an update on the use by the Authority of surveillance and Covert Human Intelligence Sources (CHIS), and also provided Members with an update on RIPA activity over the past year.

DCFO Blunden stated that he was the designated senior responsible person to ensure that RIPA was used responsibly; RIPA had not been used over the last 18 months.

Members noted that Corporate Performance reports were utilised to record up to date information on the use of RIPA within the Authority and details of any RIPA activity. An annual report would continue to be submitted to the Authority.

RESOLVED – That Members noted the contents of the report.

19 DRAFT MINUTES OF THE APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE HELD ON 26 JULY 2017

Councillor Ayris queried the reason why the minutes presented were listed as ‘draft’.

M McCarthy stated that a number of the Fire Authority’s Committees and Boards had delegated authority and that, in order to ensure completeness, good governance and transparency, the minutes were presented to the Authority to ensure that all Members were made aware of the issues raised at those meetings.

RESOLVED – That Members noted the draft minutes of the Appointments Committee held on 26 July 2017.

20 DRAFT MINUTES OF THE AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE HELD ON 24 JULY 2017

RESOLVED – That Members noted the draft minutes of the Audit and Governance Committee held on 24 July 2017.
21 DRAFT MINUTES OF THE LOCAL PENSION BOARD HELD ON 20 JUNE 2017

RESOLVED – That Members noted the draft minutes of the Local Pension Board held on 20 June 2017.

22 MINUTES OF THE YORKSHIRE AND HUMBER EMPLOYERS’ ASSOCIATION HELD ON 13 JULY 2017

Councillor Haith highlighted that items 6 to 9 had been omitted from the minutes.

Councillor Burgess requested that the minutes be re-circulated to Members for information. She thanked everyone for their attendance at today’s meeting together with the questions raised.

RESOLVED – That:-

i) Members noted the minutes of the Yorkshire and Humber Employers’ Association held on 13 July 2017.

ii) The minutes be re-circulated to Members for information.

CHAIR
SOUTH YORKSHIRE FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY

16 OCTOBER 2017

PRESENT:

Councillor L Burgess (Chair)
Councillor A Atkin (Vice-Chair)
Councillors: S Ayris, A Buckley, M Clements, T Damms, P Haith, C Hogarth, C Rosling-Josephs, C Ransome and J Satur

CFO J Courtney, DCFO M Blunden, T/ACO M Mason and S Booth (South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Service)

A Brown, N Copley, A Frosdick and D Cutting (Barnsley MBC)

M McCarthy, L Noble and M McCoole (Joint Authorities Governance Unit)

M Buttery (Office of the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor M Maroof, Dr A Billings and D Terris

1  APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were noted as above.

2  ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

3  URGENT ITEMS

None.

4  ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE ABSENCE OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS

None.

5  DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS IN RELATION TO ANY ITEM OF BUSINESS ON THE AGENDA

None.
REPORTS BY MEMBERS

Councillor Burgess had recently visited Tankersley Fire Station with CFO Courtney, as part of a range of visits undertaken by senior officers to all South Yorkshire fire stations and watches. She supported Members attendance on such visits, which provided a good opportunity to interact with the senior officers and staff; Members had been provided with a revised schedule of the visits.

Councillor Burgess had recently attended an HMICFRS meeting in London with CFO Courtney in relation to developing an inspection programme for the fire and rescue sector. Delegates had learned about the process to date, and had provided feedback on those issues that were being considered for inspection together with the methodology being developed; Members would be provided with further information at the Corporate Advisory Group meeting held later today. She was sure that SYFR would deal with the inspection in a very appropriate and positive manner.

Councillor Burgess and CFO Courtney had also attended the LGA Fire Commission meeting in London on 13 October 2017, where a large input had been provided by the Professional Standards Body for those working in the fire and rescue services in relation to the development of the standards. Input had also been provided from the Head of the Retained Firefighters Union and the Chair of the National Pensions Scheme Advisory Board, who had made a request to ensure that appropriate linkages were in place between the Authority (as Scheme Manager) and the Local Pension Board. Input had also been received from the Business Service Director of the Fire Service College in relation to what they can offer fire and rescue services. There had been an interesting discussion regarding at least 250 social housing buildings nationwide, to which the Government expected that any improvements would be funded from each local council’s HRA; it was anticipated that this would cause problems for the local councils in funding such developments. A proposal had been made for the establishment of a Sprinkler Working Group in relation to the issues post Grenfell, to provide for a much stronger case for the installation and retrofitting of sprinklers, in particular in high rise buildings. Members noted that updates following the Grenfell Tower fire would remain on the agenda for some time.

Councillor Haith thanked GM D Henderson for his presentation at the Safer Stronger Doncaster Partnership on 28 September 2017 on Making Every Contact Count and the Safe and Well Visits, which had prompted a good debate and questioning.

Councillor Atkin requested that congratulations be given on behalf of the Authority to the SYFR BA Team who had recently won the national competition.

Councillor Clements referred to a recent visit to Cudworth Fire Station where he had visited Green Watch. He had been very interested to meet with the crew and to receive a demonstration of the equipment; he looked forward to attending further visits.
RESOLVED – That Members noted that:-

i) The position would be ascertained, to ensure that appropriate linkages were in place between the Authority (as Scheme Manager) and the Local Pension Board.

ii) Updates following the Grenfell Tower fire would feature on the Authority’s agendas for the foreseeable future.

7 RECEIPT OF PETITIONS

None.

8 TO RECEIVE ANY QUESTIONS OR COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC, OR COMMUNICATIONS SUBMITTED BY THE CHAIR OR THE CLERK AND TO PASS SUCH RESOLUTIONS THEREON AS THE STANDING ORDERS PERMIT AND AS MAY BE DEEMED EXPEDIENT

None.

9 MINUTES OF THE AUTHORITY MEETING HELD ON 18 SEPTEMBER 2017

Councillor Ayris referred to the request he had made at the last Audit and Governance Committee that any information that had been provided as a result of Members’ questions should be appended to the minutes, particularly in relation to the Grenfell Tower fire. He considered that it was important that any findings or data regarding the buildings within South Yorkshire were made clear and transparent, to enable an audit trail of the findings to include the data and action taken, in the event of a similar incident occurring within South Yorkshire.

Councillor Burgess stated that Members would have received several emails from L Noble to provide responses to the questions raised that were unable to be answered at the meetings; the information was recorded within the governance section. She stated that the responses did not form part of the formal minutes, but that further consideration should be given to establish an appropriate way that the responses to the questions could be suitably published for openness and transparency.

M McCarthy commented that it had been agreed that any questions or requests for information raised by Members would feature within the resolutions within the minutes. He was unsure how workable it would be to append the relevant information to the minutes in terms of length.

Councillor Ayris stated that his concern was that the information provided in relation to the follow up from the Grenfell Tower fire should be within the public domain in order to inform members of the public of the discussions undertaken, and to provide reassurance that the Authority and SYFR were taking the appropriate action.

A Frosdick stated that the principle was that if an answer could not be provided at the meeting to a question that was raised, that there was a need to capture the response available logistically without the need to produce reams of paper. He
suggested the inclusion of a link to the responses within the minutes to the
questions raised to be published in a proportionate way, to enable a process to be
designed without making the task too onerous in terms of resources or complexity.

Councillor Ayris commented that he did not want to overburden the meetings with
excessive sets of minutes, but highlighted the need for members of the public to
gain access to the responses provided to Members.

A Frosdick suggested that the inclusion of a link within the electronic minutes to a
file containing the correspondence would provide the level of transparency
required.

Councillor Burgess stated that the Authority did not wish to hide any information
from the public.

Councillor Haith highlighted that the minutes be amended to indicate the correct
spelling of St Leger.

Councillor Haith referred to the progress report on the improvements to the
procurement and property functions. She queried when the Authority would be
provided with the updated Contract Standing Orders for consideration and
approval, and a draft Procurement Strategy for approval.

S Booth stated that Members would be provided with the documents at the
November 2017 Authority meeting.

RESOLVED – That:-

i) Subject to the above amendment, the minutes of the Authority meeting held
on 18 September 2017 be agreed and signed by the Chair as a correct
record.

ii) Members would be provided with the updated Contract Standing Orders and a
draft Procurement Strategy at the November 2017 Authority meeting.

iii) A way of publishing responses to Members’ questions for public consumption
would be explored.

SYFR ANNUAL REPORT 2016/17

A report of the Deputy Chief Fire Officer/Director of Service Development was
submitted to present the SYFR Annual Report for 2016/17, to review SYFR’s
performance and achievements over the past year, and to provide a summary of
how the priorities set out in the Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP) for 2013
to 2017 were met.

DCFO Blunden stated that the Authority met the priority of the Fire and Rescue
National Framework for England by demonstrating its accountability to the
communities for the services provided; the report would be made available on the
SYFR and FRA websites.
Councillor Ransome referred to the 30% increase in accidental fires in non-domestic premises. She queried whether SYFR was reviewing the issue and how this could be improved in the future.

DCFO Blunden stated that the number of accidental fires in non-domestic premises in 2009/10 had stayed around the current level; the lowest level had been achieved in 2012/13. SYFR took the issue extremely seriously and worked with local authorities, SYP and coroners where appropriate, to ensure that SYFR did the upmost to support those businesses effected by fire.

Councillor Haith queried the number of members of the public that had viewed and commented on the SYFR Annual Report 2015/16 that was available on the SYFR website.

DCFO Blunden stated that he would ascertain the position.

Councillor Ayris suggested that members of the public viewing the report would be unable to ascertain the causation factors of the increase in the number of primary fires in South Yorkshire, and the work undertaken to resolve the issue.

DCFO Blunden stated that reference was included within the SYFR Annual Performance Report, which he would include within the SYFR Annual Report 2016/17 to demonstrate the work undertaken.

Councillor Atkin suggested that the report be amended at page 32 to remove the reference made to ‘last week’.

Councillor Buckley informed Members that a second throwline station had been unveiled at Ulley Country Park last week.

Councillor Burgess gave thanks for the report.

RESOLVED – That Members:-

i) Endorsed the contents of the report.

ii) Be provided with the number of members of the public that had viewed and commented on the SYFR Annual Report 2015/16.

iii) Noted that the causation factors of the increase in the number of primary fires in South Yorkshire and the work undertaken to resolve the issue would be included within the SYFR Annual Report 2016/17.

iv) Noted that the report would be amended at page 32 to remove the reference made to ‘last week’.
A report of the Director of Support Services was presented seeking Authority approval to utilise £70,000 of the Authority’s Invest to Save – Transformation Reserve to procure a forensic analysis and review of its current operational and business processes across all service areas.

Councillor Hogarth queried whether consideration had been given to how other fire and rescue authorities in the country dealt with the matter, and what information SYFR had obtained from other fire and rescue authorities.

S Booth stated that a business partner with the right experience would be commissioned, to ensure that SYFR had the correct solution and that it was as streamlined as possible whilst meeting the customer needs. SYFR would take soundings from other fire authorities where appropriate to do so.

Councillor Clements commented that he was pleased that Phase 1 would commence with an inventory of SYFR’s assets; he assumed that the assets would be recorded on an asset register. He queried how SYFR would procure a business partner. He was interested to learn of the discussions that had already taken place with potential business partners.

S Booth confirmed that SYFR had an asset inventory in place together with a large amount of application software; it was the extent to which the use of the business software was optimised to its best functionality. There were opportunities for the finance system to be used smarter and to turn on those applications that were not currently utilised. SYFR would review a framework agreement, as part of the procurement exercise, for consultancy services that had been established by national leading procurement agencies. Members noted initial discussions had been undertaken with a small number of companies to shape the brief, to test the market and the pitch and value of the process undertaken. SYFR envisaged the commissioning of an intensive and forensic piece of work that would result in the consultant spending a considerable amount of time on site, to deliver a high proportion of workshops and conduct one-to-one interviews. He therefore considered that the request for the initial investment of approximately £70,000 to procure the services of a relevant business partner was at the appropriate level.

Councillor Ayris queried that Authority’s approval was sought today for up to £70,000, but that there may be a requirement to request additional investment from the Authority in the future. He queried the position in relation to the Contract Standing Orders.

S Booth stated that the only commitment sought by the Authority was for an investment of £70,000. The work that SYFR would procure through a supplier would be through a framework agreement that had been through a competitive tendering process, that was both managed and navigated by CCS, YPO or SPO to which SYFR could utilise those framework agreements to ensure the organisation was fully compliant with the Contract Standing Orders. This work had been closely undertaken with Michael Wood, the Interim Procurement Officer. In relation to Phase 2, there was no financial commitment to any company that SYFR had decided to work with as part of Phase 1. The intention was to have a separate
contractual arrangement, if opportunities had been identified, to which SYFR would present an identified business case to the Authority to set out the tangible business benefits that could be realisable if SYFR implemented or invested further monies.

M Buttery stated that Dr Billings, the Police and Crime Commissioner was very supportive of the digital strategy which would enable many collaboration opportunities. She added that the ability to share data between agencies was key.

RESOLVED – That Members approved:-

i) An initial investment of approximately £70,000 to procure the services of a relevant business partner to complete the work identified in Section C of the report.

ii) That the estimated cost of the works was funded from the Authority’s Invest to Save Reserve in line with its intended purpose.

12 CONFERENCE REPRESENTATION - LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION (LGA) ANNUAL FIRE CONFERENCE AND EXHIBITION 2018 ON 13 - 14 MARCH 2018

A report of the Clerk to the Fire and Rescue Authority was submitted to seek expressions of interest to attend the LGA Annual Fire Conference and Exhibition 2018 on Tuesday 13 – Wednesday 14 March 2018, at the Hilton Hotel, Newcastle Gateshead.

Councillor Burgess sought Members interest in attending the event.

Councillor Ayris requested that a full feedback report be provided to the Authority.

Members agreed that Councillors Burgess, Atkin, Damms and Clements would represent the Authority at the conference.

RESOLVED – That:-

i) Members approved representation at the LGA Annual Fire Conference and Exhibition 2018.

ii) A full feedback report to be provided to the Authority.

13 DRAFT MINUTES OF THE AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE HELD ON 18 SEPTEMBER 2017

RESOLVED – That Members noted the draft minutes of the Audit and Governance Committee held on 18 September 2017.
SHEFFIELD CITY REGION COMBINED AUTHORITY/SOUTH YORKSHIRE PENSIONS AUTHORITY

JOINT LOCAL PENSION BOARD

5 OCTOBER 2017

PRESENT:
G Boyington (Scheme Member) (Chair)
G Berrett (Employer, SYP), N Doolan-Hamer (Unison), P Lofts (Employer BMBC), S Ross (Scheme Member), J Thompson (Employer, Action Housing) and G Warwick (GMB)

Officers: S Barrett (Interim Fund Director), G Chapman (Head of Pensions Administration), M McCarthy (Deputy Clerk) and G Richards (Democratic Services Officer)

Apologies for absence were received from S Carnell and K Morgan

1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

The Chair welcomed Cllr Lofts to his first Board meeting. Apologies were noted as above.

The Board noted that as the Passenger Transport Pension Fund would transfer to the Greater Manchester Pension Fund on 1 November 2017, Steve Carnell would not be attending another meeting of the Board. The Board requested that a letter of thanks be sent to Steve to thank him for all his input into the work of the Board.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

3 ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

4 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 20 JULY 2017

With regard to the implementation of the General Data Protection Regulation in May 2018, G Chapman confirmed that training had been secured for IT staff. The online training system would be updated and staff would be required to take a compulsory course. Progress would be reported to the Corporate Planning and Governance Board in the New Year and the Local Pension Board would be kept informed.

It was confirmed that the Authority’s insurance covered the Board with regard to public indemnity but with an excess of £500,000; this could be reduced to zero subject to an annual premium of £2,000.
The Board requested that this be arranged as soon as possible to ensure they were fully covered.

M McCarthy reported that work was ongoing to fill the vacancies on the Board.

RESOLVED:

i) That officers arrange for the above mentioned insurance policy to be secured.

ii) That the minutes of the last meeting be agreed as a correct record.

5 WORK PROGRAMME

The Board’s Work programme was noted.

6 RISK MANAGEMENT - DRAFT RISK REGISTER

The Board considered that Authority’s Risk Register, noting the amendments and the new risk that had been added which reflected the risk around the implementation of the General Data Protection Regulation.

For the risk scores, it was suggested that it would be useful to add arrows to indicate if the score had gone up, down or had remained the same.

G Berrett questioned whether the scoring was subjective or based on a quantified assessment of probability.

M McCarthy reported that there was a risk matrix which would be made available to the Board.

7 REPORT OF BREACH TO PENSIONS REGULATOR

G Chapman reminded the Board that last year every effort had been made to get all Annual Benefits Statements despatched by the deadline but this had led to a large backlog of work. This year the decision had been made not to do this and therefore he had informed the Pensions Regulator in May that the Authority would only be able to issue approximately 75% of annual benefit statements by the 31 August deadline. The letter explained the reasons for this and also the plans and actions to ensure that all statements would meet the deadline next year.

The Board noted that the Pensions Regulator did not respond until August and their response included a number of questions which were duly responded to.

Following this the Head of Pensions Administration had a conference call with senior staff at the Regulators’ office; they indicated that they understood the reasons behind the decision and they were unlikely to take any further action. The Head of Pensions Administration had promised to update the Regulator on progress and had confirmed that over 90% had been sent out to date.
RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

8 LOCAL PENSION BOARD BUDGET

The Board noted its current budgetary position.

9 UPDATE TO CONSTITUTION AND TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Board were reminded that the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Pension Fund would transfer to the Greater Manchester Pension Fund on 1 November 2017. Consequently the Board would become ‘South Yorkshire Local Pension Board’ and all mention of SYPTPF removed from the Constitution and Terms of Reference.

RESOLVED – That the amended Constitution and Terms of Reference be submitted to the meeting of the Pensions Authority in November for approval.

10 INVESTMENT UPDATE

S Barrett informed the Board that the Annual Performance report had been considered by the Investment Board in September.

Overall, for the year end to March 2017 returns had been strong compared to previous years; approximately 22% against the benchmark.

For the first quarter of this financial year performance had been just above the benchmark and the second quarter had been around the same.

An equity protection scheme was being considered to protect the strong gains achieved.

The property strategy had worked well and there were plans in place for the property in Warrington which had been causing concern.

11 AUTHORITY AND BOARD WORK PROGRAMMES

The Board considered the Work Programmes of the Authority and its Boards.

Timings of Local Pension Board meetings were again discussed to enable the Board to comment on reports before they were finalised. Stand-alone meetings would be considered to facilitate this, especially for the Annual Governance Statement.

RESOLVED – That the Work Programmes be noted.

12 SYPA ANNUAL FUND MEETING

A report was submitted to inform the Board of the 2017 Annual Fund Meeting.
The meeting was to be held at the Source Skills Academy, Meadowhall on Thursday 19 October at 5.30pm. All Board members were urged to attend if possible.

The style and format of the meeting would follow last year’s event; questions would be invited from the floor after each presentation. The meeting would again be available to view in near real time, this had been publicised in newsletters and on the website.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

13 DRAFT REPORTING BREACHES PROCEDURE

A report was submitted to enable the Board to review the draft Reporting Breaches Procedure before submission to the Authority for approval.

The Head of Pensions Administration informed the Board that although there was already a procedure in place for reporting breaches of the Pensions Regulators Code of Practice No. 14 the reporting Breaches Procedure, attached as an appendix to the report, formalised this procedure.

Work was currently being undertaken to put in place the mechanism for identifying, reporting and logging breaches; a register for all breaches would be kept and published as appropriate.

Although no breaches were anticipated, further training and guidance would be provided to all staff to ensure they were aware of the circumstances in which breaches could occur and the appropriate mechanism for reporting them.

RESOLVED – That the Board recommend that the Reporting Breaches Procedure be submitted to the next meeting of the Pensions Authority for approval.

14 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

S Ross requested that officers consult Scheme Advisory Board guidance with regard to reporting breaches to ensure the Board’s Terms of Reference were consistent with the guidance.

M McCarthy reported that a post-pooling staffing structure for the Authority had recently been approved; this would be circulated to the Board once staff had been informed. BCPP press releases regarding recruitment would also be shared with Board members.

CHAIR
SOUTH YORKSHIRE PENSIONS AUTHORITY

5 OCTOBER 2017

PRESENT: Councillor S Ellis (Chair)
Councillor R Wraith (Vice-Chair)
Councillors: S Cox, T Hussain, J Mounsey, K Richardson,
A Sangar, I Saunders and Z Sykes

Trade Unions: N Doolan-Hamer (Unison) and G Warwick
(GMB)

Officers: S Barrett (Interim Fund Director), G Chapman (Head
of Pensions Administration), A Frosdick (Monitoring Officer),
B Clarkson (Head of Finance), N Copley (Treasurer),
M McCarthy (Deputy Clerk) and G Richards (Democratic
Services Officer)

Observers: G Berrett, G Boyington and J Thompson

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor S Durant,
Councillor K Harpham, Councillor K Wyatt and D Patterson

1 APOLOGIES

Apologies were noted as above.

2 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair announced that Deloittes had been appointed as the Authority’s external
auditor with effect from 2018/19 to replace KPMG.

3 URGENT ITEMS

None.

4 ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE ABSENCE OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS.

RESOLVED – That item 18 ‘SYPA Staffing Structure Post Pooling and Related
Matters’ and item 19 ‘Release of Preserved Benefits’ be considered in the absence of
the public and press.

5 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

None.

6 MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL AUTHORITY MEETING HELD ON 15 JUNE 2017

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the Authority’s Annual meeting held on 15 June
2017 be agreed and signed by the Chair as a true record.
RESOLVED – That the minutes of the Authority’s Ordinary meeting held on 15 June 2017 be agreed and signed by the Chair as a true record.

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting of the Corporate Planning and Governance Board held on 20 July 2017 be noted.

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting of the Investment Board held on 22 June 2017 be noted.

RESOLVED – That the Work Programme be noted.

The Chair informed Members that the district Treasurers were being kept up to date with all BCPP developments.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

The Authority considered the Corporate Planning and Governance Board’s Audit Committee Function Annual Report 2016/17.

The report covered the Board’s work during the financial year 2016/17 in relation to its audit committee function; it outlined the Board’s:

- Role and responsibilities;
- Membership and attendance; and
- Achievements.

It was suggested that attendance should be monitored and any concerns be raised with the authority concerned.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.
SYPF ANNUAL FUND MEETING 2017

A report was submitted to advise Members of the 2017 Annual Fund Meeting.

The event was to be held at the Source Skills Academy, Meadowhall on Thursday 19th October at 5.30pm. All members were welcome to attend.

The format of previous meetings would be followed; questions would be invited from the floor after each presentation.

The meeting would again be available to view in near real-time allowing members with internet access to watch the event, this was publicised in newsletters and on the website.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

POOLING UPDATE

A report was submitted to update on the progress of pooling in the Border to Coast Pensions Partnership (BCPP).

Members were informed that the steps necessary to respond to the implementation of MiFID II were ongoing.

Rachel Elwell had recently been appointed as Chief Executive Officer; the position of Chief Operations Officer had been determined but not yet signed off by all shareholders.

At the request of Members it was agreed to send out a brief biography of each senior appointment.

The Chair informed the Authority that two premises for BCPP staff in Leeds had been shortlisted; negotiations were continuing and it was expected that a decision would be made at the meeting of the Joint Committee on 20 October 2017.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

LGPS CURRENT ISSUES - FOR NOTING

Members considered a LGPS current issues paper prepared by Mercer noting in particular the items regarding early retirement strain costs and the tax implications for high earners where an individual’s Pension Input Amount exceeded the annual allowance for that tax year. G Chapman informed the Authority that a tax seminar in November had been arranged to give advice to anyone affected.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

SOUTH YORKSHIRE JOINT LOCAL PENSION BOARD ANNUAL REPORT

G Boyington and J Thompson, the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Joint Local Pension Board, presented the Board’s annual report.
The Authority were reminded that the Board’s remit was to ‘assist South Yorkshire Pensions Authority and South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Pension Fund (until November 2017) to maintain effective and efficient administration and governance’.

The Board had met three times during the year and attendance was generally good although there was concern that the Local Authorities consistently failed to fill their vacancies and their attendance had been poor.

Following the transfer of the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Pension Fund to Greater Manchester Pension Fund in November the Board would be recruiting for a new employer and employee representative. G Boyington thanked S Carnell for his involvement with the Board as the employee representative of SYPTPF and asked that a letter of thanks be sent to him from the Authority.

The Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board had attended national Pension Board events throughout the year and all members had attended various training events.

The Authority’s Chair suggested that it would be useful to invite all members of the Board to the next two-day BCPP training event which had been very successful. She thanked the Board for all their hard work and their attendance at Authority meetings.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

SYPA STAFFING STRUCTURE POST POOLING AND RELATED MATTERS

A report was submitted to seek Members’ agreement to the proposed staffing structure post pooling and to consider related matters including the recruitment of a permanent Fund Director, succession planning for the Head of Pensions Administration, the net reduction in posts as a result of transfer of functions to BCPP and consequential new posts required to meet the Authority’s ongoing strategic investment management responsibilities.

RESOLVED – That the Authority:

a) Agreed to the recruitment of a permanent Fund Director as set out in the report, allowing time for the new appointee to consider the resilience of the new structure and engage in the recruitment of the Investment Performance Manager.

b) Noted the succession plan for the post of Head of Pensions Administration.

c) Noted the proposed changes in the Finance Team as set out in the report.

d) Noted the deletion of the 7 f.t.e. investment management posts consequent upon the transfer of functions to BCPP and the creation of 2 new f.t.e. posts as set out in the report.

e) Noted that the new roles would require a level of qualification or a commitment to train and qualify to that level within a reasonable timeframe and noted that appropriate HR advice had been followed, the proposed structure had been shared with staff and the process had been agreed with the Trade Union representative.
f) Noted the existing and proposed staffing structure for the SYPS finance and investment teams.

g) Noted the budgetary impact of the changes as set out in the report.

h) Noted the requirement for further review as set out in the report.

19 RELEASE OF PRESERVED BENEFITS

A report was submitted to seek a decision from Members in relation to a request from a former South Yorkshire Magistrates Courts Committee employee for the release of preserved benefits on compassionate grounds.

RESOLVED – That the Authority agree to the release of preserved benefits on compassionate grounds as detailed in the report.

CHAIR
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1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were noted as above.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair explained that, prior to the meeting commencing, it was important to inform Panel Members that the Chief Constable had been invited to attend today’s meeting to discuss Neighbourhood Policing with the Panel informally, and not for scrutiny purposes. It was felt important for Members of the Panel, and the public, to hear from the Chief Constable about this important piece of work.

The Chair reminded Members that the Panel’s role was very clear; this was to challenge and scrutinise the Police and Crime Commissioner.
On behalf of the Panel, the Chair thanked Chief Constable Watson for taking time out of his extremely busy schedule to attend today’s meeting.

3 URGENT ITEMS

None.

4 ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE ABSENCE OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS

None.

5 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS IN RELATION TO ANY ITEM OF BUSINESS ON THE AGENDA

None.

6 PUBLIC QUESTIONS:-

7 TO THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER

There were no written public questions to the Police and Crime Commissioner.

8 TO THE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

There were no written public questions to the Police and Crime Panel.

9 VERBAL QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC TO THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER

There were no verbal questions from the Public to the Police and Crime Commissioner.

10 VERBAL QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC TO THE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

There were no verbal questions from the Public to the Police and Crime Panel.

11 QUESTIONS FROM POLICE AND CRIME PANEL MEMBERS TO THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER

In accordance with Procedure Rule 11 (General Questions from Members of the Panel), the following questions had been submitted and the response from the Police and Crime Commissioner:-

**Question from Mr A Carter**

"It is understood that, assuming their knowledge of how to go about it innocent, i.e. so-called “unconvicted” people may apply for the deletion from police records of their custody image - there being a presumption that this will then be automatically deleted unless its retention is deemed necessary for an operational policing purpose and/or there is an exceptional reason to retain it."
Whilst recognising the need to strike a careful balance between protecting individual privacy and giving the police the tools they need to keep us safe it is also to be recalled that a High Court ruling of 2012 asserts that the retention of custody images of such persons is unlawful.

Despite concerns having been raised by the Commons Science and Technology Committee over the lack of controls or safeguards, police forces apparently routinely continue to build up a massive and largely unregulated photographic database, readily capable of biometric scanning but without any of the controls or privacy safeguards that apply to police DNA and fingerprint databases.

Has the Commissioner any concerns about this issue and does he have a view about the South Yorkshire Police’s access to a database of images of potentially a great many individuals who have never been charged with, let alone convicted of, an offence?"

Response

At the current time, South Yorkshire Police are only responding to requests for photographs to be removed on a case by case basis as set out in the Home Office guidance.

A meeting is planned (4 October) with the relevant business leads to introduce the necessary processes to address the wider position of retention of photographs. For requests to have data removed, South Yorkshire Police will adopt a similar process to the one used nationally for the removal of DNA and fingerprints.

Currently, the wider retention of photographs is carried out under the Authorised Professional Practice (APP) Management of Police Information. The processes around retention and deletion of photographs will also form part of the CONNECT implementation plan.

Supplementary Question from Mr A Carter

Mr Carter thanked the Commissioner for his response. He commented that, from questions he had previously asked, he did have concerns regarding the increasing use of Artificial Intelligence within the Police service.

Mr Carter asked if he could be informed what the term ‘Connect’ referred to. Additionally, he asked if this was ongoing and something that the Panel may wish to receive further information on.

The Commissioner replied that, Connect was an IT system; further discussion around Connect would be brought up on today’s agenda under the item on the 101 Service.

Question from Councillor B Cutts

I am referring back to the last public demonstration in Rotherham that was police controlled, what was the level of liaison between SYP and RMBC?
Who is responsible for what and who determines the level of restraint and final approval?

Is there a final assessment, is there a de briefing?

Response

The planning for the EDL protest on 25th February 2017 started in January when we were notified of it taking place. Liaison with RMBC took place at multiple levels throughout the planning and delivery phase. The Gold Commander (ACC Forber) met with both the Chief Executive and the Leader of the Council during the planning phase. RMBC representatives were present at every strategic and tactical planning meeting, and were present in Gold and Silver Control on the day.

All decisions regarding the route and the method of policing the event rest with the Gold Commander, in this case ACC Forber. While extensive consultation took place with different stakeholders and the community, these decisions are based on the best possible option in order to prevent harm to people and to minimise crime and disorder.

ACC Forber attended a meeting at RMBC Council Chambers on 22nd February (at which I believe Cllr Cutts was present) where he fully explained the policing strategy for the protest and how he intended to ensure there was no disorder.

A full multi-agency debrief was conducted after the event which involved senior officers from RMBC.

Question from Councillor J Otten

Councillor Otten commented that a response to his question had not been provided. He stated that, from discussions held earlier this morning, the Chair was minded not to allow his question.

Councillor Otten felt that his question was relevant, and asked ‘Does the Commissioner believe it was right for Sarah Champion MP to “resign” from Labour’s front bench over remarks reported in The Sun newspaper?’

The Chair reiterated the role of the Panel was to hold the Police and Crime Commissioner to account regarding his statutory functions. In his opinion Councillor Otten’s question was not relevant to the function of this Panel. The Chair stated that he would be disallowing Councillor Otten’s question.

Councillor Otten protested the Chair’s decision; in his opinion the Chair was taking a narrow view, which diminishes the Panel’s role in a vital function with regards to holding the Police and Crime Commissioner to account.

The Chair reiterated his position and asked for other Members’ views.
With regard to the Judicial Review: Outcome, Councillor Otten stated that he felt that the following statement in the minutes was inaccurate: “to request the Commissioner to explain his actions was inappropriate in this forum and did not help the Panel going forward”.

Councillor Otten queried what the role of the Panel was; if these words could be spoken and recorded in the minutes.

L Noble confirmed that the words recorded in the minutes were spoken by the Monitoring Officer at the meeting.

Councillor Otten stated that, in his opinion, this was a matter arising. He raised concerns that Panel Members needed to understand what the role of the Panel was, if it was not appropriate to ask the Commissioner to explain his actions.

The Chair recalled from the meeting that, in terms of Judicial Review Outcome, it would not help matters moving forward, if Panel Members were to go back and ask the Commissioner to explain his actions and decisions.

Councillor Otten commented that, it was a supremely narrow view of the role of this Panel’s work if there are whole areas of the Commissioner’s work, which fall outside of the remit of this Panel’s scrutiny and challenge of his decisions. Furthermore, Councillor Otten stated that, in his opinion, it was his fear that the Panel had become emasculated to the nth degree over the last few meetings.

Councillor Sansome commented that, he too shared Councillor Otten’s frustrations regarding the Panel’s role not being able to challenge the Commissioner on the issues that Panel Members felt are relevant, but this was a Home Office decision and not one taken locally.

The role of Police and Crime Panels, and their powers, was discussed at the 12th July LGA workshop and would, undoubtedly, be discussed again at the Annual Police and Crime Panel Conference in November.

Councillor Sansome asked the Commissioner to provide details as to how he was holding the Joint Independent Audit Committee (JIAC) and the Chief Constable to account regarding outstanding internal audit recommendations which had been outstanding for a long period of time. Additionally, he asked what timescales had been given in terms of completing the outstanding issues.

The Commissioner replied that the JIAC was currently in the process of working through these outstanding issues. The Commissioner added that he received regular updates from the JIAC, which were received via exception reports at his Public Accountability Board (PAB). It was the responsibility of the Chair of JIAC and Committee Members to ensure that they got the responses they required to those outstanding items.

Mr Chu recalled that he had requested information at the previous meeting on contact management performance to see how it had improved or otherwise.
Mr Chu felt that there had been a missed opportunity at agenda item 11 (101 Update) which did detail the volume of calls received, but did not set out the performance information which he had asked for. Mr Chu asked if this information could be provided at the December Panel meeting.

The Commissioner agreed to provide this information.

Councillor Hughes commented that, following the restoration of Neighbourhood Policing, he had not yet seen any extra PCs and PCSOs in his village (Highfields, Doncaster) or in his Wards (Adwick and Carcroft, Doncaster), and that various crimes were on the increase. He asked how the Commissioner was holding the Force to account in relation to one of his priorities “to tackle offenders that cause the most harm in the community”.

The Commissioner noted Councillor Hughes’ concerns. He agreed to follow up these points with the Force.

The Commissioner added that the restoration of Neighbourhood Policing was only just beginning to be rolled out across the county by the Chief Constable. Furthermore, the Force had been proactive with its use of Operation Duxford, which had been rolled out in different areas in South Yorkshire involving a large concentration of Police Officers and partners in specific ‘hot spot’ areas.

Councillor Wilkinson reported that Operation Duxford had worked well within her Ward. She asked if Operation Duxford would be rolled out into other ‘hot spot’ areas within Doncaster.

The Commissioner replied that Operation Duxford had been operating in all four South Yorkshire districts, and that this would be continued.

Councillor Cutts asked if South Yorkshire Police were giving up on drugs and drug addicts. He referred to a case where video evidence had been supplied to the Police. However, the Police had stated because the video did not contain audio footage, they were unable to pursue the case.

The Commissioner replied that the Force was not giving up in this area. He asked that, if Councillor Cutts had a specific question he could contact his local Inspector or submit a question via his Office.

RESOLVED – That:-

i) The minutes of the Police and Crime Panel held on 7 July 2017 be agreed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

ii) The Commissioner follows up Councillor Hughes’s concerns with the Force regarding Neighbourhood Policing as outlined above.

ii) The Commissioner provides Mr Chu with information on contact management performance at the December Panel meeting.
The Panel received a briefing from Chief Constable Watson on the revised Neighbourhood Policing Model. A YouTube video clip introducing the improved policing service was shown for Panel Members’ information.

Panel Members were informed that the initial revised Neighbourhood Policing Model had been launched on 25 September 2017, with 12 neighbourhood areas across South Yorkshire; four in Sheffield, three in Doncaster and Rotherham and two in Barnsley, with over 350 dedicated officers, and a planned increase to over 400 by January 2018.

Each area was now led by a Local Inspector with a Sergeant, PCs and PCSOs dedicated to policing the local neighbourhoods. The teams would also provide support and assistance to local communities operating as problem solvers, with regular engagement events and drop-ins to enable members of the public to speak directly about any issues or concerns in their areas.

The Force would continue to engage with members of the public to find out how they are doing and if the implementation of the Neighbourhood Policing Model was meeting their needs and expectations.

The Chair thanked Chief Constable Watson and invited questions from Panel Members.

Councillor Hughes invited the Chief Constable and the Commissioner to attend the next Doncaster PACT meeting. He asked if they could provide a presentation on Neighbourhood Policing. Furthermore, Councillor Hughes asked if there were enough resources to carry out the proposals outlined by the Chief Constable.

Chief Constable Watson replied that there would be a significant number of Officers dedicated to Neighbourhood Policing. He was confident that these Officers would make a huge difference in South Yorkshire.

Councillor Otten asked if the whole of South Yorkshire would be covered by Neighbourhood Policing Teams. Additionally, he asked how the Force would deal with demands in more difficult areas.

Chief Constable Watson confirmed that the whole of South Yorkshire would be covered by a dedicated Neighbourhood Policing Team. Some areas would have a Neighbourhood Team more widely dispersed than others; every Town Centre and City Centre now had a dedicated Team. The Force would prioritise high priority areas, via demand data and deploy other resources accordingly.

Councillor Sansome asked if he could be provided with details regarding the background as to how the Force had decided on the number of dedicated Neighbourhood Officers for each district.

Chief Constable Watson replied that a significant degree of detailed work had been carried out to decide the number of dedicated Neighbourhood Officers in each district using a nationally agreed model of calculation.
Councillor Sansome recalled that, at a previous PAB meeting the Chief Constable had referred to a number of officers who were “shining stars” within the Force. He asked if any of those officers had been deployed to Neighbourhood Policing.

Chief Constable Watson confirmed that those Officers had all been allocated to Neighbourhood Policing Teams, with their training being specific to problem solving.

Councillor Cutts asked how members of the public could contact their local Neighbourhood Policing Team via the Force’s website.

Chief Constable Watson replied that there was a page on the Force’s website which allowed members of the public to input their home postcode, and information was then supplied on how to contact their local Neighbourhood Policing Team.

Councillor Hughes asked if the Force would be publishing any of its successes with regards to tackling crime.

Chief Constable Watson replied that the Force would begin to showcase good news achieved via Neighbourhood Policing.

It was noted that arrangements were currently being made for the Chief Constable to provide separate briefings on the revised Neighbourhood Policing Model for all Elected Members, at each of the four district councils.

The Chair commented that the new model was very welcome; he looked forward to its successful implementation. He commented that, to ensure the model was successful, work needed to take place at a “grass roots level” regards the public’s perception of SYP within the communities of South Yorkshire.

The Chair asked that, given the diverse range of communities in South Yorkshire, had the Force taken account of the different approaches required when interacting with different communities.

Chief Constable Watson replied that he wanted all of his Officers, in all circumstances, to behave with the highest integrity and be able to tailor their methods of communications and understanding to the sensitivities in certain areas of the communities they serve. The Force was currently looking at this element, with officers being fully engaged with the communities they serve.

In relation to the Force’s interaction with the public, Chief Constable Watson hoped that the Panel would see this reflected in reports from HMIC etc.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Police and Crime Panel:-

i) Noted the presentation.

ii) Thanked Chief Constable Watson for attending today’s meeting and for providing Panel Members with an interesting and informative presentation.
A report was presented to inform Members of the Panel of the capital expenditure planned for 2017/18.

The Panel noted that the Commissioner had approved the capital programme for 2017/18 as part of the budget setting process on 15 February 2017. The capital programme for 2017/18 amounted to £13m.

The forecast outturn as at 31 July 2017 showed capital expenditure of £14.8m, with the majority of the variance to budget relating to projects that would slip from 2017/18 to 2018/19.

S Slater provided Members with a detailed breakdown of the projects contained within the 2017/18 capital programme.

Councillor Wilkinson asked what the effect on removing the pay cap on Police Officer salaries would have on police finances; would this be funded by the Force or would it affect Police Officer numbers.

The Commissioner replied that Government had announced a 1% pay increase in Police Officer salaries and a 1% bonus on top of the pay increase, back dated to September. There was currently uncertainty around the payment of the 1% bonus. The Commissioner was assuming a 1% salary increase next year. In relation to police staff, the Commissioner was currently unclear what the Government were proposing.

The Commissioner confirmed that to fund salary increases this year, these had been met from reserves; if salaries continued to rise there could be implications on the number of staff employed.

Councillor Griffin asked how the Commissioner holds the Chief Constable to account with regards to the Force’s revised Estates Strategy.

The Commissioner replied that he was regularly updated on the Force’s Estates Strategy, which was currently being reviewed. It had been acknowledged that the Force would need to sell some of its unused buildings, as part of that review.

Councillor Griffin stated that in terms of public confidence, the disposal of police buildings on a large scale would need to be undertaken sensitively.

The Commissioner concurred with Councillor Griffin, he stated that the Chief Constable was extremely aware of public sensitivities around the disposal of any police buildings.

M Buttery added that, in terms of holding the Chief Constable to account, she could confirm that the Commissioner owned the assets (as set out in law).

Furthermore, the Commissioner also had an interest in the appointment of a new Head of Estates for South Yorkshire Police, and he had asked to sit on the interview panel because of his interest. Previously, there had been an Estates Board, Chaired by a representative of the PCC, where the Force was held to
account for its Estates Strategy and the decision making around the finance, the operational need and the public consultation around the disposal of buildings etc.

The Commissioner would be asking the new Head of Estates, on their appointment, to discuss with them the best way of holding the Force to account in this area.

Mr Carter asked if he could be informed how the apportionment of financing the Connect system was worked out via the various partners. Additionally, Mr Carter noted the ‘Specific Grants’ in the 2017/18 capital budget showed a nil sum, he asked what would feature in ‘Specific Grants’, and at what point, if any.

S Slater confirmed that in terms of apportionment, there was a set net revenue expenditure split between the Force and Humberside Police for the Connect project. In respect of the Specific Grants, it was confirmed that, at the beginning of the year, the Commissioner did not know what grants he would be receiving, therefore a nil balance was shown. As grants are received, this information would be applied.

Councillor Sansome commented that there had been a recent report released concerning the levels of overtime paid by South Yorkshire Police to its officers and staff; he asked how this overtime was being managed against the budget.

S Slater replied that monthly budget monitoring reports containing the overtime figures are presented at the Commissioner’s Public Accountability Board (PAB) for scrutiny and monitoring. This issue of overtime was ongoing and this was being closely monitored by the Force’s Finance Team and its Senior Leadership Group.

Councillor Sansome asked how the Chief Constable intended to maintain staff morale, bearing in mind the amount of additional hours officers were working.

The Commissioner confirmed that he regularly asked the Chief Constable to monitor the overtime budget to understand why overtime was being paid for particular duties.

The Chair reported that the Commissioner’s Chief Finance and Commissioning Officer, Allan Rainford would shortly be leaving the OPCC.

On behalf of the Panel, the Chair thanked Allan for his hard work and for the support provided to both past and present Members. His work around the budget had been invaluable in helping the Panel make informed decisions.

M Buttery informed Panel Members that, Allan Rainford’s replacement would need confirming by the Panel, as required in law. L Noble was currently making arrangements for a meeting date.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Police and Crime Panel noted the report on Capital Expenditure.
A report was submitted that provided Members of the Panel with information on how the Commissioner determines the policing and crime priorities for South Yorkshire, approves the budget, issues the council tax precept and issues or varies his Police and Crime Plan.

Members noted that the OPCC had a Strategic Planning Timetable which supported the Commissioner in fulfilling these requirements. The Timetable set out the activities necessary throughout the current planning and financial year, including consultation with the public, Chief Constable, partners and the Police and Crime Panel to refresh the Police and Crime Plan.

It was noted that the Commissioner had indicated to the Chief Constable that he did not intend to refresh the strategic priorities this year; however, this would be dependent upon the information gathered by the OPCC.

M Buttery provided the Panel with an example of the detailed information the Commissioner required from the Chief Constable.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Police and Crime Panel noted the contents of the report.

101 UPDATE

A report was submitted to provide Members of the Panel with an update on the 101 system and the total number of emergency and non-emergency calls received per year by South Yorkshire Police.

Members noted that a full review on the contact management service at Altas Court was currently taking place around resources, IT and governance.

The Commissioner informed the Panel that the Force were making considerable investments to replace its existing information systems and contact management platforms with the introduction of the Connect system and Smartcontact.

The Connect System would be launched in December 2017, with Smartcontact due to be implemented in March 2018. This brought four existing data bases into one.

The new technology would enable the Force to better respond to calls and reduce the demands which are currently being received via 101. People would be able to contact the Police in several new different ways via Smartcontact.

The Panel was informed that Humberside Police had already gone live with the Connect System which was currently enabling the Force to learn lessons from their implementation.

Councillor Wilkinson asked why the Force were not advertising more widely about the facility to report a crime etc. via their website.

The Commissioner asked his Community Engagement and Communications Manager, Fiona Topliss to take up this issue with the Force on his behalf.
Councillor Wilkinson suggested that the Force could develop a mobile App which would allow smart phone users to report a crime etc. via the App.

The Commissioner commented that this may be possible and would be considered with the implementation of the new technology.

Mr Chu asked if there was a particular reason why the number of non-emergency calls had doubled since 2014.

The Commissioner suggested that this may be due to public sector resources being squeezed; where people may have contacted another service in the past, they now contacted 101 for assistance. Understanding what the demand is was currently part of the review of Atlas Court.

M Buttery suggested that the increase in non-emergency calls in 2014 may have been a result of the ‘Sheffield factor’ where a triage of calls had been taken by the Police and re-routed to Sheffield City Council. M Buttery agreed to investigate and report back to Mr Chu.

Councillor Sansome asked if the Commissioner felt the failings of the 101 service were being properly communicated to the public of South Yorkshire and if not, how could this be improved.

The Commissioner replied that the system failings were well known by the public who had used the service. He added that there needed to be an educational campaign around when it was appropriate to dial 999, 101, and when it was appropriate to dial another service.

The Commissioner anticipated that the Panel would see a gradual improvement in call handling performance from March/April 2018 onwards.

Councillor Sansome asked if Panel Members could receive the Force’s scope for the 101 Review.

The Commissioner acknowledged Councillor Sansome’s request. M Buttery stated that this information would be included within the next Performance report.

The Chair asked if the Panel could receive regular updates on the progress of the Force’s Review of 101.

The Commissioner acknowledged the Chair’s request.

Mr Carter asked if Panel Members could visit Atlas Court, at an appropriate time, when the new systems had been implemented and staff had received training.

The Commissioner stated that arrangements would be made by his Office for Panel Members to visit Atlas Court at a later date.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Police and Crime Panel:-

i) Noted the contents of the report.
ii) Noted that the Commissioner had asked his Community Engagement and Communications Manager to speak with the Force regarding wider advertising of reporting crimes etc. via the Force’s website.

iii) Noted that M Buttery had agreed to investigate why there had been an increase in non-emergency calls in 2014 (possibly due to the ‘Sheffield Factor’) and report back to Mr Chu.

iv) Noted that the Force’s scope for the 101 Review would be included within the next Performance report to the Panel.

v) Noted that a visit to Atlas Court would be arranged by the Commissioner’s Office for Panel Members, shortly after the new systems had been implemented and staff had received training.

17 HATE CRIME

A report was presented which provided Panel Members with information regarding how the Commissioner holds the Chief Constable to account for Hate Crime.

The Commissioner highlighted that there had been a rise in the number of hate crime and hate incidents reported to both the police and crime monitoring organisations nationally, post the EU Referendum, numerous terrorist attacks across Europe and elsewhere.

The Commissioner provided the Panel with assurances that the Force had understood the importance of hate crime and hate incidents, along with understanding the five protected characteristics which may result in a hate crime. It was highlighted that the public had found it difficult to distinguish between a hate incident and a hate crime; both of which were recorded. Hate incidents had decreased, whereas hate crime had increased.

Panel Members noted that the Commissioner’s Independent Ethics Panel (IEP) had the role of monitoring hate crime on the Commissioner’s behalf, via bi-annual update reports. IEP Members reported any exceptions / areas of concern to the Commissioner via his Public Accountability Board.

Councillor Sansome asked if Panel Members could receive a breakdown of the types of hate crimes / hate incidents reported in each of the four South Yorkshire districts.

The Commissioner acknowledged Councillor Sansome’s request for information.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Police and Crime Panel:-

i) Noted the contents of the report and commented upon any matters arising.

ii) Noted that the Commissioner would provide Panel Members with a breakdown of the types of hate crimes / hate incidents reported in each of the four South Yorkshire districts.
THE PCC’S AND SOUTH YORKSHIRE POLICE’S PARTNERSHIPS AND COLLABORATION ARRANGEMENTS

A report was submitted which provided Members of the Panel with a high level overview of the Police and Crime Commissioner’s (PCC’s) and South Yorkshire Police’s (SYP’s) partnerships and collaboration arrangements.

The report highlighted that there was a need for Panel Members to understand the PCC’s and SYP’s partnerships and collaboration arrangements, in order that the Panel could decide where and when it needs to involve itself in supporting or scrutinising the PCC’s activities and decision making.

The Commissioner highlighted that the PCC’s and SYP’s partnership and collaboration arrangements were part of a complex landscape, with some being statutory and others non-statutory and on a formal or informal basis.

Panel Members noted the PCC’s and SYP’s principal arrangements, which were set out under four category headings within the report.

The Commissioner reported that under Category One, he was now a Member of Sheffield’s Health and Wellbeing Board. Furthermore, the Commissioner was a Member of South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority. A Police and Fire Collaboration Board had been established, Chaired by the Commissioner.

Councillor Otten asked if Panel Members could question the Commissioner with regards to his conduct, actions and voting on South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority.

D Cutting replied that he was aware of this emerging area of the Commissioner’s accountability. He agreed to provide Members with a written response to Councillor Otten’s question via email after today’s meeting.

M Buttery informed the Panel that, in relation to governance and ensuring that the partnerships were adding value, the OPCC, on behalf of the Commissioner and the Force had agreed to carry out joint work to review their current collaborations and partnerships, which would form part of the budget setting process regarding future funding decisions.

It was noted that the Force and Commissioner would only enter into collaborations and partnerships which added value in terms of efficiency and effectiveness for the communities of South Yorkshire.

Mr Carter indicated that he was a Member of the Sheffield Safer and Sustainable Communities Partnership Board. He stated that he was concerned about this Board, which had last met on the 16th May 2017. At the May meeting there had been no representatives from the Commissioner’s Office or the Force present.

Subsequently, the Board meeting scheduled for 19th September 2017 had been cancelled due to the number of apologies received. The Board had now been rescheduled to December 2017. Mr Carter commented that, in his opinion, if this
was supposed to be an effective and effective partnership, he needed to be convinced.

The Commissioner acknowledged Mr Carter’s concerns; he commented that he would need to consider if his Office should be giving more support to this particular Board.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Police and Crime Panel:-

i) Noted the contents of the report.

ii) Noted that D Cutting would provide Members with a written response via email after today’s meeting to clarify if Panel Members could question the Commissioner with regards to his conduct, actions and voting on South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority.

iii) Noted that the Commissioner would take on board Mr Carter’s concerns relating to meetings of the Sheffield Safer and Sustainable Communities Partnership Board.

19 UPDATE TO THE RULES OF PROCEDURE

A report was presented to draw Members attention to revisions to the Panel’s Rules of Procedure.

Panel Members were informed that the Panel’s current Rules of Procedure did not include elements for dealing with disruptive behaviour, Notices of Motion or Amendments to the Rules. These elements had now been added with some minor amendments for clarification.

D Cutting stated that, during the course of this morning’s meeting he had considered further amendments to the Rules of Procedure, which may be helpful in clarifying the function of the Police and Crime Panel.

In respect of Rule 22.2, D Cutting stated that he would add extra wording setting out the conditions, where the Rules may be suspended (with the Monitoring Officer’s consent) to deal with emergency or urgent matters.

In respect of written questions from members of the public at Panel meetings, the Rules of Procedure would be amended to reflect that a member of the public must give at least five working days’ notice in writing to the Monitoring Officer.

D Cutting asked Panel Members to consider if Rule10 needed to be amended to take account of urgent oral questions from members of the public at Panel meetings.

Councillor Griffin suggested that the Panel needed to consider the wider role of the public in this meeting.

M Buttery suggested that it may be helpful for Panel Members to know how many individuals viewed webcasts of the Panel meetings.
L Noble agreed to obtain details and report back to Members of the Panel.

Councillor Wilkinson pointed out that questions from Panel Members to the Commissioner, set out that questions which had been asked and answered, must not be repeated at a Panel meetings in the 6 months preceding the date of the meeting. Councillor Wilkinson suggested that this point be added to the Rule of Procedure relating to questions from members of the public.

Members agreed to Councillor Wilkinson’s suggestion.

D Cutting added that he would amend the Rules of Procedure to take account of the matter. If it was considered still to be a ‘live’ matter, then this would be at the discretion of the Chair to allow the question.

Mr Chu stated that, in his opinion, the facility for submitting written public questions was adequate; there was no need for the Panel to take oral questions from members of the public.

After consideration, Panel Members agreed that written questions from members of the public would continue to be allowed.

With regard to oral questions from members of the public, Panel Members agreed that under normal circumstances these would not be allowed. However, in exceptional circumstances, at the discretion of the Chair, a member of the public may be allowed to ask a question at a Panel meeting on the day.

D Cutting referred to Rule 11.2 (written general questions to the Commissioner by Members), he suggested that Members may wish to consider increasing the word count currently set at 50 words to now not exceed 100 words.

It was agreed that a reasonable approach would be taken in relation to the word count.

D Cutting asked Panel Members to consider if there needed to be a time limit set at Rule 11.4, to state that the Members questions agenda item shall last no more than x amount of minutes for both written and oral questions, unless the Chair of the meeting extends this period.

Panel Members agreed that the time set for the Panel Members questions agenda item would be at the discretion of the Chair.

Councillor Otten suggested that provision to suspend the Rules of Procedure be added to points listed at Rule 13.3. D Cutting agreed to add this point at Rule 13.3.

A Carter referred to Rule 13, he commented that, usually, Notice of Motions are moved and seconded. He suggested that this be added to the Rules of Procedure. D Cutting agreed to add a sentence at Rule 13.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Police and Crime Panel:-
i) Noted the contents of the report and the suggested amendments.

ii) Agreed that the Rules of Procedure be amended, taking account of Panel Members' comments as outlined above.

iii) Authorise the publication and use of the revised Rules of Procedure.

iv) Noted that L Noble would provide Panel Members with details regarding how many individuals viewed the webcasts of Panel meetings.

20 PCC DECISIONS

A report was presented to provide Members of the Police and Crime Panel with information on the decisions taken by the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC).

RESOLVED – That Members of the Police and Crime Panel noted the contents of the report.

21 SOUTH YORKSHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL - WORK PROGRAMME 2017/18

The Panel considered its 2017/18 Work Programme.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Police and Crime Panel noted the 2017/18 Work Programme.

22 ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POLICE AND CRIME PANELS

L Noble reported that, Members may already be aware that there was a National Association of Police and Crime Commissioners and that, there had been discussions around the establishment of a national association of Police and Crime Panels.

At the LGA’s Police and Crime Panels Workshop in July, the Chair of Hertfordshire PCP announced that he had resurrected discussions around a national association and would be putting together a consultation paper to inform the way forward.

A consultation document was received in August and sent to Members for comment. The Panel had responded to the Clerk of Hertfordshire PCP on 22 September.

It was very likely that the LGA would be facilitating some kind of Special Interest Group, as the general consensus from those present at the Seminar in July was that there was no spare money within existing Grants to set up, develop and support an independent Association.

It was anticipated that a revised document on the Independent Association would be discussed at the National PCP conference in November, at which the Chair and Vice-Chair would be present. A written update report on the National PCP
conference would be presented at the December Panel meeting for Members’
information.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Police and Crime Panel:-

i) Noted the update.

ii) Noted that a written update report on the National PCP conference would be
presented at the December Panel meeting.

23 DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Panel will be held on Friday 15 December 2017, 10:00 am
at the Offices of the Joint Authorities, 18 Regent Street, Barnsley, S70 2HG.

CHAIR
PRESENT: Councillor A Khayum (Sheffield City Council) (Chair)

Councillors: B Cutts (Rotherham MBC), J Dunn (Sheffield City Council), D Hughes (Doncaster MBC), B Johnson (Sheffield City Council), J Otten (Sheffield City Council) and S Wilkinson (Doncaster MBC)

Independent Co-opted Member: Mr A Carter

Dr A Billings (South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner), E Redfearn (Office of the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner) and F Topliss (Office of the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner)

Officers: D Cutting, M McCarthy, L Noble and A Shirt (Barnsley MBC)

M Clements (Candidate)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor S Sansome, Councillor D Griffin, Councillor R Sixsmith MBE, Mr S Chu, M Buttery and A Frosdick

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were noted as above.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS IN RELATION TO ANY ITEM OF BUSINESS ON THE AGENDA

None.

3 ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE ABSENCE OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS

RESOLVED – That the Confirmation Hearing be held in public with exception of the deliberation by the Panel in respect of the proposed appointment which would take place at the end of the Confirmation Hearing in the absence of the public and press.
CONFIRMATION HEARING - CHIEF FINANCE AND COMMISSIONING OFFICER, OFFICE OF THE SOUTH YORKSHIRE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER

Consideration was given to a report presented by the Commissioner, which confirmed how the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 (‘the Act’), under Schedule 1, Paragraph 6 directed that the Police and Crime Commissioner for a police area must appoint a Chief Finance Officer.

Under Paragraph 10 of Schedule 1 of the Act, the Panel must review the proposed appointment, hold a Confirmation Hearing and make a report to the Commissioner on the proposed appointment, including a recommendation to the Commissioner as to whether or not the candidate should be appointed, within a period of three weeks beginning with the day on which the Panel receives notification from the Commissioner of the proposed appointment.

Following the retirement of the Commissioner’s current Chief Finance and Commissioning Officer, Mr Allan Rainford on 10 November 2017, notification from the Commissioner, to the Police and Crime Panel had been received of his intention to appoint a preferred candidate, Mr Michael Clements, to the position of Chief Finance and Commissioning Officer.

Additionally, the report set out the powers of the Panel and the process to be followed in the Confirmation Hearing. The Panel noted the information provided by the Commissioner relating to the appointment of the Chief Finance and Commissioning Officer which included:

- The name of the preferred candidate;
- The criteria used to assess the suitability of the candidate for the appointment;
- Why the candidate satisfies those criteria; and
- The terms and conditions on which the candidate is to be appointed.

The Commissioner informed the Panel that a total of eleven applications had been received for the position, with five applicants meeting the shortlisted criteria to allow them to proceed to an assessment centre and formal interview. An overview of the intensive recruitment and selection process followed to select his preferred candidate, Mr Clements, was provided to the Panel.

Councillor Khayum informed the Commissioner that in preparation for today’s Hearing Panel Members had raised several questions in relation to the report, which he asked the Commissioner to answer.

Firstly, could the Panel be provided with assurances that the recruitment and selection process had been robust, and the reasons why the Commissioner believed that the candidate was the most suitable person for the position.

The Panel were given assurances by the Commissioner that the appointment process was robust to ensure that the preferred candidate met the criteria set out in the role profile and person specification. Each shortlisted applicant went through the same process and were treated equitably.
E Redfearn outlined the assessment centre process which had consisted of three elements to test the candidates’ suitability against the essential criteria; a technical exercise, a commissioning exercise with a stakeholder panel, and a formal interview panel.

It was confirmed that Mr Clements had scored highest across the three elements of the assessment centre and was the Commissioner’s preferred candidate for the role.

The Panel asked if the Commissioner believed that the interim arrangements proposed of one day per week were sufficient.

The Commissioner stated that he was confident that interim arrangements were sufficient.

E Redfearn confirmed that Mr Clements would be carrying out the Section 151 responsibilities during the interim period of one day per week. A number of other Police and Crime Commissioners did not have a full time Section 151 officers.

The Panel asked what other financial / commissioning support there was in the interim period.

E Redfearn informed the Panel that, within the Commissioner’s Office, there was a Finance Manager and Commissioning Manager whose roles are to manage the day to day aspects of the office. Additionally, South Yorkshire Police had offered intermediate support should it be required.

The Panel asked if the Commissioner had received references from the candidate’s current employer, and would the Commissioner be willing to share those with the Panel.

E Redfearn replied that this was personal information and in any event would need to obtain Mr Clements’ permission. Additionally, it was confirmed that the Commissioner had now received Mr Clements’ security clearance.

Councillor Khayum thanked the Commissioner and E Redfearn for answering the additional questions. He added that this was with a view to improving the process for future Hearings.

In conclusion, Panel Members felt that it would have been helpful to have received more detail in the written report submitted by the Commissioner. They asked that future confirmation hearing reports provide more information around the de-selected applicants and the reasons the preferred candidate had been put forward for confirmation.

The Commissioner acknowledged the Panel’s requests.

At this point in the meeting, Councillor Khayum asked the Commissioner and his Officers’ present to leave the public meeting.
Mr Clements was invited into the Hearing, welcomed by Councillor Khayum and introductions were made by Panel Members and Officers present.

The Panel asked a series of questions to Mr Clements which related to his professional competence, personal independence and the key challenges faced in the role of Chief Finance and Commissioning Officer. The answers provided enabled Members to evaluate Mr Clements’ suitability for the position.

At the end of questioning, the Chair thanked Mr Clements and provided him with an opportunity to clarify any responses given and to ask any questions of the Panel.

Mr Clements thanked the Panel for inviting him to the Confirmation Hearing. He confirmed that he did not have any additional questions to ask the Panel.

At this point, Councillor Khayum closed the meeting to the Public and Press.

The Panel retired to consider all the information that had been provided in the Confirmation Hearing, the profile of the candidate and the answers to the questions before coming to a decision.

At this point in the meeting, Councillor Khayum re-opened the meeting to the Public and Press.

On the basis of the information provided by the Commissioner, and the discussions held in the Confirmation Hearing, Councillor Khayum informed the Commissioner that the Panel agreed to the appointment of Mr Clements to the role of Chief Finance and Commissioning Officer.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Police and Crime Panel:-

i) Reviewed and approved the appointment of Mr Michael Clements as the Commissioner’s permanent Chief Finance and Commissioning Officer from 1 January 2018, and his acting Chief Finance Officer between 11 November and 31 December 2017.

ii) Agreed to make a report to the Commissioner on the appointment of Mr Michael Clements in accordance with the requirements of Schedule 1 of the Act.

CHAIR