

During December 2016 and January 2017, O&S Committees considered the budget proposals relevant to their remits. The following note summarises the key points:

(Housing and Homes O&S Committee)

CC5: Surpluses expected to be generated on the Housing Benefit Subsidy Grant

- Officers were confident in their ability to meet targets and generate the surplus. However, it was noted that the introduction of Universal Credit with payments in arrears could impact on the HRA.
- Members felt that Core Cities and other West Midlands authorities should be asked about how they are using their incentive payments.

(Schools, Children and Families O&S Committee)

In relation to CC2: Introduce a Corporate Future Operating Model (FOM) across all support services and management structures for the Council Members noted that there had been many FOMs in the Council previously and not all of which has delivered the required savings. Also, there is a difficulty of attributing savings to this model and of avoiding double counting with the other saving targets. Therefore, Members wanted reassurance that there would be the capacity to deliver both the savings and the services if there were future

requested further details of the evidential basis for the 11 wards proposed and specific costs around the setting up of a licensing scheme.

HN7 – Asset and Property Disposal Programme

- Members initially questioned the capital values required for selling off assets to meet the revenue targets. They were subsequently informed that a three year disposal programme is planned (equating to £8m of operational assets and service outlets that are no longer required for the delivery of services). These assets will be identified during 2017/18 and the disposals are expected to commence in the final quarter of 2017/18 at the end of the year. The receipts will be used to repay debt and this will result in savings on our interest and debt repayments.
- Members reiterated the need for consultation with Ward Members prior to sale of assets.

HN11 – Extension of the INReach Housing Programme (up to 200 homes)

- Members felt that the level of detail in the budget consultation paper should be better explained. However, they did receive further information. The Council has already commenced the development of new homes for private rent through this Wholly Owned Company (InReach). The financial model for this approach is:
- Development of homes for PRS through the Council's Wholly Owned Company (WOC) InReach generates income for the General Fund;
- The sale of Council development sites to the WOC creates a capital receipt to the Council;
- The Council borrows money at Public Works Loan Board rates to lend on to the WOC at a (higher) commercial rate;
- Any surpluses generated by the WOC return to the Council to fund General Fund services.
- The model also provides opportunities to buy back council house right to buy stock and to build new social rented Council homes which are protected

- Members were assured that this would not lead to a service reduction, but was about a more accurate balance of HRA and General Fund contributions.

changes to and reductions in service, but they will need to know the outcome of budget discussions first.

- Members raised concerns about impact on vulnerable people, and the ability of third sector providers to mitigate the costs. Further concerns were raised about deliverability of the proposals and if details would be known prior to the budget vote;
- Members requested further details on the consultations, specifically:
 - Where will the impacts occur;
 - Evidence of views back from the Supporting People Engagement Group;
 - Details of proposed mitigation plans;
 - Equality Analysis.

(Schools, Children and Families O&S Committee)

In relation to HW1: Supporting People savings proposals, Members were most concerned that

Budget Consultation 2017+

Schools, Children and Families O&S Committee

1 Context

1.1 The City Council's consultation on its proposed budget was launched on 8th December 2016. The closing date for the consultation is on the 18th January 2017. The Schools, Children and Families O&S Committee met on the 11th January 2017 to review the proposals as they relate to the committee's remit and considered four key questions:

1. What impact would the proposals have on citizens of Birmingham?
2. What assumptions underpin the budget proposals?
3. Are there any other options that could be considered / explored?
4. What are the proposals for delivery of the proposals?

2 Budget Consultation 2017+ Paper

2.1 Members had a number of concerns regarding the consultation paper and made the following suggestions on how this can be improved:

- The budget lines should include the baseline budget figures so that the percentages of the savings can be known.
- It should be implicate that the budget being consulted on does not include savings already agreed for previous budgets.
- It should be explained that the savings per year are cumulative figures and eacu-

x

3 Children Budget Consultation

- 3.1 The Cabinet Member for Children, Schools and Families explained that these saving proposals are for £50.593m and are in addition to the £27.8m savings already consulted on and agreed previously. Some of these previously agreed savings have not yet been implemented.
- 3.2 Below is the feedback for the Cabinet Member for Children, Schools and Families portfolio (CH1 – CH6). This includes a risk rating of whether the Committee thought the savings are achievable (low risk to being achieved, medium risk to being achieved, high risk of not being achieved).

CH1: Contact and Escort

- 3.3 The proposed total saving for this is £100,000 from a £1.4m budget. Alastair Gibbons, Executive Director for Children's Services clarified that the service supervised too much contact and a number of visits need to be facilitated, rather than supervised. The number of supervised visits had reduced over the past two years and it was felt supervised visits could be further reduced, with the budget saving proposal having "no pain" and being achievable. On the information provided Members were satisfied with this proposal and the risk of this not being achieved was assessed as being low.

CH2: Residential Closure

- 3.4 The proposed saving for this is £300,000 for 2017/18 and an extra £100,000 in 2018/19 from a £5.1m budget for the disabled children's homes run directly by the City Council. The Executive Director for Children's Services clarified that the proposed savings are for the closure of one disabled residential children's home and the increase of foster carers costs were not factored into this. Members raised concerns about the need for short term breaks for disabled children and the risk of not finding sufficient foster carers with the expertise to offer short breaks, if a home is closed. On the information provided the majority of Members were satisfied with this proposal due to the current underuse of these homes and awarded this a medium risk to being achieved, due to the phased nature of merging the two children's homes.

CH3: CWD – Child Protection Resources (assessment of parenting capacity)

- 3.5 The proposed saving for this is £200,000 from a £310,000 budget. Concern was expressed regarding the last sentence 'This may mean that the service provided is not as flexible and families may be required to wait longer for this specialist assessment'. Alastair assured Members that this wording was incorrect and it was not the case, as demand for this has reduced in the last four years and the remaining team of five within this service can be integrated into the main service.

4 Other Saving Proposals

4.1 The Cabinet Member for Children, Schools and Families highlighted a number of saving proposals not within her portfolio that may impact negatively on children:

-