

Second Addendum to the Report of the Assistant Director, Office of the Chief Executive to the meeting of the Executive to be held on 21 February 2017 (Document 'BA')

Subject:

Consultation feedback and equality assessments for the 2017-18 and 2018-19 Council budget proposals - report addendum (Document 'BA')

1. Summary

1.1 The report (Document BA) of the Assistant Director, Office of the Chief Executive was published on 30 January 2017 and was presented to the Executive at its meeting on 7 February 2017. The report includes information from the public engagement and consultation programme in relation to the budget proposals for the 2017-18 and 2018-19 budget. The report gives details of information as follows:

- the public consultation and engagement sessions to the end of 30 January 2017,
- the written comments both postal and via the website to the end of 30 January 2017

1.2 The public consultation and engagement programme continued until 12 February 2017 meaning that there was an on-going requirement to provide details of further information and comments received. The first addendum to the report was presented to the Executive on 7 February 2017 and published the same day, and provided an update on feedback received through the budget consultation programme from 31 January 2017 to 2 February 2017.

1.3 This is the second and final addendum to the report presented on 7 February 2017 and contains an update on feedback received since 2 February 2017 through to the closure of the budget consultation programme on 12 February 2017.

2. Participation

2.1 There have been no further dedicated consultation sessions with community of interest groups since the first addendum was published on 7 February 2017.

2.2 In total, since the beginning of the consultation, the Council has received comments from 916 people or groups through the online questionnaire, an increase of 230 since 2 February 2017. In total this produced comments on 1009 different budget proposals for 2017/18 and 2018/19, an increase of 270 since 2 February 2017. A total of 188 comments have also been made that are not specific to particular proposals for the next two years, an increase of 57 since the 2 February 2017 report.

In addition, a total of 239 postal questionnaires have been received (an increase of 100 since the last report) and 47 representations have been made through emails or letters (an increase of 17).

- 2.3 The additional written responses have included submissions from all three local Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCG's) (Airedale, Wharfedale and Craven, Bradford City and Bradford Districts), the Bradford District Care NHS Foundation Trust, Bradford Chamber of Commerce, and Bradford Safeguarding Adults Board.
- 2.4 The written responses relating to the proposals have been reported back to the departments. The Strategic Director (SD) or other appropriate Chief Officer (CO) has responsibility for ensuring that the proposals for their department or service area are reviewed and that the proposals, along with the relevant Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) are updated as appropriate. A revised version of the EIA's, version 3, will be published on 16 February 2017 in advance of the Executive meeting on 21 February 2017 as Elected Members need to have regard to all the information contained in them when considering their recommendations to Council on the budget for 2017-18 and the budget savings proposals for 2017-18 onwards.

3. Equality Assessments

- 3.1 The updated equality impact assessments now include a response from the relevant Council service to the feedback received. Having received the feedback, further consideration has been given to what impacts there might be on protected characteristic and low income/low wage groups both on which groups will be impacted, and the levels of those impacts. The detail of any changes can be found on the individual EIA's as published on 16 February 2017. However an update is provided below on the consequent changes to the cumulative impacts.
- 3.2 The EIA for the proposal Regeneration - Sustrans (4R20), shows high impact across more than one protected characteristic (age and low income/low wage).
- 3.3 The protected characteristic of age remains very high for both young people and older people. This is seen primarily through the Public Health and Adults and Community Services (Better Health, Better Lives) proposals which will have a high impact on a smaller number of people, and Better Skills, Jobs, Economy which will affect a large number of people. 32 of the 39 proposals show impacts. Likewise for disability, there are fewer proposals showing high impact, but still 30 showing impact across all proposals, with the areas of most concern being public realm management, adults demand management reductions and Public Health's funding of warm homes and injury minimisation programmes.
- 3.4 Again across all proposals, 32 show impacts on people with low income and low wage. Most high impacts occur through the range of Public Health proposals in Better Health, Better Lives. Another protected characteristic being affected by a larger number of proposals, 24 in total, is race through a possible cessation of provision of early intervention measures from Public Health and potential additional costs of burials. Pregnancy/maternity also has a large number of impacts, 22 in total and although most of these are low impact, it does establish that once the proposals are looked at together, one group can be affected more than might first be apparent.

3.5 The table below highlights the impacts of all the proposals on the protected characteristic groups.

Protected Characteristic	Impact Levels			
	High	Medium	Low	TOTAL
Age	11	10	11	32
Disability	6	12	12	30
Gender reassignment	0	2	11	13
Race	5	4	15	24
Religion/belief	0	6	11	17
Pregnancy/Maternity	3	7	12	22
Sexual Orientation	1	1	9	11
Sexual Orientation	3	6	9	18
Marriage & Civil Partnership	0	0	7	7
Low Income/Low Wage	8	9	15	32

3.6 All equality impact assessments with service responses included where appropriate, can be accessed on the Council's website at <https://www.bradford.gov.uk/your-council/council-budgets-and-spending/budget-eias-2017-18>, and should be read in full by Elected Members.

4 Additional Consultation Feedback Received

4.1 Since the start of the consultation, the proposals generating most comments are;

- Theatres and Community Halls (4E10) with most comments focusing on community halls - 368
- Parks and Bereavement (4E1) with most comments on bowling greens - 290
- Physical Activity, Food and Nutrition (4PH6) with most comments focusing on the breastfeeding programme in Keighley and some on the healthy lifestyle services run in the Windhill area - 145
- Street Cleansing and Public Conveniences (4E5) with most comments on the public conveniences - 146
- Homestart/ Worksafe/ Injury Minimisation (4PH5) with comments about the Homestart and Worksafe projects - 75
- Adults, Overall Demand Management Strategy (4A1) - 46
- Council Tax - 39
- Small Grants (VCS funding) (4PH7) - 27
- Ministry of Food (4E12) - 24
- Remodel of Visitor Information and Frontline Service (4E7) - 22

4.2 Other proposals that are generating between 10 and 15 comments are Libraries (4E9), a Prepared and Skilled Workforce (4C3) and Substance Misuse Service (4PH2). A further 25 proposals received between one and nine comments.

- 4.3 As outlined above from 2 to 12 February 2017 there has been a significant increase in concerns raised in respect of the proposal Public Health - Homestart, Worksafe and Injury Minimisation Programme (4PH5) particularly in relation to programmes run by Homestart Bradford. Though the numbers of representations has increased the issues in essence remain the same as those previously reported. The exception being additional comments about the areas that are covered by Worksafe including educating young people about the dangers of gas leaks, electrical safety, power lines and substations.
- 4.4 Further suggestions have also been received in relation to Physical Activity, Food and Nutrition (4PH6), proposing that the Council consider a short extension of funding for a period of time to enable organisations running projects to secure alternative funding to enable the work to continue.
- 4.5 Further general comments have also been received around the funding of provider organisations, such as those in the Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS). A suggestion has been made that the Council in its commissioning approach should make greater use of grant giving to support the VCS in leveraging in additional funding to the District. It is suggested that the Needle Exchange Service (Substance Misuse 4PH2) should be looked at for clinical effectiveness in reducing long term illnesses that are far more expensive to manage. Some programmes funded through the Sexual Health (4PH3) proposal provide valuable education for young people to reduce risk and harm; ceasing the programmes could be more costly to public services in the longer term.
- 4.6 From 2 to 12 February 2017 there has also been a significant increase in the number of written responses to the proposal Theatres and Community Halls (4E10) and the need to keep these open as they are seen as the key hub in those communities.

Concerns about the possible closure of the buildings if the Council does not retain control of them is the predominant theme of the comments, although it is clear from the representations that any possible transfers or changes to the buildings management could be determined by such factors as the current physical condition of the buildings (some being in good repair, others not) and also the current usage of the buildings and the financial viability of them a separate entities.

- 4.7 All three local Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCG's), (Airedale, Wharfedale and Craven, Bradford City and Bradford Districts) have submitted a detailed response highlighting their concerns particularly for proposals included within Adult and Community Services, Public Health and Children's Services.

The letters confirm the CCG's agree with the general direction of travel towards prevention, the development of community resilience and reducing the dependency on statutory services and the CCG's commitment to continue working with the Council on the shared strategic aim of keeping people well and in their own homes where possible. However some the proposals do, in their view, pose an element of risk in achieving this in that some of the proposals to de-commission some public health services for example, would routinely be seen by the CCG's as preventative work.

The CCG's have also confirmed their commitment to work with the Council to further strengthen integrated commissioning arrangements across health and social care to achieve a total joint health and social care budget through the expansion of the Better Care Fund.

In welcoming the development of the Council's demand management strategy for adult social care, the CCG's have raised the need to ensure that other parts of the system are not de-stabilised as a result e.g. the ability to develop a high quality nursing and care home market. They would also welcome the opportunity to discuss and understand in more detail, the possible consequences of not only the changes to the Adult Services proposals, but also the possible outcomes for young people and families of the Children's Services proposals aside from the clear impacts on health visiting and school nursing, and the wider impact on other community services.

- 4.8 A detailed submission from the Bradford District Care NHS Foundation Trust (BDCFT) has been received as part of the consultation feedback on the last day of the consultation. The submission raises concerns that in its view, BDCFT were not engaged soon enough in discussions as the proposals were developed. The submission confirms that whilst the Trust wishes to support the Council to re-design services and reduce costs, reasonable lead in times are vital to effect change and move to new models of working. It does however recognise the work that is now taking place with Children's Services to establish integrated service planning across Health Visiting, Children's Centres and Social Workers, although it raises concerns that this will be too late to support the proposals in these areas in 2017-18.

The submission identifies the cumulative cash reductions on Public Health contracts with BDCFT and the potential implications for service users as well as identifying the need to mitigate associated risks.

The submission specifically notes the proposals relating to Health Visiting, School Nursing and Family Nurse Partnerships (FNP) and suggests that School Nursing services should not be included due to the current caseloads in that service area and that therefore, savings are more likely to be targeted at Health Visiting or FNP services.

It also suggests that the proposals relating to Substance Misuse Services will seriously de-stabilise the residual dual diagnosis provision and mean that dedicated provision is likely to become unsustainable. This would impact on some aspects of prescribing for the most complex patients and will reduce the level and quality of advice and support to the whole sector.

In terms of the Social Care proposals, it comments on the consequences if Social Work numbers within the Integrated Community Mental Health teams are reduced and the current problems for Community Nursing Teams, particularly in Keighley, as a consequence of social care cuts and other sector pressures which it says would only increase the pressure on already over stretched health care co-ordinators with a likely wider whole system impact.

- 4.9 Bradford Safeguarding Adults Board (SAB) submission has focussed on budget proposals which they believe could have an adverse impact on the District's capacity to safeguard adults. The feedback confirms its acceptance of the emphasis given to the continuing personalisation of services and people being given as much control of their lives as possible but expresses a view that the Adult Social Care proposals currently lack detail and it hopes therefore, that as the plans are further developed, the approach to safeguarding adults with care and support needs, is addressed more explicitly.

The Board also notes the Councils proposal to apply the social care precept but would expect to see clear evidence that this has been fully applied to the social care budget and whilst it recognises there are many opportunities with the approach the Council is adopting, it also warns that the scale of change required, should not be underestimated.

- 4.10 The submission from the Bradford Chamber of Commerce focusses on the need for the Council to create an environment for businesses to grow, invest and relocate as the reliance on business rates increases and therefore, cutting back on any services aimed at supporting business growth and investment, should be reconsidered.

The Chamber supports the work being undertaken by the Council in highlighting the effect of the Government cuts and the injustice and impact it is likely to have on the District and it is pleased to see that 'Better Skills, more good jobs and a growing economy' is a priority outcome.

However, it is concerned about the potential impact on visitor numbers of the proposals for Visitor Information Centres (4E7) and Events and Festivals (4E8). These could have an effect on the local businesses and the wider economy which it has asked to be reconsidered, as well as the proposals for West Yorkshire Combined Authority Transport Levy (4R2) and the proposed increased charges in Planning, Transport and Highways (4R5) which it believes may stifle development in the District.

The Chamber is particularly concerned about the proposal relating to the Economic Development Service (4R13) and the reduction in European Strategic Investment Fund match funding and suggests that any support currently provided to create a stronger and flourishing business environment is essential for economic growth in Bradford to continue, and that therefore this proposal should also be reconsidered.

- 4.11 Previous reports have mentioned two petitions having been received as part of the consultation in relation to the proposal Theatres and Community Halls (4E10). One related to Ian Clough Hall in Baildon and one from Friends of Silsden Town Hall. Since the last report was published the Silsden Town Hall petition has received a further 713 signatures in addition to the 1841 already presented - this now totals 2554.

A further petition has now been received linked to the same proposal from Denholme Town Council in relation to Denholme Mechanics Institute. The petition refers to the building being a key local facility highly valued by the community of the village which underpins the sense of community in Denholme and plays a core part of the heritage of Denholme itself. It also refers to the high turnout of local people at a meeting about the future of the centre and the number of signatures on the petition as highlighting the strength of feeling with regard to the threatened closure of the building.

The petition, containing 915 signatures, refers to research which references a perceived lack of community facilities and amenities in the village, in particular for young people and older residents, a lack of community spirit and isolation for some residents. The Mechanics institute featured prominently in the research in responses, clearly being seen by local people as a key venue in the village to accommodate both services and leisure opportunities.

In addition, a further petition has been received about the proposal Parks and Bereavement (4E1) from Baildon Crown Green Bowling Club asking for the proposal to withdraw maintenance from Bradford and District Bowling Clubs to be reconsidered. The petition contains 28 signatures.

4.12 In summary it is necessary to ensure that the Executive have comprehensive information when considering the recommendations to make to Council on the budget for 2017-18 and the budget savings proposals for 2017-18 onwards. It is a legal requirement that Elected Members have regard to all the relevant information and accordingly Elected Members are referred to all the information in this addendum and in the equality impact assessments with updated equality evidence and the relevant Council department responses. The equality impact assessments can be found at: <https://www.bradford.gov.uk/your-council/council-budgets-and-spending/budget-eias-2017-18/>