

## THE PRELIMINARY BUDGET REPORT

In accordance with Part 4 E16 of the Constitution, the 22 October 2009 Cabinet decision relating to the Preliminary Budget has been called in for review by this Panel.

### Reason for Call-in

The preliminary budget report assumes large potential savings arising from reorganisation of Directorates. Neither at Overview and Scrutiny nor at Cabinet was the detail of how that was to be achieved, fully explored. Following subsequent discussions with staff, it is believed that a more open examination of these changes can take place. It is important that alterations of the significance envisaged should be properly scrutinised by the Panel tasked with doing so.

### Options

Having considered the Call-in, Members may:-

if satisfied with the decision, resolve

a) to take no further action,

if still concerned about the decision, resolve

b) to refer the decision back to Cabinet for reconsideration, setting out the nature of the Panel's concerns; or

c) to refer the matter to Council for consideration.

A copy of the Cabinet decision is attached at Appendix 1 and a copy of the Cabinet report is attached at Appendix 2.

CABINET

22 OCTOBER 2009

CABINET MEMBERS' REPORTS

Finance

The Preliminary Budget Report

Cabinet considered the Preliminary Budget Report, which set the context for discussions that had been held over the past weeks as part of the process for setting the Budget for 2010/11.

Cabinet was addressed by Mr Hooper in relation to the item. Mr Hooper stated that cutting of services and selling of assets had been done in previous years, for example the sale of the King Edward Curt car park which had led to a significant loss of revenue for the Council. He believed that the Windsor Parking Strategy had been a total disaster. He had recently looked at local car parks and found that the Legoland park and ride car park on average had 7 cars in it during the week and 14 at weekends. The Dials car park regularly had 2 and a half floors empty and was loss making. He had no confidence that the racecourse park and ride would provide a revenue stream and he urged the Council to consider again a park and ride scheme on the Northfield site by the Relief Road. He suggested that the land should be compulsory purchased by the Council from Eton College at the existing use value of £5000-7000 per acre. The Council could set up a park and ride scheme and receive revenues from tourists and commuters and sell any excess land.

The Lead Member for Finance thanked Mr Hooper for his comments; although they did not directly relate to the budget, he was confident his colleagues would take them into consideration. Members noted that 2010/11 would mark the end of the Government's first three-year grant funding settlement. This gave a degree of certainty year on year but also showed a significant real-term reduction in financial support. Speculation was growing about public sector spending; it now seemed inevitable that the Council would receive a significant reduction in the level of financial support from the Government in the period 2011/12 and beyond. Whilst it was very difficult to predict the level of these reductions it was important that the Council started to plan for such an eventuality. In the light of the significant pressures the Council would face, the report sought approval for the cost reductions that had been discussed at the Budget Steering Group with Strategic Directors. The Lead Member highlighted a number of pressures the Council faced, including the recession, a reduction in interest rates, waste disposal costs, safeguarding in children's services and an increase in demand for benefits. Reserves were in a healthy state, which would enable the Council to handle economic problems. Inflation had dropped to -1.4%.

The Director of Adult and Community Services provided Members with a summary of the comments from the Adult, Community Services and Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel. She explained that Members of the Panel had expressed concern at

the lack of detail in relation to some line items. It had been explained to the Panel that a number of the items related to sensitive staffing issues and the Panel had decided to move into Part II to allow for further debate.

The Director for the Environment commented that the King Edward Court car park was privately run as part of the shopping centre. The Council had not therefore disposed of this car park as suggested but had invested in improvements in the shopping centre which gave a guaranteed financial return. The Council had also received a full report on projected growth in the demand for parking in Windsor, which had led to the strategy endorsed by Cabinet earlier in the year. The Dials car park was not used as effectively as the Council would like therefore additional marketing had taken place and an improved link to the town centre was under consideration which would hopefully address the issue.

The Lead Member for Adult and Community Services congratulated the other Lead Members and officers for the hard work put in to develop the report. The recommendations included would help the Council to bring about cost and efficiency savings to have a full year effect for the next financial year. Approximately £6.3m had been identified in savings and efficiencies, which represented 10% of the budget for those line items. The Lead Member for Policy and Performance added his thanks to Lead Members and officers and commented that the recommendations in the report would provide a strong financial backing for the Council's plans. The Council needed to be careful about backing huge white elephant schemes, which were unpopular with the majority of residents.

Councillor D. Wilson congratulated Members and officers on the report. He requested clarification on Preventing Violent Extremism (PVE) funding. The Lead Member for Finance explained that £131,000 of grant funding from the government would be distributed between various partner organisations. Councillor Mrs Hunt expressed concern over the difficulties of appealing against business rate decisions. The Chairman agreed that the issue had caused distress for small businesses in Maidenhead, Windsor and Ascot. The Lead Member for Finance explained that the Borough collected Business rates on behalf of the government, but only received a small proportion of the funds back. He commented that a motion would be put to Full Council in future on the issues.

Councillor Mrs Newbound asked whether decisions re staffing levels would be discussed by Members; it was confirmed that any decisions in relation to redundancies would go via the usual Employment Panel process. She also asked how the £6m gap identified in paragraph 3.24 of the report would be filled. The Head of Finance responded that no external borrowing was anticipated.

In relation to the comments from the Adult, Community Services and Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel, Councillor Mrs Proctor highlighted that there had been a lot of disquiet from all Members of the Panel at the lack of detail, which had made it difficult to properly scrutinise the report. In relation to a number of questions posed by Councillor Mrs Proctor, the Lead Member for Adult and Community Services commented that the report identified savings in sensitive areas, which could not be subject to full discussion. A press release had been issued earlier that day to confirm the Council's view that individualised budgets would enable people to gain control

and be more empowered. Efficiencies would be derived from the change as a result of more efficient commissioning and purchasing of services. In relation to the Boyn Grove day centre, he explained that the Council wanted to ensure the Learning Disability day centre was fully up and running before the dementia service was implemented, to avoid overburdening the service. He stated that the staff were the Council's greatest asset and it was important that the appropriate workload was achieved. The Director of Adult and Community Services confirmed that any decision based on an assessment of need would be taken by the relevant social worker. Any decision on funding followed an assessment of need by a social worker/care manager and was now subject to a funding panel to ensure the most appropriate and cost effective service was provided. If additional funds were required this would be agreed by the head of service or the Director of Adult and Community Services. Funding included for anticipated demographic growth had not been required this year.

Councillor Richards asked whether the Council's risks would be covered if insurance premiums were reduced. The Head of Finance explained that over the last ten years, money had been put into the insurance fund above the level the actuary advised was required, therefore the reduction in premiums would have no effect.

The Chairman echoed the comments of the other Members of Cabinet on the work put into the report by Lead Members and officers.

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That:**

- i) The content of the Report be noted**
- ii) The cost pressures outlined in Appendix A be approved for inclusion in the budget proposals being developed for the 2010/11 Budget**
- iii) Authority be delegated to Strategic Directors and Heads of Service to make the necessary organisational changes required to deliver the savings proposals outlined in Appendix B, the impact of which will be included in the 2010/11 Budget Proposals.**

## REPORT TO CABINET

Title: **THE PRELIMINARY BUDGET REPORT**  
 Date: 22 October 2009  
 Member Reporting: Councillor Kellaway  
 Contact Officer(s): Andrew Brooker, Head of Finance, 01628 796341  
 Peter Brown, Chief Accountant, 01628 796207  
 Wards affected: All

**2. SUMMARY**

- 2.1 The preliminary budget report sets the context for discussions that have been held over the past weeks as part of the process for setting the Budget for 2010/11 which will go to Cabinet on 11<sup>th</sup> February 2010 and Council on 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2010.
- 2.2 2010/11 marks the end of the Government first three-year grant funding settlement. This gave a degree of certainty year on year but also showed a significant real-term reduction in financial support. Speculation grows about public sector spending. It now seems inevitable that the Council will receive a significant reduction in the level of financial support from the Government in the period 2011/12 and beyond. Whilst it is very difficult to predict the level of these reductions it is important that the Council starts to plan for such an eventuality.
- 2.3 The report discusses increased costs arising from such diverse areas as the effect of the recession, reduction in interest rates and waste disposal and considers how the Council Tax base may vary.
- 2.4 The report concludes with a section on School Funding and rehearses some of the challenges that the Council faces, together with the School's Forum in agreeing to the distribution of the Dedicated Schools Grant. School Budgets will face some of the challenges facing other Council services with below inflation increases in per capita funding and emerging cost pressures, principally from complex SEN placements.
- 2.5 In the light of the significant pressures the Council is facing the final section seeks approval for the cost reductions that have been discussed at the Budget Steering Group with Strategic Directors.

**3. RECOMMENDATION: That:**

- i) The content of the Report be noted**
- ii) The cost pressures outlined in Appendix A be approved for inclusion in the budget proposals being developed for the 2010/11 Budget**
- iii) Authority be delegated to Strategic Directors and Heads of Service to make the necessary organisational changes required to deliver the savings proposals outlined in Appendix B, the impact of which will be included in the 2010/11 Budget Proposals.**

<b>What will be different for residents as a result of this decision?</b>
---

Residents can be assured that members have all relevant information necessary to provide a context for their budget discussion over the next few months. The Council can deliver a sustainable budget within available resources whilst maintaining its commitment to set low Council Tax levels.
---

#### 4. **SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

##### **Background**

##### 2009/10 Budget

4.1 2009/10 has seen significant budgetary pressures arising from increases in service demands within children's services and benefit support. By and large these pressures have been recession led and have been outside of the Council's control. These pressures arise from:

- Stagnant property market: increase in housing accommodation enquiries and rental loans; lower than expected increase in occupation of new property (thereby affecting Council Tax base) and lower income from developers (Section 106) and land charges.
- Rising unemployment: increases in benefit claims; increase demand for adult and children's services as personal finances reduce; reduced income from car parks, leisure centres and council property as organisations close and spending profiles changed.
- Sustained low interest rates: loss of income to support council services

4.2 To the end of September 2009 these pressures approached £1m.

4.3 The Council recognised the potential impact of the recession when setting the budget for 2009/10 and set up a reserve to support services affected by the economic climate. This has been further enhanced with a number of in year savings, largely arising from lower than expected pay award and contract inflation.

4.4 The reserves are available to support short-term pressures. However, items that have a permanent impact on services require longer term funding and this is only achieved by increasing the demand on the council tax. Appendix A includes a list of ongoing costs that impact on 2010/11 that require Cabinet approval to include in the budget process.

##### **GOVERNMENT SETTLEMENTS**

4.5 2010/11 is the final year of a current 3-year settlement. As for the current year there is some movement of specific grant to area based grant expected but whilst these are still in debate, they should be cost neutral. One exception is a new area based grant in respect of preventing extreme violence £131k for which an equal value growth is submitted, as most of this grant is distributed to our partners.

4.6 The anticipated increase is 1.5% in 2010/11, which is approximately in line with our expected increase in the inflation on council run services. The Formula Grant methodology continues to assume that Councils will deliver 3% cash releasing

efficiency measures. Since the 'Gershon' targets were introduced, the Borough has remained ahead of its cumulative targets; in common with most other authorities the ability to continue to meet this repeating target will become increasingly challenging.

4.7 The expected formula grant is summarised as:

	2009/10 £'000	% Increase	£'000	20010/11 £'000	% Increase
Formula Grant Base	18,257			18,536	
Floor Increase		1.75	278		1.5
Technical Adjustments	279		-15	263	
<b>Formula Grant</b>	<b>18,536</b>			<b>18,799</b>	
Area Based Grant	5,445			7,014	Note 1
<b>Total External Support</b>	<b>23,981</b>			<b>25,813</b>	

Note 1 – Reflects movement of Supporting People Grant to ABG (£1.723m), the one year introduction of preventing extreme violence grant (£131k) and the end of Extended Schools Start Up Grant (£341k reduction)

### **MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN (MTFP)**

4.8 The MTFP has been under constant review since it was last updated as part of the 2009/10 Budget report. The volatility in inflation rates, interest rates, and the uncertainty of the 2009/10 pay award has significant impact on the MTFP, which can show significant fluctuations between each iteration.

4.9 As discussed earlier in this report the level of public expenditure over the next few years is the subject of much speculation. It is clear that levels of Government support will be reduced, what is not clear is by how much. Given this uncertainty, the consideration of the MTFP is deferred until Council Tax setting Cabinet meeting in February

#### Inflation

4.10 The 2009 Budget statement from the Treasury saw significant variations in RPI and CPI inflation over the short term and predicted the RPI at September 2009 would be (-)3% with a return over the longer term to (+)2%. However, recent inflationary pressures have arisen. As this report was written the latest available inflation data showed that in August the year on year change in RPI was (-) 1.3%. Looking forward inflation is expected to rise, by all commentators, the rate of that rise being the subject of debate

- 4.11 Officers will continue to review inflation assumptions up to publication deadlines for the Council Tax setting Cabinet in February.

#### Pay Awards

- 4.12 Despite negative inflation rates and increasing unemployment level, and after significant negotiation the 2009/10 national pay award of 1% increase was eventually agreed.
- 4.13 Pressure remains on local authority budgets nationally and a number of authorities have moved away from the national review process settling for a local method that introduces greater certainty and transparency into the budget setting process. The Royal Borough is also committed to do so and negotiations with staff are ongoing. Once finalised an increase in pay will be built into the budget and enable more certainty when setting the budget for 2010/11 and onwards.
- 4.14 It is important to note, however, that provision of an additional 1% for pay (in non-school services) would cost close to £600k. Given the fact that Government support is unlikely to increase and that the Council has a clear commitment regarding Council Tax increases this additional provision would be at the expense of further efficiency measures.

#### Pensions Increase

- 4.15 Employer Pension contributions are currently set until April 2011 at their current level 14.7%. Since the initial impact of the stock market decline the fund has bounced back so that the fund is currently 70% funded and improving. However, it is important to remember that the actuaries take a longer, 40-year, view on the fund performance rather than short-term gains and losses.
- 4.16 The actuarial review in 2010 will determine the need for increase in the Employer contribution rates. There are a number of circumstance and alternative funding proposals that could delay or eliminate any increase and the Pensions Fund Manager is discussing these with the actuaries

#### Service Pressures

- 4.17 Every effort will be made, as always, to contain service pressures within existing budgets but national issues such as demographic pressures and waste management legislation are largely unavoidable. Allowance is, therefore, made for these additional costs.
- 4.18 Service Pressures identified to date are outlined in the attached Appendix B.

#### Capital Financing

- 4.19 The Council continues with its long term objective to fund a greater proportion of its capital spend from Revenue. This ambition is reflected in the MTFP in the form of additional annual revenue contributions to the Capital Fund.
- 4.20 Historically, the Council spends £1.3m per annum on 'short life assets', Leisure Centre equipment; IT Hardware; Vehicles etc. It is anticipated that this may reduce



to £1m with the further IT infrastructure investment following a number of invest to save initiatives. The base budget for 2009/10 includes provision for a £800k contribution to the Capital Fund and an increase of £200k would therefore achieve this £1m target.

- 4.21 Recurring Highways, Streetlights and Property expenditure remains funded from capital resources. It remains a longer-term objective of the Council to fund a greater proportion of these costs from revenue, thereby, saving financing costs.
- 4.22 Government Departments announced as part of the 3-year settlement its spending allocations 2010/11. Whilst some of these allocations come to the authority in the form of grants most are in the form of 'supported Capital Expenditure', the revenue cost of which is, in theory, reflected in Formula Grant assessments. However, as the Council is below the grant floor, there will be no increase in grant to cover these allocations. Consequently, the impact of all capital financing directly impacts on the Council Tax.
- 4.23 Continued capital investment is required in the Council's infrastructure. Therefore, surplus assets will be identified wherever possible and where appropriate those assets will be sold to support the Council's Capital programme. Before assets are sold the Council will ensure that it is the right time to sell but more importantly whether these assets can be better used to generate revenue for the Council.
- 4.24 Where capital receipts or grants are not available to help fund the capital programme, the Royal Borough will have little alternative but to borrow funds, especially to finance priority infrastructure maintenance and development. Decisions on how the programme is funded will be taken by the Head of Finance in conjunction with Lead Members as part of his Treasury Management responsibilities. An assumption, carried forward from previous MTFP's is that £6m of capital spend will require corporate funding each year.
- 4.25 A significant proportion of the capital programme has over the past few years been funded from s106 contributions. 2008/09 saw significant reduction in the level of receipts due to the economic climate and the impact of the proposed Community Infrastructure Levy is uncertain. Therefore, the Royal Borough cannot assume that the level of receipts attracted in the recent past will continue.

#### Fees & Charges

- 4.26 Under the current climate no increase in Fees & Charges is proposed beyond car parking changes, agree at the September Cabinet, and those are included in the savings proposals. Last year the government announced a temporary reduction in VAT that affected a number of council charges. This reduction end in January and therefore a full list of Fees and Charges will be tabled for approval as part of the council tax setting process in February.

#### Efficiency Savings

- 4.27 The Governments Comprehensive Spending Review 2007 assumes that 3% cashable efficiency savings are available in each of the three years 2008/9 – 2010/11 some £3m pa. The Royal Borough has delivered cashable savings in excess of this

target and plans to deliver further savings in 2010/11 (Appendix B). In common with most other local authorities delivering the same annual value if savings becomes harder as the base budget shrinks. A time will come when value based efficiencies are not achievable without affecting the long-term sustainability of service provision.

- 4.28 In order that the proposed savings can be delivered in an orderly manner and that the Council can benefit from the measures at the earliest practicable opportunity authority to start implementing these proposals immediately is sought.

### Interest Rates

- 4.29 Interest Rates have an important impact on Council Finances. However, recent decline in rates will have no effect on the cost of borrowing as the Council's long term loans were taken out at fixed rates some while ago and further borrowing is not anticipated in the near future

- 4.30 The more important impact is on the interest that the Council earns on its cash balances. The recent steep decline in interest rates, to the historically low level of 0.5%, and the use of cash reserves to fund the capital programmes makes it difficult to accurately assess future income levels from this source. Interest on these balances has declined significantly over the past year and some of the longer-term investments are due to end at the end of this year. Recent short-term investments have attracted interest at 1.5% and if this continues the Council will earn around £600k in a year on its average cash balances. Many "experts" are predicting that interest rates will rise again shortly but budgeting for that increase is a risk.

- 4.31 The decision that the Council will need to make when it sets its budget is to what extent it maintains its longer term approach of making a cautious assessment of its investment income so that in times of higher levels of investment income, "windfall" receipts are taken into reserves, and when interest rates fall the revenue budget is supported from reserves. These reserves then being available to support short-term projects, deficits arising from changes in the economic environment or to pump prime alternative savings proposals.

### **COUNCIL TAX INCOME**

- 4.32 Council Tax is the most important source of revenue for the Council, and funds a greater proportion of Council spend than most other authorities. In 2009/10 nearly 74.3% of the Councils Gross Budget Requirement (that element funded from Formula Grant, Area Based Grant and Council Tax) was funded from Council Tax. This is the 2nd highest compared to other unitary authorities where the average is 48.5%.

- 4.33 Annual increases in Council Tax on individual properties are supplemented by increases in the taxbase (increase in the number of properties on which the tax is levied). It is perhaps this fact that DCLG have recognised (but arguably over compensated for) in its grant distribution models.

- 4.34 The Council has a very clear commitment to aim to keep its tax increase below RPI; in August the year on year change was (-) 1.3%.

- 4.35 The taxbase for 2010/11 is the subject of a report to Cabinet in December. It is expected that it will reflect the general slowdown in the housing markets. At present collection rates are being maintained although this is one of the risks that needs to be assessed in the Budget report.
- 4.36 Members should note that, dependent on tax base, 0.5% in Council Tax generates approximately £340k revenue for the Council.

### **SCHOOL FUNDING**

- 4.37 The main source of school funding is the ring-fenced Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). The grant must be used in support of the Schools Budget as defined in regulations<sup>1</sup> and is supplemented by other sources of funding such as standards fund grants, and Learning and Skills Council funding for sixth forms.
- 4.38 RBWM's 2009-10 DSG allocation was £75.873 million. The 2010-11 allocation will be determined by pupil numbers in January 2010 but latest estimates suggest an increase in total pupil numbers of around 70 compared with 2009-10. The unit rate on which DSG is calculated is fixed for the period 2008-11 and will increase from £4,193 per pupil in 2009-10 to £4,378 in 2010-11, a rise of 4.4%. This compares with an increase of 3.8% per pupil in the previous year.
- 4.39 The minimum increase schools can expect to receive in their 2010-11 budgets is 2.1% per pupil, as defined by the Minimum Funding Guarantee set by the Department of Children Schools and Families (DCSF). Once this school guarantee and other unavoidable inflation and contractual pressures have been met, any balance of DSG funding available, known as 'headroom', must be allocated either to schools directly or to central services within the Schools Budget, such as out-borough independent special school placements, and central behaviour support services. The allocation of the Schools Budget is the subject of consultation each year with the Schools Forum.
- 4.40 The main calls on DSG funding in 2010-11 after uplifting budgets for inflation and adjusting for pupil numbers are likely to be:
- a) The one-off cost (approximately £700k) of implementing the new admissions policy for rising 5s in reception from September 2010. (DSG generated in future years is expected to cover the full year effect).
  - b) Any DSG deficit carried forward from the 2009-10. Latest projections suggest the 2009-10 central schools budget may be overspent by £600k. The DSG reserve at the start of 2009-10 was £146k.
  - c) Continuing anticipated pressures on the out-of-borough special school placements budget
  - d) An additional cost of around £200k related to the implementation of the new early years single funding formula.
- 3.41 The Council is responsible, in consultation with the Schools Forum, for determining the split of the DSG grant between expenditure on central functions and delegated funding to schools. However, DCSF regulations determine the minimum amount

---

<sup>1</sup> School Finance (England) Regulations 2008 cover the three year period 2008-11

authorities must delegate to schools. Plans to delegate less than this amount must have Schools Forum approval.

## 5. OPTIONS AVAILABLE AND RISK ASSESSMENT

### 5.1 Options

	Option	Comments	Financial Implications
1.	Accept the report	This report is for information and explains what factors affect the budget making decision	Contained within the report
2.	Reject the report	This is not an option. The Council is required to complete its Council Tax making process	

### 5.2 Risk assessment

5.2.1 A number of the risks associated with the preparation of the budget are discussed in the body of the report. Individual risk assessments have been made for the detailed proposals being made for inclusion in the Budget for 2009-10

5.2.2 The biggest single risk to the Council is the impact of the “Credit Crunch” which is outlined in paragraphs 3.1.1 to 3.1.4 above

## 6. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

6.1 Budget proposals are being guided by Manifesto commitments made before the May 2006 elections

6.2 A series of discussions co-ordinated by the Budget Steering Group have taken place with Lead Members and Strategic Directors

6.3 Regular meetings are held with both the Windsor and Maidenhead Chambers of Commerce

## 7. COMMENTS FROM THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

### Corporate Services Overview & Scrutiny Panel

7.1 The Panel endorsed the report but were anxious to ensure that Lead Members were kept fully engaged in the implementation of any organisational changes required to deliver savings proposals

### Children’s Services Overview & Scrutiny Panel

7.2 The Panel endorsed the report. They requested that Cabinet’s attention be drawn to the budget pressures of developing fostering services and the recruitment and retention of social workers, which they considered important areas for investment.

7.3 In relation to proposed savings they expressed their concern about the lack of detail provided in the report. They were also disappointed to learn that the proposed reporting/decision making mechanisms would prevent any proper scrutiny of the proposals

Adult, Community Services and Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel

7.4 To report verbally

Planning & Environment Overview & Scrutiny

7.5 The Panel endorsed the report but were anxious to ensure that Lead Members were kept fully engaged in the implementation of any organisational changes required to deliver savings proposals.

## 8. IMPLICATIONS

8.1 The following implications have been addressed where indicated below.

Financial	Legal	Human Rights Act	Planning	Sustainable Development	Diversity & Equality
✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	N/A

Background Papers: None

# Growth Proposals

Reference Nos.	Level of Service Detail	Description
(1)	(2)	(3)

INCREMENTAL GROWTH	
2010/11	2011/12
(4) £'000	(5) £'000

## CHILDRENS SERVICES

1	<b>Staffing costs in Safeguarding</b>	Steps are being taken to reduce the overspend of agency staffing during the financial year 2009/10 but given the consistently increasing demands on the Service it is proving impossible to meet the Managed Vacancy Factor (MVF). The figure shown is based on the MVF of the cost centres where the current identified overspend is occurring.
2	<b>Safeguarding - Guardianship Payments</b>	Special Guardianship Orders are granted by the court to provide permanency for the child. It is used in cases where adoption is not appropriate (eg for an older child) and young people are entitled to ongoing support sometimes until age 24. As reported last month, the number of guardianship orders has increased significantly from 2 a month for most of 08-09 to the current number of 11 a month
3	<b>Safeguarding - Internal Foster placements</b>	The national picture in relation to children in care is one of overall increasing numbers. This picture is replicated in RBWM where the number of children looked after at May 2009 has risen to 109 from 72 this time last year. The majority of these are children placed in foster homes with RBWM families. These numbers have also risen from 53 to 69 in the last 5 months, an increase of 30%. The average cost of a 0-10 year olds in foster care is £13k pa, and £19k pa for those aged 11+. The increase in numbers has therefore put this budget under significant pressure
4	<b>External Foster placements</b>	The increase in overall numbers of foster children means that there are now fewer foster carers within the Borough still able to accept children. As a result, the children of three families have had to be placed with foster care agencies at a much higher cost per annum (£30k - £40k) than internal foster care. Last year we had 3 children placed with agencies, this year we currently have 11. An assumption has been made that the commitment will be for the full year, but that may change.

293	
100	
200	
50	

**APPENDIX A**

GROWTH

<b><i>Growth Proposals</i></b>		
<b>Reference Nos.</b>	<b><i>Level of Service Detail</i></b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>(1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(3)</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Looked after / Disabled Children's residential care</b>	The 2008-09 £200k overspend on looked after and disabled children in residential care looks likely to be repeated in 2009-10. The additional cost of 3 new looked after children since April has been partially offset by others who left their placement in 08-09 or transferred to adult care. There is an additional disabled child who started in April and there is pressure on the budget from the full year financial affect of others who were placed part way through 08-09. Approximately £60k of the projected overspend relates to higher payments for individual children compared with last year. The average full cost of children in residential care is between £3,000 and £4,000 per week of which around 54% is funded by the LA safeguarding budget, and the rest from PCT contributions and Dedicated Schools Grant.
<b>6</b>	<b>Speech &amp; Language Therapy</b>	Higher than budgeted number of children requiring Speech & language therapy
<b>7</b>	<b>Occupational Therapy</b>	Growing demand from residents for Occupational Therapy. New service being instituted in conjunction with East Berkshire PCT together with Slough BC and Bracknell Forest BC that is designed to provide better value for money than the previous history of spot purchasing. Figure requested covers contribution to that service £37k.

<b>INCREMENTAL GROWTH</b>	
<b>2010/11</b>	<b>2011/12</b>
<b>(4) £'000</b>	<b>(5) £'000</b>
250	
60	
37	

**TOTAL CHILDREN'S SERVICES GROWTH BIDS**

**990**

**APPENDIX A**

GROWTH

# Growth Proposals

Reference Nos.	Level of Service Detail	Description
(1)	(2)	(3)

INCREMENTAL GROWTH	
2010/11	2011/12
(4) £'000	(5) £'000

## ADULT & COMMUNITY SERVICES

1	Parks maintenance	Additional cost of water testing and dosing for fountains at Grenfell Park and King George V
2	Parks maintenance	Net additional cost of maintenance of new play areas following from installation of new play areas as a rest of the Play builder project
3	Parks maintenance	Net additional cost of wood chip pellets and electricity for new pavilion at Braywick Park
4	Unit budgets	Net additional cost of issuing chip Advantage Cards , over non chip cards ,
5	Cemeteries maintenance	Closed Churchyard - Legal duty to take on maintenance of full graves in churchyard , St Michael's Church, Sunninghill. Churchyard closure order passes responsibility to RBWM October,2009
6	Museum	Establish Guildhall, Windsor museum

2	
2	
4	
12	
12	
30	70

### TOTAL ADULT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES GROWTH BIDS

62	70
----	----

## ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

1	Waste Disposal	Impact of increase in Landfill Tax
2	Community wardens	Increase community wardens to 14

350	
105	

### TOTAL ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES GROWTH BIDS

455
-----

## RESOURCES

1	Customer Service Centre	Communications with the change in telephony system and increased lines within the CSC the increased costs are no longer containable from within existing budget.
2	Housing Benefits	Employee Costs Establishment increased by 3 Assesment Officers to cope with increased level of claims.

35	
94	

### TOTAL RESOURCES GROWTH BIDS

129
-----



**APPENDIX A**

GROWTH

# Growth Proposals

Reference Nos.	Level of Service Detail	Description
(1)	(2)	(3)

INCREMENTAL GROWTH	
2010/11	2011/12
(4) £'000	(5) £'000

## PLANNING, POLICY & PERFORMANCE

PLANNING		
1	Planning	Planning Application income due to economic climate
<b>Growth impact on 2010/11</b>		

25	
<b>25</b>	

POLICY & PERFORMANCE		
1	Stategic Partnerships	Distribution of Preventing Violent Extremism funding to RBWM partners. Financed through increase in Area Base Grant.
<b>Growth impact on 2010/11</b>		

131	
<b>131</b>	

### TOTAL PLANNING POLICY AND PERFORMANCE GROWTH BIDS

<b>156</b>	<b>-</b>
------------	----------

## CORPORATE INITIATIVES

1	Pan Council	Corporate Initiatives Savings targets now moved to Directorates
---	-------------	--

376	
-----	--

### TOTAL CORPORATE INITIATIVES

<b>376</b>	
------------	--

## TOTAL ALL SERVICES GROWTH BIDS

<b>2,168</b>	<b>70</b>
--------------	-----------

<b>Savings Proposals</b>			BUDGET	INCREMENTAL SAVING		
Item No	Specific Service Area	Description	2009/10 Service Budget	2010/11 (Full or part year)	2011/12 (Full year)	2012/13 (Full year)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
			£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>CHILDRENS SERVICES</b>						
1	CS Commissioning Home to school transport	Removal of coach transport to Henley College from Maidenhead, replaced by bus and train season tickets	2,300	30		
2	CS Commissioning Home to school transport	Savings from the gradual removal of the subsidy for denominational transport	100	15	15	15
3	Education & Childcare Psychology Service	Increase charge of Early Years EP work to Surestart Grant	325	17		
4	Families & Young People Family & Community Learning	Charge 50% of Information Officer post to ACL Grant	10	10		
5	Children's Services Directorate	Cross directorate reorganisation of resources	7,166	322	148	-
6	CS Commissioning Home to School Transport	Retendering of 3 year contract for Home to School Transport from Sep-09	2,300	207		
7	Families & Young People Family & Community Learning	Review Adult and Community learning charges to target specific activities to generate additional income	37	5		
8	Family and Youth Support	Increase income generation for outdoor education	40	5	5	
9	Family and Youth Support	Reduction in Connexions Contract	1,163	35	25	
<b>TOTAL CHILDRENS SERVICES</b>			<b>13,441</b>	<b>646</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>15</b>

<b>Savings Proposals</b>			<b>BUDGET</b>			
<b>Item No</b>	<b>Specific Service Area</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>INCREMENTAL SAVING</b>			
			<b>2009/10 Service Budget</b>	<b>2010/11 (Full or part year)</b>	<b>2011/12 (Full year)</b>	<b>2012/13 (Full year)</b>
<b>(1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(4)</b>	<b>(5)</b>	<b>(6)</b>	<b>(7)</b>
			<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>
<b>ADULT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES</b>						
1	Adult Social Care - Learning Disability	Budget Monitoring - use of contingency. Proposed that placements are budgeted as they occur rather than according to forecast, with contingencies held corporately	9,996	450		
2	Charters Leisure Centre	Income generation from Squash Courts. Squash Courts open to non members 7 days in advance if they pay on booking.	11	1		
3	Charters Leisure Centre	Reduction in plant & equipment spend	12	2		
4	Community Leisure Services	Migration to electronic media printing/marketing	5	1		
5	Community Leisure Services	Review of subsidies for swimming pool and gym use for 13-19s.	12	12		
6	Cox Green Leisure Centre	Income generation from floodlit Tennis courts.	-	5		
7	Libraries -Mobile Library Review	Mobile Review and relocation of 'pool stock'	222	24		
8	Library Services	Reduced Non Domestic Rates on Libraries		18		
9	Magnet Leisure Centre	Catering Services Full year effect of 2009/10 staff reduction	5	5		
10	Magnet Leisure Centre	Swimming Lesson Income Review of swimming lesson operation	50	20		
11	Magnet Leisure Centre	Migration to electronic media printing/marketing	15	4		
12	Magnet Leisure Centre	Ceroc being offered as new service	-	5		
13	Magnet Leisure Centre	Special Populations Gym being offered as new service	-	5		
14	Magnet Leisure Centre	Review of staff membership costs	-	8		
15	Outdoor Facilities	Increase letting of catering income Increasing the number of fairs at Dedworth Manor	-	1		
16	Outdoor Facilities	Sale of unused property. Yield from Capital Receipt estimated at £450000	-	13		
17	Outdoor Facilities	Contribution from Horse Show for the use of Home Park	4	5		
18	Windsor Leisure Centre	Reduced administration budget	92	10		
19	Windsor Leisure Centre	Migration to electronic media printing/marketing	10	4		
20	Windsor Leisure Centre	Restructure of catering operation To change the balance of staff to more at lower grade and less supervisors	176	12		

<b>Savings Proposals</b>			<b>BUDGET</b>			
<b>Item No</b>	<b>Specific Service Area</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>INCREMENTAL SAVING</b>			
			<b>2009/10 Service Budget</b>	<b>2010/11 (Full or part year)</b>	<b>2011/12 (Full year)</b>	<b>2012/13 (Full year)</b>
<b>(1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(4)</b>	<b>(5)</b>	<b>(6)</b>	<b>(7)</b>
			<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>
21	Windsor Leisure Centre	Increase number of swimming lessons on Friday afternoon. Results in increased income	197	5	8	
22	Windsor Leisure Centre	Review of balance of creche / nursery placements Resulting in increased income	45	6		
23	Windsor Leisure Centre	Efficiencies in utility budget. Resulting from new boilers and combined heating power units due to be installed in 2009/10	113	10	3	
24	Windsor Leisure Centre	Review Parent & Toddler lesson charges in line with Magnet	197	4	6	6
25	Windsor Leisure Centre	Review of Carpark charges	242	23		
26	Windsor Leisure Centre	Review of Café opening hours & staff rota's	31	5		
27	Windsor Leisure Centre	Concessionaire contract increases for Premier, Team Health & One	26	3	2	
28	Windsor Leisure Centre	Review of Health Spa hours	160	2	1	
29	Windsor Leisure Centre	Increased income from birthday party operation	100	2	3	
30	Windsor Leisure Centre	Restructuring of staff training		2	1	
31	Windsor Leisure Centre	Relocation of mooring bins	4	2		
32	Windsor Leisure Centre	increase demand for gym membership	-	10	15	
33	Windsor Leisure Centre	Review of staff membership charge	-	4		
34	Windsor Leisure Centre	Efficiencies in utility budget.	113	7		
35	Adult Social Care	Continuing Care		75	75	
36	Adult Social Care	Impact of increased Pension Credits on financial assessments		20		
37	Adult Social Care	Smile & Preventative Services run by Voluntary organisations		(25)	(25)	50
38	Adult Social Care	More effective commissioning service - phase 1	7,000	200		
39	Adult Social Care	Slip opening of Boyn Grove dementia day centre to June 2011		100	(100)	
40	Adult Social Care - Concessionary Fares	Support in respect of concessionary fare schemes.	958	50		
41	Adult Social Care / Supporting People	Cross Adult Social Care and Supporting People reorganisations		123	-	-
42	Heritage	Reduce Exhibition budget	11	2	2	
43	Leisure Services	Cross Leisure Services reorganisations		194	50	-
44	Libraries - FSR Rec. 10.8	Transfer Daily Delivery Service currently provided by Facilities Team to LIHAS. This would need to be investigated thoroughly alongside colleagues in Facilities.		28		

<b>Savings Proposals</b>			<b>BUDGET</b>			
			<b>INCREMENTAL SAVING</b>			
<b>Item No</b>	<b>Specific Service Area</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>2009/10 Service Budget</b>	<b>2010/11 (Full or part year)</b>	<b>2011/12 (Full year)</b>	<b>2012/13 (Full year)</b>
<b>(1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(4)</b>	<b>(5)</b>	<b>(6)</b>	<b>(7)</b>
			<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>
<b>45</b>	<b>Libraries -ICT</b>	Charge for ICT		17	15	
<b>46</b>	<b>Library Services</b>	Cross Library Services reorganisations		96	38	5
<b>47</b>	<b>Supporting People</b>	Review Supporting People services in line with recent spend	469	75	25	
<b>48</b>	<b>Windsor Leisure Centre</b>	Reassess menu at WLC catering		25	-	
<b>49</b>	<b>Outdoor Facilities</b>	Review frequency of inspections	65	37		
<b>TOTAL ADULT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES</b>			<b>20,341</b>	<b>1,707</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>61</b>

<b>Savings Proposals</b>			<b>BUDGET</b>			
<b>Item No</b>	<b>Specific Service Area</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>INCREMENTAL SAVING</b>			
			<b>2009/10 Service Budget</b>	<b>2010/11 (Full or part year)</b>	<b>2011/12 (Full year)</b>	<b>2012/13 (Full year)</b>
<b>(1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(4)</b>	<b>(5)</b>	<b>(6)</b>	<b>(7)</b>
			<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES</b>						
1	Access	Improved negotiations within providers to reflect opportunities for additional external/commercial funding.	123	30	25	-
2	General	Explore external funding	-	35		
3	Licensing	Re-base level of Hackney carriage income	(132)	60	-	-
4	Operations Service	Review operational budgets Land drainage, emergency planning, etc.	100	10	10	-
5	General	Review operating costs Admin Buildings Energy savings etc	224	70		
6	General	Review Directorate operating levels and overheads	5,890	200	220	235
7	Highways Maintenance	Efficiency savings- Highway maintenance & street lighting	1,026	65	30	-
8	Other Highway Services	Review other highway service areas including bridges, street furniture, licensing and consultancy costs	335	50	20	-
9	Parking Services	Car parking service review	3,572	200	150	-
10	Public Protection	Refuse & Recycling contract negotiations.	5,570	100	100	
11	Traffic Management	Review operational levels Safer roads partnership, etc.	195	30	25	-
12	Waste Disposal	Reduce tonnages to landfill following impact of recycle initiatives.	2,554	75	75	75
13	Fleet Management	Continuation of pooled cars scheme Following success of pilot scheme.	-	25	25	-
<b>TOTAL ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES</b>			<b>19,457</b>	<b>950</b>	<b>680</b>	<b>310</b>

<b>Savings Proposals</b>			<b>BUDGET</b>			
<b>Item No</b>	<b>Specific Service Area</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>INCREMENTAL SAVING</b>			
			<b>2009/10 Service Budget</b>	<b>2010/11 (Full or part year)</b>	<b>2011/12 (Full year)</b>	<b>2012/13 (Full year)</b>
<b>(1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(4)</b>	<b>(5)</b>	<b>(6)</b>	<b>(7)</b>
			<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>
<b>RESOURCES</b>						
1	Finance	Reduction of insurance premiums		250		
2	Finance	Reduced Agresso licences charges		25		
3	Finance	Increased council tax collection rates		150		
4	Finance	Cashflow changes to pension fund generating additional interest		30		
5	Finance	Additional DWP grant to support benefit services (2010/11 only)		94	(94)	
6	ICT	Reduction in Energy consumption	2,962	25		
7	ICT	Cancellation of remaining SunGard DR contract		68		
8	ICT	Rationalisation of GIS licences		10		
9	ICT	Land line to mobile call charges reductions		30		
10	Legal Services	Reduction in payment for Coroners Service as part of Joint Arrangement	148	5		
11	Legal Services	Reduction in Magistrates Court Costs	17	2		
12	Legal Services	Reduced Land Charges costs due to introduction of Uniform	(270)	3		
13	Procurement	Reduction in Agency staff		25		
14	Finance	Control Discretionary Council Tax relief		45		
15	Finance	Control Discretionary Housing payment		50		
16	ICT	Income from selling data centre capacity		15	40	
17	Pan Council	Reduction in allowances and expenses		230		
18	Pan Council	Reduction in allowances and expenses		25		
19	Print & Post	Savings from centralising and restructuring Print & Post functions and budgets		150		
20	Procurement	Goods and Services delivered through centralisation of strategic procurement team		100		
21	Resources	Cross directorate reorganisations of resources		1,053		
<b>TOTAL RESOURCES</b>			<b>2,857</b>	<b>2,385</b>	<b>(54)</b>	<b>-</b>

<b>Savings Proposals</b>		
Item No	Specific Service Area	Description
(1)	(2)	(3)

BUDGET	INCREMENTAL SAVING		
2009/10 Service Budget	2010/11 (Full or part year)	2011/12 (Full year)	2012/13 (Full year)
(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000

## PLANNING, POLICY AND PERFORMANCE

### PLANNING

1	Building Control	Reduced volume of Structural Engineering referrals
2	Development Control	Review Planning Application process
3	Planning Policy / Cons	Reduce service level of conservation work by sharing with other authorities
4	Planning Units	Review Unit operating levels and overheads
5	Transport Policy and Planning Implementation - s106	Project management Charge for s106 payable by developer for site supervision
6	Building Control	Introduction of Charge for Demolition Notices
<b>Savings impact on 2010/11</b>		

	5		
	73	20	15
	15		
	134	145	13
	10		
	5	5	
<b>-</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>28</b>

### POLICY AND PERFORMANCE

1	Complaints	Reduction in complaints budget - Social Care Complaints
2	Corporate Communications	Changing distribution company for Around The Royal Borough
3	Corporate Performance & Development	Reduction in refreshment budget
4	Corporate Performance & Development	Reduction in room hire budget
5	Democratic Services	Reduction in salaries budgets, postholders appointed at a lower scale than budgeted
6	Electoral Services	Reduction in district election budget
7	Mayoral & Civic	Reduction in Members allowances
8	Mayoral & Civic	Reduction in Members refreshments allowances and conference fees
9	Policy and Performance	Cross services reorganisation of resources
<b>Savings impact on 2010/11</b>		

41	17		
204	18		
582	2		
	2		
	9		
190	22		
914	50		
	17		
720	200	-	-
<b>2,651</b>	<b>337</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>

### TOTAL PLANNING, POLICY AND PERFORMANCE

<b>2,651</b>	<b>579</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>28</b>
--------------	------------	------------	-----------

### TOTAL ALL SERVICES

<b>58,747</b>	<b>6,267</b>	<b>1,108</b>	<b>414</b>
---------------	--------------	--------------	------------