## SERVICE GROWTH / COST PRESSURES - 2017/18 - 2019/20

Service	Item	2017/18 2018/19		2019/20	
		2017/18 £m	2010/19 £m	£m	
	Demographic Changes	2.111	2111	2111	
Regeneration &					Between 2015 and 2020, the council is expected to see sign
Environment	Brent Transport Services	0.1	0.1	0.1	5% over this period, with particularly sharp rises in the under significant determinants of the level of spending on children's has already taken place and has therefore been factored in t
Regeneration & Environment	Refuse Collection	0.1	0.1	0.1	
Regeneration & Environment	Public Realm (excluding Refuse Collection)	0.2	0.2		
Children & Young People	Children's social care	0.4	0.4	0.4	
Adult Social Care	Learning Disabilities (18-65)	0.2	0.2	0.2	
Adult Social Care	Older People (65+) Non Home Care	0.3	0.3	0.3	
Adult Social Care	Older People (65+) Home Care	1.5	1.5	1.5	
Resources	Customer Services	0.1	0.1	0.1	
Resources	Legal services	0.1	0.1	0.1	
Central	Income	(1.0)	0.0	0.0	Just as the budget must recognise, at a technical level, the c generated from the additional demand for those services whi above.
	Total Demographic Changes	2.0	3.0	3.0	
		2.0	5.0	5.0	
	Service Specific Inflation				
Various	Payroll Inflation	1.1	1.1		The pay settlement for 2017/18 is known to be 1%, which ad the budget assumes, for financial planning purposes, that it w
Central	Contract inflation	3.0	3.0	3.0	General contract inflation is assumed to average at 1.3%, wh
Adult Social Care	Older People - Living wage for carers	0.4	0.4	0.4	The cost of paying providers for the uplift caused by the annu 2020 will add £0.4m to the adult social care budget each year
Central	Other service specific inflation	0.8	0.8	0.8	General contract inflation is assumed to average at 1.3%, whether the second seco
Resources	Business Rates	0.6	0.2	0.0	As a result of the business rates revaluation, the rates payab with a further £0.2m in 2018/19.
Regerantion & Environment	West London Waste fixed charge levy growth	0.8	0.3		There are additional charges from the West London Waste A across the pay as you throw levy and the fixed cost levy. This and 2017/18 being the first year of the operation of the Seve part of the service review for the Public Realm
	Total Service Specific Inflation	6.7	5.8	5.3	
	Pension related costs, risk mitigation and insurances				
Central	Insurance fund	0.1	0.1	0.1	There are a set of costs associated with pensions, redundan
Central	Central Items other cost pressures (excl Levies)	0.4	0.4		actuarial review of the pension fund, which will affect pension recently strengthened, but this has been against the backgro
Central	Pension fund	0.0	0.8	0.4	likely increases to mortality assumptions. The run off of the in the number of payments for previously granted premature point of the decision). Finally, the ongoing strategy to meet revenue budget and the need to make savings. As this was to match likely future liabilities. The total impact of these iter the actuarial review.

## Comments

gnificant increases in its population. The overall rate of increase is expected to be der 18s (6.6%), and over 85s (24%). The numbers in these two groups are n's social care and adult social care respectively. Some of this population growth n to the council's existing budgets. For the avoidance of doubt, this is the sed by a rising population. It follows that recognising this in the budget is a not imply any change in policy choices.

e costs of a growing population so too it must recognise the additional revenue which are charged for. This is estimated to be £1m based on the population data

adds £1.1m to the total staffing costs. As the 2018/19 settlement is not yet agreed it will also be at 1%.

which will cost £3.0m each year

nnual increases to bring the national living wage up to 60% of median earnings by rear

which will cost £0.8m for specific identified service issues

able by the authority for the properties it occupies increase by £0.6m in 2017/18,

e Authority, expected to total £0.8m in 2017/18 and a further £0.3m in 2018/19 his increase is due to a combination of population and business growth, inflation, vernside Energy Recovery Centre. These costs are currently being reviewed as a

ancy and other related payments. The main issue is the impact of the triennial ion costs from 2017/18 onwards. The relative position of the pension fund has ground of generally poor investment returns over the last three years, coupled with he closed LPFA fund adds to this, partially offset by the ongoing gradual reduction re retirements. (Any new early retirements are met by capital contributions at the et new redundancy costs from identified reserves has reduced the pressure on the as not intended to be permanently sustainable the base budget is adjusted upwards tems is £1.0m, including insurance costs, the majority of which relates directly to

	GRAND TOTAL OF SERVICE COST / GROWTH PRESSURES	14.7	15.0	13.7	
	Total Contingency and social value	3.6	3.5	3.5	
Central	Social value investment fund	2.5	2.5	2.5	Any logically constructed budget also requires contingencie record of consistently achieving over 90% of these. Good g is nonetheless proposed to continue to make a 10% allowar services when delivery exceeds this allowance and, more in This is an important contingency device, and setting a budg The council also retains its £2.5m social value investment fu
Central	Savings risk mitigation fund	1.1	1.0	1.0	
	Contingency and social value				
	Total Freedom passes and levies	0.9	0.9	0.9	
Central	Levies	0.2	0.2	0.2	year to the cost base
Adult Social Care	Freedom pass growth	0.7	0.7	0.7	ageing demographic, and relatively good transport links, the by an estimated £0.7m each year
	Freedom passes and levies				
	Total Pension related costs, risk mitigation and insurances	1.5	1.8	1.0	
Central	PFI credits	1.0	0.5	0.1	The council also receives grants for its three PFI schemes, of built into the council's budget plans, as it was known at the t the end of the street lighting PFI contract within the budget p changes in the relevant service expenditure lines, but for tra the budget planning period.

s, commonly referred to as PFI credits. The long-term structure of these has been e time that the deals were signed, in some cases as long as 20 years ago. With t planning period this leads to a reduction in this grant income line, offset by ransparency is shown here as a pressure of  $\pounds 1m$  in 2017/18, rising to  $\pounds 1.5m$  over

ssociated with London wide policies. The main issue here is freedom passes, the according to data provided by the Oyster cards that record journeys. Given Brent's he inevitable consequence is that the costs of the scheme continue to rise locally,

, such as to the Environment Agency and for Lea Valley Park, adding £0.2m per

ties. The council aims to deliver all of its agreed savings proposals, and has a good governance mechanisms are in place to continue this record of achievement, but it vance for slippage, in line with recent policy. This allows for reinvestment in importantly, avoids the need for short-term action to cut services if delivery slips. dget without it in today's challenging financial environment would be imprudent. t fund