Brent	**Cabinet** 24 October 2016 **Report from the Chief Finance Officer**
	Wards affected: ALL
Budget Proposals 2017/18 – 2018/19	

1. Introduction

1.1. This report sets out draft budget proposals for 2017/18 and 2018/19. Subject to the results of consultation it is envisaged that these would then form the basis of the budget to be agreed at the Full Council meeting of February 2017.

1.2. The process following this cabinet meeting is:

- These proposals, together with any changes made by cabinet, will form the basis of a consultation between November and January with local residents, businesses and other stakeholders;
- The two scrutiny committees will review the budget proposals and report accordingly;
- General purposes committee will review the calculation of the council tax base;
- In December Cabinet will receive a paper on the Collection fund surplus which is a technical report on the distribution of estimated surplus on collection of council tax and NDR; and
- After consultation, a budget paper will be presented for Cabinet to recommend a final budget and council tax to the February 2017 Council meeting.

2. Recommendations

2.1. That Cabinet notes the overall financial position.

2.2. That Cabinet endorses the savings previously agreed, as set out in Appendix One.

2.3. That Cabinet agrees to consult on new draft policy options, as summarised in Appendix two and detailed in Appendix Three.

2.4. That Cabinet agrees to consult on council tax increases of 3.99% in each of 2017/18 and 2018/19.

2.5. That Cabinet endorses the technical assumptions underpinning the budget as set out throughout the report.

2.6. That Cabinet authorizes the drawdown of further capital resources to support delivery of the temporary accommodation reform plan, as set out on paragraph 6.7.

3. Key Assumptions and Review of Revenue Budget Proposals

3.1. The council's recent financial history, the medium term financial outlook and the implications of these were set out in the September Cabinet report. There have been no material changes to the position, and it should therefore be read in conjunction with this report.

Technical budget assumptions

3.2. NDR income is expected to grow by between 3.2% and 3.5% per annum in 2017/18 and through to 2019/20. This is based on an assumption of 2% inflation, based on the Bank of England's target, and assumed growth in rateable values of between 1.2% and 1.5%. The existing NDR top up grant is assumed to grow by 2% each year between 2017/18 and 2019/20 on an assumption of 2% inflation, in line with the BoE core forecast.

3.3. Business rates revaluation in 2017/18 adds significant volatility to this position, which will be managed through existing contingency reserves. Whilst the revaluation itself has been published, the calculation of business rates both payable by businesses and income due to the borough is dependent on the value of the business rates multiplier as well as the revaluation, and the multiplier will not be finalized until later this year. Another uncertainty is that Central Government is consulting on how these changes will be phased in for different sizes of business. The monies that the council spends on business rates will be affected by all these changes, as there are several unknowns this cannot be quantified exactly at this point in time. On the income side, there is a consultation from Central Government on how to change the amounts of business rates top up and tariffs to mitigate the impact of the revaluation on council's net income, overall the impact on all councils should be zero, but there may be some councils who lose or gain based on the specifics of the final mechanism.

3.4. Revenue Support Grant is expected to be cut by between 21% and 27% per annum in each year between 2017/18 and 2019/20 based on the last settlement from central government. Following the September Cabinet meeting the Leader and Chief Executive have written to DCLG accepting the proposal to fix this settlement, for the reasons set out previously. This does not imply that the Council believes that the settlement is adequate; merely that reducing volatility in this way is the best alternative in the circumstances.

3.5. Council tax base is assumed to grow at 4.4% per year every year from 2017/18 to 2019/20 due to additional housebuilding within the borough. This is based on the rolling average growth in the households over the past three years. This assumption will be updated each year for the most recent data, which will help to smooth the financial planning assumptions and reduce the risk of significant budgetary changes being imposed in response to any given year's data. This is related to, but not directly correlated with, the rate of population growth.

3.6. Considering smaller specific grants: Education Services grant is £2.8m in 2016/17 and expected to end by 2017/18 based on current indications from the Department for Education. Public Health grant is assumed to be cut by 2.5% per annum from 2017/18 based on indications from the Department of Health. Housing Benefit and Council Tax Administration Grants are assumed to be cut by £0.2m per annum based on recent experience. Table 1 below shows the net impact of these changes.

	2016/17 £m	**2017/18 £m**	**2018/19 £m**	**2019/20 £m**
Income				
RSG	56.0	42.7	33.7	24.5
NDR	34.9	36.1	37.2	38.5
NDR top up	48.7	49.7	50.7	51.7
Council Tax	98.4	102.7	107.4	112.3
Specific grants	34.2	30.4	29.4	28.4
Total Income	**272.2**	**261.6**	**258.4**	**255.4**

Table 1

Expenditure pressures

3.7. Between 2015 and 2020, the council is expected to see significant increases in its population. The overall rate of increase is expected to be 5% over this period, with particularly sharp rises in the under 18s (6.6%), and over 85s (24%). The numbers in these two groups are significant determinants of the level of spending on children's social care and adult social care respectively. Some of this population growth has already taken place and has therefore been factored in to the council's existing budgets. Table 2 below sets out the additional costs expected to be incurred in 2017/18 through to 2019/20. For the avoidance of doubt, this is the additional cost of providing the same level of services caused by a rising population. It follows that recognising this in the budget is a technical assumption – albeit an important one – and does not imply any change in policy choices.

Department	Service Units	Marginal Growth p.a. 2017/18 to 2019/20 £m	Basis
Regeneration & Environment	Brent Transport Services	0.1	1.3-1.4% growth in population 0-15 years
Regeneration & Environment	Refuse Collection	0.1	1.1% growth in population
Regeneration & Environment	Public Realm (excluding Refuse Collection)	0.2	1.1% growth in population
Children and Young People	Children's social care	0.4	1.0 to 1.2% growth in population 0-18 years; 0.9% growth population 0-21 years
Community Well Being	Learning Disabilities (18-65)	0.2	0.8% growth in population 18-65 years
Community Well Being	Older People (65+) Non Home Care	0.3	2.6% growth in population over 65
Community Well Being	Older People (65+) Home Care	1.5	Projected growth in home care hours
Resources	Customer Services	0.1	1.1% growth in population over 18
Resources	Legal services	0.1	Additional caseload caused by above, principally children's social care
Various	Revenue – see below	(1.0)*	Additional revenue, see below
Total Demography		**2.0**	

Table 2 *Aggregate impact, not per annum

3.8. The main consequence of a rising population (in the narrow terms of the direct impact on the council's budget) is to increase costs. Crudely put, residents require services and services cost money to deliver. However, a growing population also necessarily results in some additional revenue for those services for which the council charges, in addition to the impact on the council tax base, which has already been set out. The principal sources of revenue are from services such as parking, provision of adult social care, various planning and licensing fees, use of paid for facilities such as leisure centres and so on.

3.9. Any changes to the actual fee structures for these services will be dealt with separately. However, just as the budget must recognise, at a technical level, the costs of a growing population so too it must recognise the additional revenue generated from the additional demand for those services which are charged for. This is estimated to be £1m based on the population data above.

3.10. The pay settlement for 2017/18 is known to be 1%, which adds £1.1m to the total staffing costs. As the 2018/19 settlement is not yet agreed the budget assumes, for financial planning purposes, that it will also be at 1%. General contract inflation is also assumed to average at 1.3%, which will cost £3.0m each year, with an additional £0.8m for specific identified service issues. This is an average figure, and there is some risk attached to it. If inflation starts to move more sharply upwards, as some analysts are forecasting, then this may subsequently need to be reviewed. In addition, the cost of paying providers for the uplift caused by the annual increases to bring the national living wage up to 60% of median earnings by 2020 will add £0.4m to the adult social care budget each year.

3.11. The budget also needs to recognise a series of adjustments to what are usually referred to as “central” items which are not carried against individual departmental budgets. These are summarised in the following paragraphs.

3.12. There are a set of costs associated with pensions, redundancy and other related payments. The main issue is the impact of the triennial actuarial review of the pension fund, which will affect pension costs from 2017/18 onwards. The relative position of the pension fund has recently strengthened, but this has been against the background of generally poor investment returns over the last three years, coupled with likely increases to mortality assumptions. The run off of the closed LPFA fund adds to this, partially offset by the ongoing gradual reduction in the number of payments for previously granted premature retirements. (Any new early retirements are met by capital contributions at the point of the decision). Finally, the ongoing strategy to meet new redundancy costs from identified reserves has reduced the pressure on the revenue budget and the need to make savings. As this was not intended to be permanently sustainable the base budget is adjusted upwards to match likely future liabilities. The total impact of these items is £1.0m, including insurance costs, the majority of which relates directly to the actuarial review.

3.13. The council also receives grants for its three PFI schemes, commonly referred to as PFI credits. The long-term structure of these has been built into the council’s budget plans, as it was known at the time that the deals were signed, in some cases as long as 20 years ago. With the end of the street lighting PFI contract within the budget planning period this leads to a reduction in this grant income line, offset by changes in the relevant service expenditure lines, but for transparency is shown here as a pressure of £1m in 2017/18, rising to £1.5m over the budget planning period.

3.14. The council also needs to recognise unavoidable costs associated with London wide policies. The main issue here is freedom passes, the cost of which is paid for across London and redistributed according to data provided by the Oyster cards that record journeys. Given Brent’s ageing demographic, and relatively good transport links, the inevitable consequence is that the costs of the scheme continue to rise locally, by an estimated £0.7m each year. In addition, Brent is required to contribute towards London wide levies, such as to the Environment Agency and for Lea Valley Park, adding £0.2m per year to the cost base.

3.15. Any logically constructed budget also requires contingencies. The council aims to deliver all of its agreed savings proposals, and has a good record of consistently achieving over 90% of these. Good governance mechanisms are in place to continue this record of achievement, but it is nonetheless proposed to continue to make a 10% allowance for slippage, in line with recent policy. This allows for reinvestment in services when delivery exceeds this allowance and, more importantly, avoids the need for short-term action to cut services if delivery slips. This is an important contingency device, and setting a budget without it in today's challenging financial environment would be imprudent. The council also retains its £2.5m social value investment fund. Table 3 below shows the impact of these items:

	2017/18 £m	**2018/19 £m**	**2019/20 £m**
Payroll Inflation	1.1	1.1	1.1
Service specific inflation	4.2	4.2	4.2
Pension related costs and insurances	1.0	1.0	1.0
PFI credits	1.0	0.5	0.1
Freedom passes and levies	0.9	0.9	0.9
Contingency and social value	3.5	3.5	3.5
Total other growth	**11.7**	**11.2**	**10.8**

Table 3

4. Calculation of Savings Targets to 2019/20

4.1. The additional savings required are the difference between the council's anticipated total expenditure less forecast total income. Total expenditure is the net 2016/17 budget, plus the expenditure in 2016/17 funded by specific grants, plus council wide inflation, plus the specific cost pressures less the savings already planned, as shown in Table 4 below.

	2016/17 £m	**2017/18 £m**	**2018/19 £m**	**2019/20 £m**
Expenditure				
Net 2016/17 budget plus expenditure funded by specific grants	272.2			
Assumed budget b/f before growth and savings		272.2	261.6	258.4
Net demographic growth		2.0	2.0	2.0
Other growth		11.7	11.2	10.8
Savings previously agreed (February 2016) [1]		(9.5)	(9.2)	0.0
Savings previously agreed (February 2015) [1]		(4.3)	(1.6)	0.0
Total Expenditure	**272.2**	**272.1**	**265.0**	**272.2**
Less Total Income	**(272.2)**	**(261.6)**	**(258.4)**	**(255.4)**

[1] See Appendix One

Net additional savings required		**10.5**	**6.6**	**16.8**

Table 4

5. Council Tax

5.1. The above figures do not assume that the council raises the council tax charge. The council is permitted to increase council tax by up to 3.99% per year. Of this, 1.99% is for general inflation, and 2% is for adult social care.

5.2. A 2% increase in council tax per year would not cover all the additional costs, demographic and inflationary, of providing for the growing population requiring adult social care. The table below sets out the impact of council tax rises in each of 2017/18 and 2018/19.

5.3. A 3.99% increase on council tax is the maximum permitted under the existing legislation, unless a referendum is conducted. Increasing council tax by this amount would generate £4.1m p.a. additional income in 2017/18, rising as set out in the table below for the compounded impact of increases in the council tax base, as shown in Table 5 below.

	2017/18	**2018/19**	**2019/20**
	£m	**£m**	**£m**
Net additional savings required	**10.5**	**6.6**	**16.8**
Net additional income with 3.99% a year council tax increase	(4.1)	(4.7)	(5.3)
Cumulative savings required with 3.99% council tax increase	**6.4**	**1.9**	**11.5**

Table 5

5.4. This clearly illustrates the significance of the decision on council tax, for which reason it is proposed to consult on the increases in 2017/18 and 2018/19. Legally, separate decisions on council tax will still formally be required at each of the budget setting meetings of the Full Council (i.e. in February 2017 and February 2018).

6. Budget Options for Consideration

Technical adjustments to the budget from policy changes

6.1. The council make repayments of the principal associated with previous borrowing for capital expenditure through the statutory minimum revenue provision (MRP) regime. There are considerable complexities in the actual operation of this. What follows is a summary of the issues and their impact on the budget in relatively plain English.

6.2. Although the need to set aside MRP, as a charge to the revenue account, is statutory, there is considerable discretion as to how this can be applied. To date the council's policy has, arguably, been more prudent than strictly necessary, essentially repaying most debt relatively early in the life of the assets that were built or acquired through borrowing, and consequently repaying less debt as those assets age.

6.3. By way of analogy, this is very different to the approach used by most people when they buy a house through a mortgage. An ordinary repayment mortgage would normally result in the debt being repaid through an annuity payment, which means that the total payment for both interest and repaying the debt stays constant over time. By adjusting the MRP policy so that it more closely matches the life of the assets acquired the actual charges to the revenue account would more closely match the actual schedule for repayment of debt, and be more akin to how a typical annuity mortgage on a house would work.

6.4. Put another way, in previous years, the council has made charges to the general fund to repay debt that were greater than the amount of debt to be repaid, resulting in an increase of unusable reserves.

6.5. For the audited 2015/16 accounts, this policy was revised and the minimum revenue provision reduced to a level appropriate to the level of debt repayments. This has two impacts. Firstly, the council has funded routine maintenance (not improvement) works to its highways infrastructure through annual borrowing, which was never the most suitable source of financing. With the revenue resources released through the change in MRP policy this can be funded through general expenditure, reducing debt charges in future years. Secondly, the MRP charge in 2017/18 can be reduced by £3m from that currently built into the budget plans. This amount then declines gradually year-on-year, as the change in MRP policy itself does not change the total amount of council borrowing. In other words, the impact of the policy is to change the timing of debt repayments, not the total amount, and over the very long term (more than 50 years) the total impact is therefore necessarily nil.

6.6. The council also has an agreed investment strategy, the initial focus of which is to deliver the temporary accommodation reform plan. These plans were agreed by Cabinet in April and March 2016 respectively. Their purpose, as with all council plans, is ultimately to improve outcomes for residents. In this case, by reducing the demand for expensive temporary accommodation in the private sector the council can, through investing in its own provision, improve outcomes at the same time as reducing costs. Financial modelling shows that the dividend on the council's investment, after new borrowing costs are met, will be £0.7m each year.

6.7. In agreeing these plans Cabinet authorized an initial tranche of borrowing of £10m to finance acquisition of properties. This was to test the model, which has been shown to be financially sound. It is a challenging market in which to operate, and identifying properties that are suitable to meet the housing need at a price that makes the model affordable is not straightforward. However, as the model has now been shown to work it is proposed that Cabinet authorize officers to proceed with the balance of planned acquisitions and to draw down the remaining £40m of the authorized fund.

6.8. Finally, agreed revisions to the current approach to Supported Living to challenge and renegotiate the current highest costing Supported Living places, using new procurement models are projected to save £0.5m.

6.9. The council, in response to rising demand, is also reviewing its approach to controlled parking zones (CPZs). This is an emerging policy area, but it is unarguably the case that the rapid rise in the population creates more demand for controlled parking. The council seeks to mitigate this through the planning process, to avoid a simple 1:1 (or even greater) correlation between new development and car ownership. However, whilst the council can seek to create a place where car ownership is not seen as essential, individuals clearly can, and do, choose to own cars. As the space in the borough is, by definition, fixed and finite, there is therefore inevitably a correlation from new developments to the total amount of car ownership which in turn impacts on the demand for CPZs.

6.10. This is a complex calculation. The budget has already recognised that increased car ownership will necessarily impact on the council's revenue budget. Car owners pay residents' fees where they are in existing CPZs, use (from time to time) the council's paid for car parking facilities and, sometimes, incur fines for parking contraventions. As the number of residents, and therefore cars, continues to rise there is also a tendency for the demand for CPZs to rise. In some areas CPZs are popular with residents, as they can be an effective way of managing this demand and hence enabling them to park close to their own homes. In other areas CPZs are not popular, generally those where the impact of development has been less and hence finding parking spaces is not normally difficult.

6.11. The council's approach has been, and will continue to be, to implement CPZs subject to consultation. However, given the known demographic trends it is logical to construct the budget on the assumption that more CPZs will, over time, be agreed. CPZs generate revenue by way of fees from residents, which is used to cover the costs of implementation and to fund other highways related expenditure. The assumption for planning purposes is that this will result in £0.5m additional revenue in each of 2017/18 and 2018/19, which will be tested as policy is developed in this area.

Policy options

6.12. Table 6 below summarises this and shows the new policy options proposed for consultation. These are scheduled in Appendix Two and set out in more detail in Appendix Three.

	2017/18 £m	2018/19 £m	2019/20 £m
Annual savings required	**10.5**	**6.6**	**16.8**
Impact of council tax, if 4% increases agreed	**(4.1)**	**(4.7)**	**(5.3)**
Further savings required	**6.4**	**1.9**	**11.5**
Technical adjustments			
MRP revenue impact	(3.0)	0.3	0.3
Temporary Accommodation	(0.5)	(0.2)	0.0
Supported living	(0.2)	(0.3)	0.0
Parking demand	(0.5)	(0.5)	0.0
Subtotal technical adjustments	**(4.2)**	**(0.7)**	**0.3**
Balance of savings required	**2.2**	**1.2**	**11.8**
Sexual health transformation	(0.3)	(0.3)	
Introduce ASC charges from day 1	(0.2)	0.0	
Day care transformation	(0.3)	0.0	
20% nursing care to Supported living	(0.1)	(0.2)	
Mental health transformation	(0.5)	0.0	
Bulky waste service	(0.3)	0.0	
Special projects budget	(0.1)	0.0	
Further regulatory services saving	0.0	(0.1)	
Parking charges	0.00	(1.0)	
Public Realm	(0.5)	(0.4)	
Street lighting CMS	0.0	(0.1)	
Subtotal possible policy options	**(2.3)**	**(2.1)**	
Cumulative position if all changes made	**(0.1)**	**(0.9)**	**11.8**

Table 6

6.13. For the two years being considered in detail there are therefore sufficient proposals for there to be a choice about which of these are adopted. Some minor refinement of the timing of budget plans would be needed between 2017/18 and 2018/19, but at this stage the important point is that the published proposals would be sufficient over the two years in question. Further, although additional savings are required in 2019/20, the council has two years to identify what these could be, and can use this time to develop plans to address this gap.

6.14. It is worth highlighting the significance of the proposal to consult on council tax increases set out in this. The budget for the next two years can, broadly, be balanced if these increases are agreed. If not, additional savings of £8.8m would be required to be identified, and the longer-term gap for 2019/20 would be £5.3m higher at £16.8m not £11.5m.

7. Sustainability and Transformation Plan

7.1. In December 2015, the NHS shared planning guidance 2016/17 – 2020/21 outlined a new approach to help ensure that health and care services are built around the needs of local populations. To do this, every health and care system in England was required by central government to produce a multi-year Sustainability and Transformation Plan (STP), showing how local services will evolve and become sustainable over the next five years – ultimately delivering the Five Year Forward View vision of better health, better patient care and improved NHS efficiency. The STP for North West London was submitted in June 2016, with a view to implementation starting in autumn 2016.

7.2. If no action is taken, across North West London, the NHS is forecasting a £1.15bn funding gap by 2020/21 with a further £145m gap in Adult Social Care. For Brent this equates to approximately £21m. This is greater than the figures shown above as the figures above show what Brent Council can afford to spend from its own resources, the STP shows what is necessary to make the local health and care system sustainable.

7.3. If the approach of social care being solely funded by Brent Council is adopted, without additional funding from the STP, then the council will only be able to afford meeting its most basic duties, and will be unable to contribute to placing the local health and care system on a more sustainable path.

7.4. The "Adult Social Care gap", takes a prudent view on projections of current demographic and acuity trends in to consideration as well as price led factors (National Living Wage), as well as the transformations in service delivery that would be necessary to make the local health and care system more sustainable.

7.5. Local government has faced unprecedented reductions in their budget through the last two comprehensive spending reviews, and the impact of the reductions in social care funding in particular has had a significant impact on NHS services. To ensure that the NHS can be sustainable long term we need to protect and invest in social care, and in preventative services, to reduce demand on the NHS and to support the shift towards more proactive, out of hospital care. This includes addressing the existing gap, and ensuring that the costs of increased social care that will result from the delivery areas set out in the STP.

7.6. Without the STP and access to NHS reoccurring transformational funding the council will struggle to do any more than deliver the most basic services, which will put at risk items such as preventative services in the short to medium term.

8. Financial Implications

8.1 The financial implications are set out throughout the report. As the budget proposals are for consultation at this stage, not agreement, there are no direct costs associated with agreeing the recommendations, other than for consultation, the costs of which are built into existing budgets.

8.2 The proposed further drawdown of approved budgets to support investment in the temporary accommodation reform plan is consistent with the previously agreed strategy. As with any investment, it is not entirely without risk, but the underlying financial model shows that it remains affordable even with the rising property market. Officers will continue to monitor progress carefully.

9. Legal Implications

9.1. A local authority must budget so as to give a reasonable degree of certainty as to the maintenance of its services. In particular, local authorities are required by the Local Government Finance Act 1992 to calculate as part of their overall budget what amounts are appropriate for contingencies and reserves. The Council must ensure sufficient flexibility to avoid going into deficit at any point during the financial year. The Chief Financial Officer is required to report on the robustness of the proposed financial reserves.

9.2. Under the Brent Member Code of Conduct members are required when reaching decisions to have regard to relevant advice from the Chief Finance Officer and the Monitoring Officer. If the Council should fail to set a budget at all or fail to set a lawful budget, contrary to the advice of these two officers there may be a breach of the Code by individual members if it can be demonstrated that they have not had proper regard to the advice given.

9.3. In accordance with the Local Government Finance Act 1992, where a payment of Council Tax that a member is liable to make has been outstanding for two months or more at the time of a meeting, the member must disclose the fact of their arrears (though they are not required to declare the amount) and cannot vote on any of the following matters if they are the subject of consideration at a meeting: (a) any decision relating to the administration or enforcement of Council Tax (b) any budget calculation required by the Local Government Finance Act 1992 underlying the setting of the Council Tax or (c) any recommendation, resolution or other decision which might affect the making of the Annual Budget calculation. These rules are extremely wide in scope so virtually any Council decision which has financial implications is one which might affect the making of the budget underlying the Council Tax for next year and thus is caught. The former DoE (now DCLG) shared this interpretation as it made clear in its letter to the AMA dated 28th May 1992. Members who make a declaration are not entitled to vote on the matter in question but are not prevented by the section from taking part in the discussion. Breach of the rules is a criminal offence under section 106 which attracts a maximum fine of £1,000.

10. Staffing and Diversity Implications

10.1. Under the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) of the Equality Act 2010, Brent Council is required in the exercise of its functions, to have due regard to the need to:

- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act,
- advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not, and
- foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

10.2. There nine protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender, gender identity, ethnicity/race, religion/belief, sexual orientation, pregnancy and maternity, marriage and civil partnership.

10.3. The PSED does not prevent decision-makers from making difficult decisions in the context of the requirement to achieve a significant level of savings across all operations. It supports the Council to make robust decisions in a fair, transparent and accountable way that takes into account the diverse needs of all our local communities and of our workforce. The duty continues to be a “have regard duty”, and the weight to be attached to it is a matter for the Council, bearing in mind the principles of relevance and proportionality.

10.4. This report sets out the overall financial framework and seeks authority to consult on the above listed draft budget proposals for 2017/18 and 2018/19. Subject to the results of consultation it is envisaged that these would then form the basis of the budget to be agreed at the Full Council meeting of February 2017.

10.5. To date, all draft proposals have been subject to the Council’s Equality Analysis (EA) screening process the purpose of which is to assess their potential/likely impact on service users and/or employees with protected characteristics. The findings from the services’ screening analyses are summarised in Appendix 3.

10.6. The final proposals put to Cabinet for approval in February 2017 will be informed by the consultation findings and the appropriate level of equality analyses to ensure that Members can make informed decisions on whether to adopt, amend or reject these. Where the proposals are likely to affect employees, the diversity implications on staff will be separately assessed via the staff equality analysis process.

11. CONTACT OFFICERS

Conrad Hall

Chief Finance Officer

conrad.hall@brent.gov.uk

CONRAD HALL

Chief Finance Officer