



TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

EXECUTIVE SERVICES

Chief Executive

Julie Beilby BSc (Hons) MBA

Gibson Building
Gibson Drive
Kings Hill, West Malling
Kent ME19 4LZ
West Malling (01732) 844522

NB - This agenda contains proposals, recommendations and options. These do not represent Council policy or decisions until they have received proper consideration through the full decision making process.

Contact: Committee Services
committee.services@tmbc.gov.uk

7 January 2020

To: MEMBERS OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
(Copies to all Members of the Council)

Dear Sir/Madam

Your attendance is requested at a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to be held in the Civic Suite, Gibson Building, Kings Hill, West Malling on Wednesday, 15th January, 2020 commencing at 7.30 pm

Yours faithfully

JULIE BEILBY

Chief Executive

A G E N D A

PART 1 - PUBLIC

- | | | |
|----|--------------------------|-------|
| 1. | Apologies for absence | 5 - 6 |
| 2. | Declarations of interest | 7 - 8 |

3. Minutes 9 - 12

To confirm as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 10 October 2019

4. Any Executive Decisions which have been 'called in' 13 - 14

Matters for Recommendation to the Cabinet

5. Review of Public Health 15 - 32

This report explores the three previously identified options for the future provision of the One You Kent service within Tonbridge & Malling BC. Dependent on the option chosen by Members there may be future financial implications for the Council.

The Director of Public Health, Kent County Council (Andrew Scott-Clark) and a local GP based at the Snodland Surgery (Becky Prince) will attend to present their views and answer any questions raised by Members.

6. Review of Disabled Facilities Grants 33 - 54

This report explores the three previously identified options for the future provision of the Disabled Facilities Grant programme and the wider Better Care Fund initiatives within Tonbridge & Malling B.C. Dependent on the option chosen by Members there may be future financial implications for the Council and an analysis of this is provided for each option.

The Hospital Discharge Manager, Maidstone & Tunbridge Wells NHS Trust (Dawn Hallam) and the Occupational Therapist lead at Kent County Council (Jane Miller-Everest) will attend to present their views and answer any questions raised by Members.

7. Corporate Strategy 2020-2023 55 - 62

This report sets out a new draft Corporate Strategy for the period 2020-2023.

8. Revenue Estimates 2020-2021 63 - 74

The Council has a statutory duty to set the level of council tax for the forthcoming financial year by 11 March. Under the Budget and Policy Framework Rules of the Constitution, the Cabinet is responsible for formulating initial draft proposals in respect of the Budget. The role of this Committee is to assist both the Cabinet and the Council in the preparation of the Budget for 2020/21 within the context of the Medium Term Financial Strategy and the Council's priorities.

NB: The Estimates for 2020-2021 referred to in paragraph 1.1.4 of the report will be published as a supplementary paper for convenience.

9. Capital Plan Review 75 - 96

This report considers progress on the 2019/20 Capital Plan Review and requests endorsement of recommendations to Cabinet.

Decisions to be taken by the Committee

10. Domestic Abuse Services and Associated Budgets - Scoping report 97 - 102

This scoping report will give an overview of the current work taking place within the borough to tackle domestic abuse and identify potential gaps in services.

11. Urgent Items 103 - 104

Any other items which the Chairman decides are urgent due to special circumstances and of which notice has been given to the Chief Executive.

Matters for consideration in Private

12. Exclusion of Press and Public 105 - 106

The Chairman to move that the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting during consideration of any items the publication of which would disclose exempt information.

PART 2 - PRIVATE

13. Urgent Items 107 - 108

Any other items which the Chairman decides are urgent due to special circumstances and of which notice has been given to the Chief Executive.

MEMBERSHIP

Cllr J L Sergison (Chairman)

Cllr Mrs A S Oakley (Vice-Chairman) and Cllr F G Tombolis (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr Mrs J A Anderson

Cllr M C Base

Cllr T Bishop

Cllr J L Botten

Cllr M D Boughton

Cllr C Brown

Cllr R W Dalton

Cllr M O Davis

Cllr M A J Hood

Cllr A P J Keeley

Cllr D Keers

Cllr H S Rogers

Cllr M Taylor

Cllr Miss G E Thomas

Cllr D Thornewell

Apologies for absence

This page is intentionally left blank

Declarations of interest

This page is intentionally left blank

TONBRIDGE AND MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Thursday, 10th October, 2019

Present: Cllr J L Sergison (Chairman), Cllr Mrs A S Oakley (Vice-Chairman), Cllr F G Tombolis (Vice-Chairman), Cllr Mrs J A Anderson, Cllr M C Base, Cllr T Bishop, Cllr C Brown, Cllr R W Dalton, Cllr M O Davis, Cllr M A J Hood, Cllr A P J Keeley, Cllr H S Rogers, Cllr M Taylor and Cllr Miss G E Thomas

Councillors M A Coffin, N J Heslop and M R Rhodes were also present pursuant to Council Procedure Rule No 15.21.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J L Botten, M D Boughton and D Keers

PART 1 - PUBLIC

OS 19/27 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made in accordance with the Code of Conduct.

OS 19/28 MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 29 August 2019 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

MATTERS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO THE CABINET

OS 19/29 REVIEW OF COMMUNITY SAFETY

The joint report of the Director of Central Services and the Director of Street Scene, Leisure and Technical Services set out a number of options for consideration regarding a review of community safety and the provision of CCTV.

Representatives from Kent Police and Clarion Housing attended the meeting and gave examples of partnership working to demonstrate the value of the Community Safety Unit (CSU) and CCTV in addressing crime and disorder. Members discussed the value of 'live' monitoring as opposed to 'passive' monitoring, the potential for new technologies to monitor in a different way and the financial and value for money implications of retaining the operation. The role of the CSU in addressing crime and disorder was also discussed.

RECOMMENDED: That, in respect of CCTV:

- (1) the operation be retained at its current level; and
- (2) the Borough Council write to the Kent Police and Crime Commissioner and the Chief Executive of Clarion Housing Group regarding the level of financial contribution towards the operation of CCTV.

***Referred to Cabinet**

RECOMMENDED: That, in respect of the Community Safety Partnership:

- (1) growth to the Borough Council's budget be accepted and the provision of the Community Safety Services be retained at the current level of resource; and
- (2) the Borough Council write to the Kent Police and Crime Commissioner and the Chief Executive of Clarion Housing Group regarding the level of financial contribution and general support towards the operation of the Community Safety Unit.

***Referred to Cabinet**

DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE COMMITTEE

OS 19/30 REVIEW OF DISABLED FACILITIES GRANTS - SCOPING REPORT

The report of the Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health provided background information on the Borough Council's Disabled Facilities Grants programme and the wider Better Care Fund.

Options for inclusion in the review of the service were also set out for consideration. Further information on whether cost recovery of grants could be applied to housing associations, more detail on the specific areas of the discretionary and mandatory disabled facilities grants and more detail from Kent County Council regarding 'top slicing' were also identified for inclusion in the review. It was hoped that this further information would provide better context for the benefit of decision making.

Members suggested that representatives from the West Kent Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), the Peabody Home Improvement Agency, Clarion Housing Group and Age UK should be invited to the next meeting of the Committee to participate in the discussion.

RESOLVED: That:

- (1) the content of the report be noted; and

- (2) a further report be submitted to the meeting of the Committee on 21 January 2020 regarding the options identified in section 1.10 of the report, and including the additional options identified by the Committee (summarised above).

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION IN PRIVATE

OS 19/31 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

There were no items considered in private.

PART 2 - PRIVATE

MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

OS 19/32 REVIEW OF COMMUNITY SAFETY - SCOPING REPORT OF 29 AUGUST 2019

(Reason - LGA 1972 - Sch 12A Paragraph 7 – Prevention, investigation or prosecution of criminal offences)

The scoping report of the Director of Central Services and the Director of Street Scene Leisure and Technical Services dated 29 August 2019 was attached for information and noted by Members.

The meeting ended at 9.30 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

Any Executive Decisions which have been “called in”

This page is intentionally left blank

TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

15 January 2020

Report of the Director of Planning, Housing & Environmental Health

Part 1- Public

Matters for Recommendation to Council

1 REVIEW OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Summary

This report explores the three previously identified options for the future provision of the One You Kent service within Tonbridge & Malling BC. Dependent on the option chosen by Members there may be future financial implications for the Council.

1.1 Background

1.1.1 At the meeting of this Committee on 29 August 2019 Members agreed to explore the following three options for ongoing provision of the One You Kent programme:

- 1) Adopt the principle that TMBC wishes to continue to deliver the programme by direct provision of funding above the KCC grant funding i.e. to continue the service in its current format and to continue to meet the current shortfall in funding up to a predetermined limit recognising in doing so this will generate budget growth (once the earmarked reserve is used up) and, in turn, add to the funding gap.
- 2) Adopt the principle that TMBC should only deliver the programme at a level fully funded by KCC i.e. to do as originally planned when the 'commissioning role' was introduced that the arrangement would be fiscal neutral.
- 3) Adopt the principle that TMBC should not be delivering this programme of work i.e. to discontinue delivering directly the One You service across Tonbridge & Malling and inform KCC that they would need to commission this service from another organisation.

1.1.2 The scoping report from the previous meeting is attached at **Annex 1**.

1.1.3 At the meeting on the 29 August 2019 Members confirmed that they wished to hear more about this service from the Director of Public Health, Kent County Council who commission the One You Kent programme as well as a local GP. Andrew Scott-Clark and Becky Prince (GP – Snodland surgery) have both accepted the invite to this meeting Members may wish to draw out from Andrew

Scott-Clark the impact of the One You service and any benefits of it being delivered through the district Council partnership approach in West Kent. It would be useful to hear Becky Prince's direct experience of the One You programme and the outcomes it has for her patients.

- 1.1.4 The scoping report laid out the budget position on current service delivery, which is the base position for option 1. KCC currently fund £125,143.06 per annum and TMBC currently have a savings reserve of £55,727 as at 31/3/20. Ahead of this report, KCC have informally indicated (ahead of their Public Health grant amount being confirmed) that they are intending to fund at the same level in 2020/21.
- 1.1.5 In 2015 a report was commissioned by the District Councils' Network (DCN). Its intention was to contribute to the understanding, assessment and development of the role of district councils in improving the health of their citizens and communities. It focussed on district councils' role in promoting public health through some of their key functions and enabling roles. It concluded that:
- a) Our health is primarily determined by factors other than health care. District councils are in a good position to influence many of these factors through their key functions and in their wider role supporting communities and influencing other bodies.
 - b) District councils face key challenges, the biggest of which is a fall in central government income. But public health reform and localism also create opportunities for them to increase their contribution to the health of their citizens. Moreover, many of their actions are likely to release savings to the public purse – primarily (but not solely) in the NHS. District councils therefore need to be more integrated in local health and social care policy than many currently are.
 - c) Among their core functions, housing, leisure and green spaces, and environmental health are key areas that affect public health.
 - d) District councils have an important role to play in supporting social capital by strengthening social networks and community-centred approaches to health, potentially through enabling greater volunteer involvement in health care support. These approaches have been shown to have strong and direct links to health, being as powerful predictors of mortality in older populations as common lifestyle risks, such as moderate smoking, obesity, and high cholesterol and blood pressure. They are also important in determining or averting health behaviours as well as resilience to, and recovery from, illness.
- 1.1.6 The One You team is integral to the delivery of the conclusions drawn out above by the DCN commissioned report.

1.2 Option 1 – TMBC continue to deliver One You programme in its current format

- 1.2.1 The table below provides a SWOT analysis for this option:

<p>Strengths</p> <p>Continues the positive and holistic approach to delivery of One You service within the wider district Council services.</p> <p>Continues the positive and strong working partnership across West Kent.</p> <p>Retain committed and hardworking team who are making a difference for residents.</p> <p>Continue with the progression of the newly formed One You Kent Countywide Partnership Meeting which focuses on continuous improvement and sharing best practice across all districts and KCHFT.</p> <p>Enables the current level of activity – dealing with 370 referrals and 135 participants in weight loss programmes.</p> <p>Helps to meet our corporate strategy aims where we state we remain committed to developing our dialogue with partners including those for health improvement and one of our key outcomes is to maintain effective joint working across West Kent on key issues such as health provision.</p>	<p>Opportunities</p> <p>Further develop the strong health links across the Council and with partner organisations particularly with housing and leisure</p> <p>Further develop the health in all policies agenda across the Council.</p> <p>Relook at the partnership across West Kent and if this provides any opportunity for rationalisation.</p> <p>To continue to raise the profile of this preventative work such that other partners e.g. health, community services will seek to also invest.</p> <p>Seek income generation opportunities.</p> <p>Improved efficiency in service through IT improvements.</p> <p>Seek additional funding opportunities.</p>
<p>Weaknesses</p> <p>This is not a mandatory service however has strong links into other such duties of the Council e.g. housing.</p> <p>Impact on senior management time - service needs to be managed within a head of service and Director portfolio so has an effect on resources available</p>	<p>Threats</p> <p>Future funding is uncertain so will represent budget growth once reserve fully spent.</p>

for the rest of the service, many of which are statutory.	
Funding burden on Council if there is a funding shortfall.	

- 1.2.2 This option enables TMBC to continue to deliver the One You services with all the wider benefits this has for the Council – further detail is provided in 1.3.3 below.
- 1.2.3 However it is recognised that this option is highly likely to represent budget growth once the Public Health reserve has been used up and the length of time that will take is unknown due to the commissioning funding coming from KCC and staff costs rising through inflation. Members will recall from the last report that when the service was introduced it was on the understanding that the ‘commissioning role’ would be fiscally neutral for TMBC. This option will not achieve that objective and indeed the gap may widen each year.

1.3 **Option 2 – TMBC continue to deliver One You programme at a level funded by KCC**

- 1.3.1 The table below provides a SWOT analysis for this option:

Strengths	Opportunities
<p>There will be no budget growth for the Council – the service will be managed within the annual KCC funding utilising the reserve (£55,727 as at 31/3/20, made up of underspends in public health in previous financial years) for any difference and staffing adjusted as required.</p> <p>Retains positive and holistic approach to delivery of One You service within the wider district Council services.</p> <p>Continues the positive and strong working partnership across West Kent.</p> <p>Retain committed and hardworking team (subject to level of KCC funding) who are making a difference for residents.</p>	<p>Further develop the strong health links across the Council particularly with housing and leisure.</p> <p>Further develop the health in all policies agenda across the Council.</p> <p>Relook at the partnership across West Kent and if this provides any opportunity for rationalisation.</p> <p>We continue to raise the profile of this preventative work such that other partners e.g. health, community services will seek to also invest.</p> <p>Seek income generation opportunities.</p> <p>Increased efficiency in service through IT improvements.</p>

<p>Continue with the progression of the newly formed One You Kent Countywide Partnership Meeting which focuses on continuous improvement and sharing best practice across all districts and KCHFT.</p> <p>Helps to meet our corporate strategy aims where we state we remain committed to developing our dialogue with partners including those for health improvement and one of our key outcomes is to maintain effective joint working across West Kent on key issues such as health provision.</p>	<p>Seek additional funding opportunities.</p>
<p>Weaknesses</p> <p>This is not a mandatory service however has strong links into other such duties of the Council e.g. housing.</p> <p>Impact on senior management time - service needs to be managed within a head of service and Director portfolio so has an effect on resources available for the rest of the service, many of which are statutory.</p> <p>There may be a reduction in the number of residents that can be assisted should the grant from KCC reduce significantly.</p>	<p>Threats</p> <p>Future funding is uncertain so shortfall for TMBC to fund (if any) will be determined year to year and may require staffing level changes, which could have staff retention and HR implications.</p>

- 1.3.2 This option enables TMBC to continue to deliver the One You services and all the wider benefits this has for the Council within the budget provided by KCC. In 2019/20 this has already happened with a reduction in the “Healthy Living Initiatives” budget from £23,000 to £10,000.
- 1.3.3 Without a doubt the delivery of the One You service by TMBC has paid dividends for our residents. The service has been able to influence the assessment criteria and process to enable wider district services as highlighted above e.g. housing to be explored with residents and where required issues to be addressed. It offers a

holistic approach to the resident ensuring that any underlying issues e.g. financial difficulties, poor housing conditions are also addressed at the same time as any lifestyle intervention. This is more likely to create a scenario where improving lifestyles can be maintained and prioritised. The West Kent partnership maintains that the districts are well placed to bring a number of additional benefits to the One You service and can help in offering a holistic approach for users. This combined with the strengths that KCHFT offer such as the stop smoking service mean that there are a variety of services and support on offer.

- 1.3.4 The One You team has successfully developed an extremely strong relationship with housing, leisure, benefits, environmental health and others that have many interlinked approaches, policies and aims around the improvement of the health and wellbeing of our residents.
- 1.3.5 The service has recently been through a “process mapping” exercise led corporately by IT services. This will result in the reengineering of the processes to determine if more efficient ways of working can be implemented. This could lead to assisting with the reduction in cost of the service without impacting on service delivery. In addition the IT system in use at the moment is being considered by the Head of IT as to whether any improvement can be sought in light of the Council’s move to improved mobile working etc.
- 1.3.6 Once the annual grant (or hopefully in the future longer term grant funding periods) are known T&M could plan accordingly to deliver the service within budget. If required this may mean some amendment to revenue budget/staffing changes within the team and the Public Health reserve could be used to allow for any period of adjustment.
- 1.3.7 We are aware that Sevenoaks DC operate to this model and apart from management costs do not top up the grant received from KCC. They have however been successful in accessing other sources of funding to add benefit to the work of the team. This is something we have identified

1.4 Option 3 - TMBC do not deliver the One You programme

- 1.4.1 The table below provides a SWOT analysis for this option:

Strengths	Opportunities
No financial risk to the Council.	The management resources currently used to manage the service can be utilised elsewhere in the wider Housing & Environmental Health service.

Weaknesses	Threats
<p>The strong links to other Council services that often adds value both for the Council and the resident may be lost.</p> <p>The ability to steer the direction of the One You service e.g. ensuring housing needs are being identified may be lost.</p> <p>The often “good news” and positive stories for the Council of residents being helped to transform their lives will be lost. Residents are not guaranteed the holistic support to maintain a healthy lifestyle.</p> <p>Loss of a committed and dedicated team who make a difference for our residents.</p>	<p>There remains a need for the Council to ensure that the health and wellbeing of residents is considered across all services. The momentum and focus for this may be lost.</p> <p>A loss of focus on staff health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Possible HR costs associated with six members of staff.</p> <p>Impact on wider partnership. Becomes less sustainable for other parties to continue.</p>

- 1.4.2 This option could lead to an external organisation delivering the One You service across T&M. In East Kent KCC commission Kent Community Health Foundation Trust (KCHFT) to deliver the One You service. Historically there have been some challenges in this approach in terms of the links between district services and the KCHFT delivering the One You Service in a joined up and holistic approach centred around the person. In order to address these challenges KCC launched a Quarterly One You Kent Countywide Partnership Meeting to identify areas for improvement, share best practice and to ensure all partners are linked up with the delivery of the service across Kent. This is still in its infancy but a number of improvements have already taken place such as KCHFT opening up their training offer to the districts at a very reduced rate. The development of a Network event for all advisors in West Kent and KCHFT has also been scheduled for January 2020. Advisors will hear a number of presentations from drug and alcohol services and social prescribing in their areas. This is also an opportunity for the Districts to present to the KCHFT staff the benefits the district advisors can offer (such as housing and debt advice and how/when to refer) and likewise KCHFT can offer advice on how to signpost into their stop smoking services in West Kent. KCHFT do have some One You advisor resource in the T&M area targeting the lower quintile areas and although we have never received a housing referral for any of their clients they have confirmed that they regularly signpost to districts when housing/debt or other district related issues are raised. Currently T&M One You advisors are in touch with the housing team on a very regular basis and taking advice on how best to help residents sustain healthier living. This difference leads

officers at TMBC to conclude that there is a huge advantage for the resident to receive the One You service via the district Council and they receive a much better service.

- 1.4.3 This option also poses a serious risk to the West Kent partnership. Sevenoaks have expressed concern should this option be taken as shared resources and posts have been established e.g. One You support officer, IT and call centre. Although there are no contractual implications for TMBC there is a significant impact on the remaining two local authorities within the partnership.

1.5 Legal Implications

- 1.5.1 There is no mandatory duty for Tonbridge & Malling B.C. to deliver this service although it does link in strongly with other parts of Council services where there are mandatory duties e.g. housing.
- 1.5.2 Should option 2 or 3 be preferred, there will be HR implications for current staff. These have already been discussed with the HR Manager and staff have been briefed on the Overview & Scrutiny process and offered the opportunity to discuss their individual circumstances.

1.6 Financial and Value for Money Considerations

- 1.6.1 There is currently a Public Health reserve that stands at £55,727 as at 31/3/2. This is made up from savings on previous years Public Health grant. KCC currently fund TMBC £125,143.06 per year. The grant from KCC does not increase year on year in line with expected rate of living increases.
- 1.6.2 Option 1 will have the most impact with future year's delivery representing budget growth and in turn adding to the corporate funding gap and the savings and transformation target once the Public Health reserve is used up. The KCC grant does not increase with cost of living pay awards so the gap will increase.
- 1.6.3 Option 2 will maintain a status quo with the KCC Public Health grant funding so that the programme is amended each year in line with the grant received. The Public Health reserve could be utilised in this option to fund any period where staffing changes are required to bring the service in line with the available funding.
- 1.6.4 Option 3 may incur initial costs from redundancies however in the medium and long term will have no impact on Council's budget. This scenario would be dealt with following the Council's Retention, Recruitment and Redundancy policy.

1.7 Risk Assessment

- 1.7.1 None arising from this report.

1.8 Recommendations

1.8.1 Members are recommended to consider the three options in light of the information provided in this report and input from the invited speakers and APPROVE an option for the One You (Public Health) function from the following;

- a) continue to deliver the One You service in its current format, accepting that this will require funding input from TMBC at current or higher than current levels depending on KCC Public Health funding grant
- b) continue to deliver the One You service within the budget envelope of the KCC Public Health funding grant, accepting that this will require dynamic service management and work with partners to consider rationalisation of the West Kent service to maintain that budget position
- c) discontinue delivery by TMBC of the One You Service, accepting that this may, dependant on the outcome of discussions with the other West Kent partners, result in redundancies

Background papers:

Nil

contact: Linda Hibbs/Eleanor
Hoyle

Eleanor Hoyle
Director of Planning, Housing & Environmental Health

This page is intentionally left blank

TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

29 August 2019

Report of the Director of Planning, Housing & Environmental Health

Part 1- Public

Delegated

1 SCOPING REPORT FOR REVIEW OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Summary

This report provides Members with background information on the Public Health team and work carried out by Tonbridge & Malling BC. Options for inclusion in the review of the service are presented for consideration.

1.1 Background

1.1.1 Kent County Council as the public health authority commissions Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council as part of a wider West Kent partnership (including Sevenoaks DC and Tunbridge Wells BC) to deliver the One You Kent Service to help achieve the common objective of promoting healthier lifestyles among the population of Tonbridge and Malling in order to:

- Extend healthy life expectancy through prevention of chronic conditions such as obesity, cardiovascular diseases and diabetes;
- Reduce health inequalities; and
- Reduce avoidable demand on the health and care system in Kent.

1.1.2 Within the One You Kent Service the following work is carried out:

- Integrated Lifestyle Services – One You Kent - focusing on healthy weight, being more active, reducing alcohol intake and stopping smoking
- Weight Management Services
- Workplace Health
- Health in all policies
- Healthy Communities – including smoke free initiatives

1.1.3 The vision of the One You Kent Service is to motivate people to achieve and maintain a healthy lifestyle by supporting them to make positive lifestyle choices.

1.1.4 A number of principles have been developed for the model. These include:

- **Integrated** – People can get all the help they need to be healthier from one service.
- **Targeted** – Aimed at people who need help most but still available to everyone.
- **Motivating** – Encouraging people to be healthier.
- **Promoting independence** – Helping people to be healthier so they don't need to rely on a service.
- **Flexible** – Meeting the needs of local people creating better choice and tailored service.

1.1.5 The service contributes to achievement of outcomes set out in the Public Health Outcomes Framework (PHOF), and Public Health England's (PHE) vision to improve and protect the nation's health and wellbeing and improve the health of the poorest, fastest; through the following two key outcomes:

- PHE Outcome 1: Increased healthy life expectancy - taking account of the health quality as well as the length of life.
- PHE Outcome 2: Reduced differences in life expectancy and healthy life expectancy between communities through greater improvements in more disadvantaged communities such as those in the most deprived quintile.

1.1.6 The team currently consists of four established posts: DV0201 – Health Team Leader (37 hours per week, grade M9); DV0297 – Health Improvement Support Assistant (37 hours per week, scale 3); DV0202 and DV0203 – One You Advisors (37 hours per week, scale 5). Both the One You Advisor posts are currently resourced by job sharers, two of whom work 22 hours per week and two who work 15 hours per week.

1.1.7 In addition there are some resources (approximately one day a week for Tonbridge & Malling work) provided from the Council's Environmental Projects Coordinator who focusses on workplace health. This involves liaising with local businesses and workplaces to encourage and support with healthy lifestyle choices and opportunities for employees. Sevenoaks DC also commission Tonbridge & Malling BC to deliver their workplace health programme and this is carried out by the Environmental Projects Coordinator in again approximately one day a week staffing resources.

1.1.8 The One You Advisors provide one to one sessions with clients to help with lifestyle choices and behaviour and continue to support that client with their ongoing journey over typically six one to one sessions. The team also provide

weight management classes and attend many local events to promote healthy lifestyles.

- 1.1.9 We work in partnership with Sevenoaks DC and Tunbridge Wells BC to deliver One You across West Kent. The teams work closely together and provide resilience for one another when required. The teams share an administrative resource, a central contact number for One You in West Kent (managed by the call centre at Sevenoaks DC) and have commissioned a joint database to manage the caseload. All these elements are jointly funded by the three authorities. Clearly any decision Tonbridge & Malling BC takes with regard to the future of the service would have some effect on these two partners.
- 1.1.10 When the partnership for West Kent was set up to deliver the One You service there was a real focus on incorporating the services that districts provide to ensure a holistic approach to health. Services such as housing and benefits are now completely embedded into the One You service and often we find that by getting to the root cause of an issue e.g. too much drinking due to concern about rent arrears we can then help to tackle that cause as well as provide healthy lifestyle advice thus leading to a much more sustained outcome. This approach to service provision was one of the selling points of the boroughs' bid to undertake the One You service and is additional to the standard One You model utilised by KCC when commissioning other organisations.

1.2 Finance

- 1.2.1 Tonbridge & Malling have received funding from Kent County Council for healthy lifestyles for a number of years. More specifically a Healthy Lifestyle One You Kent (OYK) grant has been received from Kent County Council over the last three years. The details are provided in the following table:

Year	Amount of OYK grant
2015/16	£132,242
2016/17	£131,493
2017/18	£127,697
2018/19	£127,697
2019/20	£125,143

- 1.2.2 Members will note that over the period shown there has been a gradual reduction in the grant received other than in 2018/19 whilst costs have increased.
- 1.2.3 In terms of future funding Kent County Council's Director of Public Health, Andrew Scott-Clark has advised that "(KCC) are waiting for the results of the 2019

spending review, which will inform the Public Health (PH) grant allocation for 2020/21 and beyond. In addition, a national review around mandation will affect use of the grant. It has been possible on this occasion to apply only 2% cut but if there are further cuts announced for 2020 and beyond, we will need to apply any national reductions to the PH grant to your grant allocations.” However, it is also important to note that in the most recent discussions with KCC they have indicated that they are not currently minded to alter the arrangements with the West Kent boroughs and re-commission the service, should the boroughs wish to continue delivery. Although as a commissioning body they do retain the right to recommission how they wish.

1.2.4 The Council's revenue budget position for public health for 2019/20 is as below:

Item	£
Staff costs	141,500*
Partnership Receipts from Sevenoaks DC and Tunbridge Wells BC	(17,300)*
Managerial and other direct staff costs	34,250
Healthy Living Initiatives (budget to assist with delivery of programmes)	23,000*
Income from PH grant (does not match the actual grant of £125,143 as this is only confirmed after budget setting process)	(127,700)*
Income from other bodies (contribution from Sevenoaks DC for workplace health delivery)	(9,000)*
Central, Departmental & Technical Support Services	82,000
Summary	126,750

1.2.5 When examining direct costs and income (those items marked with an asterisk*) attributable to the One You Healthy Living service expenditure exceeds income to the sum of £10,500. When the service was introduced it was on the understanding that the 'commissioning role' would be fiscal neutral. The shortfall is currently funded from an earmarked reserve (balance as at 1/4/19 £54,477), but will in due course, were it to continue, represent budget growth and in turn add to the Corporate funding gap and the savings and transformation target.

1.3 Performance

1.3.1 The activity of the One You service is summarised in their annual return, which is attached at **Annex 1** to this report for information.

1.3.2 Some of the key highlights include the Counter Weight programme, a 12 week evidence based weight loss programme. Aimed at a moderate weight loss of 5-10%, it has demonstrated evidence of both clinical and cost-effectiveness. It is a structured weight management intervention delivered over a 12 week period, using behavioural strategies to assist people to change their lifestyle. In TMBC this year:

- 135 participants engaged in at least one session on the programme;
- 87 participants engaged in the programme;
- 87 engagers lost weight;
- 48 (55.17%) of engagers lost <3% weight;
- 20 (22.99%) of engagers lost 3-4.9% weight; and
- 19 (21.89%) of engagers lost >5%.

1.3.3 Across the One You Service as a whole, the following key statistics show very good performance levels against expected levels of engagement:

- 370 Referrals received into the One You Service;
- 72.7% Referrals contacted within 48 hours of receiving the referral;
- 176 Referrals were seen by a One You advisors; and
- 48 of the people seen were from quintiles 1 and 2.

1.4 HR Policy Implications

1.4.1 Depending upon the final outcome of the review, the Council's Reorganisation, Redundancy and Redeployment Procedure may apply. It may also transpire that relevant employment law such as TUPE may be applicable.

1.5 Legal Implications

1.5.1 There are none arising from this report.

1.6 Financial and Value for Money Considerations

1.6.1 When introduced it was on the understanding that the arrangement would be fiscal neutral. The funding provided has reduced over time whilst costs have increased where the Council is now meeting a shortfall in funding from an earmarked reserve. The reserve can 'plug' the shortfall in funding in the short term. If the shortfall were to continue this would represent budget growth and, in turn, add to the funding gap.

1.6.2 Each of the options as set out in paragraph 1.9 below will have a cost implication summary attached as part of the second O&S report.

1.7 Risk Assessment

1.7.1 With any externally funded service, the core risk is the funding being discontinued. This consideration will be built into the options appraisal.

1.8 Equality Impact Assessment

1.8.1 An equality impact assessment will need to be undertaken as part of this review.

1.9 Next steps

1.9.1 A number of options have been provisionally identified, and are set out below. Members are requested to consider which of these options they wish to see included in the review or to identify any other options they would like to explore.

1.9.2 Identified options for consideration

- 1) Adopt the principle that TMBC wishes to continue to deliver the programme by direct provision of funding above the KCC grant funding i.e. to continue the service in its current format and to continue to meet the current shortfall in funding up to a predetermined limit recognising in doing so this will generate budget growth (once the earmarked reserve is used up) and, in turn, add to the funding gap.
- 2) Adopt the principle that TMBC should only deliver the programme at a level fully funded by KCC i.e. to do as originally planned when the 'commissioning role' was introduced that the arrangement would be fiscal neutral.
- 3) Adopt the principle that TMBC should not be delivering this programme of work i.e. to discontinue delivering directly the One You service across Tonbridge & Malling and inform KCC that they would need to commission this service from another organisation.

1.9.3 In considering these various options, it is suggested that Members may be assisted by hearing from key partners in the delivery of public health services that could include the Director of Public Health at Kent County Council, GPs, Tonbridge & Malling Leisure Trust (exercise referral).

- 1.9.4 A further report with final recommendations will be reported to the December meeting of this Committee.

1.10 Recommendations

- 1.10.1 That the contents of this report **BE NOTED** and that a further report be made to the December meeting of this Committee regarding the options identified in section 1.9 of this report and any other options identified by this Committee.

Background papers:

Nil

contact: Eleanor Hoyle/Linda
Hibbs/Claire Potter

Eleanor Hoyle
Director of Planning, Housing & Environmental Health

This page is intentionally left blank

TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

15 January 2020

Report of the Director of Planning, Housing & Environmental Health

Part 1- Public

Matters for Recommendation to Council

1 REVIEW OF DISABLED FACILITIES GRANTS

Summary

This report explores the three previously identified options for the future provision of the Disabled Facilities Grant programme and the wider Better Care Fund initiatives within Tonbridge & Malling B.C. Dependent on the option chosen by Members there may be future financial implications for the Council and an analysis of this is provided for each option.

1.1 Background

1.1.1 At the meeting of this Committee on 10 October 2019 Members agreed to explore the following three options for ongoing provision of the Council's Disabled Facilities Grants (DFG) programme and the wider Better Care Fund (BCF) initiatives:

- 1) Adopt the principle that TMBC wishes to continue to deliver all the current services funded through the BCF in addition to mandatory DFGs, with an annual review of the approach by Members, acknowledging that this may mean a growth pressure on the council's budgets dependant on the approach to BCF allocations in future financial years.
- 2) Adopt the principle that TMBC should consider a reduction in the current services funded through the BCF, on the basis that where funding has allowed sufficient embedding of practice or service delivery modelling, the funding is no longer required in addition to the continuation of mandatory DFGs.
- 3) Adopt the principle that TMBC should deliver mandatory DFGs only.

1.1.2 The scoping report from the previous meeting is attached at **Annex 1**.

1.1.3 At the meeting on the 10 October 2019 Members confirmed that they wished to hear from a number of speakers. In order to manage the meeting we have invited Dawn Hallam, Hospital Discharge Manager, Maidstone & Tunbridge Wells Trust and Jane Miller-Everest, Occupational Health lead, Kent County Council to the meeting. Members may wish to draw out from Dawn Hallam the impact of the

West Kent Hospital Discharge Scheme and the working relationship with the Council as well as the possibility of health contributing funding towards the scheme. It may also be useful for Members to hear Jane Miller-Everest's experience of the secondment of the Occupational Therapist into the Private Sector Housing team and how this arrangement could be continued without Better Care Funding. There was also a request from Members to hear from Clarion Housing. We have invited Clarion to submit a statement in writing regarding their position on adaptations and Disabled Facilities Grants for Members awareness. We have also invited Peabody Care & Support to provide a written statement regarding the initiatives that they are involved with.

1.1.4 The three options are discussed in more detail below however please note mandatory DFGs clearly must continue and this is assumed across all options.

1.1.5 Members should also be aware that discussions have recently taken place between all Kent district authorities and KCC about BCF use and allocations. Although at an early stage some suggestions being considered are:

- Redistribution of some unspent district BCF allocations (TMBC is one of the few authorities to have fully spent/committed its funds and could benefit if this was to happen);
- Better involvement of district authorities in BCF planning (if DFG and district BCF schemes prove their worth could lead to improved funding); and

1.2 Better coordination of funding and schemes across health, social care and housing. Option 1 – TMBC continue to deliver all the current services funded through the BCF in addition to mandatory DFGs.

1.2.1 The table below provides a SWOT analysis for this option:

Strengths	Opportunities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continues the positive and holistic approach to delivery of integrated housing/health/social care which the Council plays a key role. • Continues the positive and strong working partnership across West Kent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investigate funding opportunities for example with health partners.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Builds on our existing lead as a good practice authority on DFG/BCF spend. • Provides vulnerable residents with timely, cost effective, valued services that enable them to remain independent at home for longer. • Wider BCF schemes are preventative often helping to manage demand for more extensive works from the mandatory DFG budget. 	
<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option presents the biggest risk of budget growth pressure as there is a need for £224,000 (estimated) in addition to meeting mandatory DFG need (this includes discretionary DFGs). This may or may not be able to be partly or fully funded from the BCF dependent on allocation and mandatory DFG spend. 	<p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future funding is uncertain so shortfall for TMBC to fund (if any) will be determined year to year and dependent on BCF allocation is very likely to represent budget growth and in turn add to the corporate funding gap and the savings and transformation target.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing demand on mandatory DFG budget.
--	--

- 1.2.2 The schemes that are delivered through the wider BCF have been developed working with a number of partners including Maidstone & Tunbridge Wells Trust, Age UK, Peabody Care & Support, Kent County Council and a local GP surgery.
- 1.2.3 They are responsive to the needs of more vulnerable residents and tend to provide low cost interventions/assistance that enables that person to stay at home safer and more independent for longer. They also can in many cases prevent demand for more extensive works, for example, through the mandatory DFG budget because they provide early intervention and are focused on making that person safe in their home.
- 1.2.4 The Better Care Fund allocation for 2020/21 onwards is unknown. From the information we have we anticipate that there will be a slight increase in 2020/21 on the £1,184,711 we received in 2019/20. We do however anticipate that Kent County Council will request an increase in the top-slice amount based on the % increase in BCF funding we received. The demand on the DFG budget has been growing year on year and the current level of spend expected in 2019/20 is £1,140,000. This includes an element of “managing” the throughput of approval of DFGs on which we will be seeking a legal opinion, however does leave us open to reputational risk and adverse Ombudsman ruling for delaying DFG approvals. From 2020/21 the mandatory DFG budget within the Capital Plan includes a £125,000 contribution from TMBC.

1.3 **Option 2 – TMBC reduce the current services funded through the BCF in addition to the continuation of mandatory DFGs.**

- 1.3.1 The table below provides a SWOT analysis for this option:

Strengths	Opportunities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continues the positive and holistic approach to delivery of integrated housing/health/social care which the Council plays a key role albeit with reduced schemes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigate funding opportunities for example with health partners. Further improve the links with social prescribing link

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continues the positive and strong working partnership across West Kent. • Builds on our existing lead as a good practice authority on DFG/BCF spend. • Provides vulnerable residents with timely, cost effective, valued services that enable them to remain independent at home for longer. • Wider BCF schemes are preventative often helping to manage demand for more extensive works from the mandatory DFG budget. • Recognises that a number of schemes that we have developed have now proved themselves and to some extent have been taken over and funded by other partners. 	<p>workers across GP surgeries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enables £133,000 (estimated) of BCF funding to be redirected back towards the mandatory DFG budget.
<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Occupational Therapy (OT) assessment times may increase if the OT is not based within the Private Sector Housing team, Support for wider housing issues 	<p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future funding is uncertain so shortfall for TMBC to fund (if any) will be

<p>by the OT e.g. housing register applications may reduce.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option presents a risk of budget growth pressure as there is a need for £91,000 (estimated) in addition to meeting mandatory DFG need. This may or may not be able to be partly or fully funded from the BCF dependent on allocation and mandatory DFG spend. 	<p>determined year to year and dependent on BCF allocation is likely to represent budget growth and in turn add to the corporate funding gap and the savings and transformation target.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing demand on mandatory DFG budget.
--	--

1.3.2 This year the Primary Care Networks (PCNs) have been established across GP surgeries. PCNs have been allocated new funding streams including for social prescribing. GP surgeries now have link workers based within the surgeries to help patients with non-medical issues e.g. signposting to housing, One You etc. This is in many ways very similar to the One You, Your Home scheme that TMBC currently operate using BCF funding. Members are reminded that the Council works in partnership with Age UK Sevenoaks & Tonbridge who appoint the One You, Your Home advisor. It may therefore be timely to consider ceasing this scheme which will enable £40,000 of BCF funding to be redirected back towards the mandatory DFG budget. Work to ensure that the social prescribing link workers are aware of all Council services and are making appropriate referrals into housing, benefits etc. would be prioritised to ensure a smooth removal of our scheme.

1.3.3 When the BCF funding was first introduced and TMBC received a significant increase funding a KCC Occupational Therapist (OT) to be seconded into the housing team was one of the first new initiatives we instigated. It has been extremely successful challenging the ways that residents can contact the OT and receive an assessment, significantly improving OT assessment times and DFG processes and providing much valued OT expertise across the wider housing service. However it may be that now this model of working has been proven to be successful KCC may agree to this arrangement without a financial payment. The statutory duty for an OT assessment lies with KCC and when funding is clearly under pressure this is a scheme that must be carefully considered as to whether it

is an appropriate use of BCF funding. If this initiative was to cease this would enable £52,000 of BCF funding to be redirected back towards the mandatory DFG budget.

- 1.3.4 The West Kent Hospital Discharge scheme and associated handyperson services continue to go from strength to strength. Without a doubt they provide timely and safe discharge from hospitals, improve the safety and comfort of residents' homes, improve patient's health and wellbeing and prevent future demand for more extensive works from the mandatory DFG budget. It also prevents patients from having to be provided with temporary accommodation through the Council's Housing Options & Support team, which as Members are aware is a growing pressure on the Council's budget. Recent examples of casework have included identifying and carrying out £200 worth of plumbing work in a property to enable a Tonbridge resident to go home on a Friday instead of waiting till at least the following Monday. This saved the NHS at least £1,200 and meant the resident was happier in his own home making his recovery easier. In another case the Housing & Health Co-ordinator worked with a patient early on after admission to identify a potential homelessness situation and helped to prevent this working alongside the Housing Options & Support team at the Council. If this had not happened temporary accommodation may have to have been provided by the Council. The cost of continuing the West Kent Hospital Discharge scheme and associated handyperson services is estimated at £91,000 per year. This may or may not be able to be partly or fully funded from the BCF dependent on allocation and mandatory DFG spend.
- 1.3.5 For 2019/20 there was a budget of £41,000 for discretionary DFG work. In 2018/19 this policy was much needed to bring to a satisfactory conclusion a number of larger Clarion property schemes that cost above the £30k mandatory limit and where Clarion were no longer funding. In 2019/20 we have not approved any discretionary DFGs and indeed the funding (£41,000) has been transferred into the mandatory DFG budget. We do not propose any discretionary DFG funding moving forwards enabling £41,000 (based on 2018/19 budget) of BCF funding to be redirected back towards the mandatory DFG budget. For any DFG cases that do go above the £30k mandatory limit the Home Support Fund operated by KCC can be applied for.
- 1.3.6 Within this option it is felt that ceasing the funding for the One You Your Home post and the OT secondment plus the discretionary DFG funding but maintaining the hospital discharge and handyperson services is a way forward that protects the service that would not be picked up by any other agency/partnership arrangement currently. This would enable a total of £133,000 (estimated) to be redirected back towards the mandatory DFG budget.

1.4 Option 3 - TMBC deliver mandatory DFGs only.

- 1.4.1 The table below provides a SWOT analysis for this option:

<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Helps the Council to manage the risk in budget growth albeit increasing DFG demand and unknown BCF allocation may still require that growth. 	<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enables £224,000 (estimated) of BCF funding to be redirected back towards the mandatory DFG budget.
<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents may have longer hospital stays and return home to an unsafe property. Occupational Therapy (OT) assessment times may increase if the OT is not based within the Private Sector Housing team, Support for wider housing issues by the OT e.g. housing register applications may reduce. 	<p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Future funding is uncertain so shortfall for TMBC to fund (if any) will be determined year to year and dependent on BCF allocation may represent budget growth and in turn add to the corporate funding gap and the savings and transformation target. Increasing demand on mandatory DFG budget. The loss of the integrated health/social care/housing schemes may lead to a further increased demand on the mandatory DFG budget. A potential increase on the Council's temporary accommodation budget as early intervention work around homelessness or making a property suitable for safe discharge does not happen due to loss of hospital discharge scheme.

1.4.2 This option presents the least risk financially to the Council as all BCF funding is directed to the mandatory DFG budget however there is still a risk that budget

growth could be required given the increasing demand for DFGs and the unknown BCF allocation.

As detailed in 1.3.4 above ceasing the Hospital Discharge scheme may impact on future demand from the mandatory DFG budget and the Temporary Accommodation budget.

1.5 Legal Implications

- 1.5.1 Disabled Facilities Grants are a mandatory grant that the Council must administer through the Housing Grants, Construction and Regeneration Act 1996.

1.6 Financial and Value for Money Considerations

- 1.6.1 The funding for these services and mandatory DFGs is awarded through the Better Care Fund. The funding is awarded year to year and usually towards the end of March/into April making forward planning of services and budget challenging.
- 1.6.2 The financial risks associated with each of the options are included within the SWOT analysis tables provided at 1.2.1, 1.3.1 and 1.4.1.

1.7 Risk Assessment

- 1.7.1 None arising from this report.

1.8 Recommendations

- 1.8.1 Members are recommended to consider the three options in light of the information provided in this report and input from the invited speakers and APPROVE an option for the Disabled Facilities Grant programme and wider Better Care Fund initiatives from the following:
- a) TMBC continue to deliver all the current services funded through the BCF in addition to mandatory DFGs
 - b) TMBC reduce the current services funded through the BCF in addition to the continuation of mandatory DFGs.
 - c) TMBC deliver mandatory DFGs only

Background papers:

Nil

contact: Linda Hibbs/Eleanor
Hoyle

Eleanor Hoyle
Director of Planning, Housing & Environmental Health

This page is intentionally left blank

TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

10 October 2019

Report of the Director of Planning, Housing & Environmental Health

Part 1- Public

Delegated

1 SCOPING REPORT FOR REVIEW OF DISABLED FACILITIES GRANTS

Summary

This report provides Members with background information on the Council's Disabled Facilities Grants programme and the wider Better Care Fund. Options for inclusion in the review of the service are presented for consideration.

1.1 Background

1.1.1 Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs) are a mandatory grant awarded by the local housing authority to provide adaptations in the home e.g. stair lift, level access shower, ramping to enable people to remain independent in their own home. They are available for both children and adults and across all tenures – owner occupied, housing association or private rented. The mandatory element is a means tested grant with a maximum award of £30,000.

1.1.2 There are a number of purposes for which a grant must be approved for a disabled person:

- To enable access into and out of the property;
- To make the property safe(r) for everyone living there;
- To provide access to the living room;
- To provide access to a bedroom;
- To provide access to a toilet;
- To provide access to a bath or shower;
- To provide access to a wash basin;
- To provide access to the garden;
- To enable the preparation and cooking of food;

- To improve or provide heating if needed by the disabled person;
 - To enable control of power, lights and heating; and
 - To provide access around the property to care for someone else.
- 1.1.3 In Kent all DFG referrals will have had an assessment of need carried out by an Occupational Therapist (OT) to determine the work required to meet the needs of the resident. The housing authority is under a duty to consult the Social Services authority as part of the DFG process and this assessment is how this duty is fulfilled however the housing authority has the final decision on works.
- 1.1.4 Where a DFG is completed on an owner occupier property, a charge may be registered against the property to seek partial cost recovery should the property be sold within ten years of the completion of the grant. Any funding recovered from this process is recycled into the DFG programme.
- 1.1.5 The DFG programme within Tonbridge & Malling BC is delivered by the Private Sector Housing team working with Occupational Therapists (OTs), Peabody Care and Support (the local Home Improvement Agency) , other agents and contractors.
- 1.1.6 The demand for DFGs is increasing. As a nation remaining independent at home is now seen as a much healthier and less costly option to provision such as residential/care homes. There are more people living into older age who with the right adaptations at home can lead longer, safer lives. TMBC has always actively supported a large, wide ranging DFG programme. Some Members will recall challenging Kent County Council over their ability to carry out timely OT assessments in order that provision of adaptations in the home could be progressed through the DFG process. TMBC has also successfully promoted the grant in recent years to ensure that we are meeting the needs of our most vulnerable residents.
- 1.1.7 Members will recall that we have in the past had to instigate management of grant approvals in order to manage the budget situation. This in effect leads to a delay in any applicant being able to carry out the adaptation works that they require and creates a waiting list of cases awaiting approval. This “slow-down” was instigated last year in September 2018 and has again been implemented within the last week of the writing of this report in order to manage an over profile spend in the current year. Last year the late additional funding announced in December 2018 clearly helped us manage the situation however there is no guarantee of the same late allocation this year. It is important to note that any case that was highlighted as particularly urgent by the OT, housing team or any other health professional would be approved without delay.
- 1.1.8 The funding for DFGs has, over the last three years, been awarded through the Better Care Fund. The Better Care Fund was established to bring health and social care funding together to encourage better integration and ways of working.

The Better Care Fund grant goes to Kent County Council (KCC) who in turn are required to pass onto districts the DFG funding element and the amounts are specified.

- 1.1.9 Any money paid through the Better Care Fund allocation that the district receives must only be used for the specific purpose of providing adaptations for disabled people who qualify under the scheme (or any other social care capital projects where otherwise agreed as above).
- 1.1.10 When the Better Care Fund was introduced and included DFG funding there was a strong message from Central Government that health, social care and housing services should work together to ensure services are integrated and that funding is used to develop local solutions to meet health needs. Although the focus had to remain on delivering DFGs, as these are a mandatory duty for a local housing authority, the additional funding was expected to help other wider social care projects that would meet the needs of residents.
- 1.1.11 Members may recall that in November 2016 TMBC in partnership with Sevenoaks DC and Tunbridge Wells BC introduced a West Kent Hospital Discharge Scheme, funded through the Better Care Fund, whereby a Housing & Health Coordinator is based at the heart of the local hospital discharge teams, linked to a handyperson service and helps with housing issues that are preventing timely and safe discharge e.g. adaptations, clutter, homelessness. As part of the West Kent partnership, TMBC is currently funding posts in both Tunbridge Wells and Maidstone hospitals. The cost of this scheme is split three ways between the districts dependent on usage by residents in the previous year.
- 1.1.12 In addition to this Tonbridge & Malling BC have through the Better Care Fund supported the provision of subsidised handyperson services across our borough to help vulnerable households remain independent and safe in their homes.
- 1.1.13 DFG funding has also been utilised for the secondment of an OT from KCC to be based within the Housing team to provide a much more responsive service for both residents and staff alike. This has proved very successful in building an understanding and relationship between housing and the OT service across all aspects of housing including DFGs, housing register applications and housing needs assessments. It has also enabled a more streamlined approach into the DFG process for residents saving time and confusion. Now that better working practices are well established and the value of placing an OT in a local authority setting is better understood, changing the way this post is funded could reduce a burden on TMBC's DFG budget without reducing the service level (see option 2 below in 1.10.2).
- 1.1.14 A report to Communities and Housing Advisory Board last year updated on the funding of the new One You Your Home Advisor who works within Warders Medical Practice in Tonbridge to assist patients who may have housing and other social issues that could be improved or resolved in order that they reduce the demand on

much stretched GP services. Typically this role may be assisting patients with minor adaptations, referring them to befriending schemes, promoting activities and clubs and working with the Private Sector Housing team on improving housing conditions. The Council work in partnership with Age UK Sevenoaks & Tonbridge who appoint the advisor. In 2019/20 this is funded through our Better Care Fund allocation. With the increase in social prescribing activity across health services and the increased understanding across the sector of the links between housing and health, there may be a case to be made for this service having embedded practices to enough of an extent that the funding is no longer required (see option 2 below in 1.10.2).

- 1.1.15 In addition to the above in 2018/19 we also introduced a discretionary DFG policy. This has typically enabled completion of large adaptations that cost above the £30,000 mandatory DFG limit and ensuring quick, responsive non-means tested small adaptations e.g. stair lift in urgent cases such as end of life care and where there is a high risk of falls. In 2018/19 this funding was utilised heavily to bring a large number of schemes that were costing above £30,000 to a satisfactory conclusion – a number of these were Clarion Homes properties who had previously contributed towards this work but no longer have funding available (see paragraph 1.2.5 below).
- 1.1.16 All of the schemes above have been approved by Members through the Communities & Housing Advisory Board. The general approach to this area of work at TMBC have been presented to the Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government and showcased at a number of national housing and health events being held up as best practice and innovation. Members may also be aware that our West Kent Hospital Discharge Scheme has won awards for partnership and collaboration. However, notwithstanding the above the schemes do in themselves put increased pressure on the mandatory DFG budget.
- 1.1.17 It is important to note that the West Kent Hospital Discharge Scheme, the Handyperson Service, the One You Your Home officer and the secondment of the OT are based on annual agreements so our commitment is until the end of March 2020. All partners and service providers have been made aware of the ongoing O&S process.

1.2 Finance

- 1.2.1 The Better Care Fund allocation for the past 3 financial years has been as detailed in the table below. In recent years we have also received an additional allocation late on in the year, although this is of course never a certainty and the levels fluctuate. From the allocation KCC top-slice an agreed amount for funding of equipment and minor adaptations, which is done county wide to benefit from economies of scale. This is an area that is reviewed on an annual basis. The top-slicing in effect replaces a capital grant that KCC used to receive directly that was ceased whilst at the same time the allocations to districts through the Better Care Fund were increased.

Year	Original allocation	Additional allocation	KCC top slice amount	Final amount
2017/18	£1,007,235	£107,283	(£147,235)	£967,283
2018/19	£1,097,910	£192,648	(£147,410)	£1,143,148
2019/20	£1,184,711	Not yet announced	(£159,020)	£1,025,691

1.2.2 The table below provides details of the revised budgets for this area of work over the last three years.

Year	Total budget	DFG (mandatory) budget	DFG (discretionary) budget	Other BCF schemes/ initiative s budget	Grant repayments (income)
2017/18	£781,000	£670,000	£25,000	£86,000	£0
2018/19	£1,511,000	£1,240,000	£159,000	£112,000	£0
2019/20	£1,170,000	£959,000	£41,000	£183,000	(£13,000)

*the budgets do not match to the allocations due to carry forward of unspent funding between years

1.2.3 The table below provides details of the actual spend for this area of work over the last three years.

Year	Total spend	DFG (mandatory) spend	DFG (discretionary) spend	Other BCF schemes /initiative s spend	Grant repayments (income)
2017/18	£742,668	£661,876	£13,077	£76,556	(£8,841)
2018/19	£1,234,608	£933,852	£209,063	£124,177	(£32,484)
2019/20 (to date)	£570,287	£537,679	£2,636	£44,174	(£14,202)

- 1.2.4 In the Council's future Capital Plan from 2020/21 to 2025/26 an estimate of £665,000 per year has been set against mandatory DFGs and no allowance for other activities. Government grant funding of £530,000 has been estimated along with £10,000 grant repayments resulting in an estimated contribution of £125,000 from TMBC. These figures are based on pre Better Care Fund allocation figures and spend.
- 1.2.5 It is important to note that Clarion Homes used to fund a significant amount of adaptations in their stock without recourse to the DFG budget. This ranged from £150,000 to £250,000 per year. This funding was withdrawn starting in 2016/17 and by 2018/19 no funding was spent on major adaptations and Clarion Homes now only fund minor adaptations to their properties. This withdrawal of funding was not done in consultation with TMBC and we had no influence over the timing of the withdrawal or commitment made. This has had a significant effect on the demand for DFGs for their tenants from the Council's budget particularly the discretionary budget in 2018/19. The Council is unable to place a charge on the property in these cases and therefore there is no recycling of the budget.

1.3 Key issues

- 1.3.1 Below is a SWOT analysis for this area of work to enable Members to focus on the key issues:

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly valued service by residents and Members • Very high performing and well respected team delivering the service • Makes a difference for residents – “changed all our lives for the better” is often the feedback received by families • Meets all the national and more local aims and aspirations to keep people living longer and more independent at home • Has strong links into other key services such 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding through the Better Care Fund is managed year to year making any long term planning difficult. • Funding announcements are usually just before the new year starts making budget planning even for the next year difficult.

<p>as housing conditions, benefits, health.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hospital discharge scheme is an award winning initiative and has been showcased nationally several times. T&M have been at the forefront of the development and support of this high impact service. • Strong partnership working with KCC, health, Age UK, Peabody Home Improvement Agency, local contractors are in place. • They are a clear demonstration of health, housing and social care working in an integrated way – the ultimate aim of the Better Care Fund. 	
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing the number of people being kept independent at home longer and having safe discharges from hospital reduces the burden on the health and social care sector. • Services are being offered now through other agencies/funding streams that replicate some of what we have proved has worked. This 	<p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KCC have requested an increase in the top-sliced amount that they receive. • Health services remain under intense pressure and reduction or withdrawal of some of this work may result in more pressure on the system. • Reduction or removal of the preventative services that we currently fund

<p>may mean we can redirect funding elsewhere or reduce our contribution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KCC/Health could be approached for funding opportunities for some of this work. • The model of having the OT within the housing team has proven so successful KCC could look to organise their existing resources in this way without the need for the district to fund additional posts. 	<p>e.g. hospital discharge scheme may lead to an increased demand for major adaptations i.e. DFGs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future funding levels are unknown. • Funding is usually announced just before the start of the new year making budget planning difficult. • DFGs are a mandatory grant and lack of funding has been found by the Local Government Ombudsman to not be a reason to hold up cases. • Based on the trend in grant levels and the applications for mandatory grants, there is a significant threat that the future allocation will only be sufficient to meet the mandatory requirements.
--	--

1.4 Performance

1.4.1 The table below highlights the number of completed DFGs and shows the increasing trend:

Year	Number of DFGs completed
2014/15	62
2015/16	64
2016/17	56
2017/18	98
2018/19	137 (118 mandatory, 19 discretionary)

1.4.2 For the period April 2018 to March 2019 the 137 DFGs were completed for the following works (will not add up to 137 as some will include two or more works) :

- Access to bedroom – 1 case
- Provision of ground floor bedroom/bathroom facilities – 10 cases
- Provision of a stair lift or through floor lift – 31 cases
- Stair lift repairs – 2 cases
- Provision of level access shower facilities or bathroom adaptations – 85 cases
- Over bath shower – 4 cases
- Improving access – 22 cases
- Safety related works – 10 cases
- Other, including additional WC facilities, kitchen works and specialist baths – 10 cases.

1.4.3 The table below highlights the performance of the West Kent Hospital Discharge Scheme. These figures are for Tonbridge & Malling BC area only and cover both Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells hospitals:

Year	Number of referrals	Number of patients assisted	Number of prior discharge home visits	Number of post discharge home visits
2018/19	210	196	61	95

1.4.4 The average time taken to see a patient when referred into this service is within one day. Clearly speed of response is of vital importance here and the integrated hospital discharge teams value the ability for this service to respond quickly and focus on those housing related issues that may prevent timely and safe discharge e.g. minor adaptations, moving of furniture to create a micro-living environment, cleaning of property, declutter of property, homelessness.

1.4.5 The One You Your Home Advisor in 2019 has received 64 referrals of patients to work with and try and help. Some of the referrals will be complex cases who have repeatedly been presenting at the GP surgery where the GP is unlikely to be able to help. All of these cases will have received a home visit from the Advisor and an assessment of need. In total for the 64 cases, 98 goals have been set by the patients. These are agreed and owned by the patient and could be goals such “I want to declutter my home”, “I want to join a local club” etc. The Advisor may help the patient to meet their goal by making a referral or accompanying them to a club

for the first time for example. Referrals by the Advisor include into housing, community activities, Occupational Therapy, financial advice and the One You team.

1.5 HR Policy Implications

- 1.5.1 There are none arising from this report. Mandatory DFGs will need to continue to be administered through the Council's Private Sector Housing Team. All other services are delivered through external providers and there are no implications for staffing through these arrangements.

1.6 Legal Implications

- 1.6.1 Disabled Facilities Grants are a mandatory grant that the Council must administer through the Housing Grants, Construction and Regeneration Act 1996.

1.7 Financial and Value for Money Considerations

- 1.7.1 The funding for these services and mandatory DFGs is awarded through the Better Care Fund. The funding is awarded year to year and usually towards the end of March/into April making forward planning of services and budget challenging.
- 1.7.2 Each of the options as set out in paragraph 1.10.2 below will have a cost implication summary included in the final report on 21 January 2020.

1.8 Risk Assessment

- 1.8.1 With the funding for these activities coming through the Better Care Fund, the core risk is the funding levels not being guaranteed year to year, being reduced or discontinued. This consideration will be built into the options appraisal.

1.9 Equality Impact Assessment

- 1.9.1 An equality impact assessment will need to be undertaken as part of this review.

1.10 Next steps

- 1.10.1 A number of options have been provisionally identified, and are set out below. Members are requested to consider which of these options they wish to see included in the review or to identify any other options they would like to explore. It is important to note that dependent on funding allocations all options (some to a greater degree than others) may represent budget growth that will need to be met from TMBC and in turn add to the corporate funding gap and the savings and transformation target.
- 1.10.2 Identified options for consideration

- 1) Adopt the principle that TMBC wishes to continue to deliver all the current services funded through the Better Care Fund in addition to mandatory DFGs, with an annual review of the approach by Members, acknowledging that this may mean a growth pressure on the council's budgets dependant on the approach to BCF allocations in future financial years.
- 2) Adopt the principle that TMBC should consider a reduction in the current services funded through the Better Care Fund, on the basis that where funding has allowed sufficient embedding of practice or service delivery modelling, the funding is no longer required (see 1.1.13 and 1.1.14 above for examples) in addition to the continuation of mandatory DFGs.
- 3) Adopt the principle that TMBC should deliver mandatory DFGs only.

1.10.3 In considering these various options, it is suggested that Members may be assisted by hearing from key partners in the delivery of Disabled Facilities Grants and our wider health and housing schemes such as Peabody Home Improvement Agency, Tunbridge Wells NHS Trust, local GPs, Age UK and KCC. A further report with final recommendations will be reported to the January meeting of this Committee.

1.11 Recommendations

1.11.1 That the contents of this report **BE NOTED** and that a further report be made to the January meeting of this Committee regarding the options identified in section 1.10 of this report and any other options identified by this Committee.

Background papers:

Nil

Eleanor Hoyle

Director of Planning, Housing & Environmental Health

contact: Eleanor Hoyle/Linda
Hibbs

This page is intentionally left blank

TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

15 January 2020

Report of the Management Team

Part 1- Public

Matters for Recommendation to Cabinet

1 CORPORATE STRATEGY 2020- 2023

Summary

This report sets out a new draft Corporate Strategy for the period 2020-2023.

1.1 Background

1.1.1 The Council's first Corporate Strategy covered the period from 2017-2019. A new draft strategy to cover the period 2020-2023 has now been prepared, a copy of which is attached to this report at Appendix 1. The draft updated strategy retains the same format as the 2017/19 version and seeks to focus on the key strategic issues for the Borough Council for the next three years:

- A review of our recent achievements over the period 2017-19
- Our vision and values for the 2020-2023 period
- Measuring future success.

1.1.2 Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee are invited to consider the content of the updated draft Strategy for recommendation to the Cabinet.

1.2 Legal Implications

1.2.1 n/a

1.3 Financial and Value for Money Considerations

1.3.1 As considered in the draft revised strategy

1.4 Risk Assessment

1.4.1 n/a

1.5 Equality Impact Assessment

1.5.1 n/a

1.6 Policy Considerations

1.6.1 n/a

1.7 Recommendations

1.7.1 That, subject to any views from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, the updated Corporate Strategy **BE RECOMMENDED** to the Cabinet.

Background papers:

contact: Mark Raymond

Nil

APPENDIX 1

Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council

Corporate Strategy

2020 – 2023

About our Corporate Strategy

Our Corporate Strategy covered the period 2017-2019. This updated Corporate Strategy now covers the period 2020-2023.

As previously, our updated strategy sets out an overview of how we intend to continue to plan and deliver our services to ensure they are cost effective and remain relevant to the needs of our residents, businesses, visitors to the Borough and to our partner organisations.

The 2020-2023 strategy will cover the following:

- ***A review of our performance and achievements over the period 2017-2019***
- ***Our vision, values and priorities for 2020-2023***
- ***Measuring Future Success***

What have we achieved to date?

Our Corporate Strategy for 2017-2019 sought to address a number of key challenges:

- *Reducing financial support from Government*
- *Making on-going savings via the delivery of our Savings and Transformation Strategy*
- *Targeting our limited resources on delivering and improving our key services*
- *Supporting and aiming to meet the needs of our residents and businesses*
- *The need to be more efficient and economical when delivering our services*

Our Achievements to date:

- *A new Digital Strategy which will help drive service improvements.*
- *Significant progress towards the adoption of the Council's new Local Plan to guide development to 2031*
- *Utilised our own assets to raise additional income and secure future investment*
- *Adding to the supply of temporary accommodation across the Borough, supported vulnerable residents with a new refuge for victims of domestic abuse and piloted community based projects for recipients of disabled facilities grants utilising Better Care Funding*
- *A risk management strategy including Brexit preparedness issues and tackling cybercrime.*
- *A range of new economic development initiatives to support local businesses in the Borough.*
- *Achieved increased affordable housing provision with 272 additional homes made available between 2017/18 and 2018/19.*
- *Enabled provision of a new Medical Centre in Tonbridge*
- *Tonbridge: Town Lock Enhancement and Station and High Street improvements*
- *Supported the flood protection project at Leigh Flood Storage Area*

- *Improved our recycling rates*
- *Secured a £250K grant from Central Government to help reduce rough sleeping.*

- *Our vision for the next three years*

To continue to be a financially sustainable Council with strong leadership that delivers valued services, a commitment to delivering innovation and change to meet the needs of our Borough.

- *Our values and priorities*

Achieving Efficiency - focusing on ensuring good value for money, continuously reviewing how our services are provided and funded, focusing our available resources where they will have most beneficial impact for our communities, and maximising commercial opportunities. The Council continues to face a period of considerable change and challenge over the coming three years and beyond. Continued reductions in financial support from Government will mean we need to continue to target our resources to ensure we can deliver our services and invest in new technologies. At the same time we have to be agile in the way we manage these services to meet the rapidly changing demands and needs of our residents and businesses, along with the ever changing statutory requirements. Our Savings and Transformation Strategy and the Medium-Term Financial Strategy will continue to provide structure, focus and direction in addressing the ongoing and financial challenge faced by the Council over the medium term.

Embracing Effective Partnership Working - achieving more by working and engaging effectively with a wide range of local partners from the private, public, voluntary and community sectors. We are committed to retaining and developing our close working relationships with our Borough partners. We will continue to support our Local Strategic Partnership, our main partnership which brings together key local partners from the public, private and voluntary sectors. We will continue to engage with our Parish and Town Councils via our Parish Partnership Panel led by the jointly agreed Parish Charter. In addition, we remain committed to developing our dialogue with local businesses and traders' groups, with local housing providers, and other partners including those for health improvement, leisure, community development and community safety. We will foster relationships with those agencies providing infrastructure to support our communities and facilitate growth where appropriate, working with the private development, investment and commercial sectors.

Valuing our environment and encouraging sustainable growth - keeping our towns, villages and countryside clean and well maintained, planning for our future homes and jobs, led by our Local Plan, driving investment in economic regeneration and infrastructure and meeting the challenges of climate change. Tackling **Climate Change** will be a major issue over future years. The Borough Council fully is committed to work with others to address this challenge. We have recently declared our recognition of global climate change and biodiversity emergencies. We will prepare a Climate Change Strategy for Tonbridge and Malling by May 2020. We will seek to develop new policies that support climate change mitigation with a view to us reaching carbon neutral status by 2030. We will work with a variety of partners and encourage best practice by other sectors in our Borough including the West Kent Partnership in relation to the sustainable growth agenda.

Innovation — developing more cultural change, innovative and efficient ways to deliver our services through the use of improved systems and technologies guided by our recently adopted Digital Strategy. Our new **Digital Strategy** will guide further investment in new IT technologies to ensure we have systems which are both resilient, secure and facilitates increased productivity. We will invest in new software to enable mobile working across the

Borough, undertake a thorough review and update of the Council's website and back office efficiencies. With the objective of becoming a 'smart' borough, we will aim to ensure that our businesses and communities can seamlessly engage and transact with the Council irrespective of the services they wish to access.

Measuring Future Success

We will review this corporate strategy at a mid-point to evaluate what we have achieved so far and what new and redirected efforts we then need to focus on.

The key outcomes we aim to achieve are as follows:

- *Meeting the targets we have set for future cost savings and additional income generation*
- *A Climate Change Strategy that sets out how our ambition to be carbon neutral by 2030*
- *Introduce new technologies and transformation to become a 'Smart Borough'*
- *A continuing programme of regeneration in Tonbridge building on the achievements secured under the previous plan.*
- *Supporting those who are in need of housing support*
- *Delivering our new Local Plan to meet our growth targets for new development to 2031*
- *Ensuring our key services meet all statutory obligations and reflect the needs of our residents and businesses*
- *Maintain effective joint working across West Kent on key issues such as health provision and our local economy.*

These outcomes reflect the strategic priorities for the Council. Individual service performance is monitored through regular reports to various Advisory Boards and Council meetings. All strategies and reports for Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council are published on our website www.tmbc.gov.uk

TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

15 January 2020

Report of the Director of Finance and Transformation

Part 1- Public

Matters for Recommendation to Cabinet

1 REVENUE ESTIMATES 2020/21

The Council has a statutory duty to set the level of council tax for the forthcoming financial year by 11 March. Under the Budget and Policy Framework Rules of the Constitution, the Cabinet is responsible for formulating initial draft proposals in respect of the Budget. The role of this Committee is to assist both the Cabinet and the Council in the preparation of the Budget for 2020/21 within the context of the Medium Term Financial Strategy and the Council's priorities.

1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 The Cabinet is responsible for formulating initial draft proposals in respect of the Budget for 2020/21. This report is intended as the basis for recommendations from this Committee to the Cabinet.
- 1.1.2 A special meeting of the Cabinet is scheduled for the 13 February to consider the recommendations of this Committee and of the Finance, Innovation and Property Advisory Board and, in addition, take into account the Council's final grant settlement.
- 1.1.3 At that special meeting on the 13 February, the Cabinet will need to formulate its final proposals in respect of the Budget for 2020/21 and the council tax to be levied in respect of the Borough Council. The Full Council will meet on the 18 February to approve the Budget and set the Council Tax. The Full Council may adopt or amend the Cabinet's proposals.
- 1.1.4 The role of this Committee is to consider both the Revised Estimates for 2019/20 and the Estimates for 2020/21 (see [Annex 1] to the report presented to the meeting of the Finance, Innovation and Property Advisory Board) within the context of the Medium Term Financial Strategy and the Council's priorities. For completeness, details of how we are updating the Medium Term Financial Strategy are contained within this report for information.

- 1.1.5 Overall, the draft 2020/21 Estimates show an increase over the 2019/20 Original Estimates of £800,695 prior to making a contribution to/from the General Revenue Reserve. Members are referred to the report presented to the meeting of the Finance, Innovation and Property Advisory Board for further details on the Estimates and subsequent recommendations.
- 1.1.6 It is likely that there will need to be changes made to the Estimates as we move through the budget setting process. It is my intention to bring these together for the Cabinet Budget meeting in February, rather than introduce them in a piecemeal fashion.

1.2 Medium Term Financial Strategy

- 1.2.1 To recap, the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) covers both revenue and capital budgets over a rolling ten-year period, and it is this Strategy that underpins the budget setting process each year and over the strategy period. The aim of the Strategy is to give us a realistic and sustainable plan that reflects the Council's priorities. The MTFS sets out the high level objectives the Council wishes to fulfil over the agreed time span. These are:
- To achieve a **balanced revenue budget** that delivers the Council's priorities by the end of the strategy period.
 - To retain a **minimum of £3.0m** in the General Revenue Reserve by the end of the strategy period.
 - Seek to set future increases in council tax having regard to the **guidelines** issued by the Secretary of State.
 - Continue to **identify efficiency savings** and **opportunities for new or additional income sources** and to **seek appropriate reductions in service costs** in delivery of the Savings and Transformation Strategy approved by Members.
 - Subject to there being sufficient resources within the capital reserve, set a **maximum 'annual capital allowance'** each year as part of the budget setting process for all new capital schemes (currently set at £200,000 from the Council's own resources) and give priority to those schemes that generate income or reduce costs.
- 1.2.2 It is proposed subject to review each year that the **maximum 'annual capital allowance'** be increased from £200,000 to £250,000 to reflect cost inflation.
- 1.2.3 The MTFS sets out, not only the projected budgets for the period, but also the levels of council tax that are projected to be required to meet the Council's spending plans. Underneath the Strategy for the budget setting year sits detailed estimates formulated in conjunction with Services taking into account past outturn, current spending plans and likely future demand levels / pressures.

- 1.2.4 Members are aware of the financial challenge faced by the Council as a result of the Government's budget deficit reduction programme which has resulted in reductions in the financial support offered to local government. We do, however, believe that our MTFS is resilient and the financial pressures likely to confront us can be addressed in a measured and controlled way, but this is becoming progressively more difficult.
- 1.2.5 When setting the budget for 2019/20 in February 2019, projections at that time suggested a funding gap between expenditure and income of circa £550,000. This 'gap' was translated into three savings and transformation contributions of £100,000, £400,000 and £50,000 to be achieved by the start of the year 2020/21, 2024/25 and 2028/29 respectively.
- 1.2.6 The MTFS will need to be updated and rolled forward as part of the 2020/21 budget setting process. Further information about this, together with the issues that Cabinet will need to address when updating the MTFS are set out later in this report at paragraph 1.8.

1.3 Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement 2020/21

Settlement Funding Assessment (Core Funding)

- 1.3.1 On 20 December 2019, the Secretary of State for the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, Robert Jenrick MP, made a statement to Parliament on the provisional local government finance settlement for 2020/21. The provisional settlement is expected to be confirmed in late January 2020.
- 1.3.2 The expectation this time last year was that the 2019 Spending Review would determine the overall funding envelope for local government over a three or four-year period; and the Fair Funding Review how that funding was shaken down to individual councils and, in turn, business rates baselines and baseline funding levels.
- 1.3.3 Given the diversion of parliamentary business on other matters this has proved not to be the case with a Settlement Funding Assessment (SFA) for one year only (2020/21) and the Fair Funding Review also deferred. As a result further prolonging the period of 'limbo' which again does little to aid medium term financial planning. Furthermore, the proposed move to a 75% Business Rates Retention Scheme in 2020/21 has also been deferred.
- 1.3.4 The SFA for 2020/21 is not that dissimilar to 2019/20 uplifted for inflation with the Government funding, for a further year, what has been referred to as 'Negative RSG'. To put this into context in our case 'Negative RSG' is around £1m and, in turn, giving a SFA of either £1.3m or £2.3m. However, it is important to stress that **funding beyond 2020/21 will be dependent** on the outcome of the expected multi-year settlement to follow and the Fair Funding Review.
- 1.3.5 As a result 2019/20 and now 2020/21 could be seen as a **holding year**.

- 1.3.6 Our provisional SFA for the year 2020/21 as shown in the table below is £2,301,752, a cash increase of £36,902 or 1.6% when compared to the equivalent figure of £2,264,850 in 2019/20.

New Homes Bonus

- 1.3.7 Similarly, New Homes Bonus (NHB) is to continue in its current form in 2020/21 and where the baseline below which NHB will not be paid remains at 0.4%. The Council's NHB for the year 2020/21 as shown in the table below is £3,375,063, a cash decrease of £82,365 or 2.4% when compared to the equivalent figure of £3,457,428 in 2019/20.
- 1.3.8 However, NHB, in its current form at least, is highly unlikely to continue beyond 2020/21 where legacy payments only, excluding the 2020/21 allocation, will be received, the last of which in 2022/23. Notwithstanding NHB would have continued to reduce over time as the changes already made to the scheme worked their way through the system and the recent above average housing delivery fell out of the calculation to around £1.8m.
- 1.3.9 The future of NHB or a replacement remains the subject of discussion. To put this into context NHB could:
- Continue in its current form – NHB £1.8m
 - Withdrawn and not replaced – NHB £nil placing the Council's finances under severe pressure.
 - Replaced, but where the funding stream and sum awarded is much reduced – for example NHB replacement £900,000 or half that of NHB.
- 1.3.10 This is a dramatic change to the sums (in excess of £3m) we have so far received. It remains our ambition to restructure the MTFS so it is not as reliant on NHB or its replacement.

Overall Government Grant Funding (Settlement Funding Assessment + NHB)

- 1.3.11 Overall, grant funding including NHB for the year 2020/21 as shown in the table below is £5,676,815, a cash decrease of £45,463 or 0.8% when compared to the equivalent figure of £5,722,278 in 2019/20.

	2019/20 £	2020/21 £	Cash Increase/ (Decrease)	
			£	%
Local Share of Business Rates (baseline)	2,264,850	2,301,752	36,902	1.6
Tariff Adjustment ('negative RSG')				
Settlement Funding Assessment	2,264,850	2,301,752	36,902	1.6

New Homes Bonus	3,457,428	3,375,063	(82,365)	(2.4)
Overall Grant Funding	5,722,278	5,676,815	(45,463)	(0.8)

- 1.3.12 It is requested in view of the timescales involved and the programming of meetings, delegated authority be given to the Director of Finance and Transformation in liaison with the Cabinet Member for Finance, Innovation and Property to respond to the provisional settlement, which is subject to consultation, as appropriate.

1.4 Kent Business Rates Pool

- 1.4.1 The Council is a member of the Kent Business Rates Pool. In the event that the Council exceeds its baseline funding level will pay a reduced levy to Central Government. If the Council fails to achieve 92.5% of its baseline a safety net payment is made by the Pool up to this level.
- 1.4.2 The proposed move to a 75% Business Rates Retention Scheme has been deferred.

1.5 Local Referendums to Veto Excessive Council Tax Increases

- 1.5.1 The Localism Act gives local communities the power to veto excessive council tax increases. The Secretary of State will determine a limit for council tax increases which has to be approved by the House of Commons. If an authority proposes to raise council tax above this limit they will have to hold a referendum to get approval for this from local voters who will be asked to approve or to veto the rise.
- 1.5.2 For the year 2020/21, a referendum will be triggered where council tax is increased by **2%, or more than 2% and more than £5**.
- 1.5.3 Referendum principles currently do not apply to town and parish councils.

1.6 Draft Capital Plan

- 1.6.1 A report elsewhere on this agenda seeks to advise Members of the way forward on the Capital Plan. The criteria established to guide the inclusion of new schemes to List C (holding list of schemes not yet fully worked up) and ultimately the inclusion of schemes on List A (schemes assigned budget provision) are:
- to meet legislative requirements including health and safety obligations;
 - funded from external resources; and
 - reduce revenue expenditure and or generate income.

- 1.6.2 The Capital Plan review report recommends schemes for inclusion on List B, the short-list of schemes for possible inclusion in the Capital Plan. Members are reminded that the selection from List B, of schemes to be included in the Capital Plan (List A) – if any – will be made at Cabinet on the 13 February for endorsement by Council. With this in mind Members are advised that, other than loss of investment income and the car parking improvement works capital plan scheme, the revenue consequences of new capital schemes **have yet to be incorporated**.
- 1.6.3 It is important to ensure that the revenue reserve for capital schemes can continue to fund capital expenditure at least until we reach a position where the annual contribution to the reserve matches the funding required for the replacement of existing assets (vehicles, plant and equipment) as well as recurring capital expenditure.
- 1.6.4 As a result there is an annual capital allowance for all other capital expenditure. Any 'bids' for capital schemes or discretionary capital grants are to be assessed in the context of the annual allowance. The annual capital allowance is currently set at £200,000. It is proposed subject to review each year that the maximum 'annual capital allowance' **be increased to £250,000** for the period 2020/21 to 2025/26. It should be noted, based on current projections, that from 2026/27 the Council may need to borrow to fund such expenditure.
- 1.6.5 This does not however, preclude a decision to borrow in order to fund in full or in part a commercial investment opportunity that meets the Council's strategic priorities and objectives, achieves value for money and delivers a financial return. Each such opportunity to be considered on a case by case basis as appropriate.
- 1.6.6 In addition, the Invest to Save Reserve or Transformation Reserve (made up of specific grants received from government in respect of revenues and benefits functions) could be used to fund in full or in part appropriate capital plan schemes.

1.7 Consultation with Non-Domestic (Business) Ratepayers

- 1.7.1 Before the Borough Council determines the amount of its total estimated expenditure and makes calculations of its requirements for the ensuing financial year, it consults representatives of its non-domestic ratepayers about its expenditure proposals (including capital expenditure). The consultees, who include the local Chambers of Commerce as well as a group of the larger ratepayers in the Borough, receive on request information and copies of the draft budgets and are invited to make written representations if they deem it appropriate. Any points of clarification required are dealt with by telephone, written correspondence or, if appropriate, an informal meeting with officers.
- 1.7.2 Any comments or representations received from the consultees will be reported to Members during the budget process as appropriate.

1.8 Medium Term Financial Strategy Update

- 1.8.1 When updating the MTFS we need to take into account the following (not exclusive) factors:

Overall Government Grant Funding (Settlement Funding Assessment + NHB)

- 1.8.2 Notwithstanding the continuing uncertainty and volatility surrounding local government finances with the increased risk of significant variations compared to projections, we still need to plan ahead as best we can. To put this into context at one end of the spectrum overall government grant funding could be £1.5m and at the other £3.3m.
- 1.8.3 In the latest iteration of the MTFS it is assumed overall government grant funding will **steadily** reduce from circa £5.95m (includes an element of business rates growth) in 2019/20 to £2.45m in 2023/24 uplifted for inflation year on year thereafter. A cash decrease of £3.5m or 58.8% over the period.
- 1.8.4 A hypothetical example of how the assumed overall government grant funding of £2.45m in 2023/24 might be made up is business rates baseline (£1.5m) business rates growth (£250,000) and NHB replacement (£700,000).

Business Rates Retention Scheme

- 1.8.5 The ongoing impact of the Business Rates Retention Scheme and the move to an 'interim' 75% Retention Scheme deferred to 2021/22 and an 'eventual' 100% Retention Scheme.
- 1.8.6 Beyond 2020/21, however, the **question remains** as to what will our business rates baseline and baseline funding level be under an 'interim' 75% and 'eventual' 100% Business Rates Retention Scheme and how this then compares to that reflected in the MTFS taking into account transfer of any new responsibilities?

Council Tax Referendum Principles

- 1.8.7 The MTFS sets out, not only the projected budgets for the period, but also the levels of council tax that are projected to be required to meet the Council's spending plans.
- 1.8.8 For the year 2020/21, a referendum will be triggered where council tax is increased by **2%, or more than 2% and more than £5**. This time last year the MTFS assumed a council tax increase of £5 representing a 2.4% increase in council tax.
- 1.8.9 For the purposes of preparing the budget papers and updating the MTFS an **increase of £5 in 2020/21** has been assumed and each year thereafter.

Funding Gap

- 1.8.10 As we know, the funding gap is not static and constantly changes in response to both internal and external factors. When setting the budget for 2019/20 in February 2019, the funding gap was anticipated to be circa £550,000.
- 1.8.11 In October 2019, following an interim high level review of our MTFS and the anticipated challenges we were expecting to face, a report to Cabinet suggested that when taken together budget or potential budget pressures in the 'pipeline' could push the funding gap to circa £800,000. Since then a series of decisions or recommendations have been made by Members which have been incorporated into these draft Estimates and accordingly, amongst other things, have contributed to our savings and transformation contributions, netting the projected outstanding funding gap down to £320,000. By way of example:
- 1) Purchase of temporary accommodation for homelessness purposes.
 - 2) Transfer of ownership and responsibility for public conveniences to the relevant town/parish council or disposal.
 - 3) Impact of pension fund triennial valuation less than expected.
 - 4) Recommendations regarding fees and charges including existing and proposed new car parking charges recommended, subject to consultation, by the Street Scene and Environment Services Advisory Board.
 - 5) Much higher take-up of the opt-in garden waste service.
 - 6) Inflationary uplift applied to the waste services contract sum.
 - 7) Not forgetting that the sale of both River Walk Offices and River Lawn Amenity Land, together with the closure of customer surgeries are also included in the financial position presented.
- 1.8.12 **Clearly, if one or more of the above are not actioned either in full or in part or the savings and transformation contribution is less than that assumed the projected funding gap increases accordingly.**
- 1.8.13 The MTFS will continue to be updated as we move through the 2020/21 budget cycle and as more information becomes available and in due course presented with the Budget report to Cabinet in February.

1.9 Savings and Transformation Strategy

- 1.9.1 Alongside the MTFS sits a Savings and Transformation Strategy (STS). The purpose of the Strategy is to provide structure, focus and direction in addressing the financial challenge faced by the Council. In so doing, it recognises that there is no one simple solution and as a result we will need to adopt a number of ways

to deliver the required savings and transformation contributions within an agreed timescale.

- 1.9.2 A number of key themes have been identified, together with outline targets and timescales which will need to be revisited and aligned with the latest projected funding gap as part of the budget setting process. An updated version of the STS will be presented with the Budget report to Cabinet.

Savings and Transformation Contributions

- 1.9.3 To recap, this year's savings and transformation contribution was set at £100,000 and to date **net savings in the order of £230,000 have been identified** when looking across the ten-year period of the MTFS as summarised in the table below.
- 1.9.4 Factors that have contributed towards meeting this year's contribution include the waste services contract, recommendations regarding fees and charges, purchase of temporary accommodation and review of public conveniences provision. Factors that have taken the funding gap in the 'wrong' direction include increase in homeless caseload, government grant and demand on the IT infrastructure.

	£'000
Savings and Transformation Contributions Identified to Date	(369)
Other Factors Impacting on MTFS	139
Net (Savings) / Budget Growth	(230)

- 1.9.5 This time last year the projected funding gap was £550,000 and a year on, all other things being equal, was expected to be £450,000. **The latest projected 'outstanding' funding gap is £320,000** (£550,000 - £230,000). The number, scale and timing of requisite future savings and transformation contributions is the subject of consideration.

1.10 Finance, Innovation and Property Advisory Board

- 1.10.1 The draft Revenue Estimates are to be considered in detail at the meeting of the Finance, Innovation and Property Advisory Board on 8 January where a number of officers will be available to answer detailed questions.
- 1.10.2 It is not our intention to replicate the officer representation at this meeting and assume that Members will wish to focus on the strategic aspects of the Estimates rather than the detail. If Members do have detailed questions, please contact Neil Lawley, Chief Financial Services Officer on extension 6095 or by e-mail at neil.lawley@tmbs.gov.uk in advance of the meeting. Where appropriate, he will liaise with the relevant Services and advise accordingly.

1.11 Legal Implications

- 1.11.1 There are a number of legislative requirements to consider in setting the Budget which will be addressed as we move through the budget cycle.
- 1.11.2 The Localism Act gives local communities the power to veto excessive council tax increases. The Secretary of State will determine a limit for council tax increases which has to be approved by the House of Commons. If an authority proposes to raise council tax above this limit they will have to hold a referendum to get approval for this from local voters who will be asked to approve or veto the rise.

1.12 Financial and Value for Money Considerations

- 1.12.1 The 2020/21 provisional local government finance settlement is relatively positive for TMBC, which is welcome news. However, as I have said, this is a “further” standalone “holding year” and two key questions remain. Firstly, what will our business rates baseline and baseline funding level be under an ‘interim’ 75% and ‘eventual’ 100% Business Rates Retention scheme, and how will this compare to that reflected in the MTFS taking into account transfer of any new responsibilities? Secondly, what is the extent to which NHB will feature in future government grant funding and if replaced what level of funding would we receive in its place?
- 1.12.2 Funding beyond 2020/21 **dependent** on the outcome of the expected multi-year settlement to follow and the Fair Funding Review making financial planning that more difficult. How we will fair at the end of that process compared to that assumed a critical piece of the jigsaw.
- 1.12.3 Furthermore, the impact of current economic conditions on Council finances / financial assumptions in respect of inflation, interest rates, income levels, etc. and the scale of the impact over the medium term is uncertain and difficult to determine.

1.13 Risk Assessment

- 1.13.1 The Local Government Act 2003 requires the Chief Financial Officer, when calculating the Council Tax Requirement, to report on the robustness of the estimates included in the budget and the adequacy of the reserves for which the budget provides. Consideration will and is given to the risks associated with any budget setting process where various financial and other assumptions have to be made. To mitigate the risks detailed estimates are formulated in conjunction with Services taking into account past outturn, current spending plans and likely future demand levels / pressures and external advice on assumptions obtained where appropriate.
- 1.13.2 The Medium Term Financial Strategy sets out the high level financial objectives the Council wishes to fulfil and underpins the budget setting process for the forthcoming year and over the Strategy period. As the Council’s high level financial planning tool the Strategy needs to be reviewed and updated at least

annually and in the current climate the Savings and Transformation Strategy regularly reviewed by Management Team. In addition, not identifying and implementing the requisite savings and transformation contributions will put at risk the integrity of the MTFS.

- 1.13.3 The continuing uncertainty and volatility surrounding local government finances and more recently Brexit make financial planning that more difficult with the increased risk of significant variations compared to projections; and the consequent implications on the level of reserves held.
- 1.13.4 The projected figures for New Homes Bonus or its replacement are at risk of further revision downwards which would, in turn, increase the required savings and transformation contributions.
- 1.13.5 The Inter Authority Agreement with KCC as part of the Waste Services Contract may not be extended beyond the initial 8 year contract period, albeit this is considered unlikely. The Waste Services Contract also may not be extended beyond the initial 8 year contract period with potential adverse budget implications.
- 1.13.6 Members are reminded that there are factors not reflected in the MTFS, e.g. the cost of borrowing for new capital plan schemes when and if required.
- 1.13.7 Any increase in council tax above the relevant threshold, even by a fraction of a percentage point, would require a referendum to be held.

1.14 Equality Impact Assessment

Where there is a perceived impact on end users an equality impact assessment has been carried out and as further savings and transformation options emerge, further equality impact assessments will need to be carried out as appropriate.

1.15 Policy Considerations

1.15.1 Business Continuity/Resilience

1.15.2 Community

1.16 Recommendations

1.16.1 The Committee is asked to:

- 1) Endorse subject to review each year that the maximum 'annual capital allowance' be increased from £200,000 to £250,000.
- 2) Agree that delegated authority be granted to the Director of Finance and Transformation in liaison with the Cabinet Member for Finance, Innovation and Property to respond to the provisional local government finance settlement as appropriate.

- 3) Consider the draft Revenue Estimates (see [Annex 1] to the report presented to the meeting of the Finance, Innovation and Property Advisory Board) and make such recommendations, as it considers appropriate, to Cabinet for its special meeting on 13 February.
- 4) Recommend to Cabinet that the Savings and Transformation Strategy is updated to reflect the latest projected 'outstanding' funding gap as part of the budget setting process.

Background papers:

Nil

contact: Neil Lawley
Sharon Shelton

Sharon Shelton
Director of Finance and Transformation

TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

15 January 2020

Report of the Director of Finance and Transformation

Part 1- Public

Matters for Recommendation to Cabinet

1 CAPITAL PLAN REVIEW 2019/20

This report considers progress on the 2019/20 Capital Plan Review and requests endorsement of recommendations to Cabinet.

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 The capital plan process, as outlined below, provides a means of maintaining a pool of schemes (List C) from which schemes can be selected for evaluation and possible implementation. It also provides an opportunity to review the provisions for schemes which are already in the Capital Plan (List A).

1.1.2 The criteria established to guide the inclusion of new List C schemes (holding list of schemes not yet fully worked up) and ultimately the inclusion of schemes on List A (schemes assigned budget provision) are:

- to meet legislative requirements including health and safety obligations;
- funded from external resources; and
- reduce revenue expenditure and or generate income.

1.1.3 The subsequent recommendations where appropriate have regard to these criteria.

1.1.4 The review takes place within the context of the revenue estimates, reflecting the fact that capital schemes have an impact on revenue. Positive impacts may include potential to reduce costs and or generate income. Negative impacts may include loss of income during construction and will include loss of investment income where the project costs are met from the Council's resources.

1.1.5 The Capital Plan review process is to be reported to the Finance, Innovation and Property Advisory Board on 8 January 2020, where Members will consider the following issues:

- 1) The position of the existing Capital Plan (List A).

- 2) The addition of schemes to List C and the removal of schemes from List C.
- 3) The selection of schemes from List C to be evaluated.
- 4) Consideration of those schemes which have been evaluated.

1.2 Capital Plan Funding

- 1.2.1 Members are aware of the financial challenge faced by the Council as a result of the Government's budget deficit reduction programme which has resulted in reductions in the financial support offered to local government; and despite statements about an end to austerity, a challenging financial outlook remains.
- 1.2.2 Capital expenditure is currently funded from the revenue reserve for capital schemes, grants from government and other bodies, developer contributions and from capital receipts derived from the sale of assets.
- 1.2.3 It is important to ensure that the revenue reserve for capital schemes can continue to fund capital expenditure at least until we reach a position where the annual contribution to the reserve matches the funding required for the replacement of existing assets (vehicles, plant and equipment) as well as recurring capital expenditure.
- 1.2.4 As a result there is an annual capital allowance for all other capital expenditure. Any 'bids' for capital schemes or discretionary capital grants are to be assessed in the context of the annual allowance. The annual capital allowance is currently set at £200,000. It is proposed subject to review each year that the maximum 'annual capital allowance' **be increased to £250,000** for the period 2020/21 to 2025/26. It should be noted, based on current projections, that from 2026/27 the Council may need to borrow to fund such expenditure.
- 1.2.5 This does not however, preclude a decision to borrow in order to fund in full or in part a commercial investment opportunity that meets the Council's strategic priorities and objectives, achieves value for money and delivers a financial return. Each such opportunity to be considered on a case by case basis as appropriate.
- 1.2.6 In addition, the Invest to Save Reserve or Transformation Reserve (made up of specific grants received from government in respect of revenues and benefits functions) could be used to fund in full or in part appropriate capital plan schemes.

1.3 Finance, Innovation and Property Advisory Board

- 1.3.1 Details in respect of the existing Capital Plan (List A) can be found in the report to the Finance, Innovation and Property Advisory Board. The position of the existing Capital Plan (List A) recommended for endorsement is summarised in **[Annex 1]**.
- 1.3.2 As a result of the challenging financial outlook the focus has to be on what are seen as priority capital plan schemes or where there is potential for external

funding. The schedule of schemes recommended to be added to and schemes to be deleted from List C is attached at **[Annex 2]**.

1.3.3 The List C schemes recommended for evaluation is attached at **[Annex 3]**. On this occasion, four schemes have been recommended including three for Fast-Track evaluation. In addition, there are four schemes selected for evaluation in a previous Review that are either on hold following evaluation, subject to further evaluation or yet to be evaluated as follows: Tonbridge Farm Sportsground – Provision of Toilets, Leybourne Lakes Country Park – Facility Improvements, River Medway – Riverside Lighting, Tonbridge and Financial Services Document Management Software.

1.3.4 The evaluated schemes recommended for transfer from List C to List B is attached at **[Annex 4]**.

1.4 Capital Strategy

1.4.1 The requirements of the 2017 edition of both the Treasury Management and Prudential Codes of Practice published by the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) have been taken into account and reflected as appropriate in the annual review and update of the Capital Strategy attached at **[Annex 5]**. The Strategy has no annexes but includes links to a number of other documents or web pages which are referred to in the text and are available on the Council's website or the internet.

1.4.2 CIPFA – “The Capital Strategy should describe how the investment of capital resources will contribute to the achievement of the authority's key objectives and priorities that are detailed in their Performance Plans and Community Plans/Strategies. An authority's Capital Strategy should be one of the key, overarching strategies that support service plans. The strategy will also determine priorities between the various services and look for opportunities for cross-cutting and joined-up investment. The authority's Capital Strategy should describe how the deployment of capital resources contributes to the achievement of the described goals. It will also help to ensure that issues around property and other assets are fully reflected in the Council's planning.”

1.5 Legal Implications

1.5.1 The Local Government Act 2003 and its subsidiary regulations set out the framework for the system of capital controls which applied from 1 April 2004 whereby local authorities must set their own borrowing limits with regard to affordability, prudence and sustainability. Underpinning this is a requirement to follow the CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities (the Prudential Code).

1.6 Financial and Value for Money Considerations

- 1.6.1 The transfer of schemes from List C to List B has no financial impact. The transfer of schemes from List B to List A will be considered by Cabinet on 13 February in the context of the Medium Term Financial Strategy and the overall budget position.
- 1.6.2 The Capital Strategy outlines a capital plan process which follows the CIPFA Prudential Code and in addition to supporting the achievement of the Council's strategic priorities and objectives, focuses on value for money.

1.7 Risk Assessment

- 1.7.1 Financial implications of new schemes to be considered by Cabinet at the February budget meeting.
- 1.7.2 Failure to endorse a satisfactory Capital Strategy may lead to a capital programme which does not fully support the Council's strategic priorities and objectives.

1.8 Equality Impact Assessment

- 1.8.1 Where there is a perceived impact on end users an equality impact assessment has or will be carried out as schemes progress as appropriate.

1.9 Recommendations

- 1.9.1 Endorse subject to review each year that the maximum 'annual capital allowance' be **increased** from £200,000 to £250,000.
- 1.9.2 It is **RECOMMENDED** that the recommendations to the Finance, Innovation and Property Advisory Board detailed at paragraph 1.3 be endorsed.
- 1.9.3 It is **RECOMMENDED** that Cabinet be invited to endorse the Capital Strategy as attached at **[Annex 5]** for adoption by Council and publication on the Council's website.

Background papers:

Nil

contact: Michael Withey
Neil Lawley

Sharon Shelton
Director of Finance and Transformation

<div> <div>Annex 1</div> <div>Capital Plan: List A Service Summary</div> </div>									
	Expenditure To 31/03/19	2019/20 Estimate inc Prior Year Slippage	2020/21 Estimate	2021/22 Estimate	2022/23 Estimate	2023/24 Estimate	2024/25 Estimate	2025/26 Estimate	Scheme Total
<div> <div>Capital Plan Schemes</div> <div> <div>Planning, Housing & Environmental Health</div> <div>Street Scene, Leisure & Technical Services</div> <div>Corporate</div> </div> <div>Sub-total</div> <div>Capital Renewals</div> <div> <div>Planning, Housing & Environmental Health</div> <div>Street Scene, Leisure & Technical Services</div> <div>Corporate</div> </div> <div>Sub-total</div> <div>Total</div> </div>	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
	0	1,555	755	155	155	155	155	155	3,085
	235	2,881	432	636	143	1,263	159	159	5,908
	271	280	30	90	30	30	30	30	791
	506	4,716	1,217	881	328	1,448	344	344	9,784
	n/a	24	0	0	0	13	0	0	37
	n/a	533	923	287	576	389	402	304	3,414
	n/a	496	376	182	280	137	384	385	2,240
	n/a	1,053	1,299	469	856	539	786	689	5,691
	506	5,769	2,516	1,350	1,184	1,987	1,130	1,033	15,475

This page is intentionally left blank

Capital Plan Review 2019/20

Recommendations in respect of List C

	Annex 2 Page
Schemes to be added to List C	
Street Scene, Leisure and Technical Services	
Tonbridge Farm Sportsground Improvements	CP 29
Open Spaces: Holly Hill Path Improvements	CP 31
Leybourne Lakes Country Park: Path Improvement Works	CP 33
Tonbridge Cemetery Memorial Garden Vaults	CP 34
Car Parking Improvement Works	CP 36
Corporate Services	
Commercial Opportunities	CP 37

This page is intentionally left blank

Capital Plan Review 2019/20

Schemes selected for evaluation from List C

	Annex 2 Page
Street Scene, Leisure and Technical Services	
Tonbridge Racecourse Sportsground Improvement Works: Phase 3	CP 30
Leybourne Lakes Country Park: Path Improvement Works (Fast-Track)	CP 33
Tonbridge Cemetery Memorial Garden Vaults (Fast-Track)	CP 34
Car Parking Improvement Works (Fast-Track)	CP 36

This page is intentionally left blank

Capital Plan Review 2019/20

Recommendations in respect of evaluated schemes

	Capital Cost	Estimated Annual Revenue/ Renewals Cost		Annex 3 Page
	£'000	£'000		
Street Scene, Leisure and Technical Services				
Leybourne Lakes Country Park: Path Improvement Works	60	0	Transfer from List C to List B	CP 39
Tonbridge Cemetery Memorial Garden Vaults	16	1	Transfer from List C to List B	CP 41
Car Parking Improvement Works	210	(107)	Transfer from List C to List B	CP 43
Total	286	(106)		
The estimated capital cost of the path improvement works at Leybourne Lakes Country Park is to be funded by way of external funding and developer contributions; and the memorial garden vaults and car parking improvement works can be met from the annual capital allowance of £250,000.				

This page is intentionally left blank

TONBRIDGE AND MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

Draft Capital Strategy

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of the Capital Strategy is to document the principles and framework that underpin the Council's capital investment and expenditure proposals. The Strategy is drawn up under the framework provided by the Local Government Act 2003 and its associated regulations.
- 1.2 The principal aim of the Capital Strategy is to provide a context for a programme of capital investment (known as the Capital Plan) that will assist in the achievement of the Council's strategic priorities and objectives. The Capital Plan is published in the Council's [budget book](#) and available on the Council's website.
- 1.3 The component elements of the Capital Strategy comprise:
- A statement of the financial context within which the Council needs to determine its approach to capital investment (Section 2).
 - A description of the legislative framework and its associated regulations that will influence capital investment decisions (Section 3).
 - An explanation of the direct relationship between capital investment decisions and the Council's strategic priorities and objectives (Section 4).
 - The key principles supporting the Capital Strategy (Section 5).
 - Consideration of various partnership arrangements (Section 6).
 - Explanation of the processes to be followed in the implementation and management of the Capital Strategy (Section 7).
 - The Capital Plan (Section 8).
 - Post implementation reviews (Section 9).

2 The Financial Context

- 2.1 Key financial statistics are:

Net Budget Requirement 2019/20	£14.10 million
Government Grant / Business rates excluding New Homes Bonus 2019/20	£3.46 million
Borough Council Band D Charge 2019/20	£209.50
Capital Plan 2019/20 to 2024/25 (Gross expenditure)	£14.90 million
Fixed Assets at 31 March 2019	£87.89 million
Debt Outstanding at 31 March 2019	Nil
Revenue Reserve for Capital Schemes at 31 March 2019	£7.85 million

- 2.2 The Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) together with the Council's strategic priorities and objectives along with the established criteria used to guide the inclusion of capital plan schemes and the Prudential Code (see paragraph 3.1) form the basis for any capital investment decisions. The MTFS was used to guide the selection of new Capital Plan schemes in recent years

and will continue to be a major influence on the **2019/20** and subsequent Capital Plan reviews. The MTFS is updated at least once a year and the latest version is published on the Council's website.

- 2.3 Capital receipts derived from the sale of capital assets (generally land and buildings) can only be used to repay debt or finance new capital expenditure. The Council's assets are reviewed on a regular basis to identify the potential for alternative use or disposal. To assist with the Council's savings and transformation agenda Members agreed, Council February 2017 and 2018, that amounts (revenue resources) equivalent to the disposal proceeds from existing assets and other windfalls may be invested in externally managed property funds. Thus far **£5.75m**, excluding existing cash balances, has been earmarked for property fund investment.
- 2.4 The demographic and economic features of the Borough give rise to a realistic assessment of very limited opportunities to attract funds from national and regional sources. Nevertheless, the Council will continue to investigate and exploit external funding opportunities.
- 2.5 Capital expenditure is currently funded from the revenue reserve for capital schemes (RRCS) grants from government and other bodies, developer contributions and from capital receipts derived from the sale of assets.
- 2.6 All government support for the Council's capital expenditure is by way of capital grant. Government support through capital grants is usually ring-fenced for specific purposes. It is the Council's intention to try to secure capital grants, wherever possible, for schemes which advance the Council's strategic priorities and objectives.
- 2.7 It is important to ensure that the RRCS can continue to fund capital expenditure at least until we reach a position where the annual contribution to the reserve matches the funding required for the replacement of existing assets (vehicles, plant and equipment) as well as recurring capital expenditure.
- 2.8 As a result there is an annual capital allowance for all other capital expenditure. Any 'bids' for capital schemes or discretionary capital grants are to be assessed in the context of the annual allowance. The latest review is likely to see the annual capital allowance set at **£250,000 from 2020/21**; and based on current projections, that from **2026/27** the Council may need to borrow to fund such expenditure. Priority is afforded to schemes that meet legislative requirements, address health & safety concerns, generate income or reduce the Council's revenue costs.
- 2.9 ***This does not however, preclude a decision to borrow earlier in order to fund in full or in part a commercial investment opportunity that meets the Council's strategic priorities and objectives, achieves value for money and delivers a financial return. Each such opportunity to be considered on a case by case basis as appropriate.***

3 Legislative Framework and its associated regulations

- 3.1 The legislative framework is set out by the Local Government Act 2003 and its subsidiary regulations. This framework provides for a prudential system based on borrowing limits set by each individual local authority. Under this system, local authorities must have regard to affordability, prudence and sustainability and must follow the “Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities 2017 Edition” published by the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA).
- 3.2 The Prudential Code requires that the CIPFA Treasury Management Code of Practice is adopted and that a number of prudential indicators are set. Council adopted the 2017 edition of the Code on 30 October 2018.
- 3.3 The objectives of the Prudential Code are to ensure, within a clear framework, that the capital expenditure plans are affordable, prudent and sustainable, and that treasury management decisions are taken in accordance with good professional practice and in full understanding of the risks involved and how these risks will be managed to levels that are acceptable to the Council. The Prudential Code requires authorities to look at capital expenditure and investment plans in the light of overall organisational strategy and resources and ensure that decisions are being made with sufficient regard to the long run financing implications and potential risks to the authority. Effective financial planning, option appraisal, risk management and governance processes are essential in achieving a prudent approach to capital expenditure, investment and debt.
- 3.4 Another key element of the legislative framework is the duty to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the Council's use of resources. Achieving value for money is addressed in Section 5 of the Strategy as one of the key principles to be applied in capital investment decisions.

4 Strategic Priorities

- 4.1 Capital plan schemes should emerge from, or be designed to achieve, the Council's strategic priorities and objectives set out in overview in the [Corporate Strategy](#). The Strategy sets out Our Vision and Our Values guided by the following core values:
 - Taking a business-like approach.
 - Promoting Fairness.
 - Embracing Effective Partnership Working.
 - Valuing our environment and encouraging sustainable growth.
- 4.2 The Corporate Strategy is supported by a wide range of Strategies and Plans where specific improvement projects and initiatives are cascaded down into section plans across the Council. These section and other plans also cover a range of other priorities, improvements and indicators that are set and managed by individual services.

- 4.3 The Council's capital investment decisions should be in support of its strategic priorities and objectives along with the established criteria used to guide the inclusion of capital plan schemes, and this is an integral part of the evaluation process for each project under consideration. No project should proceed to inclusion within the Capital Plan unless it furthers achievement of the Council's strategic priorities and objectives.

5 Principles Supporting the Capital Strategy

- 5.1 The key principles that underpin the Council's Capital Strategy are:
- 5.2 **Strategic Priorities.** Establishment of a direct relationship with the Council's strategic priorities and objectives, with a Capital Plan based upon investment needs and prioritised on an authority-wide basis. This demonstrates an explicit link with key strategic planning documents and recognition of the need for a corporate approach to cross-cutting issues such as the environment, social inclusion, affordable housing, **economic regeneration** and community safety.
- 5.3 **Public Consultation.** The use of public consultation is, indirectly, an important part of developing the Capital Plan through its use in setting priorities and developing strategies, which may lead to capital projects coming forward.
- 5.4 **Other Consultation.** As well as individuals communicating directly with Council Officers and Members, other conduits exist for expressing views to the Council. The Parish Partnership Panel, the Tonbridge Forum, the Tonbridge Sports Association, and customer panels at leisure facilities allow specific persons or groups of users to express their views.
- 5.5 **Partnerships.** Partnership initiatives are considered in Section 6 including the Tonbridge and Malling Local Strategic Partnership, the West Kent Partnership and the Community Safety Partnership which help shape policy objectives and which aim to deliver projects in conjunction with others.
- 5.6 **Procurement Strategy.** The [Procurement Strategy](#) seeks to ensure that good procurement practice is applied consistently throughout the Council. It sets out how the Council will address procurement and establishes its importance to the Council and the contribution it can make to improved service delivery.
- 5.7 **Support for Regional and National Priorities.** To support, where possible, regional and national priorities, for example urban renaissance, transportation improvements, environmental initiatives such as increased levels of recycling.
- 5.8 **Support for Local Priorities.** The Borough Council has been consistently investing in its car parks to support the local economy through a phased programme of improvements. **The Economic Development strategy sets out broader economic development priorities.** Additional funding from the Business Rates Retention Pilot has been earmarked for economic development within the Borough. As a Flood Risk Management Authority, we

will maintain our support for the flood defence schemes being developed in the area.

- 5.9 **Availability of External Funding.** In support of the Council's strategic priorities and objectives to monitor and pursue available forms of external partnership and other funding opportunities. Capital schemes are increasingly being funded in full or part by contributions from developers.
- 5.10 The Council's [Local Development Framework Core Strategy](#), adopted in 2007, supports the Government policy that development should contribute towards the community services and infrastructure that are necessary to support that development. The provision of infrastructure by developers as part of a wider project and financial contributions are brought forward by planning conditions or legal agreements on a case by case basis where justified by the application of the statutory tests. These arrangements have brought forward significant provision of and contributions to affordable housing, education facilities, children's play, sports pitches, leisure facilities, highway works and transportation services.
- 5.11 The new **TMBC** Local Plan sets out development policies and proposals until 2031 **and is currently at examination stage following submission in January 2019**. The development **approach** is built upon strategic development options with the capacity to bring forward new infrastructure investment in parallel with planned growth. The **current** programme is for the new Local Plan to be adopted **in 2020**.
- 5.12 The Council is keen to secure a continuing supply of homes at appropriate and in sustainable locations to meet the needs and demands of the Borough. It has a proven track record in fostering growth in a strategically planned way. A range of housing provides balanced support for economic investment by companies looking to locate and expand in the Borough. The supply of new homes and businesses themselves make a contribution towards the Council tax base, potential new homes bonus funding and the potential income from business rates. So long as the level is consistent with planning policies and good practice the Borough Council will seek to secure levels of growth that assist in sustaining important local services.
- 5.13 As a non-stockholding Housing Authority, the Council has a key role to play in the delivery of the strategic housing function covering policy and enabling, private sector housing, and in identifying and addressing housing needs. Contained within a number of different strategies the key priorities are to:
- Enable and facilitate the provision of housing, especially affordable homes, across all tenures in order to meet existing and future housing need.
 - Prevent and reduce homelessness in line with duties under the Homeless Reduction Act.
 - Support households to live independently in the community.
 - Improving conditions across all tenures to achieve safe, warm and healthy homes ensuring good health and wellbeing for our communities.

- 5.14 **Use of the Council's Assets.** Maintenance of an Asset Management Plan and performance measures for the use of Council owned assets to ensure optimum returns and early release of redundant assets in support of strategic investment priorities and to attract inward investment. An updated Asset Management Plan, ***covering a four year period, is to be considered by Members in January 2020.***
- 5.15 **Consideration of the Impact on the Council's Revenue Budget.** To ensure that capital investment decisions are consistent with the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy, particularly the management of its revenue budget so as to reduce its dependence upon the use of revenue reserves.
- 5.16 **Value for Money.** Each year the Council's external auditor gives an opinion on whether the Authority has put in place proper arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources. All of the Capital Plan processes from identification and selection of schemes, through implementation to subsequent review of completed schemes can contribute to achieving value for money.
- 5.17 **Investment in IT.** In order to improve efficiency and economy and to meet customer aspirations for self-service, particularly via the website; and to enable more flexible and different ways of working to be adopted to support and assist delivery of the Savings and Transformation Strategy. The IT Strategy 2018 to 2022 ***along with the Digital Strategy 2019 to 2023 has set the direction of travel for the transformation programme.***

6 Partnerships

- 6.1 **The Tonbridge and Malling Local Strategic Partnership.** The [Local Strategic Partnership](#) is now well established and has attracted a high level of representation from the public, private, voluntary and faith sectors. Its work focuses on addressing key issues of concern locally such as older people's services, the needs of young people, the local economy, affordable housing and public health issues.
- 6.2 **West Kent Partnership.** The Council is a founding member of the [West Kent Partnership](#), formed on a sub regional rather than district basis, reflecting the degree of economic and social homogeneity across West Kent and a shared community of interest. The Partnership works with other partners in a joined up fashion for the benefit of the local community with a focus on economic development and infrastructure issues. Finance for these initiatives will come in part from the Business Rates Retention Pilot (a partnership comprising all Kent Authorities). ***A Number of strategic priorities have benefited from the Local Growth Fund.***
- 6.3 **Transportation Partnerships.** The Borough Council has consistently sought to influence the quality of transportation services in its area and increase investment in them by the relevant authorities. These authorities include the local highway authority, (Kent County Council), the strategic road network agency (Highways England), railway operators and Government Departments.

- 6.4 **The Joint Transportation Board**, comprising Members from the Borough and County Councils, provides an overseeing function for the co-ordination of transport investment in the Borough. This ranges from regular reviews of minor improvements, highway maintenance programmes and parking reviews to major investment through key strategies.
- 6.5 **Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP)**. The South East Local Enterprise Partnership (SELEP) seeks to promote economic growth across Essex, Kent and East Sussex. Given its size, a federated model of operation has been adopted and the Kent and Medway Economic Partnership (KMEP) is the local body which covers Tonbridge and Malling. A key role for both organisations is to bid for Local Growth Fund monies to fund local projects which support our local economy. ***TMBC has a key role in identifying and promoting priorities for economic regeneration.***
- 6.6 **Other Partnerships**. The Council is also part of a partnership that has promoted a bid to the Local Growth Fund to bring forward the much needed improvement to the Leigh Flood Storage area. This is a strategic infrastructure investment required to safeguard many residential and business properties in the southern part of the Borough and to enable future growth and new development to take place.
- 6.7 **Community Regeneration Partnerships**. The Council has entered into partnerships which have made a genuine difference to the local community with clear and tangible outcomes.
- 6.8 **The Community Safety Partnership (CSP)**. The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 placed an obligation on local authorities and the Police (amongst others) to work together to develop and implement a strategy to tackle crime and disorder in their area. The Tonbridge and Malling CSP vision is: working together to ensure the safety and security of Tonbridge and Malling's residents, businesses and visitors.
- 6.9 **Tonbridge Central Area Action Plan**. The Plan provides ***the ambition for Tonbridge Town Centre and*** the context for partnership projects to attract private sector investment in the town centre and secure transport and environmental improvements. A number of key sites are allocated that have potential to deliver town centre and mixed use development that can generate increased vitality into the town centre and the High Street in particular. The Action Plan is to be reviewed as part of the new Local Plan.
- 7 Implementing and Managing the Capital Strategy**
- 7.1 The Council has developed a process for considering and evaluating potential capital schemes as an integral part of its Capital Strategy. This process for selecting schemes is described below.

- 7.2 Schemes, subject to some exceptions listed below, are selected by a phased process. For convenience, the stages have been termed List A, List B and List C, with List A being the approved Capital Plan.
- 7.3 As schemes come forward they are stored in a list of schemes (List C) for consideration and possible evaluation. These schemes should emerge from, or be designed to achieve, the Council's strategic priorities and objectives along with a set of criteria used to guide the inclusion of new schemes to List C and ultimately the inclusion of schemes on List A. The criteria are: to meet legislative requirements including health and safety obligations; funded from external resources; and reduce revenue expenditure and or generate income. Justification would need to be provided for any schemes that failed to meet one or more of these criteria in order for them to progress through the capital plan process.
- 7.4 From List C, Members select schemes for evaluation. Evaluations will include:
- Specification of the purpose of the scheme and its relevance to the Council's strategic objectives and any wider national policy objectives, the setting of targets by which the success or otherwise of the project can be judged post-implementation.
 - An outline design to facilitate costing and, where appropriate, consultation.
 - Identification of milestones and risks to aid project management and decision making.
 - Consultation, including, where appropriate, public consultation on the scheme's principle.
 - The establishment of a realistic estimated capital cost, incorporating any consultation feedback on design issues.
 - An assessment of the ongoing revenue costs and income generating capacity of the completed scheme including an assessment of the loss of interest from investments and impact on capital renewals provisions.
 - Consideration of partnership and external funding opportunities.
 - Consideration of the time after the end of the project during which the targets and objectives should be reviewed and reported to stakeholders.
 - An equality impact assessment.
- 7.5 The evaluation process will reveal the impact of the project on the revenue base budget, enabling Members to compare the value of the scheme with the financial savings required to pay for it or the impact on the council tax requirement. Schemes successfully passing through evaluation will be included in List B.
- 7.6 The Council is conscious that the process of evaluation is a revenue cost in itself; involving in-house staff and resources or the buying in of external resources and which may draw resources away from the implementation of the approved Capital Plan. In order to minimise the resource impact of evaluation it is important that restraint is exercised in selecting schemes for evaluation. A balance is struck each year between deliverability of the programme and the evaluation of new schemes.

- 7.7 Under the constitutional arrangements adopted by the Council, the evaluated schemes will be reported to Finance, Innovation and Property Advisory Board which will advise the budget meeting of Cabinet of those schemes deemed suitable to progress to be included on List B. Prior to the budget meeting of Cabinet that advice will be reviewed by Overview and Scrutiny Committee and may be updated. By considering all eligible schemes at the same time, a corporate approach can be taken to selecting those schemes deemed suitable to progress. Prioritisation of such schemes will be informed by the wider financial climate, the Medium Term Financial Strategy and the requirements of the CIPFA Prudential Code. Prioritisation will take account of national and regional priorities, the Council's strategic priorities and objectives and the financial consequences arising from the schemes proposed.
- 7.8 The main exception to this selection procedure is the investment necessary to maintain existing levels of service. This will consist primarily of renewals provisions and some one-off items outside the basic renewal provisions. These provisions are subject to Member scrutiny within List A and application of value for money principles.
- 7.9 Ultimately the selection of new Capital Plan schemes from List B for inclusion in the Capital Plan (List A) will be determined by the Council following recommendations from the Cabinet in the light of advice from the Finance, Innovation and Property Advisory Board and Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- 7.10 Finance, Innovation and Property Advisory Board will also review existing Capital Plan (List A) schemes, advising Cabinet of the result. This provides an opportunity to review the budget and progress of existing schemes or even to propose their deferment or deletion.

8 The Capital Plan

- 8.1 The result of the process described in section 7 is the Council's Capital Plan. This is a medium term financial and capital planning document covering a seven-year period (current financial year + six).
- 8.2 Achievement against the Capital Plan is monitored regularly via monthly reports posted on the Council's intranet for use by the Council's staff. At the end of each quarter a statement is considered by the Council's Corporate Management Team and monitoring reports are presented to Members at meetings of the Finance, Innovation and Property Advisory Board.

9 Post Implementation Reviews

- 9.1 It is important that any issues relating to the implementation of a Capital Plan project are addressed as soon as possible; either during the project or shortly after completion. The wider issues of the effectiveness and value for money of a project are addressed through a formal system of post-implementation review. The reviews take place after completion of a project, at a time determined during the evaluation process and are reported to an appropriate Advisory Board. Lessons learnt inform future capital programme decision

making and are part of a system of continuous improvement. Monitoring reports are presented annually to the July meeting of the Finance, Innovation and Property Advisory Board.

Strategy updated: December 2019

TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

15 January 2020

Report of the Director of Central Services

Part 1- Public

Delegated

1 **DOMESTIC ABUSE AND ASSOCIATED BUDGETS**

This scoping report will give an overview of the current work taking place within the borough to tackle domestic abuse and identify potential gaps in services.

1.1 **Domestic Abuse in Tonbridge & Malling**

- 1.1.1 Domestic Abuse is defined as 'any incident or pattern of incidents of controlling, coercive or threatening behaviour, violence or abuse between those aged 16 or over who are or have been intimate partners or family members regardless of gender or sexuality'. Domestic abuse can affect anyone regardless of age, gender or sexuality and may not always involve physical violence.
- 1.1.2 Crime reports show that to the end of September 2019 there were 2,895 calls to the Police from victims of domestic abuse. This is compared to 2,401 for the same period the previous year and 1,914 the year before that. This shows that the amount of domestic abuse incidents reported to the Police is increasing year on year.
- 1.1.3 Tackling domestic abuse involves a number of different partners including the Borough Council, the Community Safety Partnership, Kent Police and others. The Community Safety Partnership has tackling Domestic Abuse as one of its priorities for this year, as have the Local Children's Partnership Group who have an action in place to look at how they can support children who may be affected by domestic abuse. Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council Housing also have a statutory duty to prevent and relieve homelessness and domestic abuse can be one of the main reasons for the loss of settled accommodation.
- 1.1.4 There are already a number of different projects/initiatives already in place in the borough to tackle this issue and partners meet together regularly through a West Kent Domestic Abuse Forum to discuss these and look at actions that may be required.
- 1.1.5 Funding for the work to tackle domestic abuse comes from a number of different sources including the Community Safety Partnership (via the Police and Crime Commissioner), Kent County Council, Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council (through Homelessness Prevention Grants) and charities who work in this sector.

1.1.6 The table below gives details about the work already being carried out in the borough to tackle this issue as well as giving brief details about the funding for this work. Further details about these organisations/initiatives can be given at the Committee meeting if required.

Project/initiative	Description	Funding sources
DAVSS (Domestic Abuse Volunteer Support Service)	Provide face to face support to all victims of domestic abuse across West Kent by using volunteers. From April to September 2019 they received 177 referrals (compared to 131 the same period last year). Also run the DAY programme within schools (around healthy relationships) and provide Support to Court for victims.	A number of different funding sources but the Community Safety Partnership provides £18,000 per annum (as do the CSP's of Tunbridge Wells and Sevenoaks).
Lookahead	Provide support to high risk victims of domestic abuse. Run the Refuge in Tonbridge which provides accommodation for women and their children.	Commissioned and funded by Kent County Council
CDAP (Community Domestic Abuse Perpetrators Programme)	Run a 27 week programme for male perpetrators of domestic abuse in order to change behaviour.	The Community Safety Partnership provides £2,000 per annum (as do other CSPs across West Kent).
One Stop Shop	This is a drop in service held every Wednesday at Clarion offices in Tonbridge. It is supported by Clarion staff as well as DAVSS, Kent Police, TMBC Housing and Lookahead.	Funded by external sources
Freedom Programmes/Recovery Toolkit (Run by Lookahead and DAVSS)	These are programmes for women victims of domestic abuse to help them recognise the signs of domestic abuse and how they can understand what has happened to them.	Some programmes funded through Lookahead. Additional funding for programmes has come via the Community Safety Partnership
MARACs (Multi-agency Risk Assessment Conferences)	These are held on a regular basis to discuss high risk victims of domestic abuse. A variety of agencies attend including Kent Police, TMBC Housing, DAVSS and Lookahead.	Not applicable.
Sanctuary Scheme	This enables households at risk of violence to remain safely in their own homes by installing a place of safety within the home (e.g. a secure telephone line, reinforced doors if required within a particular room in the house etc.)	Funded through TMBC Private Sector Housing
Family Matters	Provide an ISVA service (Independent Sexual Violence Advisor) for victims of sexual violence/assault.	Funded by external sources, including the Police and Crime Commissioner

Protection Against Stalking (PAS)	A charity set up to help victims of stalking. They work across West Kent.	Funded by external sources
Temporary Accommodation for victims of DA (TMBC Housing)	TMBC Housing provide temporary accommodation for victims of domestic abuse	Funded through Housing Benefit primarily but the Council also receives a mixture of funding from NHCLG which includes a prevention grant, New Burdens Funding and Flexible Homeless Support Grant.
Domestic Homicide Reviews	A Domestic Homicide Review is a review of the circumstances in which the death of a person aged 16 or over has or appears to have resulted from violence, abuse or neglect by: a person whom he/she was related or had been in an intimate personal relationship, or; a member of the same household.	Domestic Homicide Reviews are carried out by KCC. The Borough Council contributes to the cost of running these (this year cost £2,100 but this is reviewed each year).

1.2 Identifying good practice and gaps in provision

- 1.2.1 Within the Borough there is good practice that is already underway, including the work of DAVSS who use trained volunteers to provide face to face support to victims of domestic abuse. They currently have 59 trained volunteers in place and believe that the use of volunteers has made a cash equivalent cost saving to agencies of £215,581 (from 1 April 2017 to 30 September 2019). DAVSS were also successful in receiving a VAWG (Violence Against Women and Girls) grant from the Government to tackle domestic abuse and will also be developing a handbook so that other areas of Kent can learn how to set something similar up to the DAVSS system.
- 1.2.2 The CDAP Programme (for perpetrators of domestic abuse) is also leading the way in terms of its work with perpetrators as there are currently only two of these programmes running in Kent (the other is in Folkestone).
- 1.2.3 There is however, always more that can be done to tackle domestic abuse and agencies have previously identified gaps in provision around:
- Support for children of domestic abuse victims
 - The need to encourage male victims and LGBT victims to come forward
 - More work to tackle perpetrators of domestic abuse
- 1.2.4 Agencies working within this field may also have identified additional gaps or needs such as the uncertainty of longer term sustainable funding for their work or the closure of local courts making it more difficult for victims to obtain domestic abuse related orders.

- 1.2.5 Within Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council we recognise the importance of tackling this issue and have previously run training around domestic abuse and cyber-stalking. The Borough Council is also progressing with an application to the White Ribbon Campaign, which aims to encourage men to stand up to violence against women. As part of this we will be reviewing our Domestic Abuse policy to ensure that it is up to date and relevant to all staff.
- 1.2.6 There may be other areas of best practice from around the county that we are not fully aware of that could help us to improve our services. One of these may be the Peabody Housing Association who are members of a Domestic Abuse Housing Alliance. This alliance aims to improve the housing sectors response to domestic abuse and has introduced a set of standards and an accreditation process for housing associations to achieve. This may be something that we might want to look at further to see if it could be something that needs developing locally, although the housing associations within the borough already to work to tackle domestic abuse and do attend the Domestic Abuse Forum.

1.3 Legal Implications

- 1.3.1 The Borough Council has a duty to prevent and relieve homelessness and domestic abuse is one of the main causes of homelessness. The Council also has a duty to provide advisory services and one of the groups identified that we need to target are those who are experiencing domestic abuse.
- 1.3.2 The Council is required to establish, or participate in a Domestic Homicide Review, under the provisions of Section 9 of the Domestic Violence, Crimes and Victims Act 2004. However, KCC currently run the Domestic Homicide Reviews on behalf of the Borough/ District Councils within Kent.

1.4 Financial and Value for Money Considerations

- 1.4.1 Funding for domestic abuse services/support comes from a variety of sources including the Community Safety Partnership, Kent County Council and local charities involved in the sector.
- 1.4.2 There are no proposed increases in costs for the Borough Council.

1.5 Risk Assessment

- 1.5.1 Any reduction in services around domestic abuse would lead to additional increases in reports to the Police, lead to increased costs for the health services, could impact on housing and increase homelessness approaches and would be detrimental to resident's lives.

1.6 Equality Impact Assessment

- 1.6.1 Members are reminded of the requirement, under the Public Sector Equality Duty (section 149 of the Equality Act 2010) to have due regard to (i) eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the

Equality Act 2010, (ii) advance equality of opportunity between people from different groups, and (iii) foster good relations between people from different groups. The decisions recommended through this paper directly impact on end users. The impact has been analysed and does not vary between groups of people.

1.7 Policy Considerations

1.7.1 Community Safety

1.7.2 Housing

1.8 Recommendations:

1.8.1 To invite representatives from organisations tackling domestic abuse in the borough to present to a future Committee in order to provide information about what they do to tackle this issue and whether they can identify any additional needs.

1.8.2 To consider any best practice examples around tackling domestic abuse and any initiatives Members would like us to consider to further improve domestic abuse services

1.8.3 To consider whether there are any additional sources of funding to help support the work around domestic abuse.

Background papers:

Nil

contact: Alison Finch,
Safer & Stronger Communities
Manager

Adrian Stanfield

Director of Central Services and Deputy Chief Executive

This page is intentionally left blank

Any other items which the Chairman decides are urgent due to special circumstances and of which notice has been given to the Chief Executive.

This page is intentionally left blank

The Chairman to move that the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting during consideration of any items the publication of which would disclose exempt information.

**ANY REPORTS APPEARING AFTER THIS PAGE CONTAIN EXEMPT
INFORMATION**

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 13

Any other items which the Chairman decides are urgent due to special circumstances and of which notice has been given to the Chief Executive.

This page is intentionally left blank