New year
New plan

Town and Parish Council Conference - January 2012
Welcome and Introductions

Richard Carr – Chief Executive
Agenda for this evening

- Update on our emerging priorities
  James Jamieson, Leader of the Council

- Feedback on the budget research and proposals
  Maurice Jones, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Resources

- Round table discussions and feedback

- The timetable for setting the budget
Priorities for Central Bedfordshire

Cllr James Jamieson – Leader of the Council
Residents’ perceptions

Proportion of our residents that...

...agree that the council provides **good quality services** overall .......................... 42% +10%
...feel **informed** about the council .................................................................................. 62% +14%
...are **satisfied** with the **council** overall ................................................................. 46% +11%
...are **satisfied** with the **local area** ........................................................................... 81% +6%
...feel the council is **efficient and well run** ......................................................... 22% +6%

Most important in making somewhere a good place to live

- **Level of crime & ASB**: 60% to 58%
- **Health services**: 49% to 43%
- **Clean streets**: 48% to 35%
- **Open space**: 42% to 25%
- **Education**: 37% to 30%

What needs improving?

- **Road & pavement repairs**: 42% to 49%
- **Activities for teenagers**: 43% to 48%
- **Traffic congestion**: 38% to 42%
- **Crime & ASB**: 33% to 38%
- **Job prospects**: 25% to 17%
What do residents see?
The average council tax payer pays circa £1300 Band D a year

Universal services a small part
- Road maintenance ........................... £200
- Waste .......................................... £200
- Libraries .................................... £30
- Leisure centres, community safety etc .. £50
- Planning ...................................... £70
- Education and school transport ........ £170
- Protection of the vulnerable .......... £800
- Debt interest and corporate services... £350

(figures include Government Rate support grant, hence add up to more than £1300)
Priorities

• Value for money
• Enhance Central Bedfordshire as a place (homes/jobs/countryside/safety/culture)
• Improved infrastructure (roads/BB/transport/facilities)
• Quality resident services (bins/leisure/library)
• Promote health and well being and protect the vulnerable
• Improved educational attainment

“A great place to live and work”
Our approach

• “Yes we can!”
• A council you can do business with
• Outcome not input
Three phases of engagement

1. Listening to our stakeholders and residents

2. Consulting on the proposals

3. Communicating the final budget
Where have we got to?

- Understanding the context – financial and other challenges
- Feedback on the budget survey – what is important to our residents
- Our draft budget – what we propose to do
- Your feedback on our budget and new ways of working together
**Financial challenges**

£42m saved since 2009

28% reduction in funding to 2016

0% Council Tax increase for the 2nd year

£40m savings target including

£10.5m savings in 2012/13
Increasing demands
Phase One - Listening

- Residents survey
- Focus groups
- All household survey (News Central & online)
Themes from research

• Clear insight into priority issues
• Bleak expectations – the public don’t anticipate lower tax or improving services
• Pragmatic about new models but some scepticism
• Understand the dilemmas Councils face
• Protect the vulnerable clear theme from workshops
Views on savings options

• Residents expect the range of services we provide to reduce (53%)
• 81% agree savings should come from back office
• Recognition that the choices are difficult

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protect from savings</th>
<th>% selecting this service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roads &amp; pavement repairs</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing crime &amp; ASB</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse collection</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business / jobs</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities for teenagers</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wiling to see savings</th>
<th>% selecting this service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural services</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving town centres</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social housing</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports &amp; leisure facilities</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attitudes to working differently

Residents generally receptive to alternative models as long as they deliver value for money

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Model</th>
<th>% Selecting the Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared services</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town and Parish Councils delivering services</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use more volunteers</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online self-service</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People doing more for themselves</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outsource to a charity or social enterprise</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outsource to private sector</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Providing they keep the standards up I can’t see a problem.

If you do this stuff, you have to make sure it’s giving value for money.

I think they are still wanting to take money from the public - they should look at using the money to generate their own business.
Attitudes to working differently

Residents less receptive to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% selecting the option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change eligibility criteria for some services</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charging/ charging more for some services</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The way they decide whether someone is eligible is already pretty tough though and there are a lot of young carers as well. I don’t know if I would really want to change that.

Fines incense me!

I don’t think they should make it too difficult. If they need the help, they need the help and it should be there.
What is important to our residents?

Matters most:
- Central Bedfordshire as a place
- Council Tax
- Job prospects
- Roads & infrastructure

Less significant:
- How services are delivered
- Cuts in management and support
- Protecting cultural services
So what are we proposing to do?
# A Four Year Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formula Grant</td>
<td>-44.78</td>
<td>-44.38</td>
<td>-41.89</td>
<td>-40.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional C Tax Grant (one-off)</td>
<td>-3.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax</td>
<td>-128.96</td>
<td>-131.27</td>
<td>-132.09</td>
<td>-129.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phased Harmonisation</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Collection Fund Deficit</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding</strong></td>
<td><strong>-179.24</strong></td>
<td><strong>-175.95</strong></td>
<td><strong>-173.48</strong></td>
<td><strong>-169.66</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Base Budget 2011/12</td>
<td>181.27</td>
<td>179.23</td>
<td>175.95</td>
<td>173.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Inflation (estimate)</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressures</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Spend</strong></td>
<td><strong>189.72</strong></td>
<td><strong>187.25</strong></td>
<td><strong>181.95</strong></td>
<td><strong>178.94</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate Efficiencies</td>
<td>-10.49</td>
<td>-10.46</td>
<td>-10.35</td>
<td>-6.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings to be identified</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>-2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Savings</strong></td>
<td><strong>-10.49</strong></td>
<td><strong>-11.30</strong></td>
<td><strong>-8.47</strong></td>
<td><strong>-9.27</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Expenditure/Budget Requirement</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our ambitious and challenging targets

• No Council Tax increase and harmonisation over a two year period
• No impact on service outcomes
• Improved access to service
• Services delivered differently
Investing in our future

Increased spending on the vulnerable in 2012/13
• £3.1m additional in social care for older people and adults with disabilities

Capital investments four year programme
• Schools - £100m
• Extra care schemes - £12m
• Roads maintenance - £32m
• Street lighting - £6m
• Leisure - £8m
Delivering the savings

• Changing the way we work
• Reviewing contracts
• Covering costs and generating income
• New approaches to service delivery
Three phases of engagement

1. Listening to our stakeholders and residents

2. Consulting on the proposals

3. Communicating the final budget
Phase Two - Consulting

- Proactive communication of draft budget options to residents
- Direct communication of draft budget options to all stakeholders
- Consultation with users directly affected by our proposals
Looking Ahead - Devolving Services

• Our ambition - to ensure each service is delivered by the most appropriate council

• Responding to requests for markets, public conveniences, grass cutting, play areas, street lighting, library services

• Future model – proactive approach

• Working closely with T&PCs to focus on delivering services
Your Feedback

Are there any comments or questions you would like to raise about the Council's proposed budget and financial strategy?

How would you like to be engaged in the process of devolving services in the future?
What happens next?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sept/ Oct</th>
<th>Phase One - Listening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15th Nov</td>
<td>Executive to consider market research feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Dec</td>
<td>Executive agree draft budget options</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dec/Jan</th>
<th>Phase Two - Consulting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>Overview and Scrutiny Committees consider budget options and public feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th Jan</td>
<td>Town &amp; Parish Council Conference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 14th Feb | Executive to consider public feedback & decide final budget |
| 23rd Feb | Full Council to agree final budget |

| Feb/ March | Phase Three - Communicating |
Thank You