

AGENDA SUPPLEMENT (1)

Meeting: Cabinet

Place: Kennet Room - County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, BA14 8JN

Date: Tuesday 31 January 2023

Time: 10.00 am

The Agenda for the above meeting was published on 23 January 2023. Additional documents are now available and are attached to this Agenda Supplement.

Please direct any enquiries on this Agenda to Stuart Figini of Democratic Services, County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, direct line 01225 718221 or email stuart.figini@wiltshire.gov.uk

Press enquiries to Communications on direct lines (01225)713114/713115.

This Agenda and all the documents referred to within it are available on the Council's website at www.wiltshire.gov.uk

5 **Public participation and Questions from Councillors (Pages 3 - 22)**

Questions and responses combined document

6 **Wiltshire Council's Budget 2023/24 and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2023/24-2025/26 (Pages 23 - 48)**

- Responses to public questions are detailed in the combined document attached at item 5 above.
- Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee along with questions and answers asked at the meeting on 24 January 2023

DATE OF PUBLICATION: 30 January 2023

This page is intentionally left blank

Wiltshire Council

Cabinet

31 January 2023

Agenda Item 5 – Public Participation and Questions from Councillors

Questions from: Celia Beckett, on behalf of the Hilperton Area Action Group

**To: Cllr Nick Botterill - Cabinet Member for Finance,
Development Management and Strategic Planning**

Question 1 (22-323)

Local Plan Review - In the transport review prepared by Atkins for the Local Plan Review in 2021 it states that:

“the requirement has been identified for a Staverton Bypass to mitigate the impacts of additional traffic at this pinchpoint on the network. (at the river crossing). This scheme, which forms a viaduct across floodplain, is the subject of a development funding bid for Local Levy Fund through Wessex Regional Flood and Coastal Committee”

As the previous land earmarked for a bypass was built on some 20 years ago, this proposed bypass can only partially alleviate the traffic problems in Staverton.

Please can the Council advise us on the outcome of the funding bid and if the plan for this bypass is achievable. If so, how the continuing traffic difficulties would be alleviated both in the immediate term and if the option for development proposed in the Local plan to the NE of Trowbridge in Staverton and Hilperton Marsh goes ahead?

Response

The funding bid was successful. We received £37,662 of local levy funding. This money has been used for further scheme development and to investigate the potential of a partnership scheme with the Environment Agency (EA). Discussions are taking place with EA about whether there is potential for a further funding bid for Flood Defence Grant in Aid.

The traffic issues and constraints through Staverton are acknowledged and will be a significant factor in determining the level and location of planned growth in the area. As part of the Local Plan review, the Council will have to be sure that any associated infrastructure is viable and deliverable.

The Local Plan Review is still being developed. Detailed access and infrastructure improvements required to support proposed allocations will be made available once the draft plan and its evidence is complete. This will be brought to Cabinet and

Council for approval later this year, before it is formally published, and public consultation undertaken.

Question 2 (22-324)

The proposal to build on the Marsh Farm (site 5) will require access roads to and from an unclassified road, which is totally unsuited to a huge increase in volume of traffic.

What infrastructure improvements are planned to overcome the unsuitability of the access to this site?

Response

The Local Plan Review is still being developed. Detailed access and infrastructure improvements required to support proposed allocations will be made available once the draft plan and its evidence is complete. This will be brought to Cabinet and Council for approval later this year, before it is formally published, and public consultation undertaken.

Wiltshire Council

Cabinet

31 January 2023

Agenda Item 5 – Public Participation and Questions from Councillors

Questions from: Kevin Perrett, on behalf of Staverton Parish Council

**To: Cllr Nick Botterill - Cabinet Member for Finance,
Development Management and Strategic Planning**

Question 1 (22-325)

Traffic passing through Staverton has been too much for the local highway infrastructure for many years. In recent times this has been worsened by an increasing volume of traffic, particularly the number of heavy goods vehicles using the B3105 because of weight limits imposed on the Bradford on Avon town bridge and Cleveland Bridge in Bath. The condition of the road is deteriorating further with the B3105 causeway across Staverton meadows in need of re-engineering and other areas breaking up and being beyond temporary repair. The three bridges on the route across the River Avon, railway and canal were not built for such heavy traffic and are vulnerable to ongoing repair. Heavy rain in winter leads to the B3105 and B3106 being closed due to severe flooding. Life for many residents along this route is already intolerable due to vibration and noise from heavy traffic. Additionally pedestrians along the route are in danger from traffic due to the narrow pavement.

Wiltshire Council's proposed development on sites 4 and 5 in Staverton and Hilperton Marsh as part of the Trowbridge Local Plan Review would lead to a huge increase in the number of vehicles using these roads. The additional 2600 homes will increase the traffic and congestion considerably, particularly at peak times with new residents commuting for work or education in west and north Wiltshire, plus further afield to Bath and Bristol.

The proposed construction is on green fields which already flood during heavy rainfall and often remain flooded for many weeks. If construction goes ahead on these fields the excess water will lead to an increased local flood risk.

Can you please advise Staverton Parish Council how the current proposed plan is viable and what additional highways infrastructure construction opportunities have been identified to help Wiltshire Council protect current and future local residents should the plan go ahead for development on sites 4 and 5.

Response

The Local Plan Review is still being developed. In identifying sites for allocation consideration is given to many different factors including flood risk and impacts on roads. The proposed allocations and associated infrastructure requirements will be made available once the draft plan and its evidence, including viability appraisal, is

complete. This will be brought to Cabinet and Council for approval later this year, before it is formally published, and public consultation undertaken.

Wiltshire Council

Cabinet

31 January 2023

Agenda Item 6 – Wiltshire Council's Budget 2023/24 and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2023/24-2025/26

Questions from: Colin Gale - Chairman, Rushall Parish Council

To: Cllr Ashley O'Neill - Cabinet Member for Governance, IT, Broadband, Digital, Licensing, Staffing, Communities and Area Boards

Statement

RE: Town and Parish Council Four-Yearly Election Cycle Costs

References:

- A. Wiltshire Council email Director Legal and Governance/Monitoring Officer dated 9th January 2023
- B. Rushall PC letter of objection dated 29th January 2021.

Rushall Parish Council (RPC) strongly object to Wiltshire Councils declared intent to introduce the recovery of costs from Town and Parish Councils for the local elections starting in May 2025, reference A. This is a resurrection of Wiltshire Councils previous declaration of intent declared in 2021 which was subsequently withdrawn following parish complaints, reference B.

This item is a 'Key Decision', as this change is not financially neutral as there will be a financial reduction to Wiltshire Council, a financial increase to the Town /Parish Councils and new financial costs to Wiltshire Council to invoice and recover the costs from the Town/Parish Councils. RPC would have expected that a decision of this nature would have warranted consultation?

It is not clear from the costs identified in the email how much RPC might be expected to pay for their parish element of the overall elections as there are only indicative costs for uncontested elections and contested elections. It is also highlighted that these indicative costs are subject to inflation when implemented in 2025. The indicative costs are further caveated because of the inability to predict the number of elections that may be held in any 4 year period.

RPC is a small parish and assuming worst case these costs could represent as much as 14% plus of the current parish precept if applied to one year. The email recognizes the financial impact on smaller parishes and the need to smooth the financial impact but Wiltshire Council has let this issue drift for 2 years since the original declaration in January 2021. It should be noted that precept budgets have already been set for 2023/24 by the time this notification was sent by Wiltshire

Council. Offering to smooth the impact post 2025 puts parishes always on the back-foot with respect to planning for subsequent elections.

Question 1 (22-326)

Since this is a 'Key Decision' why has there not been any consultation with the Town, City and Parish Councils and can Wiltshire Council confirm that consultation is a requirement? Also note there has been no discussion/consultation via the Area Boards.

Response

Cabinet is not making a decision in respect of any fees and charges at its meeting on 31 January 2023. It will be determining what will be recommended for Full Council to decide on 21 February 2023.

In any case this decision would not fit the criteria required for a "key" decision, which is as follows:

1. Any decision which would result in the closure of an amenity or total withdrawal of a service;
2. Any restriction of service greater than 5 per cent measured by reference to current expenditure or hours of availability to the public;
3. Any action incurring expenditure or producing savings greater than 20 per cent of budget service areas against which the budget is determined by Full Council;
4. Any decision in accordance with the Council's Financial Regulations (Part 9), involving financial expenditure of £500,000 or above, with the exception of operational expenditure by the Chief Executive identified within the approved budget and policy framework;
5. Any proposal to change the policy framework;
6. Any proposal which would have a significant effect on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more electoral divisions;
7. Any contract (or programme) which:
 - exceeds an annual value of £1 million or the total contract value exceeds £4 million including any optional extension period;
 - involves the transfer of 50 or more employees in or out of the council; or
 - relates to a matter which is commercially, politically sensitive.

It is not considered that the proposal, which would also not come into effect until 2025, would meet those criteria even were it a Cabinet decision. There is no statutory requirement for consultation regarding this recommendation to Council. However, Town, City and Parish councils were briefed via their clerks by the Monitoring Officer in November 2022 and feedback welcomed. The Monitoring Officer subsequently wrote to all councils and invited questions in early January. The

Council has responded to a number of queries on this issue. As the actual decision about the recovery of costs will not be made until February 2025, there remains a significant period of time for additional commentary and amendments to be made if necessary. At this stage the Council is indicating a future years budget decision in the Medium Term Financial Strategy. Although there is no requirement to do so, there is in fact a considerable “consultation” period for parishes to provide comments on the proposal for us to consider.

Question 2 (22-327)

If it is agreed that these charges go ahead, is it not possible to improve on the cost estimates based on small, medium and large parishes to give parishes improved cost estimates?

Response

The cost estimates that we have provided are indicative and follow a fair methodology which should assist with precept setting. We are aware that they may increase due to external costs beyond our control, such as Royal Mail postage, printing costs and premises hire. We also do not know as yet the extent of additional costs which will flow from the introduction of the Elections Act 2022, which introduces requirements, for example, for voter identification. We are more than happy to agree arrangements for the payment of election costs, to smooth the impact and allow appropriate financial planning. This could include extending the time to pay the costs past 2025, to say 2027, if that would be helpful.

Wiltshire Council

Cabinet

31 January 2023

Agenda Item 6 – Wiltshire Council's Budget 2023/24 and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2023/24-2025/26

Questions from: Colin Gale - Vice Chairman Pewsey Community Area Partnership

To: Cllr Caroline Thomas, Cabinet Member for Transport, Street Scene and Flooding

Question 1 (22-328)

A saving proposal line item is identified to 'Maximise use of Rural Mobility Fund' with savings identified in 3 years. There is no further detail explaining this saving etc. The Rural Mobility Fund is a Government grant that has been awarded for Demand Responsive Transport in the Pewsey Community Area. Please can an explanation and details be provided for these proposed savings?

Response

By expanding the geographical area for the proposed DRT scheme using the RMT funds, Wiltshire Council can replace a more traditional bus service with a DRT operation and therefore secure a saving.

Wiltshire Council

Cabinet

31 January 2023

Agenda Item 5 – Public Participation and Questions from Councillors

Questions from: Dr Jimmy Walker

To: Cllr Caroline Thomas Cabinet Member for Transport, Street Scene and Flooding

Statement

I would like to congratulate Cllr Thomas on her appointment to the position of Portfolio Holder for Transport and thank her for her work on campaigning for cycleways in her local constituency.

May I also congratulate Wiltshire Council who, along with representatives of South Western Railway (SWR), Wiltshire College and University Centre and Co Bikes were at Salisbury station to launch the station's new cycle hub, which is the first phase of forecourt improvements part-funded by SWR through their Customer and Communities Improvement Fund.

It is fantastic news that SWR is working to increase sustainable onward travel options at its stations and this new £360,000 addition to the station is an example of the growing number of convenient green options for transport across the SWR network, especially in the West of England.

Working to offer opportunities for imaginative partnerships that can help to reduce the number of unnecessary car journeys is important to Wiltshire Council and SWR and so we are delighted pleased that Wiltshire College and University Centre plan to instal a Co Bikes docking station at its Salisbury Campus to improve the green travel offer for students and staff arriving at the station.

Such a facility at Salisbury station will provide major benefits for active travel to and from the station.

We hope that the first of many ebike hubs across Salisbury and the surrounding area to link up with the station as the bikes can only be left at an ebike charging hub.

Ebikes offer users the opportunity to travel faster and further than they would normally. Many cities are finding that ebikes are offering a choice to car users to leave the car at home as the bike provides a time and cost effective alternative to the motor car.

At a time when the cost of living is impacting on all of us encouraging residents to take up active travel modes including walking and cycling can provide cost effective travel options for distance of 5-10km. Ebikes provide an ability to extend this distance from 10-20km enabling outlying residents to gain entry to our cities.

Fundamentally this is about increasing footfall in the city centres, which translates into more people and increased income for our traders.

Question 1 (22-329)

What plans do Wiltshire Council have to implement additional ebike hubs in the city and where and when will these be implemented?

Response

The initial plan is to purchase 30 bikes and install 3 additional e-bike hubs in the city centre. The timescale will depend on securing government funding to implement the scheme.

Question 2 (22-330)

Many cities have demonstrated that student populations favour using bikes for transport and therefore it is very encouraging that Wiltshire College and University Centre are planning to install a Co Bikes docking station at its Salisbury Campus. That will make two co-bikes docking stations in the city.

What route will you be advising students to take between the campus and the railway station?

Response

The LCWIP sets out a network of walking and cycle routes that will allow pedestrians and cyclists to travel safely around Salisbury. However, the plan has yet to be delivered and the proposed walking and cycle routes that connect key hubs and destinations are not yet all on the ground. The LCWIP for Salisbury will enable the council to bid for funding to deliver the cycling infrastructure that is needed to implement the LCWIP.

As it currently stands the advised route would be:

- Cross A36 via the existing signalled controlled facility outside of the campus
- Through Churchill Gardens (existing shared use path)
- St Nicholas Road (quiet street)
- De Vaux Place (quiet street)
- Salisbury Cathedral Close (low traffic area subject to nominal 10mph speed limit)
- High Street (within the Salisbury City Centre 20mph Zone – 20mph speed limits are considered cycle friendly)
- Crane Street, Crane Bridge Road, Mill Road (all within the Salisbury City Centre 20mph Zone and subject to traffic calming features)
- Join the recently constructed shared use path running between Mill Road and the entrance to the Railway Station.

This route outlined above could be undertaken in reverse to travel to the campus.

Question 3 (22-331)

What plans do you have in the LCWIP to ensure safe cycle routes are provided and built to LTN1/20 standards between the campus and the railway station.

Response

The LCWIP sets out the routes where there is a high propensity for walking and cycling, and, where possible, identifies a tentative scheme solution and a basic cost

estimate. However, it is necessary to undertake engineering design work to identify the required LTN1/20 compliant infrastructure for each route. It is hoped that the council will secure funding from Active Travel Fund Tranche 4 (ATF4) to enable this to be done.

Question 4 (22-332)

Active Travel England will make several ambitious announcements this year to give people more choices in how they travel. The first of these announcements was the allocation of a £32.9 Million Capability Fund to train experts to deliver on the Department for Transport's pledge to increase the number of people walking and cycling.

Can Cllr Thomas clarify whether Wiltshire council were awarded any funding from the capability fund or whether Wiltshire council once again failed to attract funding to the detriment of our residents and town centres?

Response

The council has been awarded £183,110 from Active Travel England's Capability Fund.

Question 5 (22-333)

Our streets are used by everyone, so they should be designed with everyone in mind, particularly with pedestrians as the highest priority followed by those that cycle and then those that use public transport.

Thus far Wiltshire Council have failed to attract any monies from Active Travel England and in fact WC were awarded £0.00 in tranche 3 of the ATE funding. In comparison to many other councils WC is beginning to look like an outlier in its failure to take a positive approach to active travel.

It is likely that Tranche 4 bids will be due at the end of February 2023 and this provides an opportunity for WC to bid for and be allocated £Millions for investment in our towns and city for walking and cycling infrastructure built to LTN 1/20 standards.

Can Cllr Thomas provide Wiltshire residents with the assurance that she is committed to applying for funding from Active Travel England Tranche 4 funds to ensure that Wiltshire Council achieves its ambitions to reduce congestion, pollution and provide safe infrastructure to enable greater number of residents to walk and cycle for everyday journeys within our cities.

Response

Yes, the council will be applying to Active Travel England for funding from Tranche 4 of the Active Travel Fund (ATF4).

Wiltshire Council

Cabinet

31 January 2023

Agenda Item 5 – Public Participation and Questions from Councillors

Questions from: Cllr David Vigar, Trowbridge Grove

To: Cllr Richard Clewer Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Military-Civilian Integration, Heritage, Arts, Tourism, Health and Wellbeing

Status of Homes for Ukraine programme in Wiltshire

Question 1 (22-334)

How many Ukrainian individuals and families are now living in Wiltshire under the Homes for Ukraine programme?

Response

“living in Wiltshire under the Homes for Ukraine programme” means guests who are living with sponsors and not in independent accommodation, there are 820 individuals in 358 family units in sponsor households in Wiltshire.

Question 2 (22-335)

How many Wiltshire sponsors have ended their hosting arrangements?

Response

We do not specifically record sponsors who have ended their hosting arrangements, we record guests who have left sponsor households, which does include those whose sponsor did not explicitly end the arrangement. 503 individuals in 231 family units are no longer in sponsorship arrangements.

Question 3 (22-336)

How many Ukrainian households have been found new hosts by Wiltshire Council following the end of a sponsorship?

Response

107 individuals in 53 family units have been found new hosts.

Question 4 (22-337)

How many Ukrainian households are now being accommodated by the Council after becoming homeless?

Response

2

Question 5 (22-338)

Does the Council know how many Ukrainian households have progressed from a sponsorship into rented accommodation in Wiltshire?

Response

281 individuals in 122 family units have progressed into rented accommodation in Wiltshire.

Question 6 (22-339)

How many Ukrainian families have benefitted from the WiltsLet programme to guarantee deposits and pay one month's rent in advance?

Response

There were 7 families who were threatened with homelessness and who secured funding through the wilts let scheme as they had no savings.

Question 7 (22-340)

How much has the Council now received from central Government as a result of the 'tariff' payments of £10,500 per Ukrainian?

Response

We have received to date £11.459m from central government as at the end Dec 2022.

Question 8 (22-341)

How much of that tariff funding has been spent?

Response: As at the end of December £1.821m has been spent. There is further spend expected and committed for 2022/23 and also for 2023/24, as government have confirmed the monies can be rolled forward into the next financial year. The funding is ring-fenced and it is assumed that any unspent monies will be repaid to the minister.

Support for private rentals by Ukrainians

Question 9 (22-342)

Has the Council recruited the dedicated worker to work with sponsors and Ukrainian families on the options available in the private rented sector as planned?

Response

This post has been advertised 4 times but sadly the post has not attracted any suitable candidates. The post is now on an ongoing advert until December 2023.

Question 10 (22-343)

One Homes for Ukraine sponsor said: "I think that the main issue that the Council needs to face up to is producing a plan to pilot our guests on to moving into rented accommodation near to the schools that their children are attending. This way they can look forward to starting an independent life when they feel ready for it." Do you agree?

Response

No.

Question 11 (22-344)

Many Ukrainians are now seeking to move into rented property but in some cases will not have sufficient income as owners typically require tenants to earn 2.5 times their rent - which is £2,500 per month when renting an average two-bedroom home in Wiltshire for around £1,000. However, when wages, Universal Credit, including the housing payment, and child benefit are taken into account, families may have income that comes very close to the required level. Using £1m alone of the tariff funding to provide rent support payments averaging £250 per month or £3,000 per year might enable more than 300 Ukrainian households to afford a private rental and achieve independent living for a year – with no delay – and alongside other uses of the funding. Does this not provide a timely way to use some of the tariff funding to assist a significant number of the refugees that it is intended to help?

Response

No, it creates a short term solution but a much bigger longer term problem.

Question 12 (22-345)

Given hosts are paid a £350 'thank you' payment per month by the Government, rising to £500 after one year, would you consider using the tariff funding to make a £350 per month 'thank you' payment to property owners who rent properties to Ukrainian families as an alternative means of supporting rentals?

Response

No.

Question 13 (22-346)

Will the Council act as a guarantor for Ukrainian families' rentals? If not, can you please explain why?

Response

Wiltshire Council is exploring the legalities and logistics to understand if this is viable. However, updated guidance has recently been published relating to this area so we are reviewing this guidance and will develop plans as appropriate.

Question 14 (22-347)

Has the Council made any Discretionary Housing Payments to Ukrainian households?

Response

DHP does not record applicants' nationality.

Question 15 (22-348)

Does the Council regard the Discretionary Housing Payments as a potential route for Ukrainian families to gain help with short-term rental costs?

Response

Only if they are receipt of the housing element of universal credit and meet other criteria.

Support for Ukrainians seeking work

Question 16 (22-349)

For many Ukrainians, a key barrier to earning sufficient money to rent a property is finding jobs that use their qualifications and experience but can also be performed with their level of English language competence. Professional careers guidance can help them identify opportunities. However, I understand that neither the Building Bridges service nor Work Wiltshire are currently taking on new adult referrals. In November you suggested that the Council might consider employing a dedicated case worker to help with employment. Given the importance of the issue, are you going ahead with this recruitment?

Response

Community First Lead on Building Bridges and additional funding has been secured to continue the programme from April 2023. They are still taking registrations of

interest through their website, although direct delivery to participants is not taking place currently.

Work Wiltshire has not previously delivered careers education information advice and guidance to adults, but FACL (Family and Community Learning) provide this as part of their adult learning courses which includes ESOL and employability. The Post 16 Participation Team continue to support any 16-18 (yrs 12/13) from Ukraine as part of their business-as-usual support to those Not in Employment Education Training and track that cohort.

From a Wiltshire Council perspective, no decision has been made to recruit a dedicated case worker to support with recruitment.

Question 17 (22-350)

How is the council making use of its network and influence in the business community to help find employment for the refugees?

Response

Wiltshire Council is currently exploring how to best support guests into suitable employment. The Family and Community Learning team have developed ESOL courses to support our learners to develop the language skills that they need for work, life and further study. Our ESOL courses embed employability skills, with our beginner-level Life in the UK course supporting learners to develop the communication skills for living in the UK, such as using public transport, accessing health services and looking for work. These English skills are developed further through our online intermediate and higher courses – our higher course has a particular focus on the spoken and written English skills needed for the workplace. We also offer courses which develop specific employability skills such as supporting learning in schools with our Working in Schools course, as well as Customer Service and Food Safety courses planned in conjunction with the Job Centre Plus.

Counselling

Question 18 (22-351)

Ukrainians appreciate the services being provided by the Council's H4U team, such as English lessons and placement support. Is it possible also to consider funding some counselling to meet the mental health needs of guests? These needs arise from issues such as: direct experience of the war; ongoing anxiety over friends and family in Ukraine; and challenges faced by children and teenagers in adjusting to life in a new country. Hosts have reported that this is a growing problem as the war extends and becomes more attritional. It is beyond the competence of typical sponsors to address this area of need and they would welcome a "one stop" source of counselling support.

Response

We work closely with our partners, and we are currently exploring what provision may be appropriate.

Purchase of homes for Ukrainians**Question 19 (22-352)**

How many homes have been bought for use by Ukrainian refugees by the Stone Circle Housing Company?

Response

Stone Circle are acquiring homes as per their approved Business Plan. The Council are funding some of the acquisitions through an application of the Homes for Ukraine funding. The council also has nomination rights and therefore has the ability to place families in those homes. Currently no Ukrainian families have been placed in Stone Circle homes.

Question 20 (22-353)

Do you have an estimate of how many homes will be bought by Stone Circle for Ukrainians and by when?

Response

The Council is awaiting the submission of Stone Circle's business plan for 2023/24, within that there is an expectation of setting out how many homes will be acquired through the application and use of the Homes for Ukrainian funding.

Question 21 (22-354)

Will they be used as emergency accommodation, where families pay no rent?

Response

No.

Question 22 (22-355)

Is it intended that the homes bought by Stone Circle for use by Ukrainian households will be more affordable than those in the private sector?

Response

Yes.

Question 23 (22-356)

Can you indicate the level of rent that Stone Circle will charge as a percentage of the market level?

Response

The level of rent will be commensurate with the financial parameters that Stone Circle submit within their business plan. The current business plan assumes rent at Local Housing Allowance plus 10%.

Question 24 (22-357)

Do you expect homes to be bought by Stone Circle to be spread across Wiltshire or concentrated in major settlements such as Chippenham, Trowbridge and Salisbury? If the latter, will their use not lead to children having to change school?

Response

This detail will be contained in the Stone Circle business plan submission but will be predicated on market forces and availability. The request was to acquire homes across the County.

Question 25 (22-358)

If, as you suggested in November, £5m of the tariff funding were to be used to support the purchase of £25m worth of homes, then assuming an average price of £200,000, 125 homes might be bought, providing accommodation for 125 Ukrainian households. However, as of November there were more than 300 Ukrainian families in Wiltshire. Do you agree that the policy of buying homes for Ukrainians can therefore only benefit a minority of the refugees in the county, and only deliver a benefit once they have been purchased? If you do not believe this is the case, can you please explain the reasoning?

Response

Many Ukrainians will be able to secure private rental accommodation without additional support. We need to provide support to those who are not able to access this.

Question 26 (22-359)

Doesn't spending such a large share of the tariff in this way imply an over-optimistic assumption that most Ukrainians will not need any form of housing support, while a minority enjoy bespoke social housing?

Response

No

Question 27 (22-360)

Do you agree that using the money provided by central Government to buy property will over the long-term be likely to benefit more non-Ukrainians than Ukrainians unless a large number of refugees choose both to remain the UK and seek citizenship and to remain in rented property?

Response

No.

This page is intentionally left blank

**APPENDIX to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee Minutes of 24
January 2023
Wiltshire Council**

Cabinet 31 January 2023

Council 21 February 2023

**Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee on the Draft Budget
2023/24 and Medium-Term Financial Strategy 2023/24 2025/26**

Purpose of report

1. To report to Full Council a summary of the main issues discussed at the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee held on 24 January 2023.

Background

2. The meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee provides an opportunity for non-executive councillors to question the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Finance and the Chief Executive with the Corporate Director of Resources and Deputy Chief Executive (S151 Officer) on the draft 2023-24 budget and Medium-Term Financial Strategy before it is considered at Cabinet on 31 January 2023 and Full Council on 21 February 2023.
3. The Cabinet Member for Finance, Councillor Nick Botterill, supported by the Corporate Director of Resources and Deputy Chief Executive (S151 Officer), Andy Brown was in attendance along with the Leader of the Council, Councillor Richard Clewer and the Chief Executive, Terence Herbert to provide clarification and answers to issues and queries raised by the Committee.
4. In addition to the Draft Budget 2023/24 and Medium-Term Financial Strategy made available on the Council's website on 23 January 2023 and other public events, a briefing had been provided for the Financial Planning Task Group on 19 January 2023, open to all elected Members, to explain the budget and for technical questions to be answered.
5. Details had included:
 - The net general fund budget of 2023/2024 was proposed as £465.372m.
 - Council Tax requirement for the Council be set at £332.187m for 2023/24 with a Band D charge of £1,719.90, an increase of £1.57 per week; which would be a 2.99% general increase plus a levy of 2% to be spent solely on Adult Social Care.
 - The Housing Revenue Account (HRA) budget for 2023/2024 was proposed as £26.401m.
 - A 7% increase for social dwelling rents and a 5% increase in all service charges related to the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) to cover costs and garage rents.

APPENDIX to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee Minutes of 24 January 2023

Main issues raised during questioning and debate

6. This report is divided into sections relating to each of the Select Committee areas as budget proposals and impacts on services were discussed, before opening up to general queries.
7. Attached to this report is a document setting out the questions raised by each Select Committee, with written answers provided by officers.

Financial Planning Task Group

8. The report of the Financial Planning Task Group on the budget proposals was received. The report and its comments would be forwarded for attention at Cabinet and Full Council along with the report of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee itself.

Children's Select Committee

9. In relation to charging and academies and Council investment, it was outlined that the Council has some additional statutory duties in education welfare, which would not be funded from central government and therefore the Council would need to invest to cover demand.
10. Further information was requested around latent demand, with it clarified that the total to be drawn down from the latent demand reserve relating to children's services would be £2.8million over the years 2023/24 through to 2025/26.
11. Regarding the High Needs Block, it was noted that the Overview and Scrutiny Management had a task group on this, with a range of strategies in place to address issues including Delivering Better Value programme with the DfE. Up to £1.6million from the Council transformation reserve has been agreed to be used over 3 years to support this area as well with a government grant of an estimated £1million to be available under the DfE's Delivering Better Value (DBV) programme.
12. Clarification was sought as to whether reductions in spend, such as for Early Years support in settings and schools, represent a reduction to services and the minimum statutory service. It was noted that there has been dialogue to shift work towards early prevention in SEND and that the Council would continue to provide statutory duties but would not necessarily be able to deliver the same level with reduced spend. It would therefore be important to monitor demand. Additionally, grant funding would be used such as the supporting families grant to continue to meet targets and maximise output.
13. Clarity was provided regarding the overspend within Quarter 2 for Children Services, with it noted that SEND transport, issues identifying contractors and the cost of fuel had pushed up costs as well as having to place children into higher cost placements than required for their need due to availability.

APPENDIX to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee Minutes of 24 January 2023

14. It was clarified that the capital budget had not been reduced in comparison to previous years, and external factors were impacting on capital spend such as the availability of contractors and confidence of delivery.
15. It was questioned whether revenue would be freed up within the budget due to the anticipated reduction in capital spend, to which it was stated that re-profiling had taken place to reflect delivery and costs and the revenue impact also reprofiled.
16. In relation to year 2 of the MTFs, it was questioned why there would be extra costs involved in the budget when there would be less work taking place, to which it was clarified that the timing of borrowing is an important factor with borrowing assumed to take place at the end of financial years and any slippage having an impact in future years.
17. It was highlighted that there had not been a reduction to the maintenance budget of schools and that this would be spent within this year's allocated budget.
18. It was questioned whether a Council joined up approach to the cost of living would provide savings, with it noted that the Council would be utilising existing Council owned spaces as well existing staff and this was joined up.
19. It was questioned whether the Dedicated Schools Grant would always come from the government, with it noted that the Department for Education would likely move away from local authority and school forum control and that the grant would be unlikely to move to local authority control.
20. Regarding Whole Life Pathway, it was stated that the Council was looking to make savings based on different commissioning strategies as well as looking to move away from using higher cost placements.
21. Clarity was sought on the "badging" of grants, with it noted that the grants for supporting families, unaccompanied asylum seeking children and domestic abuse grants were being used differently. The Council has used the grants to help fund staffing in line with grant conditions.
22. Regarding staffing and caseloads, it was clarified that there would be a drive on decreasing vacancy rates and ensuring that those on roll were permanent rather than agency staff, which costs more.
23. The sale of Hayburn Wyke was clarified, with the Council needing a smaller and more conventional property to meet needs, with Stonecircle identified as a potential option and saving for the Council.
24. Clarification was provided around the increased cost of SGOs as there was a planned inflation increase of 4.5%.

APPENDIX to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee Minutes of 24 January 2023

25. Clarity was provided in relation to children's homes, with it noted that the budget would include the purchase of two properties and the refurbishment of a third property.

Health Select Committee

26. Clarity was sought regarding care savings, with it noted that the Care Act allows the Council to consider the best value as a local authority when considering individuals care and support needs. Needs assessments take place with individuals and their families to identify what care can be provided with the resources available. Additionally, the Council is looking to make savings through reduced reliance on traditional care homes and domiciliary care type provision.
27. It was noted that the £1million saving identified through client contributions happens each year and was not a change but rather a result of inflationary changes.
28. Regarding savings that had been identified as undeliverable in Quarters 1 and 2, it was stated that though the social care market was volatile, savings could potentially be made as part of a transformation programme, which would focus on diversifying the care market and collaborating more with voluntary and community provisions for greater sustainability. It was suggested that savings would be developed through efficiencies in processes, such as maximising block contracts.
29. It was stated that Shared Lives would have capacity for better value and that where the Council uses Shared Lives more than other provisions, it is a lower cost. It was stated that the service had some recent investment and was sufficient at this time to increase capacity so therefore recruitment was looking to take place with a view to Shared Lives supporting other functions such as hospital discharge.
30. Regarding Adult Care Transformation, it was stated that total savings from the programme would be investigated within the coming weeks.
31. It was questioned whether there was confidence that there would be a Social Care Reform following the Social Care Levy after the next 2 financial years, to which it was stated that this was unlikely. It was stated we are working towards reforms taking place in 2025 as indicated by government.
32. Regarding joint funding policy implementation with the ICB, it was suggested that such savings would be dependent on further work.
33. It was questioned where there would be a production of a new and improved Better Care Plan, to which it was stated that the Better Care Plan is being reviewed and as several schemes had been commissioned 5-years ago and after the pandemic the use of that funding had changed and there would now be a need to refocus to maintain individuals living in their homes as much as possible.
34. Questions were raised regarding technology-enabled care (TEC), recruitment, and assumptions of how TEC will contribute to savings. It was clarified that this was a new

APPENDIX to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee Minutes of 24 January 2023

area for the Council and that there had been some success recruiting to key posts and that savings assumptions had been made based on the evaluation of using tech in small packages of care.

35. Clarity was sought regarding pay increases and inflation, with it noted that for 2022/23 the pay award had been an average of 6.6% increase in overall pay and that in 2023/24 the pay award increase in budget is estimated 4.5% increase on pay, with the following 2 years after being 2.5%. It was outlined that the Bank of England November 2022 monetary policy report had been used to estimate contractual inflation linked to CPI, with inflation set to decline over the calendar year of 2023 to be at 2% in December 2023, having dropped from its current level of 10.5%.

Environment Select Committee

36. Clarity was sought on whether the leisure income growth, which had been set at £1.55m over the MTFS period, could be achieved; to which it was clarified that a stretch target had been set for place services, which had been noted within the risk assessment. The base budget had been stretched to meet a further demand and income target as well as a growth in fees, charges and usage. Reference was made to a current case with Chelmsford Borough Council, which if successful would see a VAT gain received by the Council.
37. Regarding changes to household recycling centre opening times, it had been identified that attendance during the final hour of operation had been minimal and that there would be an increase in the budget for fly-tipping prevention work.
38. Regarding inflationary pressures factored into the Street Scene contract awarded in March 2022, it was clarified that though this contract had been awarded prior to inflation, standard NEC4 contract terms had been applied to use standard indices to calculate inflation which would then be automatically applied on an annual basis.
39. In relation to reductions to Street Scene provision to “statutory levels”, it was clarified that the following four key areas for savings had been identified: Reductions in litter bin emptying, statutory responding to street cleansing and litter complaints, play areas would continue under current delegation to Parish and Town Councils, reducing the frequency of grass cutting moving to a reactionary service driven on reports.
40. Clarification was sought in relation to savings proposals for re-patterning and reducing bus services, to which clarity was provided that all routes across networks would be assessed and any cessation would be based on usage and alternatives available.

General Queries

41. Clarity was sought on whether savings would be achieved through the implementation of the Evolve Programme (Oracle system) and if this had not been included within the budget, how would current difficulties affect the MTFS. It was stated that no savings had been predicated on the implementation of the Oracle System, though conversations had taken place with core services and directors to discuss the required

APPENDIX to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee Minutes of 24 January 2023

structures needed. Additionally, such services had identified savings, but these would not be realised until the specification had been signed off and the benefits mapped out before being crystallised into the budget. A decision had been made not to include any potential Evolve Programme savings in the budget until further clarity and delivery confidence had been gained.

42. It was questioned where in the budget was the money allocated from supporting Ukrainian refugees and whether any unspent amount would be liable for return to central government. It was clarified that this had not been included as part of the net-based budget as it is funded by grant from government. The Council was looking to utilise the grant to acquire homes to house Ukrainian families and any unspent grant is assumed to be returnable to government.
43. It was questioned how the Council would be maintaining staff motivation and retention, to which it was clarified that from a transformation perspective a reserve had been established to undertake such projects without using existing budgets. The example of the Evolve Programme was cited, where staff had been moved with their roles backfilled whilst they then gained expertise of a new system with plans for knowledge transfers to take place to develop others. Savings would be made through the removal of vacant posts, with work also having been undertaken by HR to benchmark salaries and ensure that the Council is competitive with neighbouring organisations. Health and Wellbeing had also been identified as a top priority for the Council, with activity taking place such as staff health checks.
44. A further question was asked in relation to staffing, with concern raised that the removal of posts could lead to front line workers potentially having to conduct back-office tasks to keep services running. It was clarified that assessments had been undertaken by Heads of Services and Directors when setting proposals to identify the right vacant posts to be removed and how this would impact on service delivery. The total number of removed posts in the context of all the proposed savings and the overall workforce would be minimal.

Conclusion

45. To note the Draft Wiltshire Council budget for 2023-24 and Medium-Term Financial Strategy for 2023-24 to 2025-26 and to refer the comments of the Committee and the report of the Financial Planning Task Group to Cabinet and Full Council for consideration on 31st January and 21st February respectively.
46. To support the Financial Planning Task Group's ongoing monitoring of the delivery of the budget and the development of the budget for 2024-25.

Councillor Graham Wright Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

Report Author: Ben Fielding, Senior Democratic Services Officer, 01225 718504 or Benjamin.fielding@wiltshire.gov.uk

**APPENDIX to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee Minutes of 24
January 2023**

Report Date: 27 January 2023

This page is intentionally left blank

Budget 2023/24 and MTFs 2023/24 – 2025/26 – Scrutiny Select Committee questions and responses

Questions on the budget following the informal meeting of the Children's Select Committee on 19 January 2023

This document also includes questions submitted by email or in conversations by members of the Children's Select Committee.

Please note that the page numbers refer to the Budget Paper as considered by the committee on 19 January which can be accessed on:

<https://cms.wiltshire.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1160&MIId=15027&Ver=4>

Q1 - On page 13, paragraphs 40 & 41, investment of £0.3m (ceasing of charging academies – White Paper) and savings planned of £0.3m (school effectiveness) are planned. Does WC ever not go ahead with an investment because it needs to be covered by savings?

The two are separate;

- Investment - the statutory duties around education welfare are changing which mean two things, 1. Increased levels of service to ALL schools (both maintained and academies); meaning additional staff are required, and 2. Equity of service to ALL schools which means trading with academies is no longer possible.
- Investment - the savings are in school improvement where the new Head of Service is introducing a new model with both improvement and efficiencies.

Q2 - Latent demand When questions have been asked at Children's Select Committee we have been told that the latent demand had not been seen / felt, or at least not at the levels originally anticipated. [Cllr Helen Belcher] Furthermore, with our Children subject to a Child Protection Plan, Children currently looked after and Children In Need figures still at such low levels (which can be seen as good news and evidence of the impact of our early help work), **Q** what is the rationale behind the estimated latent demand of £1m for Children's Social Care which will be funded from a drawdown from the latent demand reserve? (page 14, paragraph 50)

Page 60 - Latent demand earmarked reserve

Education and Skills – Inclusion and Send £0.117

This comprises two elements, fixed term contracts for a S19 (alternative provision) enquiry officer and two additional education welfare officers to support learners in alternative provision where they are unable to attend school full time. The pandemic has impacted many learners' school attendance and it is imperative that these children can access learning and where possible, return to mainstream school.

Families and Children – social care placements £0.926

The placement sufficiency challenges mean the unit cost per placement of our children in care has increased, so whilst our children in care numbers have not risen significantly; the cost of each placement This is much higher.

Families and children – families and children - £0.197

Reflective of the increased volume of contacts into our Integrated Front Door at an Early Help level; additional capacity in our Early Support Hub along with increased capacity in our support service is required.

An increase in care experienced young people requiring the support of Personal Advisors (PA) means a need for increased capacity within our PAs.

Paragraph 106 - £4.7m to be drawn down from the latent demand reserve over the MTFs (only £0.3m used in 2022/23)

106. The latent demand reserve is being held to specifically mitigate any unquantified risks facing the authority on social care, particularly children's social care. £0.3m is being drawn down from the reserve in 2022/23 and a further £4.7m is planned to be utilised over the MTFs to offset increased costs in Children's Social Care, Planning and Adult Social Care.

Q – what is actually the total to be drawn down from latent demand reserve relating to children's services?

£2.8m across 2022-23 to 2025-26 financial years for children's services.

Q3 - Page 27, paragraph 125. Is this the first school in Wiltshire with "mental health" in its title? What happened to children with MH needs in the past and were they moved to other specialist units?

The needs being addressed with this provision are SEMH – social, emotional mental health needs. Children's needs can vary and therefore a range of services are required from support in a mainstream classroom, to an independent placement. The gap analysis identified the primary need as SEMH. This describes the type of provision but will not be the name of the provision.

Q4 – Page 30, paragraph 145 – High Needs Block

We understand that Wiltshire has been historically underfunded in this area and it is anticipated that demand and needs will keep growing. Are we confident that the £2.9m drawdown from the DSG reserve will be enough to support a focus on early help and prevention, knowing the backlog in meeting current demand?

With the difficulties in recruitment experienced across the sector are we confident we have / will have the right people in place to deliver our planned early help and prevention?

There are a range of strategies being applied to address the issues in this area;

1. Involvement in the DfE's Delivering Better Value Programme which itself, attracts a grant (estimated at £1m)
2. Directing the 2023/24 "additional" HNB grant to support early help and prevention"
3. Use of the Council's transformation reserve (£1.6m over 3 years)
4. Cabinet Investment of £0.8m over the MTFs period to recruit and retain additional education psychologists (EP) SEND and case workers.

5. Focussed use of the early years block of DSG to recruit EY intervention workers and other training and resources to ensure that our youngest children with emerging needs can access support when they need it.

With regard to recruitment difficulties, we are in the process of re-grading the Educational Psychologists (EPs) in an attempt to both retain and attract them, however, there are insufficient numbers of EPs nationally and so this will be a challenge. Roughly 260 EPs qualify nationally each year (number fluctuates a little +/- 10%). There are around the same number of LAs and LAS in general do not feel that they have enough EP capacity. The gender and age profile mixed into this creates a significant supply and demand problem which shows little sign of abating. Many EPs chose to work PT for LAs now and undertake private work for the remainder.

We have restructured the team to appoint assistant EPs who are able to support early years children and allow EPs to focus on statutory school age children.

COMMENT - Pleased to see the proposed increase in budget for Care Leavers' numbers and setting up home allowance, as well as investment to secure recruitment and retention of social workers (page 58, appendix 1, annex 3 – detail by service on Prior Year Budget Changes and annex 4 – detail by service on Cabinet investment).

Q5 - Where is the evidence that reductions in the spend, such as the Early Years Support for settings and schools, do not represent a reduction to delivering the bare minimum statutory service but instead are the benefits of restructuring spend with improved outcomes?

The statutory duties will continue to be delivered in full. The resource will focus on the settings that need most support, this will improve outcomes in these settings.

(as detailed on Page 65 of the budget report – Appendix 1, Annex 7 – detail by service on Savings Proposals - Education and skills – Review of Early Years support for settings and schools with a focus on prioritising statutory work)

Q6 - In the 2022/23 budget Education & Skills had an overspend of 1.783m in Q1, reducing it to £0.976 in Q2. Similarly, Family & Children Services had an underspend in Q1 of £1.178m then an overspend of £0.173 in Q2. I think we are still waiting for Q3 figures, but this just shows the real variation in costs within a years' budget, of which there are many causes.

Q – Is the 2023/24 budget going to be more resilient to these fluctuations and do we know the cause for these significant variations for last year? Are they likely to happen again?

The Education & Skills overspend related to SEN transport. New specialist places have been difficult to negotiate with schools and we are awaiting building contractors' availability and other new DfE schemes have been delayed such as the 150 place Free School. As soon as these changes are known, they are fed into the transport route planner. However, the market is nationally and locally challenging and we are vulnerable to the limited and volatile market. There are several schemes for 2023/24 exploring cost efficient routes however, the length of time spent travelling to school and the mix of children on transport is a deciding factor. Key to this is

establishing quality local provision in mainstream schools. The economic situation, rising fuel and taxi / coach driver recruitment issues have not been resolved and therefore challenges in forecasting costs continue.

The Families & Children's position changed significantly over the summer as residential placements for children were required. A placement sufficiency strategy is in place to tackle this local and national challenge. In addition, providers felt the impact of the economic situation and workforce wage increases; we ourselves, provided an uplift to 4.5% (against a budgeted 2%) to foster carers to retain placements in challenging economic times.

Q7 - The pay award for last year is not yet settled and then there is this year's negotiations (starting in April I think). When it is settled, there will potentially be considerable backpay to come out of the budget. With the economy still very unsettled, are we confident that the budget proposals are robust enough to cover future pay settlements?

The pay award for 2022/23 was agreed with a flat rate payment of £1,925 with effect from 1 April 2022, which equated to an average across the whole council as a 6.6% increase overall. An estimated increase of 4.5% is included for 2023/24 with the following 2 years estimated at 2.5%. This is higher than the Bank of England inflation forecasts and is considered adequate, but risk remains that this might not be sufficient. This risk is noted in the S25 report on the robustness of budget estimates.

Q8 - Has Education & Skills or Children & Families lost any core grants in the 23/24 budget that they had previously? If so - how will the council "compensate" that loss? (page 45)

No core grants have been lost however there are some funded time limited projects ending which is common. The challenge we experience is when statutory duties change without associated funding from central government as with education welfare service.

We have more opportunity to claim through the Supporting Families grant than previously which will enable us to support more families.

Q9 - Local Youth Network Funding. With many voluntary groups and charities being highly impacted by inflation, have we considered the potential need to increase the financial help that can be offered through Area Boards?
Given the current financial situation, if the amount available for LYN funding does not increase is this not effectively a cut?

There is evidence seen by councillors at area board level (requests for help from schools) and in their other roles of the needs and demands for mental health support and early help for young people.
If the latent demand is coming through Area Board funding is this not an argument again to increase LYN funding?

The Area Board funding investment is continually analysed and assessed, both in terms of its value to Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) as well as the impact it offers for local residents. Wiltshire Council Officers are in regular contact with leaders from the VCSE sector to understand the inflationary pressures on the sector. We are currently investigating the potential opportunities of pilot models such as the DCMS funded Local Youth Partnerships, which aims to build capacity in the local youth sector and support resources to go further: [LYP Capacity Building Project \(ypftrust.org.uk\)](http://ypftrust.org.uk). This pilot is being discussed between the local authority, a wide range of VCSE youth partners, Wiltshire Community Foundation and the Young Peoples Foundation Trust.

Area Boards are working better in partnership now than ever before, leveraging their investment by bringing in more funding partners. In 2021/22, for every £1 the boards spent an additional £5.88 was raised through other fundraising and volunteering. Therefore, the local authority investment remains consistent but the overall value of the projects being delivered continues to rise, with the boards supporting organisations to access the wider funding they require.

To date in 2022/23 Area Board youth investment currently stands at £165,192, with over half of the £347,700 budget remaining unallocated. Whilst all Area Boards have at least one grant funding meeting remaining, this would suggest it is likely there will be an underspend in youth activities this financial year.

It is also worth noting that the Area Board youth funding is subject of an Overview and Scrutiny process that is due to start imminently.

Q10 - Capital budget. We understand that the capital budget has been reduced to £200m (previous years around £300m) to make it more manageable. What guarantee can we have that the projects that have been selected will actually be delivered when planned?

Is there urgent work that will not be done this year due to the reduction in capital spend?

Have we been able to balance the need / timing for these projects against the potential academisation for these schools?

As part of the Budget 2023/24 additional schemes are proposed to be added to the Capital Programme, with £6.668m added in 2023/24 and a total over the programme of £28.955m, including all known Health & Safety works required. There are many external factors that impact the timing of capital spend and it is critical that there is a robust budget monitoring process that provides validation and challenge to ensure forecasts are as accurate as possible. The council has seen over-confidence with the deliverability of the scale of the programme that has been set previously in any given year. Profiling of the programme is critical not only to ensure deliverability but also due to the funding assumptions for those that impact revenue are realistic.

In Education, we have not reduced any of our capital budgets, budget has been slightly reprogrammed on some schemes to fit with project delivery but no projects have been delayed simply to push back spend. There has been no reduction in our maintenance budget and we will fully spend this years allocation. No urgent projects have been delayed to reduce capital spend. In fact, if our capital bids are approved we will have significantly more funding to progress additional schemes over the next few years. When selecting schemes for mobile replacements or maintenance we prioritise based on the condition of the buildings, we would not select a mobile

replacement project at a school we knew was going to academise within the next few months but if urgent maintenance work was required we would still need to go ahead to keep the school safe and open.

Q11 – joined up approach. Councillors have been informed of a number of positive projects taking place across the county, warm places, emergency places, safe places, etc. Has consideration been given to a joined-up approach for these and shared use of buildings and resources as this would be likely to provide savings?

In response to the cost of living issues, we are utilising existing places across the county and for council owned property looking at our libraries which are already open and available to offer a warm spaces. These schemes are not using additional funding but some separate funding sources eg Household Support Fund and discretionary energy rebates are being utilised.

Q12 - Page 29, paragraph 139 onward - Dedicated Schools Grant - Do we think this grant will always come from the Government or do we think they could transfer it totally to the LA? If they do transfer it how would it add it to our risk register and what would be the added costs of our running it entirely?

The DfE are moving away from local authority / schools forum control over the schools block with the national funding formula. In our view it is unlikely this will move to local authority control. It is possible the other blocks could move the LA control but they have said that schools forum will remain as a consultative body. The total funding for DSG for 2023/24 is £452m, of that, schools block is £346m. At the moment local authorities rely on an accounting exception, allowing the DSG deficit reserve to be treated as though held outside the accounts. This power has been extended to 31st March 2026. There is significant financial risk to the council if this is removed, as has been indicated by the DfE.

Q13 – Whole Life Pathway – base budget for this year is £96.147m (which is an increase of 18% from previous year at £81.200m) BUT it is set to decrease in 2024/25 (95.747) and 2025/26 (94.306). (page 11)

Last year saw undeliverable savings for Whole Life Pathway of £0.500 for the “improved use of Care Cube” (page 58).

On page 60 we are told we expect increase in level of demand (0.206), we have demand pressure identified through budget monitoring (1.780) and pressures to be funded from latent demand earmarked reserve (0.254)

Q – is the planned reduction in base budget for 24/25 and 25/26 based on savings to be achieved or reduction in services?

This is based on savings to be achieved using different commissioning strategies based on developing the market and alternative provision, moving away from high costs placements where feasible.

Q14 – Families and Children base budget (page 14) - base budget for this year is £62.724m, which – if my maths is correct – is around a 3% increase on previous year £60.776m.

This is below inflation.

Q – is this very modest increase in base budget truly manageable whilst ensuring all our services are delivered?

The strategic approach to this MTF5 was that all services were asked to fund their own demand & growth. Whilst this was not possible in its entirety for Families & Children’s, a number of challenging savings programmes are in place. In addition, external grant has been used to fund existing services thus, lowering the cost to the revenue budget.

Q15 – Paragraph 42 (p13) – “The impact of the pandemic is putting pressure on early years children” – *should that be services (instead of children)?* **Yes**
 £0.2m investment for inclusion advisers and £0.1m for education welfare officers funded from the latent demand reserve have been included in the MTF5

Q – what are the current unmet needs for inclusion and EWO – will this investment be enough to cover the gap? Does this take into account any increase in needs / demand?

Higher numbers of young children are requiring early language support and social skills development following the pandemic. The increased demand has been factored into the budget requests.

Q16 – paragraph 44 (p13) – “investment in statutory SEN is sought” – how much? Is it on top of the £1.6m bid to transformation reserve? (para 45)

Yes – the investment in statutory SEN is permanent base budget opposed to one off investment and is found at Annex 6.

Inclusion & SEND - Planned increase in statutory service staffing over the MTF5 to align to increase in demand plus recruitment strategy grading review to ensure salary offer attractive	0.725	0.305	0.281
---	-------	-------	-------

Q17 - Paragraph 46 (p13) – school transport – an increase in line with EHCP increase is expected and combined with scarcity of resources, we have demand and inflation estimated at £7m. Yet we are also expecting savings of £0.805m in the MTF5 through a number of transformational schemes and route review. In annexe 7 – detail by service on Savings Proposals the SEND transport saving through developing independence for more children and young people with SEND, provide a wider range of options, and improve service delivery and efficiency is showing at £0.313m.

Q – where is the rest of the expected £0.805m savings coming from – is it under highways and transport?

There is a presentational error in the draft budget papers. The £0.805m includes the £0.250m from the 22-23 MTF5 below and the papers included in the Cabinet agenda have been corrected.

Corporate Director People	Education & Skills	Stretch Income Targets for Place Services	0.250	-	-	0.250
Corporate Director People	Education & Skills	SEND Transport: Develop independence for more children and young people with SEND, provide a wider range of options, and improve service delivery and efficiency.	0.313	0.121	0.121	0.555

Q18 – paragraph 50 (page 14) “Annual demand for 36 additional children and young people and inflation mirroring staff pay assumptions and from framework agreement

contracts are included in the MTFs at £4.9m and £2.5m respectively for Children’s Social Care placements and support.”

Q - how was 36 additional children and young people calculated? Is this taking into account any possible latent demand? Are we expecting a similar increase year on year through the MTFs?

The MTFs estimates are net of the latent demand estimates. The £4.9m & £2.5m apply to all children in care, care experienced young people and other permanence arrangements including adoption and special guardianship orders. This is why the number is significant. The demand has been estimated across the 3 years MTFs as in annex 6 – this also shows latent demand separately – extract below.

Corporate Director People	Families & Children Services	Pressures of Latent Demand Ear Marked Reserve Childrens Social Care Placements	0.926	0.157	(1.083)
Corporate Director People	Families & Children Services	Pressures for Latent Demand Ear Marked Reserve for Families & Children	0.197	0.005	(0.201)
Corporate Director People	Families & Children Services	Children in Care - demand for internal care placements and planned growth in in house foster carers; Special Guardianship Orders 5%; Adoption Allowances 1.5%; in house foster carers 6%	0.654	0.508	0.550
Corporate Director People	Families & Children Services	Children in Care - demand for external care placements, independent foster carers, external residential care placements 1.5%	1.578	0.117	1.281
Corporate Director People	Families & Children Services	Children in Care with SEN needs aged 0-18 years, 2.5%	0.061	0.082	0.072

Q19 – could we have some clarification on the first sentence in paragraph 53 (page 14) - “Other savings plans include badging existing services to grant for supporting families, asylum seeking children and domestic abuse contract; £0.516m.” What does badging mean in this context?

This is where grants are awarded, and the local authority is already providing this service. The impact / outcome will be achieved with existing services. For Supporting Families grant, this aligns with the family key worker prevention model. For the USAC grant, both the rates and guidance have changed which means the grant can be used to fund staff previously funded by the local authority. The Public Health grant is being used to fund the children's element of the Splitz contract.

Q20 – Paragraph 51 (p14) £0.50m investment for competitive salaries and manageable caseloads for social workers.

Q – how many more staff do we anticipate this to equate to / enable the council to recruit - assuming additional recruitment is required to make caseload manageable with expected increase of 36 children for 2023-24.

There are currently vacancies in the service and agency staff are used which are more expensive. The strategy included in this MTFs is to increase numbers of permanent staff using market supplements and reduce the agency spend whilst maintaining caseloads at manageable levels.

Annex 4 – Detail by service on Cabinet Investment

Corporate Directorate	Service	Description	2023/24 £m	2024/25 £m	2025/26 £m
Corporate Director People	Families & Children Services	A setting up home allowance (also known as a leaving care grant) helps Care Leavers buy essential things when moving into their own homes. Currently support is at £2,000 per care leaver, investment will raise this to £3,000 per care leaver	0.060	-	-
Corporate Director People	Families & Children Services	Key to the service ambition to be outstanding in CSC is the recruitment and retention of social workers, market supplements for social workers will ensure a competitive remuneration offer	0.433	0.011	0.011
Chief Executive Directorates	Transformation & Business Change	Realising the council's ambition to implement an effective Business Insights function	0.378	0.013	0.013
Cabinet Investment Total			0.871	0.024	0.024

Q21 - Paragraph 119 (p26) – sale of the centre at Hayburn Wyke and purchase of a smaller and fit for purpose property.

Q – how confident is the council that this smaller and fit for purpose property exists? Have we explored partnership use of the centre at Hayburn Wyke to lower holding costs (linking with Q11 on joined up approach)

A smaller more conventional four bedroom type property would meet service needs. The Council has experience of acquiring such properties for its own use as well as providing that acquisition service for the Stone Circle housing company thus has good relationships and contacts in the market to secure this purchase. If partnership opportunities exist they can be catered for in any future purchase although they would need to be formalised to achieve cost savings targets.

Q22 – annex 3 – base budget changes

People – families and children’s services - SEN Social care placements demand - reflecting transitional arrangements – reduction in base budget of £1.735m

Q – apologies if this was elsewhere in the report, but what are the transitional arrangements that would support this saving / reduction in base budget?

The proposed new children’s homes and lower cost units would “only” be providing a £0.250m saving in 2023-24 (paragraph 52).

Annex 3 relates to pre-2023/24 changes, so changes that relate to pressures faced in 2022/23. The Q1 budget variances were funded if they were assessed to be on-going pressures. In Q1, there was a forecast underspend in this area which fed into base changes as part of the process. Inflation and demand were later assessed for the MTFs and this is captured in the demand / inflation section.

Q23 – annex 3 (Page 57) Could we have some clarification on the planned increased cost for SGOs – is this staff cost purely to deal with expected increase in demand for SGOs? What about likely increased cost in SGO allowances, is this planned for elsewhere or included in the proposed additional £0.266m?

There is a planned inflationary increase of 4.5% which is included with other internal carer payments below:

For internal carer payments, staff pay awards are mirrored as an inflation assumption at 4.5%, 2.5% & 2.5%	0.393	0.241	0.261
--	-------	-------	-------

This is in addition to the anticipated demand for special guardianship orders.

Families & Children Services	Demand for Special Guardianship Orders often, court ordered	0.266
------------------------------	---	-------

Q24 – annex 7, page 65 – People – education and skills – could we have an explanation of what “Stretch Income Targets for Place Services” means?

Apologies this is an error and is part of the SEN transport savings target – it has been corrected in the Cabinet agenda public pack online (see response to Q17 above)

Q25 – page 65 and 66, savings proposals – could we have an explanation as to how / why what is effectively extra “income” is classed as savings?

- E&S – price increases in line with inflation rates to cover cost of trading services (£0.067m)
- F&C – extra grants for supporting families (£0.166m) and asylum seeker (£0.170m)

The approach to balancing the budget is that various strategies are in place to achieve savings plans and in line with other MTFs some of these are use of external grants and increased income.

How confident are we that the council will get these grants? The Supporting Families grant has been notified and the Council’s historical success in this area provides confidence this will be achieved.

Q26 – annex 10, capital programme (page 73)

Families and children’s service – Children’s home £0.930m

Q - Is that purchase of one property only or does it also include potential adaptations in all 3 properties the council will own as children’s homes?

This is the purchase of two properties covers refurbishment of three; in addition to the purchased properties, the refurbishment of Aspire House, Melksham.

COMMENT – areas that the committee would like to receive more information on:

- The placement sufficiency strategy (paragraph 52) - £0.350m savings expected in 2025-26 (annex 7, page 70)

The placement sufficiency strategy meeting met for the first time in January which is where oversight of demand and savings is provided by the Director. This is in addition to fostering excellence and the South West sufficiency strategy. It’s important to monitor all savings related to CSC placements (below.) The plan is to achieve savings across the three years of the MTFs and is a continuation of the 2023/24 and 2024/25 savings plans, leaving flexibility to expand or contract, depending on external markets and the success of the children's homes and internal foster carer strategy.

Service	Saving Proposal Description	2023/24 £m	2024/25 £m	2025/26 £m	TOTAL £m
Families & Children's Services	Ongoing review of existing placements where children and young people's needs may be better met in a family setting.	0.150	0.100	-	0.250
Families & Children's Services	Purchase of residential houses using matched DfE grant to create childrens homes. Commissioning for a block contract at reduced weekly placement fee rates.	0.150	0.150	-	0.300
Families & Children's Services	An invest to save approach to increase in-house fostering provision which will reduce demand and thus achieve savings on purchasing from the market	0.300	0.150	-	0.450
Families & Children's Services	The is a Placement Sufficiency Programme of work underway between finance, commissioning and operational teams which will be responsible for making this saving, linked to more children placed with in house foster cares, with connected carers or in Independent Fostering Agency placements.	-	-	0.350	0.350

- The council’s transformational funding (£1.6m) to support change to align with the “Delivering Better Value” DfE programme to facilitate financial recovery in Wiltshire (paragraph 149)

The bid includes funding for 6 new temporary staff, led by a sustainability programme lead, including operational workstream leads, financial and data & performance staff for up to 30 months in the first instance to lead on consultation and transformation together with a new way of working for AP using an AP classroom robot.

- The potential new SEN and mental health primary school (£16m in future capital programs seeking Cabinet approval in 2023-24) (Paragraph 125)

Please see extract below from the bid:

Demand for special educational support is rising year on year in Wiltshire. The number of requests for Educational Health Care Needs Assessments has risen 27% in the year to September 2022. The number of learners with Education Health Care Plans has grown by 227 to 4,526, in the nine months to September 2022. Space planning forecasts suggest that Wiltshire Council needs to grow special school places by 7.2-7.8% (equating to 68 additional special school places) every year to meet growth – even taking account SEND & Inclusion initiatives to support learners in mainstream provision. The growth requirements are in addition to the known gaps in special school provision that already exist in term 1 of 2022/23.

The provision of additional special school places is part of the 'jigsaw' of provision. To meet increasing demand for SEND provision, Wiltshire Council have plans to increase special school places; resource bases in both primary and secondary schools; and enhanced support for mainstream provision across all age groups. The proposal sits alongside the bid for a DfE free school for SEMH learners – the outcome of which will be known in January 2023. All the above are deemed preferable to the more costly Independent Special School placements, which attract on average a £30,000- £50,000 annual premium, per place. In October 2022 there were 331 learners in ISS and 67 children awaiting a special school place.

Even if Wiltshire Council secures DfE funding for the Free School, there will still be the need to provide additional special school places. Aside from Social Emotional and Mental Health designation specified in the Free School bid, there is unmet need for Severe Learning Difficulties, as well as Autism Spectrum Disorder.

This proposal is to secure capital funding to acquire land and buildings for an Independent Special School, run as a wholly-owned subsidiary of Wiltshire Council. The proposal is modelled on Coombe House special school, which is owned by Dorset Council in partnership with education providers.

The project aim is to build the number of Wiltshire special school places (by 70 – 100), for children and young people aged 5-19. Following identification of a suitable site, there may be the potential to increase numbers on roll further. Capital funding is required to acquire land and existing buildings (through purchase or lease), together with the refurbishment required to create an excellent learning environment for children and young people with SEND. The primary designation for learners will depend on the location and the success (or otherwise) of the DfE Special School Free School bid – the outcome of which will be known in January 2023.

Health Select Committee

Overall good to see an increase in the budgets of the services relevant to HSC work, i.e. Whole Life Pathway and Living and Ageing Well.

- Clarification needed around **Care** savings
- Reference to savings being made as a result of Care Act but narrative not clear. (p 67)

The Care Act allows us to consider best value to the Local Authority when making decisions with individuals in relation to their care and support plan i.e how we will meet eligible need. We will need to have clear conversations with individuals and their families regarding this and what it is possible to fund and also consider more broadly use of community and universal resources to meet eligible need rather than reliance on traditional Domiciliary Care and Placements.

- £1 million in savings with clients contributing more towards their care, but how does this work? (p68)

We uplift the amount that people have to contribute to their care each year when benefits/pensions etc are also increased. This uplift will generate additional impact for the local authority. This is a process that take place each year at the beginning of the financial year and does not represent any change in standard process. The uplift is in line with benefit/pension increases and is a considerable value this year due to the larger increase in benefits/pension as a result of inflation.

- In Quarters 1&2 savings were identified as being undeliverable amongst a rising overspend. We note an expectation of further savings in the budget for 2023/24.
- Given the continued volatility in the social care market how confident can we be that these identified savings are anymore deliverable than those in the current budget?

The care market is volatile. However, the savings identified in the MTFs will be delivered alongside the transformation program in adult social care which is focused on diversifying the care market and ensuring we have sufficient capacity. The savings also have a different focus including more collaboration with voluntary and community organisations in sustainable way.

- Could these savings assumptions be justified?

Yes, see above. In addition we are confident as a number of savings plans are developed around evidenced efficiencies we can make in our processes, for example maximising use of existing block contracts .

- **Shared Lives (p69)**
- Is the £150,000 a cut to the programme or savings as a result of the success of the programme?

This is not a cut to the programme. By delivering more shared lives capacity we can make savings as this often represents better value for money than other options e.g. placement and offers benefits to the individual.

- Should we be investing more in the short term for longer term benefits? The service has the investment it requires – we are focused on recruiting more shared lives carers which will allow us to expand.

- Could we be more ambitious with this programme?

Yes, there are other areas shared lives could support with i.e. hospital discharge. We are considering these areas in our social care transformation program.

- **Adult Care Transformation (p12 para 36-38)**

1. What are the expected target rates?
2. What are the total savings resulting from that?

We are not currently able to directly attribute savings against the transformation program as a whole, there are significant co-dependencies that are being identified and worked through that will enable us to be more specific going forwards.

Workshops are booked to work through the savings attributable to the transformation programme in the coming weeks.

- Assumption that **Social Care Levy** will continue for the next 2 financial years (p42).
 - How confident are we that there will be Social Care reform at the end of that period?

We are working on the basis that the reforms will take place in 2025 as indicated by government and will adapt our plans as further information becomes available.

- **Joint funding policy implementation with ICB (p68)**

- What impact do we expect as a result of integration of health and care? Do we anticipate savings or increased costs?

The joint funding policy is a positive step forwards as it acknowledges that individuals often have both health and care needs. It will provide a framework to identify where this is the case and ensure that costs are attributed to the appropriate organisation. We anticipate savings as we believe that there are a number of packages of care that are fully funded currently by social care where there a significant health needs.

- When can we see production of a new, improved Better Care Plan?
- How will this contribute to the uplift in savings?
- Is there an equitable distribution of payment between health and social care? Are budget discussions part of the integration process/partnership work?

BCF is being reviewed, many of the existing schemes were commissioned over 5 years ago, and the pandemic has changed the needs and the way people access care and support. The focus needs to be on maintaining people to be healthy and independent at home, including new technological advances and ways of working together. Community based offers need to be developed, and neighbourhood based care organised into a consistent offer.

- **Technology Enabled Care (p10, para 28 & 29)**

- Given the known difficulties of recruitment to key posts how confident can we be that the TEC transformation will contribute to the significant savings identified in the social care transformation programme?

TEC is new area of development for the council and we have been able to recruit to some key posts within this area. The staff who have these specific skills may come from areas that are not traditionally seen as social care. We also have knowledge and expertise within our current workforce – particularly Occupational Therapists who are able to prescribe TEC options alongside more traditional assistive equipment

- What are the assumptions based on?

Savings assumptions are based on an evaluation of use of TEC on a small number of packages of care. As this is rolled out there will more scope to deliver care and support in a more innovative way and potentially deliver increased savings while ensuring individuals are receiving the right support that enables them to remain at home.

- Has this been issue been given a red rating on the risk register? No as no current indication that we will be unable to recruit in these areas.

- **Potential Pay increases**

- The pay settlement in 2022 is unresolved as we approach the settlement for 2023. What assurance can be provided that sufficient capacity exists in the budget for 2023/24 to cover a settlement over two pay years?
- How accurately do the assumptions cover risks relating to pay?

The pay award for 2022/23 was agreed with a flat rate payment of £1,925 with effect from 1 April 2022, which equated to an average across the whole council as a 6.6% increase overall. An estimated increase of 4.5% is included for 2023/24 with the following 2 years estimated at 2.5%. This is higher than the Bank of England inflation forecasts and is considered adequate, but risk remains that this might not be sufficient. This risk is noted in the S25 report on the robustness of budget estimates.

- **Considerations of inflation (p7, para 7)**

- Could there be clarification of the calculations around inflation?

Please see the above response on pay inflation. Other inflation explanation can be seen in Appendix 1. Given the volatility experienced in inflation, the significant level of uplifts already applied in the current year and the forecast provided above the average CPI that is being used in 2023/24 for contractual inflation is 6%, and this will fall back down to 2% from 2024/25 onwards.

A significant amount of inflation, around £14m of the £27.7m for 2023/24, has been applied to Adult Social Care and will be used in the engagement and negotiation with providers to agree fee uplifts that will support the Adult Social Care market and the provision of care packages in Wiltshire.

Environment Select Committee

1. It is stated that there are inflationary pressures factored into the Street Scene contract. This contract was retendered last year (2022) delivering savings to the council. Can it be clarified what the inflationary issue are with this contract given it was agreed so recently? (para 54)

The Streetscene Contract was awarded in March 2022 prior to inflation pressures. We achieved a saving of £0.4m at the time of tender, with further savings proposed for 2023/ 24. The contract is a standard NEC 4 contract and is used by other services. The contract states indices to be used to calculate the inflation increases which are applied automatically on an annual basis. This mitigates the risk of tenderers having to predict inflation increase from the time of tender to the 1st payment uplift, removing the risk this has on higher contract rates. Hence the action ensures the best value is achieved.

2. Phase 1 of the Fleet Strategy provides for a proposed vehicle replacement plan over 2023/24 to 2025/26 totalling £4.964m. Electric vehicles will be purchased up to the council's current electric infrastructure capacity. What does that mean in terms of vehicle numbers and types? (para 120).

We are improving our electric charging infrastructure along with deploying new electric vehicles. Over the next 3 years we will be purchasing 120 new electric vehicles ranging from 4x4/ Mini Buses/Panel Vans and Tankers

Vehicle	2023	2024	2025
4x4	4	13	
Car	7		
Car			3
Estate Car			1
Demounts - Tanker – LGV	1		
Tanker – LGV	1		
Display Van			1
High Van			3
Panel Van		1	
Small Pan Van	17		27
Large Panel Van			2
Medium Panel Van			5
Minibus	5	17	
Minibus Chair Ramp	2		

MPV	4		
Tractor		6	
	41	37	42

3. The staff vacancy factor is set at 6.5%, in 2022/23 it was 1.5%, can you explain the reason for the significant rise this year particularly as services have offered up staff reductions as savings? (para 195)

In prior years the vacancy factor was not consistently applied to services but for the majority of services was in the region of 5%. We are continuing with the proposal agreed last year to increase the vacancy factor by 1.5% to a consistent 6.5% across all service areas.

4. The assumption for this years' pay award is 4.5% with 2.5% in later years, given the current inflation rate is that realistic? (Appendix 1, Annex 4)

The pay award for 2022/23 was agreed with a flat rate payment of £1,925 with effect from 1 April 2022, which equated to an average across the whole council as a 6.6% increase overall. An estimated increase of 4.5% is included for 2023/24 with the following 2 years estimated at 2.5%. This is higher than the Bank of England inflation forecasts and is considered adequate, but risk remains that this might not be sufficient. This risk is noted in the S25 report on the robustness of budget estimates.

5. There are several increases in charges and changes in opening hours for household recycling centres (Annex 7, pg63). Has an assessment of the impact been undertaken, and will that mean an increase in the budget for anti-fly-tipping enforcement?

- Impacts of the proposals have all been considered, including tonnage variations, accessibility to sites and capacity. Many of the proposals will free up capacity on sites and enable a better flow for Wiltshire residents using them. The proposal for charging will also help to prevent cross boarder and commercial waste being disposed of at the expense of Wiltshire taxpayers.
- Recent studies by both DEFRA (November 2022) and by WRAP (September 2021) have been unable to show a direct link between HRC policy changes and fly tipping rates. Generally, fly tipping is an attitudinal behaviour by a very small minority of the community. You either fly tip or you don't.
- There are no plans to increase the enforcement resources as a direct consequence of these savings proposals and Enforcement have recently extended their team with additional funding and will continue to take the necessary steps to investigate fly tipping and take prosecutions where possible.

6. Reductions of Streetscene provision to 'statutory levels' is suggested (saving £0.315m); what does this mean in terms of delivery and impact? (Annex 7, pg64).

- **Litter bins which are non statutory service.** - The council now pays per litter bin empty. This proposal is for the reduction in litter bin emptying to achieve improve service efficiencies for example, not emptying a bin if it is only a quarter full.
- **Street cleansing:** -Moving to statutory level responding to litter complaints. The council's local standards for response remains better than statutory requirements.
- **Play area maintenance** -Continue under the current delegation to Parish and Town Councils.
- **Grounds maintenance.** -The council now pays a per m2 rate. Reducing the frequency of cutting in appropriate areas reduces the m2 or moving to a reaction service driven by reports.

7. Leisure income growth has been set at £1.155 over the MTF5 period, how confident are we that this can be achieved? (Annex 7, pg65).

A large amount is forecast to be made from price increases, and based on the current trajectory of growth this estimate was considered realistic

Within the savings proposals it refers to a reduction / repatterning and in some cases cessation of bus services that have the 'least impact upon public transport users' e.g., out of county, non-essential shopping journeys or being out of catchment school pupils. This would save £0.250m over three years. What process will be used to identify such routes particularly if they have the least impact? (Annex 7, pg65).

All routes will be assessed across the network to ensure service efficiencies and in general terms any decision to cease services will likely be made upon current usage and whether there might be a viable alternative

8. Wiltshire Council's Commercial Policy [Wiltshire Council - Commercial Policy 2017-27 Final.pdf](#) includes at Para 3-15: "...use our infrastructure for commercial gain where we can trade advertising or activities that can use our digital platforms, street furniture, vehicles or other assets...." This may have led to the Council's Advertising Policy [Advertising and sponsorship - Wiltshire Council](#) but does not appear to be reflected in the budget. Do we have any income from these sources, and do we foresee any in future? [Cllr Jackson]

A programme is yet to be developed - We currently have an advertising contract with Clear Channel which provides advertising on 39 bus shelters in Salisbury

This page is intentionally left blank