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OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 8 January 2019 - 7:00 pm
Council Chamber, Town Hall, Barking

Members: Cllr Jane Jones (Chair) Cllr Andrew Achilleos (Deputy Chair); Cllr Dorothy Akwaboah, Cllr Toni Bankole, Cllr Princess Bright, Cllr Rocky Gill, Cllr Olawale Martins, Cllr Ingrid Robinson, Cllr Paul Robinson and Cllr Phil Waker

Date of publication: 21st December 2018
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Contact Officer: Leanna McPherson
Tel. 020 8227 2852
E-mail: leanna.mcpherson@lbbd.gov.uk

Please note that this meeting will be webcast, which is a transmission of audio and video over the internet. Members of the public who attend the meeting and who do not wish to appear in the webcast will be able to sit in the public gallery on the second floor of the Town Hall, which is not in camera range.

To view webcast meetings, go to https://www.lbbd.gov.uk/council/councillors-andcommittees/meetings-agendas-and-minutes/overview/ and select the meeting from the list.

AGENDA

1. Apologies for Absence

2. Declaration of Members' Interests

   In accordance with the Council’s Constitution, Members are asked to declare any interest they may have in any matter which is to be considered at this meeting.

3. Minutes - To confirm as correct the minutes of the meetings held on 20 November 2018 and 4 December 2018 (Pages 3 - 11)

4. Tri Borough: What are the Police doing to address victim satisfaction and the perception of crime in the Borough? (Page 13)

5. How well are the Council's new Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) arrangements working? (Pages 15 - 30)
6. Work Programme (Pages 31 - 33)

7. Budget Monitoring (Pages 35 - 49)

8. Any other public items which the Chair decides are urgent

9. To consider whether it would be appropriate to pass a resolution to exclude the public and press from the remainder of the meeting due to the nature of the business to be transacted.

Private Business

The public and press have a legal right to attend Council meetings such as the Assembly, except where business is confidential or certain other sensitive information is to be discussed. The list below shows why items are in the private part of the agenda, with reference to the relevant legislation (the relevant paragraph of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended). There are no such items at the time of preparing this agenda.

10. Any confidential or exempt items which the Chair decides are urgent
Our Vision for Barking and Dagenham

ONE BOROUGH; ONE COMMUNITY; NO-ONE LEFT BEHIND

Our Priorities

A New Kind of Council

- Build a well-run organisation
- Ensure relentlessly reliable services
- Develop place-based partnerships

Empowering People

- Enable greater independence whilst protecting the most vulnerable
- Strengthen our services for all
- Intervene earlier

Inclusive Growth

- Develop our aspirational and affordable housing offer
- Shape great places and strong communities through regeneration
- Encourage enterprise and enable employment

Citizenship and Participation

- Harness culture and increase opportunity
- Encourage civic pride and social responsibility
- Strengthen partnerships, participation and a place-based approach
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MINUTES OF
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
Tuesday, 20 November 2018
(7:00 - 9:05 pm)

Present: Cllr Jane Jones (Chair), Cllr Dorothy Akwaboah, Cllr Toni Bankole, Cllr Princess Bright, Cllr Rocky Gill, Cllr Olawale Martins, Cllr Paul Robinson and Cllr Phil Waker

Also Present: Cllr Dominic Twomey and Cllr Maureen Worby

Apologies: Cllr Andrew Achilleos and Cllr Ingrid Robinson

11. Declaration of Members' Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

12. Minutes - To confirm as correct the minutes of the meeting held on 9 October 2018

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 October 2018 were confirmed as correct.

13. Task and Finish Group: Visits to Void Properties

The Chair introduced a report on the Task and Finish Group, which was established at the meeting held on 9 October 2018 (Min 7 refers), and who visited various void properties on 31 October 2018.

Councillors Jones, Akwaboah, Martins and I Robinson visited four properties within the borough which were left in different conditions by outgoing tenants. It was noted that the condition the properties were left in dictated the amount of repair work that the team needed to undertake to bring the properties back to letting standard.

The report summarised some of the work that was being undertaken and it was noted that the team had 21 days to work on each property, irrespective of the state that it may have been left in and the amount of work that may need to be undertaken.

While the Task and Finish Group had no objection to the targets set, it was felt that the current 21-day target was not achievable or sustainable in most cases.

The Director of My Place was asked to respond to the findings by the Task and Finish Group, and he advised that a report was currently being prepared for the Corporate Performance Group (CPG) which would be looking into each step of the voids process and how it could be shortened. The report presented by the Task and Finish Group highlighted the need for better communication between the teams and the findings would feed into the report for the CPG.

The Committee resolved that officers review the void property turnaround target and consider implementing a revised target:
1. Either extended to 28 days overall 
Or 
2. Two turnaround targets were set, one for properties where only minor works needed to be carried out and another for properties that required major works and/or specialist works such as asbestos reports, deep cleans, garden clearance etc.


The Cabinet Member for Finance, Performance and Core Services presented a report to the Committee regarding the budget strategy for 2019/20 to 2020/21.

The Cabinet Member explained that the Council had achieved over £122m of savings since the Government embarked on its austerity programme in 2010 and the Council’s current MTFS, which covered the four-year period 2017/18 to 2020/21, had identified further savings of circa £58m. As a consequence of the Council’s financial planning, no new savings proposals were necessary for 2019/20 and the predicted budget gap of £570,000 could be met by a drawdown from the 2018/19 Council Tax Collection Fund surplus. The Cabinet Member also referred to the Council’s ambitious Transformation Programme and the need to allow the new arrangements to bed-in before assessing how future years’ savings could be achieved. With that in mind, it was noted that the development of a new MTFS for the period up to 2023/24 would commence in the New Year.

With regard to the plans for the 2019/20 budget, the Cabinet Member confirmed that a 1.99% Council Tax increase would be proposed. The public consultation on the Council’s plans would also include the option of an additional 1% levy specifically for services for children and young adults with disabilities, to help mitigate the pressures on those services as a result of Government underfunding.

In response to questions, the Cabinet Member advised that:

- Reserves were currently at £17m;
- The overspend in social care would be reduced in time and the overspend for this year would be covered however it was noted that the demands on the service were still high;
- Increased business rates would be received this year via the revenue support grant and bids were currently being received for the power station, which would result on more business growth;
- Small businesses were doing well in the Borough when compared to neighbouring boroughs with support through the Barking Enterprise Centre and the Chamber of Commerce, however this did not address the decline of high streets which was a nation-wide problem; and
- Budget monitoring was robust, with regular Member/officer meetings taking place and monthly budget reports being considered by both Cabinet and Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

The Cabinet Member for Social Care and Health Integration addressed the Committee, answering various questions asked by the Committee regarding the budget pressures on social care, advising that:
• The overspend figure was at £11m and this had already been reduced to £5m in under two years;
• The average overspend in London Boroughs for social care was £6m;
• 400 additional new cases had been received in one year, on top of the cases that would normally be received;
• An additional 17 social workers, who were not budgeted for, were now in place with each social worker taking on 19 cases;
• Adoption and fostering places within the Borough and neighbouring boroughs were fully utilised; and
• It was hoped the forthcoming budget announcement from the Chancellor would reduce pressure on adult’s social care with new money being introduced into the system.

The report was noted.

15. Work Programme

The Chair asked for the Committee to consider items for the work programme post-April 2019.

Two suggestions were received:

- Internal works for current tenants; and
- HRA Recharges: Updated List.

The work programme was noted.
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16. Declaration of Members' Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

17. Core Support Services - Post Elevate Delivery Models

Further to minute 2 (4 September 2018), the Chief Operating Officer and the Commercial Lead presented a report to the Committee regarding Core Support Services and the post Elevate delivery models. The presentation summarised the proposed delivery models recommended within the final business case.

The Committee were reminded that the Elevate Contract ended in December 2020 and in consideration of the options available to the Council to deliver the Elevate services post 2020 as well as deliver savings against these services, a series of options appraisals had been developed. Gartner, the recognised IT specialists, were contracted to provide a detailed options appraisal of ICT and separate options appraisals were carried out by the Transformation Programme with colleagues from the client team for Revenues and Benefits, Accounts Payable and Procurement and for Customer Services.

A full business case summarising these options appraisals had been developed which tested the optimum operating model against agreed criteria and which validated the savings to be achieved.

In response to questions from the Committee, the officers advised that:

- A phased handover would begin in 2019 to ensure a smooth transition of services by December 2020;
- Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006 (TUPE) would apply to staff who would transfer back into the Council service where the service was coming back;
- The current joint venture was undertaken with Agylisis, and it was noted that such a venture would not be entered into now as neither party (Agilisys or the Council) controlled both parts of the venture;
- The full business case was developed as just transferring the service back to the Council would not change the issues with the current business model, nor would it assist the Council with future service changes such as the introduction of Universal Credit. The aim of the business case was
therefore to transfer and transform the service;

- Self-service options would be increased such as accounts payable (receipt of invoices) and HR services for council employees;
- Assurances were given by the Chief Operating Officer that robust monitoring processes would be put in place following the transfer of services back to the Council.

The Committee noted the report.

18. Social Value In Procurement

The Commercial Lead presented a report to the Committee regarding Social Value in Procurement.

The Committee were advised that the Council had an obligation under the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 to consider how it might improve the economic, social and environmental well-being of the relevant area and how it may act with a view to securing that improvement. The Act came into force on 31 January 2013 and applied to public services contracts and framework agreements relating to services to which the Public Contracts Regulations 2006 and as revised under the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 (“the Regulations”) apply.

Members noted that Social value, as a concept, was about seeking to maximise the additional benefit, i.e. social, economic and environmental, that can be created by procuring or commissioning goods and services, above and beyond the benefit from the goods and services themselves but must be related to the services being procured.

Within the Council’s contract rules it was mandated that social value must be considered at pre-procurement and strategy development stage. Some examples of how that has been achieved at the Council were discussed and included:

- Thames Partnership for Learning - national skills academy for construction targets included in the procurement of Jerram Faulks and exceeded as well as local employment targets;
- Adecco UK Ltd – attendance and interaction at recruitment fairs via the Job Shop;
- United Living South – support to curriculum events, and employment opportunities offered to local residents via the Job Shop;
- Neilcott Construction Ltd – national skills academy for construction apprenticeship targets met and worked with the Job Shop with vacancies;
- SLM – 4 apprentices employed since September 2017; and

The Commercial Lead advised that a small working group had been established to look at developing a revised Social Value Policy as well as a working framework as part of reviewing the procurement operating model in the Core project. The review would include looking at the procurement process to see where the Council could provide guidance documents for commissioners as well as prospective service providers to give a clearer articulation of what ‘good’ social value contributions looked like in different categories of
procurement. Furthermore, the new policy would ensure operators were committed to providing promised social value contributions.

The Committee welcomed the report and the progress the Council was making with social value however were concerned that many of the examples given were for large scale/high value procurements. In response to these concerns, the Commercial Lead advised that work was being undertaken to look at how the Council could help local businesses, for example by encouraging and assisting local businesses to jointly bid for local procurements.

The Committee noted the report.

19. Growth Commission Stocktake: Towards Inclusive Growth for Barking and Dagenham

The Director of Inclusive Growth presented a report updating the Committee on the Growth Commission Stocktake.

Facilitated by Mike Emmerich and Metro Dynamics, the Growth Commission Stocktake did three things:

- Provided a review of the Borough’s progress since the 2016 Growth Commission;
- Explored the evidence in relation to Inclusive Growth, and made some suggestions for what an Inclusive Growth framework for Barking and Dagenham might look like; and
- Made a set of recommendations as to where the Council and its partners should focus their efforts in order to plug any gaps in the overall Inclusive Growth Programme.

The Stocktake had found that the council and partners had made huge progress since 2016 across all areas highlighted in the original commission, particularly in relation to issues associated with the physical regeneration of the place, but that much more needed to be done to connect local people into the benefits of the growth. In other words, economic growth had been strong and employment had risen, but a significant inclusion gap remained.

The Stocktake suggested five ‘Grand Challenges’ that the Borough should focus on in order to close this gap:

- ‘Building sustainable communities’, including a renewed focus on the Becontree Estate and Barking Riverside as exemplars of 21st Century sustainable, connected, and vibrant urban developments;
- ‘Creating a new enterprise agenda’, including a range of activity to expand the business base and improve job density;
- ‘A new deal with decent jobs for everyone that can work’, including a sustained focus on the economically inactive population;
- ‘Preparing our young people for the future’, including a renewed effort to support young people to make successful transitions from schools to further learning or work; and
- ‘Beyond civic foundations; a new civic culture’, including a new approach to engaging residents in growth and regeneration.
The Committee supported the growth agenda however raised concerns regarding the ‘working poor’ and the provision of housing within the Borough. This was addressed in more detail later on the agenda (Min. 20 refers - Local Plan Update).

The Committee, while welcoming larger businesses such as the forthcoming film studios, recognised the need for micro, small and medium sized enterprises in the Borough to encourage growth.

The report was noted.

20. Local Plan Update

The Chief Planning Director, Be First, presented a report to the Committee summarising the direction of travel for the emerging Local Plan.

The Local Plan would replace the current suite of documents comprising the Council’s local planning policy documents, previously adopted in 2010 and 2011. It provided a vision and framework for guiding development delivery within the borough to 2035 and had been prepared with regard to the Growth Commission and Borough Manifesto.

The report before the Committee did not go through each emerging policy in detail, however focused on key policy topics, outlining the emerging approach such as housing, development areas (including Town Centres), the economy, and, community and social infrastructure.

The Committee raised concerns regarding the provision of social housing within the Borough, in particular the working poor who could not afford to rent properties a year at market rate and properties advertised at 80% market rent which were still unachievable for many local people.

The Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Social Housing addressed the Committee advising that the need for more social housing within the Borough was not disputed and that there was a target of approximately 2000 new social housing properties planned for the borough for the next couple of years. However it was noted that although the Council was one of the top Boroughs in London providing social housing, the actual number of properties being built was still relatively low. Unfortunately, approximately 200 – 250 properties were being lost from the Councils stock each year under the Right to Buy scheme.

The Director of Inclusive Growth advised the Committee that the Council had recently engaged with the Mayor of London’s Housing Programme, which would provide approximately 200 homes at 50% market rent.

Following questions by the Committee, the Chief Planning Director and the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Social Housing advised that:

- The number of betting shops opening in the Borough were being monitored;
- The Local Plan would be responding to demographic changes within the Borough, for example religion and new places of worship;
- Changing attitudes would influence the Local Plan, for example young
people were not as protective over the green belt as older generations were;

- Parking was an ongoing and difficult issue with new developments throughout the borough, on top of parking issues already faced by residents;
- A draft policy had been prepared regarding the loss of public houses;
- A monitoring officer had been employed to monitor new developments within the Borough; and
- There would be an annual monitoring report on the Local Plan.

The Committee noted the report.

*Standing Order 7.1 (Part 2, Chapter 3, of the Council Constitution) was suspended at this juncture to enable the meeting to continue beyond the 9pm threshold.*

21. **Work Programme**

The work programme was noted.
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

8 January 2019

Title: Tri Borough: What are the Police doing to address victim satisfaction and the perception of crime in the Borough?

Report of the Operational Director – Enforcement Services

Open Report For Information

Wards Affected: None Key Decision: No

Report Author: Leanna McPherson, Democratic Services Officer

Contact Details:
Tel: 020 8227 2852
Email: leanna.mcpherson@lbld.gov.uk

Accountable Strategic Leadership Director: Fiona Taylor, Director of Law and Governance

Summary

The Committee will hear the views of service providers who are working with victims of crime and the views of the Safer Neighbourhood Board (SNB) based on the information picked up via the ward panels.

The Committee will consider what information the service providers and SNB are hearing from their local areas in terms of:

- Why victim satisfaction in Barking and Dagenham is the lowest in the MPS?
- The response from police for victims of crime;
- The support that victims of crime are getting; and
- Are there certain types of crime where victims feel they are less supported?

Representatives from the Metropolitan Police East Base Command Unit (BCU) will also be in attendance to address the Committee on work that they are undertaking in relation to victim satisfaction and the perception of crime, and respond to the points raised from the service providers and the SNB.

Recommendation(s)

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee is recommended to:

(i) Consider the issues raised by the Service Providers and the SNB; and
(ii) Discuss with the Police the issues raised and hold them to account.

Reason(s)

Under the provisions of Section 19 of the Police and Justice Act 2006, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee shall act as the Crime and Disorder Committee.
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Overview and Scrutiny Committee
8 January 2019

Title: Overview and Scrutiny Report into changes to MASH

Report of the Cabinet Member for Social Care and Health Integration

Open Report For Information

Wards Affected: None

Key Decision: No

Report Author:
Heather Storey, Head of Commissioning – Children’s Care and Support

Contact Details:
Tel: 020 8227 2827
E-mail: Heather.Storey@lbbd.gov.uk

Accountable Directors:
Chris Bush; Commissioning Director for Children’s Care and Support
Mark Fowler; Director for Community Solutions
April Bald; Operational Director for Children’s Care and Support

Accountable Strategic Director: Elaine Allegretti, Strategic Director for People and Resilience

Summary

In Autumn 2017 the council moved into its new structure which saw the creation of the Core, Care and Support and Community Solutions. As part of this new arrangement, the MASH (Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub) was moved from the operational oversight of Children’s Social Care to Community Solutions. The rationale for the move was to strengthen information-sharing; whole family approaches and ensure families get access to a range of targeted early help support.

As part of the development of an enhanced quality assurance arrangement around this change in operational arrangements, this report sets out evidence for Overview and Scrutiny Committee regarding the quality and impact of the current MASH arrangements to protect children and young people from harm.

Since the Ofsted focused visit during March 2018, there has been new leadership within Children’s Social Care including a new Director of People and Resilience (DCS), Director of Operations for Children’s Social Care and more recently, a new Head of Assessment and Intervention. The new leadership has commissioned several independent and internal assurance activities to support greater understanding of the quality and impact of the local MASH arrangements, and the front door.

Recommendation(s):

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee are recommended to agree:

(i) That as part of its quality assurance arrangement that MASH is considered annually by Overview and Scrutiny Committee; and
(ii) To consider the progress and impact of Early Help alongside the ongoing scrutiny of the MASH arrangements.
1. Introduction and Background

1.1 The Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) was developed by the Police, Local Authorities and other agencies to co-locate safeguarding agencies and their data into a secure, research and decision-making unit. This was in response to the challenges faced by agencies, on occasions to effectively share information which has been the comment of numerous Serious Case Reviews (SCRs) and public enquiries.

1.2 Implementing the MASH model required Local Authorities to co-locate professionals from core agencies to support the research, interpretation and determination of proportionate risk assessments for those cases being investigated through the MASH. LBBD launched its MASH in 2014. This built on existing positive working relationships with the Met Police and their Public Protection Desk. Additional core partners from across the borough were either co-located or linked to the MASH that sat within Children’s Services as the Front Door to Children’s Social Care. All cases referred are reviewed and risk assessed, but not all cases require a MASH investigation. ‘To MASH’ or ‘not to MASH’ depends on the quality of information being referred in and the consistency and quality of the front door practitioners’ ability to apply the Local Authorities threshold when decision making. The options available at the front door are:

- Advice and guidance provided
- Refer to another agency e.g. potentially as an out of borough case
- Step across for early help
- MASH investigation
- Progress to referral and S47 investigation
- Information passed to existing team (case already known and allocated within Social Care)

1.3 In all instances, the primary focus of the decision-making is to ensure children and young people are safeguarded and protected from harm. For those cases, where threshold is not met, the outcome could be a step across to early help, and may include support at tier 2 around health, housing, or parenting support.

Simplified schematic of the front door to CSC
1.4 As part of the wider Council transformation programme and Community Solutions design, the decision was taken to move all staff and services providing early support to residents in Community Solutions and included the team responsibility for No Recourse to Public Funds. This included moving the MASH and the wider Triage front door function for children and young people from children’s social care to Community Solutions in Autumn 2017, as part of a bid to create a single, integrated front door across children and adult’s services. This connected triage function offers a more targeted approach to early help, including closer links to housing and then employment skills. The benefit of moving MASH into Community Solutions has been to bring those services that previously sat across different parts of the Council, closer in both physical proximity under a shared set of objectives, including to foster resilience, intervene early, and reduce demand. Operational accountability for the MASH now sits with the Director of Community Solutions rather than the Director of Operations Children Care and Support. This arrangement does not affect the statutory duties of the Director of Children’s Services and Lead Member for Children.

1.5 This report seeks to bring the range of evidence together in this area to support Overview and Scrutiny Committee to:

- assure the quality and impact of the local MASH arrangements to protect children from harm following the move of MASH arrangements from operational leadership of the Children’s Care and Support to Community Solutions; and

- consider emerging evidence so far on achievements and areas for development regarding work to realise the ambitions and rationale for moving MASH, including the single front door and improvements to the early help offer.

2. What we know so far

2.1 A range of information, both qualitative and quantitative is available to help us scrutinise the impact of moving the MASH into Community Solutions, achievement of anticipated benefits and quality and impact of decision making. The most substantial of these, as discussed throughout this report are:

- Performance data and trends
- Findings from audits
- Quality assurance activity undertaken by Community Solutions;
- The MASH Peer Challenge findings
- OFSTED Focused Visit findings
- Findings from recent external reviews and internal assurance activity

2.2 In analysing the effectiveness of our MASH we need to test ourselves against the four core elements of the MASH as identified in the recent LSCB MASH challenge 2018:

1) All notifications relating to the safeguarding or welfare of children go through a single point of contact.
2) Engagement with children and families is a vital part of the assessment of need and risk.

3) A co-located team of professionals from core agencies research, interpret and determine what is proportionate and relevant to share

4) Risk is analysed and assessed, based on the fullest information picture and used to decide what action should be taken.

**Quality and Impact of MASH Arrangements**

**All notifications relating to the safeguarding or welfare of children go through a single point of contact.**

2.3 Managers in the MASH risk-assess and rate cases, as red, amber, or green (RAG). This ensures that the most urgent work is prioritised. Overall, safeguarding concerns are promptly recognised and passed on quickly for assessment and action. For children in need of protection, strategy meetings are identified swiftly and prioritised for urgent action. Cases are immediately forwarded to the referral and assessment duty team whilst MASH checks are completed. Most referrals are dealt with in a timely manner with over 90% dealt with within the 24-hour timescales. Evidence suggests that performance of right first-time decision (repeat referral within previous 12 months) is at 16% and in line with London performance and below the national and similar area averages of 22% and 20%.

2.4 MASH offers the opportunity for referrers to receive consultation from a MASH social worker, to explore whether a case meets threshold for a referral to early help or social care. This is used effectively and supports partners in understanding our threshold and should support improved quality of referrals, and decreased numbers of inappropriate referrals. Scrutiny on the consultation process since July 2018 has highlighted some recording issues requiring remedial action and this is in now being undertaken.

2.5 As a result of improved knowledge of service provision and better connections and relationships across Community Solutions services, more cases are directed for support or advice in areas outside of safeguarding. Contacts not progressing to a service sat at 65% in 2017/18 and currently sit at 30% as of October 2018, illustrated this shift in approach. Over the same period, re-referrals into Triage has dropped from 15.6% (17/18) to 14.5% across 2018/19.

2.6 Out-of-hours arrangements are effective. Interventions are timely and proportionate, and followed up by prompt recordings and liaison with daytime staff. Communication and handovers are well managed, resulting in continuity for children and families.

2.7 Since summer of 2018, the increased focus by senior leadership on the MASH and front door regarding consistency and quality of thresholds has identified there are improvements needed. This has resulted in enhanced arrangements to strengthen operational oversight and revised quality assurance arrangements to check, balance and drive continuous improvement of threshold applications. To further support this, a revised threshold document is due to be presented to the LSCB in December and discussions between the independent chair and DCS regarding how the board can support improvements in quality of referrals by partners, which is a significant
contributing factor to the appropriateness, quality and timeliness of decision making in MASH.

**Engagement with children and families is a vital part of the assessment of need and risk.**

2.8 Recent audit activity and external review has highlighted MASH decision making needs to give more focus to the child’s lived experience i.e. basing decisions on the impact of the referred concerns upon the child. Parents and carers are often spoken to and their views obtained as part of the MASH enquiries.

2.9 Going forwards, scrutiny of MASH activities will continue to test whether the parent’s views are taken at face-value, ensuring curiosity and child focussed decision making is given priority at the front door. An independent review challenged identified the use of language not being reflective of our current developing practice framework to adopt a whole service approach instead of, at times, a possibly perceived punitive and risk averse approach to families.

2.10 Consent checks are generally recorded, but it is not always clear when the discussions took place.

**Sharing information appropriately and quickly. (A co-located team of professionals from core agencies research, interpret and determine what is proportionate and relevant to share.)**

2.11 Information sharing within the MASH is generally good. A MASH Information Sharing Agreement is in place. The information shared includes family demographics, previous involvement with the council and its partners, known or suspected safeguarding concerns and any other information as per the professional judgement of the MASH Social Worker. The LBBD MASH has strong multi agency working and sharing of relevant information to make informed decisions on how to progress a referral. Health, Police, National Probation Service, Victim Support, and early help social workers are co-located in the MASH, enabling routine engagement in information sharing including in strategy meetings. Staff and their expertise are deployed flexibly across range of services within the single front door.

2.12 During the Ofsted focused visit, inspectors noted delays for a small number of children in the sharing of information before early help services were offered; recent activity shows that this remains the case with work in hand to improve tracking and reporting of this within early help quality assurance developments. However, effective systems are in place once children are provided with the help they need. When a case receives no further action from a safeguarding perspective, an appropriate signposting is taking place with partners are engaged across the system. Where cases may previously have been closed at the initial point as NFA (no further action), a greater number are now signposted and 30% of the cases receive targeted assistance from the intervention or support lifecycles in Community Solutions.

2.13 Once a case is being 'MASHed', information sharing, and partnership working is largely effective. However, we continue to experience issues with the quality of referrals from across the partnership, with improvements needed to completion of the MARF (multi-agency referral form) and in context of declining use of the common assessment framework. Work is currently under development regarding how to
improve quality of referrals and to review and refine pathways to and from early help with universal services (health and schools) and children’s social care.

Risk is analysed and assessed, based on the fullest information picture and used to decide what action should be taken.)

2.14 The Ofsted Focused Visit in March 2018 found that no child is being left at immediate risk of harm by decisions made by the MASH. Independent and internal quality assurance activities since July 2018 echo this however go on to say that risk is not always sufficiently explored, and there is not enough curiosity and challenge of referring agencies and some variation in application of thresholds.

2.15 In supporting the decision as to whether threshold is met, the MASH refers to its own threshold document as well as the LSCB Section 47 threshold document and Barnardo’s risk assessment for Domestic abuse cases. There is evidence in MASH manager decision records that these are being applied. There are other risk assessment tools that would further support the MASH decision makers e.g. Brook Sexually Harmful behaviour risk tool and Child Exploitation risk tool.

2.16 Data indicates we currently have a high number of S47 investigations and single assessments resulting in no further action, which suggest greater work is needed on quality of referrals, and the quality of decision making in the front door. This includes greater clarity in referral pathways and clarity of the early help offer both within Community Solutions and across the wider partnership, in order to provide a robust alternative to statutory assessments. This area of work is currently under development with external support from the LGA and oversight of the local safeguarding board. This work has led to further deep dives of practice areas, such as pre-birth assessments and focus on early permanency, both are likely to inform practice changes in these areas.

2.17 Requests for support services are made using the Multi Agency Referral Form (MARF). Internal quality assurance activities and external scrutiny have consistently found the quality of these to be too variable and insufficient and in turn, impact on decision making and ability to apply the threshold accurately. This is a priority for the LSCB and considerable work is underway to improve in this area. The location of MASH within Community Solutions could be a significant asset in improving this area, as it should provide improved communication and opportunities for consultation between a wider set of partners and its pathways into universal services. This is currently being explored by Community Solutions managers.

Achievements and areas for development to realise ambitions and rationale for moving MASH

2.18 A key ambition of Community Solutions is to contribute to the reduction in demand of children in need of statutory support services within children’s social care, and although not exclusively, was a key driver of moving MASH and enhancing the Early Help offer as part of work to ensure a joined-up approach.

2.19 As within the national context, local children’s social care demand has continued to see a steady increase over the last 12 months. Although, our numbers of Children in Care are bucking national trends, our rise in child protection cases is significantly above national rates and we are seeing increases in our high needs SEND population (those with Education, Health and Care Plans) and unaccompanied minors.
Caseloads remain higher than average rates, as do numbers of agency staff and turnover. This area is currently being reviewed at the highest levels of the organisation to identify how this can be improved in both the short and longer term. These pressures are a significant factor in the current overspend position within Children's Social Care, which does remain below the London average rate of overspend of approximately 12% over budget.

2.20 This evidence suggests that Community Solutions has, as yet, not been able to significantly impact on the demand of children’s social care, which is made up of several issues, and amongst those above includes, changing population needs, national austerity measures, quality of decision making and threshold application, clarity of early help offer and pathways between statutory services. As described above, several work areas are in hand or in development to deliver reduced demand, some of which are targeted at Community Solutions including getting the right pathways and offer, for those who can be stepped down from statutory children’s social care support. Work within Care and Support is in development to look at how current practice models within a statutory support can be strengthened to better tackle underlying causes and deliver good quality intervention, both of which will contribute to longer term demand reductions and a sustainable social care model.

2.21 However, to successfully stem demand to acute services, the local offer needs to be much further reaching than Community Solutions and include priorities to work together to improve wellbeing in schools, health, voluntary sector and community safety including youth crime and contextual safeguarding.

**Improvement activity includes:**

- The Care and Support quality assurance framework is being enhanced to extend to assuring the quality and impact of MASH and Early Help arrangements and to be reported to the DCS and Corporate Leadership team through forums such as Assurance Board and Corporate Performance Group (CPG).
- The strengthening of assurance activities in line with Ofsted recommendation to continue to embed and maintain oversight of threshold management between Community Solutions and Children’s Care and Support
- Continued support and refocus of the Community Solutions dedicated service improvement function to work more jointly with the Operational Director for Children’s Care and Support and Director of Children’s Commissioning to develop and refine appropriate oversight, scrutiny and assurance systems at all levels to regularly test the quality and consistency in decision-making in early help, MASH and front door and that reflect the whole journey of the child.
- Regular thematic multiagency audits to inform learning and improvement, this includes recent audits being undertaken under the Children’s Safeguarding Board across early help and quality of front door, indicative findings suggest both strengths and areas for development.
- Taking part in an LGA led project to further support development of the local early help offer which includes multiagency live action learning sets to refine practice and impact
- With three distinct components to our system needing to work in harmony, and further developments in our quality assurance arrangements must ensure that
local arrangements do not impact adversely on the journey and experiences of our children.

These developments include support and challenge from the Independent Safeguarding Board Chair, the DCS and Principal Social Worker.

(iii) Conclusion

3.1 There no evidence to suggest moving the MASH from children’s social care into Community Solutions has compromised safety and quality and approach to decision making, with much of the activities remaining unchanged since its move from one part of the system to another. However, enhanced scrutiny of these arrangements since Summer 2018 has shown that although there are strengths, there is a need to improve further so that children and families to get the right help, in the right place and the right time and as a result achieve better outcomes. This has resulted in the development of an enhanced quality assurance approach that includes oversight of the Operational Director of Children’s Care and Support and Director of Children’s Services and Lead Member roles. This strengthened arrangement includes greater operational and strategic oversight of consistency and quality of threshold management and decision making and includes work with the safeguarding board.

*It is recommended that as part of this enhanced quality assurance arrangement that this area is annually reviewed by OSC. Next due January 2020.*

3.2 Secondly, in regarding the achievements and areas for development to realise the ambitions for moving MASH, including a reduction in demand for children’s social care through an improved early help offer – evidence reviewed suggests we are still early in this journey, and although aspirations remain this ambition is yet to be realised. There is much work in hand to continue work to achieve this aspiration, with some early indications showing there are strengths to build upon. In the short term, there is work needed to develop better pathways, interfaces and thresholds between early help and statutory child protection services. Longer term work to improve the impact of whole system offer Early Help, of which Community Solutions is just one component, will be the priority and includes how we work across health, schools, voluntary sector and the police.

*It is recommended that developments in this area are reported back to OSC during summer 2019.*

4. Financial Implications

Implications completed by: Katherine Heffernan, Head of Service Finance

There are no financial implications arising directly out of this report which concerns a review of the Councils arrangements for the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub. The budget for this team is contained within the Triage Service in Community Solutions – the total budget for which is just under £2m.

5. Legal Implications

Implications completed by: Lindsey Marks, Deputy Head of Legal Community
The Local Authority has a general duty to safeguard children by virtue of Section 17 Children Act 1989. Section 10 Children Act 2004 details the requirements for the Local Authority to make suitable arrangements for co-operation between relevant partners in order to improve the wellbeing of children in the Local Authority’s area. Section 11 Children Act 2004 creates a duty for the key agencies that work with children to put in place arrangements to ensure that they take account of the need to safeguard and promote the welfare of children when undertaking their duty. The MASH co-locates safeguarding agencies and their data, into a secure assessment, research, and referral unit for notifications of vulnerable children.

Public Background Papers Used in the Preparation of the Report: None
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- **Appendix A**: Frontdoor flowchart for End of Year 17.18
- **Appendix B**: Frontdoor flowchart for Q2 17.18
- **Appendix C**: Frontdoor flowchart for Q2 18 19
Contact and referral flow chart year to date as of end of year 2017/2018

Contacts

10155

Referrals

3511

Referral via MASH\(^1\)

2413 (24%)

Straight to referral\(^1\)

1098 (11%)

Other contact outcomes\(^1\)

Information and advice given 5159 (51%)
CAF recommendation 755 (7%)
Refer to other agency 392 (4%)
Freedom of information request 222 (2%)
Not recorded 116 (1%)
Total 6644 (65%)

Other referral outcomes\(^2\)

Information and advice given 480 (14%)
Refer to MAP 166 (5%)
Transfer straight to team 120 (3%)
Refer to other agency 92 (3%)
Not Recorded 39 (1%)
CAF recommendation 35 (1%)
Total 932 (26%)

Progress to S47 or Assessment\(^2\)

2579 (74%)

Key
1 = As a percentage of all contacts
2 = As a percentage of all referrals

National: 90%
London: 92%
### S47s completed

- **London:** 356 (27%)
- **National:** 423 (33%)
- **Total:** 779 (60%)

### Assessments completed

- **Total:** 2548

#### Further action required

- Progress to ICPC: 356 (27%)
- CIN plan required: 423 (33%)
- **Total:** 779 (60%)

#### Closure/Other outcomes

- No further action: 517 (40%)
- Not Recorded: 0 (0%)
- **Total:** 517 (40%)

#### Further action required

- Child In Need Plan: 458 (18%)
- Ongoing Work: 257 (10%)
- ICPC required: 178 (7%)
- Transfer to Key team: 51 (2%)
- **Total:** 944 (37%)

#### Closure/other outcomes

- Information and Advice: 611 (24%)
- CAF recommended: 436 (17%)
- Refer to other agency: 303 (12%)
- Not Recorded: 236 (10%)
- Declined/Family Moved: 18 (1%)
- **Total:** 1604 (63%)
Contact and referral flow chart year to date as of Q2 2017/2018

Contacts

- 4577

Referrals

- 1800

Referral via MASH

- 1296 (28%)

Straight to referral

- 504 (11%)

Other contact outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>(% of Contacts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information and advice given</td>
<td>2117</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAF recommendation</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to other agency</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of information request</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not recorded</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2777</td>
<td><strong>61%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other referral outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>(% of Referrals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information and advice given</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to MAP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer straight to team</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to other agency</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Recorded</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAF recommendation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>533</td>
<td><strong>30%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Progress to S47 or Assessment

- 1267 (70%)

Key:

1 = As a percentage of all contacts
2 = As a percentage of all referrals
### S47s completed

- **682**
  - Progress to ICPC: 224 (33%)
  - CIN plan required: 235 (34%)
  - Total: 459 (67%)

### Assessments completed

- **1197**
  - No further action: 216 (32%)
  - Not Recorded: 7 (1%)
  - Total: 223 (33%)

### Further action required

- Child In Need Plan: 196 (16%)
- Ongoing Work: 126 (11%)
- ICPC required: 81 (7%)
- Transfer to Key team: 22 (2%)
- Total: 425 (36%)

### Closure/Other outcomes

- Information and Advice: 291 (24%)
- CAF recommended: 200 (17%)
- Refer to other agency: 144 (12%)
- Not Recorded: 127 (11%)
- Declined/Family Moved: 10 (1%)
- Total: 772 (64%)

**London: 38% National: 42%**
Contact and referral flow chart year to date as at end of Q2 2018/2019

Contacts

- 7302
  - Of which 2846 (39.0%) have had pre-MASH checks

Number of contacts via MASH

- 508 (7%)

Number of MASH contacts to referral

- 253 (3%)

Referrals

- 1794

Progress to S47 or Assessment

- 1682 (94%)
  - Single Assessment only: 1204 (67%)
  - Strategy discussion: 478 (27%)

National: 90%
London: 92%

Other contact outcomes

- Step down: 1949 (26%)
- NFA: 2234 (30%)
- Other agency: 1070 (14%)
- Total: 5253 (72%)

Other referral outcomes

- NFA: 59 (3%)
- CP transfer in conference: 13 (1%)
- Private fostering: 4 (0%)
- Other outcomes: 36 (2%)
- Total: 112 (6%)

Key
1 = As a percentage of all contacts
2 = As a percentage of all referrals
S47 and Assessment outcome chart year to date as at end of Q2 2018/2019

S47s completed

- CP conference: 210 (34%)
- NFA continue with single assessment: 279 (45%)
- Total: 489 (79%)

Assessments completed

- Child in need plan update: 378 (21%)
- Continuing work (CP / CIN / CLA): 285 (16%)
- Legal Action: 19 (1%)
- LAC request: 22 (2%)
- Specialist assessment: 1 (0%)
- Strategy discussion: 106 (6%)
- Total: 790 (44%)

Closure/Other outcomes

- No further action: 75 (12%)
- Other outcomes: 56 (9%)
- Total: 131 (21%)

Closure/other outcomes

- Information and Advice: 64 (4%)
- Referral to EHM: 334 (18%)
- Refer to other agency: 105 (6%)
- No further action: 510 (28%)
- No further action (Exit due to s47 end): 7 (0%)
- Total: 1020 (56%)
### Overview and Scrutiny Committee

**Chair: Councillor Jane Jones**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Agenda Items</th>
<th>Officer(s)</th>
<th>Cabinet Member</th>
<th>Final Report Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **5 February 2019** | • How do we communicate with our residents? *(potential task and finish group item)*  
• Refuse Collection Service - Update  
• Work Programme  
• Budget Monitoring | • Tom Hook  
| | • Robert Overall  
| | • Democratic Services  
| | • Katherine Heffernan/Democratic Services | • Cabinet Member for Finance, Performance & Core Services | 21 January 2019 |
| **5 March 2019** | • Results from the Residents’ Survey  
• Internal Governance of Trading Partnerships  
• How well does the Council support its residents to live as independently as possible?  
• Work Programme  
• Budget Monitoring | • Tom Hook  
| | • Relevant Chief Officers from the Trading Partnerships  
| | • Mark Tyson  
| | • Democratic Services  
| | • Katherine Heffernan/Democratic Services | • Cabinet Member for Community Leadership & Engagement  
| | | • Cabinet Member for Finance, Performance & Core Services  
<p>| | | • Cabinet Member for Social Care and Health Integration | 18 February 2019 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2 April 2019 | • Refuse Collection Service: How have the changes made improved the service for our residents?  
                • Private rented Sector Licensing Scheme: How are we protecting our residents through enforcement?  
                • Work Programme  
                • Budget Monitoring |
|            | • Robert Overall  
                • Jonathon Toy  
                • Democratic Services  
                • Katherine Heffernan/Democratic Services |
| 18 March 2019 | Cabinet Member for Public Realm  
                Cabinet Member for Enforcement and Community Safety |
| 30 April 2019 | • Response to Grenfell: How have we responded/what has been done to date?  
                • Community Rehabilitation Companies: What will be the impact on the Council of changes to the service?  
                • How week is the Council supporting a good start for its youngest children (0-5)?  
                • Work Programme |
|            | • Robert Overall/Jonathon Toy  
                • Jonathon Toy  
                • Jane Hargreaves  
                • Democratic Services |
| 11 April 2019 | Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Social Housing / Cabinet Member for Enforcement and Community Safety  
                Cabinet Member for Enforcement and Community Safety  
                Cabinet Member for Educational Attainment and School Improvement / Cabinet Member for Social Care and Health Integration |
| Budget Monitoring | Heffernan/Democratic Services |
Title: Budget Monitoring

Report of the Chief Operating Officer

Open Report | For Information
---|---

Wards Affected: None | Key Decision: No

Report Author: Leanna McPherson, Democratic Services Officer | Contact Details: Tel: 020 8227 2852 E-mail: leanna.mcpherson@lbld.gov.uk

Accountable Strategic Leadership Director: Claire Symonds, Chief Operating Officer

Summary

At the meeting of the Committee held on 4 September 2018 (minute 3 refers), Members requested that a Budget Monitoring report be included on the work programme for each meeting to enable the Committee to discuss the Council's current spending performance and financial position.

A copy of the Budget Monitoring 2018/19 – April to October (Month 7) presented to Cabinet on 11 December 2018 is attached to this report at Appendix A1.

Recommendation(s)

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee is recommended to discuss and note the report.

Reason(s)

Scrutiny of the Council's budget falls under the remit of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Public Background Papers Used in the Preparation of the Report: None

List of appendices:

- Appendix A1 – Budget Monitoring 2018/19 – April to October (Month 7)
- Appendix A – General Fund Revenue budgets and forecasts.
- Appendix B – Housing Revenue Account budget and forecast.
CABINET
11 December 2018

**Title:** Budget Monitoring 2018/19 - April to October (Month 7)

**Report of the Cabinet Member for Finance, Performance and Core Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Report</th>
<th>For Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wards Affected:</strong> All</td>
<td><strong>Key Decision:</strong> Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Author:** Katherine Heffernan, Group Manager – Service Finance

**Contact Details:**
Tel: 020 8227 3262
E-mail: katherine.heffernan@lbld.gov.uk

**Accountable Director:** Helen Seechurn, Interim Finance Director

**Accountable Strategic Leadership Director:** Claire Symonds – Chief Operating Officer

**Summary**

This report shows the updated forecast based on financial performance in the first seven months of the year. The forecast outturn position has remained broadly the same since last month’s forecast and is now total expenditure of £149.186m against the approved budget of £145.368m which is an overspend of £3.818m. It should be noted that this is dependent on the successful delivery of the People and Resilience Action Plan which is expected to achieve a £3.5m reduction in spend from their current trajectory of which £2.5m has been included in the forecast. The plan was developed in September and October and so it is too early to see the impact of the actions taken in the financial information.

Before the impact of the action plan there is an overspend of £11.547m across People and Resilience. Although the Children’s Operations position has held steady and Disabilities has slightly improved, the Adults position has worsened somewhat. As we are now approaching the winter months, careful monitoring will be required as expenditure in this service can be strongly affected by external issues such as the weather, the performance of the health service and seasonal infections.

In addition to this overspend there are small overspend variances in Culture and Heritage, Community Solutions and Public Realm being offset by other services, central expenses and contingency. This means that the overall variance is £3.818m.

This report also contains the quarterly update on the Housing Revenue Account. This is showing a £17.735m revenue contribution to the capital programme/reserves which is £0.9m less than originally budgeted.

**Recommendation(s)**

The Cabinet is recommended to:
(i) Note the current forecast outturn position for 2018/19 of the Council’s General Fund revenue budget as detailed in section 2 and Appendix A to the report;

(ii) Note the forecast outturn position for 2018/19 on the Housing Revenue Account, as detailed in section 4 and Appendix B to the report;

(iii) Agree the inclusion of Local Transport Capital Grant Funding of £0.42m in the Capital Programme, as detailed in section 5 of the report; and

(iv) Agree the inclusion in the Fees and Charges schedule approved by Cabinet on 13 November 2018 (Minute 54) of new fees and charges relating to animal welfare as detailed in section 6 of the report, to be effective from 1st October 2018.

Reason(s)

As a matter of good financial practice, the Cabinet should be informed about the Council’s spending performance and its financial position. This will assist the Cabinet in holding officers to account and in making future financial decisions.

1 Introduction and Background

1.1 This report provides a summary of the forecast outturn for the Council’s General Fund revenue budget and the quarterly update on the Housing Revenue Account.

2 Overall Revenue Position

2.1 The overall position is currently forecast to total net expenditure of £149.186m against a budget of £145.368m which would result in an overspend of £3.818m. If this is the year-end position, it would require a further drawdown from the Council’s budget support reserve. There is sufficient funding in this reserve to cover this amount.

2.2 There are potential overspends across Care and Support, offset by an action plan within People and Resilience Commissioning and, at Council level, by underspends in Central Services and the use of risk contingencies written into the budget as part of the planning process. In many ways this could be regarded as a worst case forecast that should be reduced by further management action. However, it should also be noted that new pressures and risks may yet emerge. The position will be closely monitored and reported on a monthly basis.

3. More Information on the Main Variances

Children’s Care and Support – potential overspend of £6.028m

3.1 The Children’s Forecast has remained stable this month. There were small reductions in staffing and running costs in some areas but this has been offset by increase in the placements budget as a result of increased numbers of placements. This was partly mitigated by of a close review of commitments by brokerage and finance including clearing down old purchase orders. This work is not yet finished and so the forecast has been held constant until it is completed.
As previously reported the top three elements of the overspend are staffing, (£2.75m), placements (£2.3m), and the costs associated with legal proceedings (£0.39m) including costs of Counsel, expert witnesses and court mandated assessments and investigations – shown within Supplies and Services.). Although there have been some variations in year the pattern of expenditure has been consistent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjective</th>
<th>2018/19 Annual Budget</th>
<th>Forecast (October)</th>
<th>Variance against Budget (October)</th>
<th>Variance against Budget (September)</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Reason for Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>(2,228,000)</td>
<td>(2,674,263)</td>
<td>(446,263)</td>
<td>(271,646)</td>
<td>(174,617)</td>
<td>Estimated UASC grant for increase in the number of asylum seekers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>11,773,950</td>
<td>14,506,527</td>
<td>2,732,577</td>
<td>2,748,591</td>
<td>(16,014)</td>
<td>Revised staff forecasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises</td>
<td>78,300</td>
<td>369,121</td>
<td>290,821</td>
<td>294,389</td>
<td>(3,568)</td>
<td>Rents payable for young people housing options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>261,400</td>
<td>262,495</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>20,413</td>
<td>(19,317)</td>
<td>Reduction of transport recharge forecasts and client transport costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Services</td>
<td>1,015,840</td>
<td>1,844,072</td>
<td>828,232</td>
<td>888,054</td>
<td>(59,822)</td>
<td>Pre-Ofsted inspection cost funded by Commissioning(£49k), reduction to membership subscriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party Payments</td>
<td>19,422,980</td>
<td>22,009,733</td>
<td>2,586,753</td>
<td>2,323,997</td>
<td>262,756</td>
<td>10 new LAC placed with In-house foster care places &amp; 14 new asylum seekers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Payments</td>
<td>71,000</td>
<td>134,171</td>
<td>63,171</td>
<td>55,933</td>
<td>7,238</td>
<td>Transfer payments to asylum seekers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Costs</td>
<td>1,216,300</td>
<td>1,188,136</td>
<td>(28,164)</td>
<td>(31,508)</td>
<td>3,344</td>
<td>Legal SERCOP charge exceeds budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>31,611,770</td>
<td>37,639,992</td>
<td>6,028,222</td>
<td>6,028,222</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
costs to end of month 6 is £0.287m so there is a risk that the current forecast may be exceeded.

3.6 The budget pressures within this service are long standing and reflect the demography of the borough with a very young population and high levels of deprivation and need. The pressures reached a high point in 2015/16 when the SAFE programme was set up and successfully reduced the overspend down from over £9m to under £3m. However, this residual pressure which is the result of recruitment and staffing pressures common throughout the sector and our locally high levels of need has persisted.

3.7 Since 2016/17 a savings requirement of £2.359m has been written into the budget in line with the original Children’s Transformation business case predicated on reduced demand for services and numbers of children looked after plus commissioning and other efficiencies. Although there has been some progress on this, the full saving has not been achieved and this position has been compounded by continued increases in demand. This has required staffing levels to be raised above the budgeted establishment and caused overspends on placements.

3.8 The service therefore is no longer expecting that demand reductions will be achievable in the short term. The savings programme has therefore been refocused. Work is currently underway to develop a new operating model that delivers safe and sustainable services in the most cost effective way within the context of our local demand landscape.

3.9 In addition new opportunities for reducing costs have been identified. These can be grouped in two strands – a strand of commissioning activity which seeks to find the most cost effective forms of care and has the potential to reduce costs by up to £2.8m in the medium term and a strand of operational activity which will deliver a lower cost reduction figure (£1m over three years) but is expected to improve outcomes for children and families.

3.10 However the nature of the service is such that the impact in year will be limited and so the service is likely to end the year with a high level of overspend.

**Disabilities Care and Support – forecast overspend of £3.62m,**

3.11 The All Age Disability Service is forecasting a budget pressure of **£3.62m** as at Month 6. This is a marginal improvement since last month of £29k following further management action on staffing and discretionary expenditure. The breakdown of spend is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full year</th>
<th>Period 7</th>
<th>Variance from Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disabilities Care &amp; Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults Care Packages (inc Equipment)</td>
<td>8,194</td>
<td>9,451</td>
<td>1,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Care Costs</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>1,967</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEND transport</td>
<td>1,919</td>
<td>2,559</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centres and Care Provision</td>
<td>1,917</td>
<td>1,302</td>
<td>-615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.12 **Learning Disabilities** – The projected overspend on Learning Disability Packages at the half way point in the financial year is £1.947m. This has been reduced by the various contributions namely: Adults Social Care grant (£0.571m), iBCF (£0.120m). The net forecast after taking the contributions into account is an overspend of £1.256m, an increase of £0.01m from previous month’s forecast.

3.13 **Children with Disabilities SEND Transport** – This is the main area of improvement this month with a reduction in forecast of £0.065m from reduced overtime and charges to other Local Authorities. However, there is still a high forecast overspend of £0.64m which reflects continued demand for this service.

3.14 **Children with Disabilities Social care provision** – There has been a minor upwards change to the forecast for this service area of £11k. The cost of packages in place to support to children with disabilities is now £1.967m which is £0.793m above budget. There are currently 260 direct payment clients, resulting in an overspend of £0.392m against the budget. £0.153m of the budget pressure is attributable to the projected spend on legal cases and associated court costs. The remaining overspend of £0.248m is due to the cost of providing respite care to the clients.

3.15 There are 135.25 established FTE posts within Disability Service, and 10 FTE vacant posts, majority of them within the centres. There are currently 6.00 FTE agency staff covering vacancies of which 2 are DFG funded staff working with the Enabling Independence team. There are still £0.454m of unallocated savings held centrally.

**Adults Care and Support – Overspend of £2.020m**

3.16 The Adults forecast has worsened this month resulting in an overspend of just over £2m based on current information. The service has put into place an ambitious action plan to reduce spend so the forecast should start to come down in future months. However, it must be noted that winter can have a significant but not straightforwardly predictable impact on the level of social care need.

3.17 The forecast has increased by £0.167m in Care packages and there is a forecast overspend of £0.107m in Mental Health for the first time this year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full year Budget 2018/19 £000</th>
<th>Period 7 Projection £000</th>
<th>Variance from Budget £000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults Care &amp; Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult packages</td>
<td>10,423</td>
<td>12,052</td>
<td>1,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult teams</td>
<td>3,605</td>
<td>3,659</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult homes and centres</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>1,946</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>4,207</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults Other (Support services)</td>
<td>-2,798</td>
<td>-2,670</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.18 The overall pressure on care packages is £1.692m – this bulk of this being within homecare where hours have increased since last year. The service is working to reduce this and especially crisis intervention packages but no reduction can yet be seen in the financial data. There are also increases in residential and nursing care expenditure. Price uplifts have been agreed with providers from October 2018 funded by the precept. The impact of this has been included in the forecast.

3.19 Although expenditure has been increasing income has not been increasing. This is being investigated.

3.20 There are minor pressures in the staffing budget result from the underfunding of the establishment (as a result of the corporate decision not to pass through funding for pay increases) and the cost of some agency posts. This had previously been offset by vacancies in the JAD, but it has been agreed to fill those vacancies so there will only be a part year benefit. Kallar Lodge is currently forecasting a large overspend for the year £0.278m offset by underspends on Extra Care.

3.21 The Mental Health service is reporting a budget pressure for the first time this year. This is made up of a pressure of £0.3m on care packages especially residential and nursing care offset by staffing underspends. £0.5m of the IBCF grant has been provided as new investment in the service and this is taken into account in the forecast.

People and Resilience Commissioning and Action Plan

3.22 There is a net underspend across People and Resilience Commissioning of £0.123m mostly relating to staffing vacancies. The Children’s Commissioning team underspend forecast has increased this month.

3.23 Additional in year funding for Adult Social Care was announced in early October. Full details have not yet been published but the allocation for Barking and Dagenham is expected to be in the region of £0.9m. This funding has not been taken into account in the forecasts. We are awaiting further information from the Department of Health concerning the expectations and conditions of the grant and also discussions with our local health partners.

3.24 In addition the People and Resilience Management team have committed to meeting these targets set by the Council’s strategic management team as follows:
- To reduce the Adults Operations pressure to under £1m
- To contain all future growth in Children’s and Disability and ensure that the variance in those areas do not increase further from the end of August position
- To find £2.5m of in year reductions from across all budgets including Public Health Grant, Children’s and Adults Commissioning and Education, Youth and Childcare.

3.25 A management action plan is being developed and finalised but is currently estimated to provide a reduction in spend of approximately £3.5m. Actions being taken include:
- Review of Direct Payments balances and clawback of unspent monies
- Commissioning and Procurement savings on Supported Living and Accommodation for Care Leavers
- Stronger life planning and more community focused care for working aged Disabled People
- More effective utilisation of crisis intervention services
- In year savings within the Education budget

**Enforcement – reduced forecast – underspend of £0.085m**

3.26 Enforcement began the year with a forecast overspend in Parking but strong management action and the revised fees and charges have produced a huge improvement in the position. The Parking account is reporting a significant shift from £187k overspend in period 6 to an underspend position of £30k in period 7. This is mainly attributable to overachievement of income target across two particular income streams, PCN and Non-Staff Permit charges. PCN income has seen the highest ever monthly income in October 2018 (£649k) for the past 5 years. Income from non-staff permit charges has also surpassed the target by £334k per annum. Other services under Enforcement division are forecasted to deliver £362k underspend, resulting in a total Enforcement division net position of £392k underspend.

**Trading Entities – Reprofiling resulting in in-year gap of £0.9m**

3.27 The MTFS includes expected dividends from the Home Services/We Fix division of the Barking and Dagenham Trading Partnership and development activity income from Be First. This was based on the best information last summer about the expected performance of the company and the date upon which it would start trading. The latest information from the companies shows a reduced dividend from BDTP reflecting the final shape and structure and date of formation of the company.

3.28 It should be noted that the latest information from Be First shows an improved trading position for the company which will require a smaller working capital loan and a rephrased profile of development activity income. These two factors together create a potential gap of £0.9m against the MTFS although this position may improve. The companies will shortly be reporting their quarterly updates and the forecast will be revised at this point. This will be reflected in the monitoring report next month.

**Elevate Contract and Customer Services**

3.29 There has previously been a pressure in this area related to the recovery of court costs. This was rebased in the MTFS and is not expected to recur. However, there is a pressure of £0.2m on the IT budget which is being investigated and may be possible to resolve from the Corporate Infrastructure reserve. There is an expected saving of £0.52m for the Customer Access Strategy. The programme has achieved some channel shift and a reduction in call volumes – discussions are underway as to how far this will translate into a cashable saving, so this is currently shown as a pressure.

3.30 Discussions with Elevate have revealed that there is an unclaimed one-off discount of £0.487m against the target cost and a rebate of £93k on IaaS. This has now been included in the forecast.
My Place and Public Realm

3.31 My Place is currently forecasting an underspend of £0.270m arising from a number of vacancies across the service following the creation of the service – offset by some use of agency and interim staff. Recruitment activity is underway. However, the service will need to maintain some vacancies to absorb the pay award pressures. This underspend is being used to offset the £0.25m savings shortfall on services commissioned by My Place (Street Purchasing/Home Services).

3.32 There is an overspend in Public Realm on the Transport division mostly relating to a prior year saving that has never been achieved. The restructure to deliver the new operating model did not include the Fleet services and the Passenger transport service. The service had a £400k saving applied in 2016/17 with the expected reduction in service demands from Adults services. However, the changes in the level of demand have not resulted in the anticipated reduction in costs. The service finished 2017/18 with an overspend of £422k. The service is currently reporting a £300k pressure.

3.33 The Service is in ongoing discussions commissioning colleagues in Adults’ and Children’s services with a view to remodel the service to deliver an adequate service to both key customers at a reduced cost that is agreed with all parties and fully recharged proportionately to the Adults and Children’s services. It is anticipated that remodelling of the service and changes to fleet arrangements will deliver cost reductions to help stem this pressure. Any residual pressure will be managed within the Transport and Fleet umbrella.

Community Solutions – net variance of £0.07m

3.34 Community Solutions has been formed by bringing together a range of budgets including some budgets that have faced pressures in recent years including Homelessness and MASH/NRPF from Children’s services. The Temporary Accommodation pressure has been mitigated by additional MTFS growth funding and the service has also been very successful in working more effectively with families to avoid the need for accommodation. However, there are voids in some of the homeless hostels which is creating an income pressure.

3.35 In addition the service has inherited high levels of agency staffing in some areas (especially ex Children’s.) This is being managed down by the service management but does remain a risk.

3.36 The service is able to mitigate these pressures through use of one-off income including a brought forward grant resulting in a small net variance this year.

Other Operational Services

3.37 In addition there are a range of small variances in other services including £0.02m in Democratic Services (impact of the pay award) and £0.08m in Culture and Heritage.
3.38 The Elevate Client Unit has a pressure due to an expected fall in the Nationality Checking Service demand due to government asking private firms to tender for this service rather than provide it via Local Authorities from October 2018.

Central Expenses

3.39 Currently there is a projected underspend of £2.045m on Central Expenses. This is based on the position at year end last year and will be monitored closely.

3.40 In addition a number of risk provisions were written into the MTFS this year. These were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay Contingency</td>
<td>472,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings Risk Contingency</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Risk Contingency</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation cost contingency</td>
<td>660,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,132,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.41 As can be seen from the descriptions these offset many of the overspends described above. As the year goes on and the figures become more certain it may be appropriate to release this funding into the specific budget lines. However, for now they are shown as offsetting underspends.

4. Housing Revenue Account

4.1 The Housing Revenue Account was originally budgeted to generate an in-year revenue surplus of £18.635m to fund the capital programme. The forecast is that this will be reduced to £17.735m – an adverse variance of £0.9m. In practice this will not impact on this year’s programme as any shortfall will be met by a drawdown from the HRA.

4.2 The revenue variance is made up of three main components – £0.5m underachievement of rental income, £0.8m underspend on Supervision and Management and £1.2m overspends in Repairs and Maintenance.

4.3 The rent income reduction is mostly the result of fewer properties being let as temporary accommodation which attracts a higher rent than general needs housing. The overspend on repairs has arisen as the savings on the cost of home services are not being fully delivered. A provision had been made to cover the implementation costs of this saving however which is not required resulting in an underspend in supervision and management.

4.4 The HRA capital programme is expected to deliver broadly on budget with the exception of Investment in Stock which is forecasting an underspend of £1.761m. Within this there is expected to be some accelerated spend against specific Investment in Stock schemes (Capital Voids) but this will be offset by other schemes not expecting to be fully spent in 2018/19, as detailed plans are still to be established (e.g. Fire Safety)

5 New Capital Funding for Local Transport
5.1 The Chancellor of the Exchequer announced in the budget that funding would be made available to Local Authorities to improve local transport – especially the condition of roads and potholes. We have now received confirmation of the allocation to Barking and Dagenham which is £0.42m. Cabinet are asked to approve for this funding to be added to the capital programme to be spent in accordance with the conditions of the grant.

6. **Update on Fees and Charges**

6.1 The Council is the Licensing Authority for the purposes of the Animal Welfare (Licensing of Activities Involving Animals) (England) Regulations 2018 (the ‘Regulations’) which came into force on 1 October 2018, under the provisions of the Animal Welfare Act 2006. The Regulations include statutory fees and charges as follows, to apply from 1 October 2018 to 31 March 2020:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Licence Type</th>
<th>Application Fee</th>
<th>Licence / Grant Fee</th>
<th>Total Fee (Part A + Part B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal Boarding (Dog / Cat)</td>
<td>£299</td>
<td>£244</td>
<td>£543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling animals as Pets</td>
<td>£299</td>
<td>£244</td>
<td>£543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Boarding for Dogs (up to 6)</td>
<td>£155</td>
<td>£210</td>
<td>£365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Day Care (up to 6)</td>
<td>£155</td>
<td>£210</td>
<td>£365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeding Dogs</td>
<td>£299</td>
<td>£244</td>
<td>£543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riding Establishment (Hiring out horses)</td>
<td>£394</td>
<td>£449</td>
<td>£843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping or training animals for exhibition</td>
<td>£290</td>
<td>£134</td>
<td>£424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous Wild Animals</td>
<td>£390</td>
<td>£244</td>
<td>£634</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **Financial Implications**

Implications completed by: Katherine Heffernan, Group Manager – Service Finance.

7.1 This report details the financial position of the Council.

8. **Legal Implications**

Implications completed by: Dr Paul Feild, Senior Governance Lawyer

8.1 Local authorities are required by law to set a balanced budget for each financial year. During the year, there is an ongoing responsibility to monitor spending and ensure the finances continue to be sound. This does mean as a legal requirement there must be frequent reviews of spending and obligation trends so that timely intervention can be made ensuring the annual budgeting targets are met.

**Public Background Papers Used in the Preparation of the Report:** None
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### Appendix A

**GENERAL FUND REVENUE BUDGETS AND FORECASTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE AREA</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>ACTUALS P1-7</th>
<th>FORECAST</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BE FIRST</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE &amp; SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADULT'S CARE &amp; SUPPORT</td>
<td>17,157</td>
<td>14,355</td>
<td>19,177</td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDREN'S CARE &amp; SUPPORT</td>
<td>31,612</td>
<td>20,330</td>
<td>37,640</td>
<td>6,028</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISABILITIES</td>
<td>15,943</td>
<td>12,560</td>
<td>19,565</td>
<td>3,622</td>
<td>(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL</td>
<td>9,652</td>
<td>10,824</td>
<td>3,282</td>
<td>(6,370)</td>
<td>(144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>11,376</td>
<td>13,608</td>
<td>11,446</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACTED SERVICES</td>
<td>6,393</td>
<td>20,359</td>
<td>6,393</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEVATE CLIENT TEAM</td>
<td>5,675</td>
<td>2,815</td>
<td>5,675</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINANCE</td>
<td>6,065</td>
<td>3,592</td>
<td>6,065</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INNOVATION AND INVESTMENT</td>
<td>(1,801)</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>(1,801)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFORMATION</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>1,815</td>
<td>367</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION, YOUTH &amp; CHILDCARE</td>
<td>14,350</td>
<td>8,278</td>
<td>14,350</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCLUSIVE GROWTH</td>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>(92)</td>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFORCEMENT</td>
<td>(1,790)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>(1,875)</td>
<td>(85)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW, GOVERNANCE &amp; HR</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>(155)</td>
<td>455</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY PLACE</td>
<td>9,125</td>
<td>4,663</td>
<td>9,105</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC REALM</td>
<td>8,585</td>
<td>10,922</td>
<td>8,785</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY &amp; PARTICIPATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURE &amp; RECREATION</td>
<td>2,337</td>
<td>1,897</td>
<td>2,417</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGY &amp; PROGRAMMES</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>(314)</td>
<td>665</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PARTNERSHIP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDI COMMISSIONING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADULTS COMMISSIONING</td>
<td>5,482</td>
<td>4,111</td>
<td>5,578</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDREN'S COMMISSIONING</td>
<td>4,173</td>
<td>2,537</td>
<td>3,954</td>
<td>(219)</td>
<td>(47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTHY LIFESTYLES &amp; PHYSICAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEISURE</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>(118)</td>
<td>293</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH</td>
<td>(700)</td>
<td>(6,834)</td>
<td>(700)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;R ACTION PLAN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2,500)</td>
<td>(2,500)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRADING ENTITIES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,843</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GF TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>145,368</strong></td>
<td><strong>128,963</strong></td>
<td><strong>149,186</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,818</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HRA Class</th>
<th>Budget £’000</th>
<th>Actual to Date £’000</th>
<th>Forecast £’000</th>
<th>Variance £’000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings Rent</td>
<td>(86,186)</td>
<td>(49,250)</td>
<td>(85,686)</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Rents</td>
<td>(712)</td>
<td>(828)</td>
<td>(712)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>(20,015)</td>
<td>(12,682)</td>
<td>(20,015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Received</td>
<td>(300)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(300)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision &amp; Management</td>
<td>43,963</td>
<td>8,834</td>
<td>43,163</td>
<td>(800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>15,178</td>
<td>10,829</td>
<td>16,378</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Rates and Other</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad Debt Contribution</td>
<td>5,309</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,309</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC</td>
<td>685</td>
<td></td>
<td>685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>13,034</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Paid</td>
<td>10,059</td>
<td>4,610</td>
<td>10,059</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCCO (Capital funding)</td>
<td>18,635</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17,735</td>
<td>(900)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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