

Cabinet

Meeting held 15 February 2017

PRESENT: Councillors Julie Dore (Chair), Leigh Bramall (Deputy Chair), Ben Curran, Jackie Drayton, Jayne Dunn, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Bryan Lodge and Jack Scott

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 An apology for absence was received from Councillor Cate McDonald.

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1 No items were identified where it was proposed to exclude the public and press.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

4.1 The minutes of the meeting of Cabinet held on 18 January 2017 were approved as a correct record.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

5.1 Public Question in respect of Government Cuts

5.1.1 Jon Hinchliffe asked why the Council was not doing more to oppose Government cuts? The Council should join up with other Northern Councils to oppose such cuts. The Council had £12m reserves. As we had now reached a crisis point, why were these reserves not being used to support the Budget?

5.1.2 Councillor Ben Curran, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, responded that the Council did oppose the cuts. There was close work with the Local Government Association, Special Interest Group of Municipal Authorities (SIGOMA) and the Core Cities etc. to make clear the Council's opposition to the cuts.

5.1.3 There was a legal requirement for the Council to set a balanced budget. If the Council did not do this, Commissioners would be installed. This would not be good for the City as Councillors were accountable to the public in the way that Commissioners wouldn't be.

5.1.4 Councillor Curran was clear that the Council had stood up to the Government and had put forward its opposition to the cuts on numerous occasions, including in the way that money was distributed across the country. The next step in opposing

would be to not set a balanced budget, something which the Council was not legally able to do. No Council in the country had set an illegal budget and there was no large administration throughout the country who had suggested doing so.

- 5.1.5 Sheffield had the lowest reserves amongst all the Core Cities. All money available to protect services had been used. There was a need to save money in reserves for emergencies such as the floods in 2007 which had cost the Council £12 million, which was currently the amount available in reserves. The Council could not set an unbalanced budget and it would be abdicating its responsibilities to do so.
- 5.16 The Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore, added that she had supported a 10,000 signature petition asking for a Fair Deal from the Government and had delivered this to Downing Street. All Labour administrations had received a letter from the Labour leadership which stated that they expected Labour Council's to set a balanced budget. Sheffield City Council was standing up to the Government in respect of Government cuts such as where the Council had jointly funded a Judicial Review in respect of European funding.

5.2 Public Question in respect of Food Hygiene

- 5.2.1 Nigel Slack commented that he was interested to hear at the Budget Conversation meeting that recent legislation made it possible for Council's to charge food outlets that achieved poor hygiene results for subsequent visits to assess whether necessary improvements had been made. When will this come into effect? To how many food outlets in the City might this apply? What might be considered a fair level of charge? Would this income be available to the general revenue fund or be ring-fenced to Environmental Health?
- 5.2.2 Councillor Bryan Lodge, Cabinet Member for the Environment, commented that this option was already in operation and it was a pilot scheme which could be offered to other local businesses in the City. However, it was not about making subsequent visits. It was about businesses themselves wanting to be reassessed. Only one business had applied for this thus far. Councillor Lodge believed that the number of businesses applying would be in the tens rather than hundreds, but the scheme would be marketed.
- 5.2.3 There was a fixed fee for businesses of £150 which was based on a Government recommendation and covered the inspection and administration costs. This money was ring-fenced and could not be put back into the general fund.

5.3 Public Question in respect of Right to Buy

- 5.3.1 Nigel Slack commented that he was delighted to see the completion and occupation of new Council Houses built in the City. What protection was currently available to the Council to prevent these properties becoming subject to 'Right to Buy' legislation immediately and how might that change with the new 'Housing Bill'?
- 5.3.2 Councillor Jayne Dunn, Cabinet Member for Housing, replied that all new Council build was protected from Right to Buy legislation for 15 years and could not be sold

below market value. No opposition party at the Council had put in an alternative to the current Housing Revenue Account.

5.3.3 Councillor Dunn added that new house building was very important to the Council and houses would continue to be built across the City. It should not be assumed that everyone who lived in a Council home wanted to buy it.

5.4 Public Question in respect of University Technical College

5.4.1 Nigel Slack commented that, with news that Manchester's University Technical College (UTC) was to close due to insufficient pupil numbers, after the investment 3 years ago of £9 million, what were the prospects and pupil numbers for Sheffield's University Technical Colleges?

5.4.2 Councillor Jackie Drayton, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, commented that she was saddened to see the University Technical College in Manchester was to close. The current Government and previous Coalition Government had not valued vocational education and had turned completely to academic education.

5.4.3 Councillor Drayton further commented that UTC's were focused on technical/vocational skills as well as academic, which the the Government had consistently 'dumbed down' and, whereas all examples where previously the measure of a pupil was 5 A-C's including vocational or equivalent subjects, now it was purely academic qualifications.

5.4.4 Sheffield was fortunate in that the first UTC had been was strongly supported and it was a specialist college in design technology and engineering. The College had good links with manufacturing and engineering businesses, had a 'Good' Ofsted inspection result, and now had their first students gaining places at university and higher apprenticeship.

5.4.5 Making the transition from school at 14 years of age to the College where hours were 8:30am – 5:00pm was a big challenge and maybe a reason why numbers of pupils was not as high as expected. The Central UTC had recently seen the first pupils graduating to University and gaining advanced apprenticeships at the Manufacturing Park.

5.4.6 Councillor Drayton added that the second UTC had opened last September at the Olympic Legacy Park. It focused on two vocations, computing and health studies. It had established links with the Universities and Hospital Trusts. Although initial numbers had been low, these were starting to grow.

5.4.7 One of the major barriers to the success of the UTC's was that schools did not want pupils leaving at 14 to attend UTC's as this lost them money. Therefore, there was a need to build parental confidence in their child attending the college. The good results achieved by the first UTC was something for the second to build on and increase confidence amongst parents and pupils.

5.4.8 It was still difficult for the UTC's to get into some schools to promote their values.

The Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families (Jayne Ludlam) and Councillor Drayton had written a joint letter to all schools requesting that all pupils be offered all available options for their future.

- 5.4.9 Councillor Drayton did not know of the particular circumstances of the college in Manchester but she was confident of the continued success of the colleges in Sheffield. She would send the information in respect of numbers to Mr Slack.

5.5 Public Question in respect of Trade Union Legislation

- 5.5.1 Nigel Slack commented that an alternative interpretation of the legitimacy of Section 241 of the Trade Union Labour Relations Act (TULRA) 1992 had been provided by a QC, to one of the Street Tree campaigners, and it was notable that no felling crews, supported by their normal Police escorts, were in evidence today. This opinion, if accepted, would mean that the 19 arrests during this campaign may be illegal and an infringement of the protesters Human Rights under Article 11.

- 5.5.2 Chrissy Meleady M.B.E. had also released a statement reminding us all that in 1992, and with respect to this Act, "Sheffield Labour Council, the Lib Dems and the Sheffield Trades Council vehemently opposed, at the time, as being a draconian and oppressive tool that could be used to suppress and attack workers and the people of this City" adding "To see a piece of legislation that was created to enforce a diminution in rights being supported by those who once condemned it for its potential to erode rights, is very sad and shocking." Does the Council continue to support the use of this legislation on peaceful protesters in the City and how will this affect the ability of protesters to protect areas of the City from Fracking exploitation works?

- 5.5.3 Councillor Bryan Lodge clarified that the interpretation referred to by Mr Slack was from a junior barrister and not a QC as stated. The Council's Legal team had looked at this and it was clear that it was not for the Council to tell the Police about their powers of arrest.

- 5.5.4 Section 303 of the Highways Act stated that it was an offence to wilfully obstruct the operation of lawful work and it was an issue for the Police to interpret how they enforced this.

- 5.5.5 Councillor Dore added that the Council had consistently said it was a decision for the Police to apply the correct legislation where required.

5.6 Public Question in respect of Amey Contract

- 5.6.1 Nigel Slack commented that Street Tree campaigners had also been advised that, for each tree felled, Amey or their contractors should, where the tree overhangs private property, ask for an 'Oversailing License' from the resident and the owner (in the case of rented accommodation). Failure to do so may mean any felling work in such circumstances be deemed illegal. Do Amey or their contractors request such licenses as part of their normal working practice and is there any written evidence for this? If this work is deemed illegal, which organisation would be considered in breach of the law, the contractor, Amey, or the Council? And what

would be the consequences?

- 5.6.2 Councillor Bryan Lodge commented that, thus far, no Oversailing Licenses had been requested in the history of tree felling in Sheffield. It could be said that a tree overhanging a property was trespassing and workers could be said to be there to solve a trespass and a license may not therefore be required. The Council had a duty to maintain the highway and no licenses had been required in respect of this.

6. ITEMS CALLED-IN FOR SCRUTINY

- 6.1 The Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee, Councillor Tony Damms, submitted a report outlining the outcome of the Committee's consideration of the Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2017/18 reports to be considered at today's Cabinet meeting.
- 6.2 Following consideration of the reports the Committee resolved the following:-

RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

(a) notes the contents of the reports of the Acting Executive Director, Resources, on the Capital Programme Budget 2017/18 and the Revenue Budget 2017/18, together with the comments made and the responses provided to the questions raised;

(b) expresses its thanks and appreciation to all officers, and Councillor Ben Curran (Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources), involved in producing a balanced budget for 2017/18; and

(c) recommends that the reports of the Acting Executive Director, Resource on the Capital Programme Budget 2017/18 and the Revenue Budget 2017/18, respectively, be submitted to Cabinet without amendment.

- 6.3 It was then: **RESOLVED:** That the above recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee be noted.

7. RETIREMENT OF STAFF

- 7.1 The Acting Executive Director, Resources submitted a report on Council staff retirements.

RESOLVED: That this Cabinet :-

(a) places on record its appreciation of the valuable service rendered to the City Council by Sharon Sayles – Office Manager, Meersbrook Bank Primary School, CYPF Portfolio over a period of 30 years;

(b) extends to her its best wishes for the future and a long and happy retirement; and

(c) directs that an appropriate extract of this resolution under the Common Seal of the Council be forwarded to her.

8. FINANCIAL INCLUSION STRATEGY

8.1 The Chief Executive submitted a report presenting for approval a new Financial Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan for Sheffield, setting out how the Council and its partners intend to tackle financial exclusion and over-indebtedness in the City.

8.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) approves the document 'A Financially Inclusive City' attached to the report as a statement of the Council's strategic approach to financial inclusion;
- (b) approves the accompanying Financial Inclusion Action Plan;
- (c) delegates authority to the Director of Policy, Performance and Communications to make amendments to the Action Plan consistent with the principles set out in 'A Financially Inclusive City' if necessary on the basis of further development and consultation with stakeholders;
- (d) requests that the Chief Executive provides a report to the Cabinet Member for Community Services and Libraries on the effectiveness of the Council's discretionary hardship funds in providing support to those experiencing financial crisis; and
- (e) notes that the implementation of any of the proposed actions may be subject to further decision making in accordance with the Leader's Scheme of Delegation.

8.3 Reasons for Decision

8.3.1 The introduction of a financial inclusion strategy and action plan will provide the city with an opportunity to build on the excellent work that is already being done to improve financial wellbeing of its residents. The approaches set out here will: ensure that frontline workers are equipped to ask and answer effectively questions about financial issues; support Sheffield Citizens Advice to provide welfare and debt advice where it is needed most; encourage people to save regularly by promoting straightforward products at the beginning of tenancies; ensure that the right kind of self-help information is available for those at major life events such as relationship breakdown or cancer diagnosis to prevent them from going into financial crisis; and embed Financial Inclusion within our City's strategic approach to fairness and tackling poverty.

8.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

8.4.1 The 'As-is' option: no new strategy for financial inclusion put in place in the city. Much of the valuable work which takes place in the city supporting people with their financial wellbeing would continue. However, the new opportunities for working together to raise awareness of financial inclusion and target support

effectively would be lost, as would the potential to embed financial inclusion more strongly within our city approaches to fairness and tackling poverty.

9. SHEFFIELD CITY REGION INNOVATION CORRIDOR

9.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report seeking approval to accept Department for Transport (DfT) funding (via Sheffield City Region) which has been awarded from the Government's Large Local Major Schemes Fund. Sheffield City Council will receive the funding.

9.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) approves acceptance of up to £1.4m of grant funding from Sheffield City Region who are expected to be the Accountable Body for the grant which they will receive from the Department for Transport (DfT) and then pass on to Sheffield City Council. The grant will be utilised to develop an Outline Business Case (OBC) for a DfT major transport scheme in accordance with DfT process;
- (b) approves procurement of external support to deliver the OBC in accordance with advice from Commercial Services in the Procurement Strategy;
- (c) approves delegation of authority to the Director of Finance and Commercial Services, in conjunction with the Head of Strategic Transport & Infrastructure, to award contracts to secure the necessary external support to develop the OBC; and
- (d) delegates to the Director of Finance and Commercial Services, in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance and the Executive Director, Place the power to finalise the grant funding agreement in accordance with Council procedures.

9.3 Reasons for Decision

9.3.1 The DfT's Large Local Major Schemes Fund presents a unique opportunity to develop the significant transport infrastructure improvements required in the SCR Innovation Corridor and promote a bid for hundreds of millions of pounds in government funding at minimal risk to the Council.

9.3.2 DfT major scheme outline business cases have normally to be developed at risk, by the scheme promoter. OBC development costs can be substantial and these are only refunded by the DfT if a scheme is accepted into their funding programmes. The Large Local Major Schemes Fund offers a lower risk approach, in that it provides advance DfT funding to develop the OBC.

9.3.3 The SCR Innovation Corridor suffers from heavy traffic congestion, particularly around junctions 33 and 34 of the M1. These problems are exacerbated by the limited number of access points for cross traffic between Sheffield and Rotherham, much of which uses the motorway junctions. The project will aim to deliver a

highway scheme which will relieve the area from traffic congestion and provide better cross linkages between Sheffield and Rotherham.

- 9.3.4 The area suffers from poor air quality, to which transport emissions are a major contributor. Poor air quality is known to have detrimental effects on health, resulting in premature deaths. The project will aim to produce a scheme which lowers congestion levels, producing beneficial effects on air quality. It will also facilitate better public transport links, reducing the reliance on car trips.
- 9.3.5 The area suffers from poor public transport connectivity, which limits access to jobs and opportunities and increases reliance on car based trips due to the lack of viable alternatives. The project will aim to produce a scheme which facilitates the provision of improved public transport links to and from this area.
- 9.3.6 The output of the project will be a DfT compliant outline business case, which will be used to potentially secure very significant funding for the strategic transport infrastructure improvements needed to ensure that the area fulfils its potential as a nationally and globally significant location for advanced manufacturing. Such a transport project, potentially involving hundreds of millions of pounds of construction work, would itself have a beneficial impact on the local economy, but the transport infrastructure built would provide the best possible transport linkages to facilitate development and economic growth, providing access to jobs and opportunities for the citizens of Sheffield City Region.

9.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 9.4.1 Do nothing – do not accept the offered funding and do not develop the SCR innovation Corridor Scheme or any other intervention. This would mean that the issues of traffic congestion, poor public transport links and poor air quality would not be addressed and would in fact worsen due to ongoing traffic growth. These issues would therefore become even greater constraints to development and prevent the area achieving its full economic potential.
- 9.4.2 Do minimum – do not accept the offered funding but continue to develop and implement local improvements. Local improvements would not have significant impacts on the heavy traffic congestion and consequent air quality issues and public transport connectivity would continue to be an issue. Minor improvements gained would be offset by ongoing traffic growth. These issues would therefore continue to be major impediments to development and prevent the area achieving its full economic potential.

(NOTE: This decision is not subject to call-in, in accordance with the Fast Track process set out in Scrutiny Procedure Rule 17 of the Constitution.)

10. TOBACCO CONTROL IN SHEFFIELD: STRATEGY AND FUTURE COMMISSIONING MODEL

- 10.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report proposing a Tobacco Control Strategy for Sheffield and changes to future commissioning to support the Tobacco Control Strategy.

10.2 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) the content of the report is noted and approval is given to the Tobacco Control Strategy and the Tobacco Control future commissioning strategy;
- (b) the Director of Culture and Environment be authorised to terminate contracts relevant to the delivery of the Tobacco Control Strategy in accordance with terms and conditions of those contracts;
- (c) in accordance with the commissioning strategy and this report, authority be delegated to the Director of Financial and Commercial Services to:
 - (i) in consultation with the Director of Culture and Environment and the Director of Public Health, approve the procurement strategy for the services outlined in this report; and
 - (ii) in consultation with the Director of Culture and Environment, Director of Public Health and Director of Legal and Governance, to award, vary or extend contracts for the provision of services outlined in this report; and
- (d) the Director of Culture and Environment in consultation with the Director of Public Health, the Director of Legal and Governance, and the Director of Finance and Commercial Services is authorised to take such steps as he deems appropriate to achieve the outcomes in this report.

10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

10.3.1 The proposal set before Cabinet is the preferred option because:

It is based on detailed analysis of local need through a Tobacco Health Needs Assessment in line with commissioning good practice;

It is evidence based, drawing on good practice and evidence of what works in international contexts including the World Health Organisation MPOWER approach;

It has been developed over a 12 month period with the Sheffield Tobacco Control Board partners and is supported by the Board;

It has been tested through a 6 week public consultation through Citizen Space and through specific consultation events with key stakeholders, including NHS partners;

An important caveat is that these proposals are not supported by the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Lead for Tobacco Control or by ASH, as they include a reduction of investment in individual quits which have a strong evidence base. Sheffield City Council recognises the expertise of ASH and the Regional Lead and welcomes this challenge. Where investment has been earmarked for projects with a less strong evidence base than 4 week quits, a research partnership will be sought to robustly evaluate the projects and add to the evidence base, not just for Sheffield but for wider Tobacco Control. The Director of Public Health will

continue a dialogue with local NHS partners regarding increased NHS investment in stop smoking services.

10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 10.4.1 Do nothing – business as usual re-commissioning or extend current contracts. This option will not provide the greatest opportunity to respond to changing need as evidenced by the Tobacco Health Needs Assessment, and to the diminishing resources available and will not provide the best opportunity to re-consider how to address population prevalence.
- 10.4.2 Collaborative commissioning as a sub-region of South Yorkshire - this option is not recommended as the timescales are not conducive to be able to do so, and the aims and ambitions of the different Local Authorities are sufficiently different that there is not a good match.
- 10.4.3 Increase investment overall in Tobacco Control from additional NHS partner contributions - this remains an aspiration, as tobacco dependency is a chronic relapsing condition that usually starts in childhood and which is currently under-treated. The London Senate describe treating tobacco dependency as “the highest value intervention for today’s NHS and Public Health system, saving and increasing healthy lives at an affordable cost” <http://www.londonsenate.nhs.uk/helping-smokers-quit/> . However, further local NHS investment has not yet been agreed within the timescales for this procurement. These conversations will continue and will be led by the Director of Public Health.

11. **REVENUE BUDGET 2017/18**

- 11.1 The Acting Executive Director, Resources submitted a report to request that the Cabinet request Full Council to:-
- approve the City Council’s revenue budget for 2017/18, including the position on reserves and balances;
 - approve a 2017/18 Council Tax for the City Council; and
 - note the levies and precepts made on the City Council by other authorities.
- 11.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet recommends to the meeting of the City Council on 3 March 2017:-
- (a) to approve a net Revenue Budget for 2017/18 amounting to £395.551m;
- (b) to approve a Band D equivalent Council Tax of £1,428.36 for City Council services, i.e. an increase of 4.99% (1.99% City Council increase and 3%

national arrangement for the social care precept);

- (c) to approve the Revenue Budget allocations and Budget Implementation Plans for each of the services, as set out in Appendix 2 of the report;
- (d) to note that, based on the estimated expenditure level set out in Appendix 3 to the report, the amounts shown in part B of Appendix 6 would be calculated by the City Council for the year 2017/18, in accordance with sections 30 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;
- (e) to note that the Section 151 Officer has reviewed the robustness of the estimates and the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves, in accordance with Part 2 of the Local Government Act 2003. Further details can be found in Appendix 4 of the report;
- (f) to note the information on the precepts issued by the South Yorkshire Police & Crime Commissioner and South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority, together with the impact of these on the overall amount of Council Tax to be charged in the City Council's area;
- (g) to approve the proposed amount of compensation to Parish Councils for the loss of Council Tax income in 2017/18 at the levels shown in the table in paragraph 177 of the report;
- (h) to note the latest 2016/17 budget monitoring position;
- (i) to approve the Treasury Management and Annual Investment Strategies set out in Appendix 7 of the report and the recommendations contained therein;
- (j) to approve the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement set out in Appendix 7 of the report;
- (k) to agree that authority be delegated to the Director of Finance to undertake Treasury Management activity, to create and amend appropriate Treasury Management Practice Statements and to report on the operation of Treasury Management activity on the terms set out in these documents;
- (l) to approve a Pay Policy for 2017/18 as set out in Appendix 8 of the report; and
- (m) to agree that authority be delegated to the Executive Director of Communities to set – subject to budgetary constraints – a framework of care home & home care fee increases with effect from 1 April 2017.

11.3 Reasons for Decision

- 11.3.1 The City Council on 3 March 2017 meets to consider the Revenue Budget for 2017/18 and to determine the Council Tax for that year. The report provides information to enable the Council to set a budget and determine the Council Tax.

The proposals set out in this report provide for a balanced budget to be recommended to Council.

11.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 11.4.1 A number of alternative courses of action are considered as part of the process undertaken by Officers before decisions are recommended to Members. The recommendations made to Members represent what Officers believe to be the best options available to the Council, in line with Council priorities, given the constraints on funding and the use to which funding is put within the Revenue Budget.

(Note: This is subject to approval at Full Council at its meeting to be held on 3 March 2017 and is not subject to call-in).

12. **CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2017/18**

- 12.1 The Acting Executive Director, Resources submitted a report setting out the proposed Capital Programme from 2017-18 onwards describing the programmes to be undertaken, listing the projects to be delivered and setting out the context in which it has been compiled.

- 12.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet recommends to the meeting of the City Council on 3rd March 2017:-

- (a) that Members note the specific projects included in the years 2017-18 to 2022-23 programmes at Appendix 9. Block allocations are included within the programme for noting at this stage and detailed proposals will be brought back for separate Member approval as part of the monthly monitoring procedures;
- (b) to note the proposed Capital Programme for the 6 years to 2022/23 as per Appendix 9 of the report; and
- (c) to approve the Corporate Resource Pool policy outlined in Appendix 4 such that the commitment from the CRP is limited to one year and no CRP supported schemes are approved beyond 2017/18 unless explicitly stated. Further reports will be brought to Members as part of the monthly approval process should the receipts position improve.

12.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 12.3.1 The proposed projects within the Capital Programme will improve the services to the people of Sheffield

- 12.3.2 To formally record the Capital Programme in line with the Council's annual budgetary procedures and gain Member approval for the policy on the management of the Corporate Resource Pool.

12.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 12.4.1 A number of alternative courses of action are considered as part of the capital approval process undertaken by Officers before decisions are recommended to Members. The recommendations made to Members represent what Officers believe to be the best options available to the Council, in line with Council priorities, given the constraints on funding and the use to which funding is put within the Revenue Budget and the Capital Programme.

(Note: This is subject to approval at Full Council at its meeting to be held on 3 March 2017 and is not subject to call-in).

13. REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING 2016/17 MONTH 9 AS AT 31/12/16

- 13.1 The Acting Executive Director, Resources submitted a report providing the month 9 monitoring statement on the City Council's Revenue and Capital Budget for 2016/17.

13.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) note the updated information and management actions provided by the report on the 2016/17 Revenue Budget position;
- (b) notes the planned proposal to use New Homes Bonus reserves to reinstate the General Fund Balance to the 31st March 2016 levels following any drawdown required to balance the 2016/17 budget position. We will finalise our approach as part of Outturn; and
- (c) in relation to the Capital Programme:
 - (i) approves the proposed additions to the Capital Programme listed in Appendix 6.1 of the report, including the procurement strategies and delegations of authority to the Interim Director of Finance and Commercial Services or nominated officer, as appropriate, to award the necessary contracts following stage approval by Capital Programme Group;
 - (ii) approves the proposed additions to the Capital Programme relating to the Growth Investment Fund listed in Appendix 6.1 of the report;
 - (iii) approves the proposed variations, deletions and slippage in Appendix 6.1 of the report;
 - (iv) approves the acceptance of the grant detailed in Appendix 6.2 of the report;
 - (v) notes the variations authorised by Directors under the delegated authority provisions; and
 - (vi) notes the latest position on the Capital Programme.

13.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 13.3.1 To record formally changes to the Revenue Budget and the Capital Programme and gain Member approval for changes in line with Financial Regulations and to reset the Capital Programme in line with latest information.

13.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 13.4.1 A number of alternative courses of action are considered as part of the process undertaken by Officers before decisions are recommended to Members. The recommendations made to Members represent what Officers believe to be the best options available to the Council, in line with Council priorities, given the constraints on funding and the use to which funding is put within the Revenue Budget and the Capital Programme.