

**GENERAL FUND REVENUE OUTTURN 2011/12**

<b>Revised Budget</b>		<b>Working Budget</b>	<b>Final Outturn</b>	<b>(Under) / Over Spend</b>
<b>£000's</b>		<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>
66,409	Adult Social Care & Health	65,005	64,795	(210)
39,353	Children's Services & Learning	39,353	39,615	262
24,287	Environment & Transport	24,400	23,899	(501)
9,521	Housing	9,521	9,246	(275)
7,722	Leader's Portfolio	7,722	7,398	(324)
7,063	Leisure & Culture	7,135	7,293	158
44,588	Resources	46,537	45,685	(852)
<b>198,943</b>	<b>Sub-total (Net Controllable Spend) for Portfolios</b>	<b>199,673</b>	<b>197,931</b>	<b>(1,742)</b>
23,031	Non-Controllable Portfolio Costs	23,031	23,031	0
(242)	Environment Trading Areas	(126)	(166)	(40)
3,017	Risk Fund	2,052	0	(2,052)
<b>224,749</b>	<b>Portfolio Total</b>	<b>224,629</b>	<b>220,796</b>	<b>(3,833)</b>
	<b>Levies &amp; Contributions</b>			
46	Southern Seas Fisheries Levy	46	31	(15)
43	Flood Defence Levy	43	42	(1)
565	Coroners Service	565	612	47
<b>654</b>		<b>654</b>	<b>685</b>	<b>31</b>
	<b>Capital Asset Management</b>			
11,765	Capital Financing Charges	12,265	12,172	(93)
(24,541)	Capital Asset Management Account	(25,041)	(25,077)	(36)
<b>(12,776)</b>		<b>(12,776)</b>	<b>(12,905)</b>	<b>(129)</b>
	<b>Other Expenditure &amp; Income</b>			
1,553	Direct Revenue Financing of Capital	1,897	1,820	(77)
(1,000)	Net Housing Benefit Payments	(1,000)	(916)	84
1,090	Revenue Development Fund	1,090	976	(114)
(4,102)	Exceptional Expenditure & Income	(4,102)	(6,916)	(2,814)
250	Contribution to Pay Reserve	250	250	0
563	Contribution to Int Equal Reserve	563	563	0
1,796	Contribution to Capital DRF Funding	1,796	1,796	0
536	Open Space and HRA	536	536	0
(19,056)	Non-Specific Government Grants	(20,000)	(20,071)	(71)
(2,066)	Council Tax Freeze Grant	(2,066)	(2,065)	1
<b>(20,436)</b>		<b>(21,036)</b>	<b>(24,027)</b>	<b>(2,991)</b>
<b>192,191</b>	<b>NET GF SPENDING</b>	<b>191,471</b>	<b>184,549</b>	<b>(6,923)</b>
	<b>Draw from Balances:</b>			
1,653	(Draw from) / Addition to Balances (General)	4,917	11,763	6,846
(2,504)	Draw from Strategic Reserve	(3,807)	(3,807)	0
(655)	To fund the capital programme	(1,897)	(1,820)	77
<b>(1,506)</b>		<b>(786)</b>	<b>6,136</b>	<b>6,923</b>
<b>190,685</b>	<b>Budget Requirement</b>	<b>190,685</b>	<b>190,685</b>	<b>(0)</b>

**MAIN VARIANCES ON CONTROLLABLE PORTFOLIO SPENDING**

**ADULT SOCIAL CARE AND HEALTH PORTFOLIO**

The Portfolio has under spent by **£210,200** at year-end, which represents a percentage under spend against the budget of **0.3%**.

**ASCH 1 – Adult Disability Care Services (adverse variance £362,000)**

**There is an over spend of £523,300 on Domiciliary Care, £351,800 on Nursing and on Residential Care of £275,500. The above variance is after a draw from the Risk Fund of £720,000.**

Domiciliary Care over spent by £523,300. However, the additional cost of client packages is actually £1,023,300 which is a reduction of £396,800 compared to the over spend reported in 2010/11. The position has been offset by Health funding of £500,000 which has been received in 2011/12 to promote Social Care Services which aim to prolong the period before acute care needs develop.

It should be noted that due to a high number of staff vacancies in the City Care First Support team experienced until December 2011, the reablement service did not reduce long term domiciliary care needs by the 2011/12 saving target of £114,000. Following further recruitment it is expected that the savings should be delivered in 2012/13.

There is an over spend on Nursing of £351,800. This is mainly due to the net additional cost of client packages of £271,800. This can be supported by evidence of an increase in new referrals in 2011/12 to the Hospital Discharge Team of 246 cases compared to 2010/11, an increase of 22.8%. In addition, the over spend is due in part to budgeted income not being received of £80,000.

It should be noted that there was a safeguarding issue at a home which resulted in the need to place clients in alternative placements rather than the beds paid for under a block contract. The outturn position reflects an assumed position that any contractual costs incurred by SCC will be reimbursed by the provider. Negotiations are still being held between Health & Adult Social Care Officers and the provider with regards to the level of reimbursement to be made. If these negotiations culminate in a lower reimbursement figure than currently planned this will cause a pressure in 2012/13.

Residential Care over spent by £275,500. This includes a reduction of 16 clients compared to the level of activity at outturn 2010/11.

The following table demonstrates the effect of these changes on the equivalent number of units (before any draw from the Risk Fund):

	2011/12 Net Budget £000's	11/12 Unit Prices	11/12 Budgeted Units	2011/12 Outturn £000's	2011/12 Outturn Units	Difference (units)	Variance to Budget £000's
Day Care	87.2	£57 Per Day	1,530	57.6	1,011	(519)	(29.6)
Direct Payments	2,518.7	£9.47 Per Hour	265,966	2,479.7	261,848	(4,118)	(39.0)
Domiciliary	4,110.5	£12.85 Per Hour	319,883	4,633.8	360,607	40,724	523.3
Nursing	2,081.7	£64.82 Per Day	32,115	2,433.5	37,542	5,427	351.8
Residential	5,318.7	£49.15 Per Day	108,214	5,594.2	113,819	5,605	275.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>14,116.8</b>			<b>15,198.8</b>			<b>1,082.0</b>

There is a provision of £320,000 within the Risk Fund to meet the costs of 18 Dementia clients under review which were receiving services funded by health. The full impact of this has been evidenced and therefore the full amount will be drawn. There will be a further draw of £400,000 from the Risk Fund in relation to an increasing elderly population.

### **ASCH 2 – Learning Disability (adverse variance £864,500)**

**Loss of Independent Living funding to the value of £60,000 and new clients/changes in client costs totalling £864,500. The above variance is after a draw from the Risk Fund of £60,000**

There is an increase in residential activity of clients over and above that assumed when setting the 2011/12 budgets and the cost of this increased activity is £954,500. This has been partially offset by net savings on Shared Lives of £90,000. The Independent Living Fund (ILF) closed for new applications in 2010/11. The impact on the Portfolio was £60,000 which will be met through a draw on the Risk Fund.

### **ASCH 3 – Adult Disability Commissioning (favourable variance £578,600)**

**Supporting People has under spent by £636,000. Included within this under spend are planned savings of £420,000 in advance of the 2012/13 saving requirement. £200,000 of which is requested to be carried forward to fund one of costs required to facilitate the remainder of the 2012/13 saving. The residual £216,000 under spend is due to refunds from various contracts.**

Following an extensive review of the current Supporting People spending programme various contracts were ended or reduced in 2011/12 to achieve greater savings in the longer term. This achieved savings of £220,000 in 2011/12. In addition, refunds have been received totalling £216,000 for under utilised services. A review will be undertaken to identify any potential recurring additional savings.

It should be noted that there was a £200,000 provision within the 2011/12 Supporting People spending plan to meet the potential TUPE/Redundancy costs within Homelessness as a result of tendering for smaller service provisions. It is now expected that, as a result of delays in the tendering process, these costs will be incurred in 2012/13. A carry forward request has therefore been submitted.

The under spend has been offset in part by a net increase in contract costs compared to budget of £57,400. This is mainly due to the previously reported non achievement of expected savings on the SCA Day Care Contract.

#### **ASCH 4 – Provider Services – City Care (favourable variance £134,800)**

**There are staff savings within City Care First Support of £335,700 and additional costs in the homes of £200,900.**

There were a significant number of staff vacancies within the City Care First Support staffing teams giving total savings of £335,700. Following initial difficulties in recruiting carers and undertaking extensive recruitment drives, most vacancies have now been filled although a small number remain.

In addition, there is an over spend on Residential Homes of £200,900, predominantly due to an increase in staffing costs arising from higher than expected levels of agency usage.

#### **ASCH 5 – Complex Care (favourable variance £149,100)**

**Savings in employee costs.**

The Care Management teams significantly exceeded their vacancy management targets through holding posts vacant during a period of restructure for the Portfolio. This allowed the management team greater flexibility in shaping the future structure of the service.

#### **ASCH 6 – Directors Office (favourable variance £399,400)**

**Various under spends**

There is an under spend of £250,000 against a central budget provision which has been held to offset expenditure incurred elsewhere within the portfolio. In addition there are management staff savings of £127,000. This was due to posts being held vacant in advance of 2012/13 savings proposals and less than expected costs for jointly funded posts.

#### **ASCH 7 – Mental Health Commissioning (favourable variance £189,700)**

**Contract savings**

A number of contracts ceased or reduced in 2011/12 to achieve ongoing savings from 2012/13.

#### **ASCH 8 – Administration and Business Support (favourable variance £111,500)**

**Various minor under spends including Staffing, £63,800, Premises, £33,100 and Supplies and Services, £14,600.**

The staff savings of £63,800 are mainly due to vacant Business Support Officer posts held vacant pending the outcome of the Business Support review.

The premises under spend is due to rent and rates savings of £33,100. There was a rent free quarter on Herbert Collins House during a rent review period.

### **CHILDREN'S SERVICES & LEARNING PORTFOLIO**

The Portfolio has over spent by **£262,500** at year-end, which represents a percentage over spend against budget of **0.7 %**.

## **CSL 1 – Commissioning & Workforce Development (favourable variance £1,492,500)**

### **Remedial action taken to help offset overspends in Safeguarding.**

A favourable variance has resulted due to remedial action taken in order to help offset overspends in Safeguarding. This includes:

- £300,000 from the early implementation of 2011/12 staff savings.
- £200,000 identified from reallocation of grants against core activity,
- £960,000 identified within non staffing budgets including savings on contractual arrangements, development of childcare provision and staff development in Private, Voluntary and Independent Early Years settings. The savings identified by this process has formed the basis for the 2012/13 budget savings.

In addition, £82,000 favourable variance is due to the Head of Standards post becoming vacant in Quarter 1. This is offset by an over spend of £179,500 within school transport as a result of increasing demand for post 16 transport and the added costs of transporting children across the city to take up school places.

## **CSL 2 – Prevention & Inclusion Teams (favourable variance £596,300)**

### **Vacancies within the two locality teams, (East and West) and a directive to hold non essential expenditure has resulted in a favourable forecast variance.**

Non-practitioner vacant posts within Children's Centres amounting to £227,500 were held unfilled during the year. Managers have also been advised to only undertake essential expenditure from supplies and services budgets and as a consequence saved £302,000.

Income from schools was higher than anticipated generating an additional £74,200 during the year.

## **CSL 3 – Schools Allocations and Overheads (favourable variance £349,500)**

A carry forward of Dedicated Schools Grant has served to offset over spends within other Children's Services areas funded by the grant.

## **CSL 4 – Tier 4 Safeguarding Specialist Services (adverse variance £1,381,500)**

### **The number of children in care, for whom there is a financial cost, has increased by 44 over the current financial year.**

The increasing numbers of children in care has led to an over spend on fostering services of £1.4M. This includes an over spend of £1.1M on Independent Fostering Agencies (IFAs) placements, (36 budgeted versus 62 actual) and an over spend of £229,000 on internal fostering placements (237 budgeted versus 275 actual). A standard IFA placement costs approximately £26,000 more than the average SCC foster placement.

However, in the interim, existing IFA providers have reduced placement costs to SCC. Southampton is leading a partnership of 11 local authorities to secure more competitive IFA prices from 2012/13.

The table below outlines the changes in activity levels for 2011/12.

Service Activity	Current Daily Rate Range £	Client Numbers			
		Budgeted Activity	April 2011	Sept 2011	March 2012
Fostering up to 18	20 - 95	237	248	270	275
Independent Fostering Agencies	96 - 213	36	55	63	62
Supported Placements or Rent	16 - 43	16	10	9	12
Residential - Our House		5	0	3	3
Residential - Independent Sector	100 - 520	6	13	11	11
Secure	717 - 806	1	0	0	0
<b>Sub-total: Children in Care</b>		<b>301</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>356</b>	<b>363</b>
Over 18's	18 - 78	11	18	14	10
Adoption Allowances	1 - 32	102	93	91	92
Special Guardianship Allowances	4 - 44	19	25	28	41
Residence Order Allowances	6 - 16	26	25	19	19
<b>Total</b>		<b>459</b>	<b>487</b>	<b>508</b>	<b>525</b>

### **CSL 5 – Safeguarding Management and Legal Services (adverse variance £602,000)**

**The over spend has resulted in an increase in legal costs, arising from the increasing number of children in care.**

Included within this adverse variance is an over spend of £542,700 for unavoidable legal costs relating to court fees, legal expenses and the additional costs of external solicitors for the increased numbers of court proceedings. The latter is attributable to the increase in the number of children in care.

### **CSL 6 – Tier 3 Social Work Teams (adverse variance £546,700)**

**The adverse variance reflects the additional agency social work staff above establishment and the additional cost of agency social work staff in respect of vacancy and absence cover.**

An over spend of £951,500 relates to staffing costs of the Tier 3 social work teams. Current market conditions are such that the supply of social workers is insufficient to meet demand. This means a continuing need for temporary staff, acquired from independent agencies at a rate significantly higher than permanently employed staff. Agency staff are also being used for absence and sickness cover. The over spend on staffing costs includes £275,000 for agency staff employed over and above the team establishment for a fixed term. This is offset by specific savings reported above within Commissioning and Workforce Development.

The over spend on staffing is being partially offset by savings of £193,800 on specialist childminding placements and other expenditure incurred to prevent children entering care. This is a direct result of tight financial management of such discretionary expenditure.

The over spend on staffing is also being partially offset by savings of £136,300 from Family Centre savings. This was achieved by not recruiting to vacant posts.

### **CSL 7 – Infrastructure (adverse variance £406,600)**

The over spend reflects the cost of feasibility studies that did not materialise as actual capital projects. The remainder of the over spend relates to the School Private Finance Initiative budget, where expenditure has been funded from the General Fund.

### **CSL 8 – Inspire (favourable variance £210,700)**

The Directorate policy of not filling vacant posts and limiting non essential expenditure has saved £170,800 from employee budgets and £65,100 from other expenditure within the service without any significant reduction to income.

## **ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT PORTFOLIO**

The Portfolio has under spent by **£500,600** at year-end, which represents a percentage under spend against the budget of **2.1%**.

### **E&T 1 – Off Street Car Parking (adverse variance £182,600)**

**Parking pressures were identified relating to reduced income of £205,000 and increased rates costs of £79,600. Negotiated contracts with external bodies generated a net surplus of £105,000.**

There was an adverse variance for off street car parking, due to a number of factors. The most significant factor being that income fell short of the level anticipated during the budget setting process by £205,000 (4%). This may be attributed to the continuing economic downturn, the impact on commuters of a rise in fuel prices and the impact of parking officers taking strike action earlier in the year.

Marketing and commercial opportunities were explored, as part of an ongoing strategy to maximise income. A reduced £5 per day parking charge at the Marlands car park was introduced in January 2011 and this led to an increase in the volume of business by over £200,000 in the financial year. In addition, the service negotiated contracts with external bodies which generated a net surplus of £105,000.

There were employee deductions resulting from the strike action, which are included in the outturn position. However, there is a further variation due to the rates demands for off street car parks having increased significantly and being £79,600 adverse compared to the budget.

### **E&T 2 – Itchen Bridge (adverse variance £280,900)**

**Income from tolls was £250,000 lower than budgeted. A decrease in traffic flows was due to the downturn in the economy and disruption caused by the essential bridge repairs.**

Essential repairs to the bridge started in November 2010 and continued into August 2011 and there was further disruption in October 2011, due to inspection work. The resulting night closures and the use of temporary lights during off-peak hours resulted in a loss of toll income.

The downturn in the economy also led to a decrease in traffic flows in the City and contributed to an overall decrease in toll income of £250,000.

In addition, the financial effect of toll collectors taking strike action earlier in the year is reflected in the reduced income figures. The employee deductions resulting from the strike action are also incorporated in the outturn position. Proposals to save £70,000 from the automation of toll collection arrangements have not been met.

### **E&T 3 – Waste Disposal (favourable variance £462,800)**

**A reduction in the amount of waste has reduced disposal costs and, together with other cost savings and increased income, has generated a total favourable variance of over £460,000.**

A reduction in the amount of waste reduced disposal costs by £260,000 and resulted in lower staffing costs of £29,000. There was unbudgeted income of £56,000 through the Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme (LATS), £45,000 from the profit share for third party use of the incinerator and £81,000 from the sale of recyclable materials.

### **E&T 4 – Highways Contract Management (favourable variance £86,000)**

**There were savings of £149,000 on the PFI Street Lighting contract sum over and above the originally planned profile. However, some other contract costs increased.**

A level of savings on the PFI Street Lighting contract sum was planned and factored in corporately. There were savings of £149,000 over and above the originally planned profile. There were other additional client costs for Highways of £38,000 and for Street Lighting of £22,000.

### **E&T 5 – Bereavement Services (adverse variance £235,600)**

**There was an income shortfall on adult cremation fees of £66,000 and other adverse variances.**

There was an income shortfall on adult cremation fees of £66,000 and lower fees from non-adult cremations of £27,000. The service development to raise additional income from increasing the sale of memorials has only been partially achieved with an adverse variance of £31,000 and higher than anticipated set up costs of £51,000. In addition, Test Valley Council (where the crematorium is located) has significantly increased the rates by £16,000.

### **E&T 6 – Travel & Transportation (favourable variance £143,500)**

**There were a number of favourable variances in this service area.**

There was a variance of £40,000, due to the receipt of additional unbudgeted grant for the Bikeability service. There were savings of £36,000 on the School Crossing Patrols employee budgets, due to staff turnover, and £50,000 on grants awarded to third parties.

### **E&T 7 – Development Control (favourable variance £212,600)**

**There was a favourable variance for Development Control, due to additional planning application fee income.**

There was additional planning application fee income of £243,000, which was partially offset by additional employee and other service costs and a reduction in pre-application income.



### **E&T 8 – Sustainability (adverse variance £29,300)**

**Costs related to the Carbon Reduction Commitment scheme of £113,500 were met through a draw on the Risk Fund.**

There is a draw on the Risk Fund provision for compliance with the Carbon Reduction Commitment (CRC) scheme of £113,500. This reflects the estimated cost of allowance purchases for CO2 emissions for non school properties in 2011/12.

There is an adverse variance of £85,000, as the corporate 'use of natural resources' saving, relating to energy and water usage, has not yet been realised. However, a change to passive monitoring of street lights and traffic signals has resulted in energy costs being excluded from the CRC scheme and reduced the draw on the Risk Fund by £66,400.

There are employee savings £92,000 due to posts being kept vacant until the end of financial year and the recruitment at lower than originally estimated cost. The consequences of not having a fully staffed structure, has meant that income of £67,000 from working with other local authorities will not be achieved.

### **E&T 9 – Directorate & Portfolio Management / Highways Manager (favourable variance £176,300)**

**There are savings in the cost of senior management.**

There are savings in the cost of senior management of around £139,000, due to staff turnover.

## **HOUSING PORTFOLIO**

The Portfolio has under spent by **£274,700** at year-end, which represents a percentage under spend against the budget of **2.9%**.

### **HOU 1 – Housing Needs (favourable variance £110,400)**

**There were savings due to staff vacancies and a reduction in associated supplies and services costs.**

There were six vacancies in Housing Needs that it was anticipated would be filled during the year. Approval was given to recruit to three of the posts and these were filled in January / February. The remaining three posts were held open due to the recruitment freeze. This, together with the associated supplies and services costs, delivered savings of £110,400.

### **HOU 2 – Housing Solutions Management (favourable variance £86,900)**

**There were savings due to the deletion of a post and a reduction in supplies and services costs.**

During the year the Service Improvement Manager post was deleted, when it became vacant, in anticipation of 2012/13 savings measures. This delivered a saving of £50,000. In addition, supplies and services budgets were tightly controlled in anticipation of the savings to be delivered in 2012/13.

## **LEADER'S PORTFOLIO**

The Portfolio is under spent by **£324,100** at year-end, which represents a percentage under spend against budget of **4.2%**.

### **LEAD 1 – Legal and Democratic (favourable variance £240,600)**

#### **Early delivery of 2012/13 savings, an increase in Land Charges income and reduced spend on Elections**

The favourable variance is due to a combination of factors including early delivery of 2012/13 savings, an increase in Land Charges income and reduced spend on Elections resulting from the benefit of combined costs for the local election and referendum in May. This favourable position has been partly offset by reduced income/increased costs within Licensing which will be subject to further review in 2012/13.

### **LEAD 2 – Skills, Economy & Housing Renewal (Favourable variance £192,900)**

#### **Employee savings and additional income**

The under spend has resulted due to holding vacant posts in the Economic Development team and savings from the delayed implementation of the Council's management restructure. There has also been additional income during the year for work done on behalf of PUSH.

### **LEAD 3 – Major City Development (Adverse variance £98,200)**

#### **Expenditure on feasibility studies which did not result in a capital project**

A number of capital feasibility studies, costing a total of £118,500, did not result in a project and these costs have now been charged to revenue.

## **LEISURE & CULTURE PORTFOLIO**

The Portfolio has over spent by **£157,600** at year-end, which represents a percentage over spend against budget of **2.2%**.

### **LC 1 – Arts and Heritage (adverse variance £322,500)**

#### **Shortfalls in income, the settlement of a long term dispute and the cost of the geothermal heating for SeaCity**

Art Gallery shop and sales of reprographics income shortfalls of £202,000 have resulted due to the challenging economic conditions. This has been mitigated by making savings on expenditure budgets including repairs and maintenance and supplies and services. There is also a £68,200 over spend due to shortfalls on income from developers in the Archaeology unit, partially off set by reductions in temporary staff.

A long term legal dispute concerning the loss of Egyptian items that were loaned to Southampton City Council in the 1970's has resulted in the Council agreeing to pay £40,000 in compensation.

In addition to the above, the standing charges for the district heating and cooling system connection to SeaCity, which were payable from October 2011 have resulted in an over spend of £35,000.

### **LC 3 – Directorate and Portfolio Management (favourable variance £142,500)**

#### **Changes in senior management structure resulting in cost savings**

Leisure and Heritage moved from Housing and Neighbourhood's Directorate to Economic Development as a result of the Council's restructuring during the year. There was a corresponding reduction in the number of Directors and the charge to the areas they supported. Leisure and Heritage's proportion of this was £93,000. There was also a saving of £26,000 within the area on Capita Construction fees.

## **RESOURCES PORTFOLIO**

The Portfolio has under spent by **£852,200** at year-end, which represents a percentage under spend against the budget of **1.8%**

### **RES 1 – Corporate Management (favourable variance £250,600)**

#### **Income from Strike Deductions**

The favourable variance reflects the total net value of strike deductions received. These deductions have been captured centrally and have been partly used to offset costs incurred by those Council services affected by strike action

### **RES 2 – Central Repairs and Maintenance (favourable variance £549,600)**

#### **Under spend on planned repairs and maintenance budgets**

Full Council has agreed to automatically carry forward any surplus/deficit at year-end subject to the overall financial position of the Authority. There is an agreed list of planned projects totalling £521,000 will need to slip into 2012/13 to enable the works to be undertaken at the most appropriate time of year to avoid disruption and it is therefore requested that this amount of £521,000 be carried forward. Given the current financial position it is recommended that the remainder of the general under spend be added to General Fund balances.

### **RES 3 – Property Portfolio Management (adverse £187,900)**

#### **Reduction in income on Investment Properties**

The Investment Properties account is showing an adverse variance on income, primarily caused by reduced rent from shared income lettings, reflecting current market conditions. In addition rental income levels have reduced, combined with increased costs, due to the impact of the disposal programme; these reductions will have an ongoing impact in future years.

### **RES 4 – Property Services (favourable variance £220,600)**

#### **Rate refunds for Civic Buildings**

The Admin Buildings account is showing a favourable variance due to the receipt of one-off rate refunds during the current financial year. These have primarily arisen as a result of the planned vacation of the Civic Centre to enable essential building works to be undertaken as part of the Accommodation Strategy, together with the impact of overall rate reviews for Civic Buildings.

## **CARRY FORWARD REQUESTS**

Carry forward requests will be considered for approval if they are for already approved, one off schemes, which were not completed in year (i.e. re-phasing of one-off spend) and if there are insufficient funds available in the forthcoming year.

The carry forward requests received, relating to the 2011/12 outturn position, are as follows:

### **ADULT SOCIAL CARE AND HEALTH PORTFOLIO**

#### **Supporting People – £200,000**

It should be noted that there was a £200,000 provision within the 2011/12 Supporting People spending plan to meet the potential TUPE/Redundancy costs within Homelessness as a result of tendering for smaller service provisions. It is now expected that, as a result of delays in the tendering process, these costs will be incurred in 2012/13. A carry forward request has therefore been submitted as there is no provision in current budgets to meet these one off costs.

### **CHILDREN'S SERVICES & LEARNING PORTFOLIO**

#### **Post 16 Transport Fund – £65,000**

A request is made to carry forward £65,000 for the Post 16 Transport Partnership Fund to provide subsidised travel for low income students going to Further Education in the City. The terms of the proposed scheme have taken longer to negotiate than originally anticipated. This has meant that it has only been possible to offer and promote the scheme in the later part of the year so although the up take is lower than originally planned there has been a significantly increase in recent months.

The scheme should not be required beyond 2012/13 due to the raising of the participation age, though the continuation in the short term will cushion the effects of the withdrawal of Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA).