

SCIA 06 (17/18)

| | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------|----------------------|------------------|
| Chief Officer: | Lesley Bowles | Service: | Housing & Health |
| Activity | Housing | No. of Staff: | 2 fte |

| Activity Budget Change | Year: 2017/18 Growth £000 | Later Years Comments (ongoing, one-off, etc.) |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| HERO service | 35 | ongoing |

Reasons for and explanation of proposed change in service

Currently, there are two HERO Officers and the budget required to fund their salary costs is £70,000 per annum including travelling expenses. None of this is currently funded from SDC core budgets.

The HERO service was originally funded through external Trailblazer funding from Government. Subsequently it has been funded from securing alternative sources of external funding. This has included from funding schemes which are no longer available to the Council, such as KCC Second Homes funding and some funding from partners under Service Level Agreements.

Total external income for 2016/17 was £35,000 and it is anticipated that external funding of the following amounts will continue to be available:

£20,000 Dartford Borough Council;

£6,000 Kent County Council; and

£9,000 West Kent Housing.

These funding agreements enable the council to provide services dedicated to the clients of those three funders at locations specified by them, usually their own offices.

This funding does not, however, cover the salary costs for the service provided in house to our own residents.

The core budget provision of £35k per annum will enable the service to the council's own residents to continue.

Key Stakeholders Affected

HERO clients include vulnerable residents facing crisis relating to debt, homelessness, poverty, mental health and ill health, who, without the HERO service are likely to become homeless. Without the HERO service, the council is likely to face increased demand from these customers for housing assistance under the Housing Act 1998 as amended by the Homelessness Act 2002, under which the council has a duty to provide housing.

Likely impacts and implications of the change in service (include Risk Analysis)

The requested growth item would enable the HERO service to continue to provide assistance for our own residents. Without it, the service will be restricted to that provided for other agencies which are prepared to pay for it.

Risk to Service Objectives (High / Medium / Low)

High

| 2016/17 Budget | £'000 | Performance Indicators | | |
|------------------|-------|--|--------|--------------|
| | | Code & Description | Actual | Target |
| Operational Cost | 69 | | | |
| Income | (69) | Total number of homelessness acceptances | 19 | Less than 20 |
| Net Cost | 0 | | | |

Equality Impacts

Members are reminded of the requirement, under the Public Sector Equality Duty (section 149 of the Equality Act 2010) to have due regard to (i) eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Equality Act 2010, (ii) advance equality of opportunity between people from different groups, and (iii) foster good relations between people from different groups. The decisions recommended through this proposal directly impact on end users.

Vulnerable persons at risk of homelessness could be more likely to become homeless if the HERO service is not available to them.

SCIA 07 (17/18)

| | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------|----------------------|------------------|
| Chief Officer: | Lesley Bowles | Service: | Housing & Health |
| Activity | Leisure | No. of Staff: | 1.1 fte |

| Activity Budget Change | Year: 2017/18 Growth / (Saving) £000 | Later Years Comments (ongoing, one-off, etc.) |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| Sencio Management Fee | (44) | ongoing |

Reasons for and explanation of proposed change in service

The original management fee, paid annually to Sencio, in 2004/05 was £486,000. This has reduced over time to £80,950 in 2012/13. The fee has remained at that rate since 2012/13.

A leisure in depth scrutiny review reported its findings to Scrutiny Committee on 5 July and it was resolved that:

- a) The conclusions of the Scrutiny Working Group that Sencio did not offer value for money to the Council at this time, be noted, while noting the trend of improvement; and
- b) Cabinet be recommended to
 - i) Review the fees paid to Sencio; and
 - ii) Consider whether the Council could more effectively carry out the outreach element of the Sports Development function while retaining part of the management fee.

And in its consideration Cabinet be advised that it may wish to take account of the further investment that Sencio had been taking forward.

This recommendation is being considered by the Housing & Health Advisory Committee on 4 October 2016.

In addition to the Management Fee, the Council also pays an annual contribution of £20,000 towards 'Advantage', a concessionary scheme that offers reduced rates for leisure activities.

It is proposed that the reduction is applied to the Management Fee rather than the Advantage contribution.

Key Stakeholders Affected

Sencio Community Leisure

Likely impacts and implications of the change in service (include Risk Analysis)

Sencio is currently considering other impacts, e.g. from the Living Wage, which is likely to cost an additional £86,000. This does not take account of any pension increase associated with the Living Wage, which could cost a further £44,000.

The outcome of all of these increases could lead to an increase in fees to customers.

Risk to Service Objectives (High / Medium / Low)

Low

| 2016/17 Budget | £'000 | Performance Indicators | | |
|------------------|-------|--|--------|--------|
| Operational Cost | 250 | Code & Description | Actual | Target |
| Income | (20) | Percentage of Health Action Plan on target | 96% | 80% |
| Net Cost | 230 | | | |

Equality Impacts

Members are reminded of the requirement, under the Public Sector Equality Duty (section 149 of the Equality Act 2010) to have due regard to (i) eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Equality Act 2010, (ii) advance equality of opportunity between people from different groups, and (iii) foster good relations between people from different groups.

The decision recommended through this paper has the potential to directly impact on end users if the cumulative effect of this change and other impacts necessitate an increase in fees to customers.