

**HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
Decision Report**

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Decision Maker: | Cabinet |
| Date: | 23 June 2014 |
| Title: | 2013/14 – end of year financial report |
| Reference: | 5840 |
| Report From: | Director of Corporate Resources – Corporate Services |

Contact name: Rob Carr, Head of Finance

Tel: 01962 847508

Email: rob.carr@hants.gov.uk

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1. This report provides a summary of the 2013/14 final accounts. The draft statement of accounts will be submitted for audit on the 30 June 2013 and reported to the Audit Committee in September, in conjunction with the Audit Commission's Governance report on the accounts.
- 1.2. Net service cash-limited expenditure was £1.6m lower than budgeted against an overall gross budget of £1.8bn (0.1%). This position reflects the continuing financial strategy of achieving savings in the early part of the CSR period, which can then be used to meet the cost of change and invest to save or transformational projects in future years. The position also reflects the significant costs incurred in dealing with flooding in the earlier part of the year.
- 1.3. The position for each of the services is summarised in the table below.

| | (Under) / Over Spend £'000 |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Adult Services | 0 |
| Children's Services – Non Schools | (3,207) |
| Economy, Transport and Environment | 3,401 |
| Policy and Resources | (1,798) |
| Total | <u>(1,604)</u> |

- 1.4. The balanced position for Adult Services reflects significant management activity during the year to bring actual spend in line with the budget. Departmental contingencies were used to offset pressures due to increasing complexity and demography.
- 1.5. The under spend in Children Services mainly is due to a reduction in payments for 2 year olds, which was successfully implemented by the County Council,

but actual take up was lower than planned in the year. Other savings related to the early achievement of 2014/15 savings and the release of centrally held contingencies. This has been offset by an overspend of £2.7m in respect of Children Looked After as a result of increasing numbers and cost of packages.

- 1.6. The final outturn position for Environment shows an overspend of £3.4m. One of the major contributing factors to this overspend was the severe weather encountered in the final quarter of the year. Just under £2m of flooding costs were contained within the ETE budget as other activity was stopped during this period. The balance of costs of around £2.4m will be met corporately from central contingencies.
- 1.7. The County Council is seeking to reclaim eligible costs from the Government under the Bellwin Scheme. These costs exceed HCC's £1.5m threshold for expenditure that has to be met by the County Council before it is eligible for funding under the Bellwin Scheme, since these costs are all being met as part of the outturn position for the year, this means that any future funding received under Bellwin can be used for other purposes.
- 1.8. A further £883,000 of the ETE overspend relates to previous liabilities for landfill tax now confirmed as owing under the waste disposal contract, despite assurances that the amount originally billed and paid was correct. As this was a contributing factor in significant underspends reported against corporately held contingencies in 2012/13 it is proposed that this amount is also funded corporately.
- 1.9. Policy and Resources achieved an under spend of £1.8m mainly due to on going efficiency savings and the early achievement of 2014/15 savings within Corporate Services. CCBS achieved a managed breakeven position.
- 1.10. Service under spends within Children's Services and Policy & Resources have been transferred to earmarked reserves for use by the respective service to meet restructuring and investment costs associated with the Transformation to 2015 programme, in accordance with the revised financial management policy.
- 1.11. Given the nature of the pressures within ETE, it is proposed that these will be met by corporate resources and will be offset by underspends against central contingencies (which included a general contingency amount for unexpected costs of this kind).
- 1.12. Savings on non-cash limited budgets total £13.4m mainly as a result of Treasury Management activity and unused contingencies, which were set aside to reflect the significant levels of savings that had been removed from the budget in the last few years.
- 1.13. The overall net underspend is £10.015m after allowing for the extra costs incurred within ETE. This report recommends that £1m of this net underspend is set aside to fund the next phase of management development costs under the Workforce Development Strategy. The Chief Executive will report further on the next phase of this project before any expenditure is committed. It is proposed to transfer the balance of the underspend (£9.015m) to the Grant Equalisation Reserve.

- 1.14. The report also recommends approval of
- the annual report on the operation of the treasury management strategy, for subsequent approval by the County Council
 - the council's end of year prudential indicators
 - a revised capital financing plan for 2014/15

2. **2013/14 Final accounts**

Service cash limits

- 2.1. The table below summarises the net outturn position for each Department compared to the final cash limit for the year. The figures exclude schools spending but include cost of change paid for during 2013/14 :

| | (Under) / Over Spend £'000 |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Adult Services | 0 |
| Children's Services – Non Schools | (3,207) |
| Economy, Transport and Environment | 3,401 |
| Policy and Resources | (1,798) |
| Total | (1,604) |

- 2.2. The Children's Services and Policy and Resources under spends will be transferred to earmarked reserves to meet the future cost of change in line with the existing policy.
- 2.3. The additional spending within ETE will be met from central contingencies as the majority relates to costs incurred in dealing with flooding in the early part of the year. It is anticipated that within ETE alone costs of around £4.9M have been incurred in dealing with flooding and after allowing for HCC's Bellwin threshold of £1.5M that would leave at least £3.4m that will be available to support other spending that will be considered as part of the Capital Review report being presented to Cabinet in July.
- 2.4. Detailed explanations of the reasons for the under spends in Departmental budgets is provided in Appendix 1.

Schools Budget

- 2.5. The Schools Budget is fully funded by Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and other ring-fenced grants, which have to be carried forward for school purposes. Unless an overspending arises, spending is therefore automatically in line with the cash-limit, as the cash-limit is adjusted for the carry forward of grants. In total for 2013/14 there was a net under spend of £6.1m against the schools budget and this will be carried forward to 2014/15 as part of an overall total of

DSG of £20m. The final allocation of how this money will be used has already been or will be agreed by the Schools Forum later in the year.

Other Budgets

- 2.6. The outturn for other items contained within in the budget is shown in the following table:-

| | (Under) / Over Spend £'000 |
|--|---|
| Capital Financing / Interest on Balances | (5,125) |
| Waste Management | (353) |
| Contingencies | (7,541) |
| Other net variations | (397) |
| | <u>(13,416)</u> |

- 2.7. The main reasons for the variances in these other budgets is detailed in the paragraphs below.

Capital financing charges and interest on balances (£5.125m under spend)

- 2.8. This under spend reflects a continuing trend in previous years of a very prudent approach to capital financing costs and interest on balances. The final outturn position reflects lower capital financing costs as a result of the use of 'internal borrowing' to fund capital expenditure rather than taking out long term loans at this point. It also reflects improved interest on cash balances which have increased during the year.

Waste Management (£353,000 under spend)

- 2.9. Due to the number of variables associated with the provision of the Waste Management contract, separate central provisions are made within the budget each year and released in line with changes in waste volumes or contract terms. Any savings against the waste management contract are treated as corporate savings rather than being counted against Economy, Transport and Environment's cash limit. Waste volumes have stabilised in previous years and the County Council is continuing to benefit from income sharing arrangements put in place under the contract.

Contingencies (£7.541m under spend)

- 2.10. The level of contingencies held as part of the 2013/14 budget reflected the fact that £110m of spending had been removed from the budget over the last three years.
- 2.11. Whilst some specific contingency support was required in the year to support the Adult Services budget, the County Council was in general successful at containing pressures within existing budgets and so the general contingency provision was not required for other purposes and will be used to fund the additional spending within ETE. The other main area of saving was the provision for the annual pay award, which was only allocated to Departments where there were in year budget pressures, resulting in a saving of over £1.7m.

Other Variations (£397,000 under spend)

- 2.12. This relates mainly to an underspend against the coroners due to a lower number of inquests than anticipated and an underspend against the past deficit contribution for pension costs due to a refund of amounts charged to the County Council in respect of academies.

Allocation of net under spend

- 2.13. The net under spend is broken down in the following table and this report recommends that £1m of the net under spend is set aside to fund the next phase of management development costs as part of the Workforce Development Strategy . It is proposed to transfer the balance of the under spend to the Grant Equalisation Reserve.

| | (Under) / Over Spend £'000 |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Corporate Budgets | (13,416) |
| ETE additional spending | 3,401 |
| Net underspend | (10,015) |
| Provision for Management Development | 1,000 |
| Net Under Spend to GER | (9,015) |

3. General Balances and Earmarked Reserves

- 3.1. General Balances at 31 March 2013 are £27.7m, which after taking out the £8M carry forward of unspent contingencies from 2012/13 which will be used to fund the 2014/15 budget, the level of general balances will be in line with current policy of carrying a general balance that is approximately 2.5% of the County Council's Budget Requirement.
- 3.2. In addition to the General Balance, the County Council maintains earmarked reserves for specific purposes and to a large extent a significant proportion of

these is committed either to existing revenue or capital programmes or to mitigate risks that the County Council faces through self insurance or funding changes by Government.

- 3.3. At the time of writing this report, the actual value of earmarked reserves has not been finalised within the accounts, but is expected to rise due to the cash flow management of the capital programme leading to an increase in the capital payments reserve and under spends on Departmental and central budgets as detailed in this report. Schools balances, over which the County Council has no direct control, are also expected to increase.

4. Treasury management and prudential indicators

- 4.1. The County Council's treasury management policy requires an annual report to the Cabinet on the exercise of the treasury management function, details of which are set out in Appendix 2. Under the Treasury Management Code of Practice, the end of year report has to be submitted to the County Council.
- 4.2. The Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities requires that the County Council reports its actual performance against the Prudential Indicators that were set in its Treasury Management Strategy. Appendix 2 summarises the relevant indicators for the 2013/14 outturn which are in accordance with the figures approved by the County Council.
- 4.3. The 2014/15 Treasury Management strategy reduced the individual counterparty limit for investments in response to the increased risk to capital caused by recent legislation, as outlined in Appendix 2. In order to further diversify the level of counterparty risk, it is recommended that bond investments are added to the County Council's investment strategy and the duration of any non-local authority bond investment should be linked to the counterparties credit rating as follows:

| Counterparty | | Cash limit | Time limit |
|--|-----|---|------------|
| Banks and other organisations issuing bonds whose lowest published long-term credit rating from Fitch, Moody's and Standard & Poor's is: | AAA | £80m per counterparty (including other types of investment) | 10 years |
| | AA+ | | 5 years |
| | AA | | 4 years |
| | AA- | | 3 years |
| | A+ | | 2 years |
| | A | | 1 year |

5. Capital spending and financing 2013/14

- 5.1. £188.2m of capital schemes were committed during the year, leaving £108.2m to be carried forward to 2014/15, subject to Cabinet's approval.
- 5.2. Capital expenditure of £212.2m was incurred, which can all be financed within available resources, this includes £32.0m of spending on the street lighting PFI

scheme which will be funded by means of a finance lease funded by Government.

- 5.3. Prudential borrowing of £19.0m will be taken out to support the programme, although there will also be a further repayment of prudential borrowing from capital receipts and other funding sources of £1.7m. Further details of the outturn position for capital are provided in Appendix 3.

6. **Assurance statement**

- 6.1. The code of Practice on Local Authority Accounting in the UK requires the County Council within its Statement of Accounts to publish an annual governance statement signed by the Leader and Chief Executive. As part of this process, the Chief Internal Auditor provides an independent opinion on the adequacy and effectiveness of the system of internal control operating in the County Council as a whole. The Chief Internal Auditor's Annual Report and Opinion is approved by the Audit Committee.

- 6.2. The Chief Internal Auditor has concluded that:

“In my opinion, Hampshire County Council’s framework of governance, risk management and management control is ‘Adequate’ and audit testing has demonstrated controls to be working in practice.

Where weaknesses have been identified through internal audit review, we have worked with management to agree appropriate corrective actions and a timescale for improvement.”

7. **Pension Fund**

- 7.1. The separate accounts for the Hampshire Pension Fund will also be incorporated in the County Council’s Statement of Accounts. The accounts for 2013/14 record that the value of the fund’s assets has increased to £4.7bn during the year. The Chief Internal Auditor has provided a separate assurance opinion for the Pension Fund and has concluded that :

“In my opinion, based on internal audit work completed ‘Substantial Assurance’ can be placed on Hampshire County Council (Pension Services) framework of governance, risk management and management control and audit testing has demonstrated controls to be working in practice.

Where weaknesses have been identified through internal audit review, we have worked with management to agree appropriate corrective actions and a timescale for improvement.”

8. **Final Accounts**

- 8.1. The final accounts must be submitted for audit by 30 June each year. The purpose of this report is to outline the key issues arising from the outturn position for 2013/14, although given the much earlier report publication times

for this Cabinet meeting, it is possible that there will be minor changes within the accounts that will have to be reflected in the version that is submitted for audit.

- 8.2. Delegated Authority has therefore been requested for the Director of Corporate Resources to make any necessary amendments to the figures presented in this report for final publication in the annual accounts to be submitted for audit. Any major changes or issues will be reported back to Cabinet either verbally, at the meeting or in due course.

9. Recommendations

- 9.1. That the outturn position set out in Section 2 be approved and that it is recommended to County Council that the overall net under spend be allocated as set out in paragraph 2.13.
- 9.2. That delegated authority be given to the Director of Corporate Resources to make any final changes to the outturn position presented in this report prior to the accounts being submitted for audit by 30th June.
- 9.3. That the report on the County Council’s treasury management activities and prudential indicators as set out in Appendix 2 be approved for submission to the County Council.
- 9.4. That County Council be requested to approve the addition of bond investments to the County Council’s investment strategy, with the duration of any non-local authority bond investment linked to the counterparties credit rating as follows:

| Counterparty | | Cash limit | Time limit |
|--|-----|---|------------|
| Banks and other organisations issuing bonds whose lowest published long-term credit rating from Fitch, Moody’s and Standard & Poor’s is: | AAA | £80m per counterparty (including other types of investment) | 10 years |
| | AA+ | | 5 years |
| | AA | | 4 years |
| | AA- | | 3 years |
| | A+ | | 2 years |
| | A | | 1 year |

- 9.5. That service capital programme cash limits for 2014/15 be increased to reflect the carry forward of capital programme schemes and shares of capital receipts, as set out in Appendix 3.

Adult Services

Revenue Expenditure 2013/14

Major variations in cash limited expenditure – Nil variance against the adjusted cash limit.

| Service Area | | (Under) / Over spend £'000 | Adjusted Cash Limit £'000 | Reason for Variation |
|--|----|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Policy and Strategic Development | | (1,845) | 36,710 | The net underspend relates largely to the prevention and early intervention services, with the majority being within preventative Telecare and supporting people budgets. Public Health funding helped in offsetting pressures within both domestic violence and the community independence teams. |
| Older People (OP) and Physical Disabilities (PD) | OP | (76) | 100,978 | Although there is a small underspend there are significant complexity and demography pressures within the domiciliary care system which have been largely off set through the allocation of Health funding. There are further pressures in direct payments predominantly due to above budgeted weekly costs. In year pressures in residential and nursing care have been partially off-set through the use of an element of the department's transformation funding for the clients moving from In-house services as a result of the home closures. |
| | PD | 2,136 | 29,515 | There are significant a pressures on both purchased residential care and direct payments due to higher than budgeted and care package numbers and above budgeted weekly costs. |

| Service Area | | (Under) / Over spend £'000 | Adjusted Cash Limit £'000 | Reason for Variation |
|---|------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Learning Disabilities (LD), Mental Health (MH) and other non-operational support services | LD | 3,054 | 103,432 | Increasing complexity and demography demand on the purchased residential service, coupled with higher than budget weekly costs has led to a significant pressure. Other pressures include increased activity on day care services, higher than budgeted costs for clients receiving direct payments and a pressure against transport budgets. |
| | MH | (159) | 10,877 | The underspend is predominantly due to lower than budgeted levels of activity within purchased domiciliary care. Smaller underspends on purchased and in-house day care were due to lower weekly costs and activity than the budgeted figures. These underspends were partially offset by pressures against staffing budgets. |
| | Non-operational /other | (963) | 6,995 | The underspend relates to greater levels of income achieved than budgeted within the safeguarding and quality service and an underspend against community care services direct payments following a major review of the service. |
| In House Services | | 1,885 | 29,119 | The main area of pressure within In-house is staffing due to pressures relating to agency and temporary staff, which have been partially offset by an underspend against permanent staff. |
| Various other | | (4,032) | 5,574 | This reflects the management of the departmental contingencies which have been used to off-set the departments overall pressure. |
| | | 0 | 323,200 | |

Children's Services

Revenue Expenditure 2013/14

Major variations in cash limited expenditure – Net under spending of £3.207m against the adjusted cash limit.

| Service Activity | (Under) / Over Spend £'000 | Adjusted Cash Limit £'000 | Reason for Variation |
|--|---|--|--|
| Schools budget | | | |
| Pupil Growth / Infant Class Sizes | (947) | 5,107 | Lower than expected costs relating to implementation of additional classes to deal with increase in primary age pupils. Offset by a pressure relating to budget shares for two new schools which opened in September 2013. |
| 2 Year Old Free Entitlement Funding | (1,715) | 7,093 | The 2 year old entitlement was a new entitlement implemented for 2014/15 and take up was slower than expected when compared to the assumptions in the budget. Cost of Enhanced SEN payments for 2 year olds was also over estimated. |
| Behaviour Support Teams | (251) | 1,956 | Delayed recruitment to vacant posts within admin, behaviour support workers and team managers, together with associated running costs. |
| Early Years Central Expenditure | (525) | 793 | Contingency for 2, 3 and 4 year old funding not needed as the cost of take up was covered within the service budget. |
| Prudential Borrowing | (286) | 286 | Contingency for outstanding payments not needed. |
| High Needs Top-Up Funding | (1,840) | 33,349 | Post 16 as well as smaller underspends on resourced provisions, special schools, other local authorities and statemented pupils in mainstream, due mainly to lower learner numbers and negotiated reductions. |
| Independent & Non Maintained Special Schools | 575 | 10,415 | Higher than expected pupil numbers and related costs. Payments also made relating to previous year due to late information being supplied by |

| Service Activity | (Under) / Over Spend £'000 | Adjusted Cash Limit £'000 | Reason for Variation |
|--|---|--|--|
| Various Other (net) | (1,137) | 649,003 | other local authorities. |
| Carry forward of Dedicated Schools Grant | 6,126 | (6,126) | The Department for Education (DfE) allows any unspent DSG funds to be carried forward each year and ringfenced for schools purposes. The sum is part of the total DSG to be carried forward of £19.741m. The major components of the carry forward consist of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £11.209m of planned carry forward from previous years as agreed with Schools Forum. • £4.036m of planned carry forward agreed with Schools Forum on 1 May 2014 • £4.496m of unallocated DSG |
| Sub-total Schools budget | - | 701,876 | |
| Non-Schools budget | | | |
| Centrally Retained Contingency | (1,028) | 1,028 | Contingency not allocated but used to offset the department's other pressures. |
| Services for Young Children | (2,084) | 17,908 | Reduced take-up of early years grants and bursaries as well as reduction in children's centre grants due to lower take-up than anticipated. Re-classification of inclusion costs to schools budget. Difficulty recruiting to children's centres teacher posts due to temporary nature of posts. |
| Learning & Development | (637) | 1,986 | Vacancy Management as well as planned reduction in activity. Efficiency savings identified for 2014/15 introduced early. |

| Service Activity | (Under) / Over Spend £'000 | Adjusted Cash Limit £'000 | Reason for Variation |
|---|---|--|---|
| Young People's Learning & Development | (536) | 1,512 | Lower than anticipated take-up of traineeship scheme. Cost of change budget not required for Careers Service. |
| Services for Young People | (907) | 5,414 | Mainly as a result of increased grant funding during the year. |
| Children Looked After | 2,693 | 42,782 | Increase of 11.5% in CLA activity between March 2013 and March 2014 reflecting an increase in the numbers of children and the average cost of packages. |
| Youth Justice | 616 | 1,991 | Swanwick Lodge Secure Unit - reduction in YJB contracted income and other income as a result of bed closures and higher staff costs arising from high sickness levels |
| Various other (net) | (1,324) | 92,261 | |
| Sub-total Non-Schools budget | (3,207) | 164,882 | |
| Total Children's Services Department | (3,207) | 866,758 | |

Environment, Transport & Economy

Revenue Expenditure 2013/14

Major variations in cash limited expenditure – overspend of £3.401m against the adjusted cash limit.

Main variations

| Service Area | (Under) / Over spend £000 | Adjusted Cash Limit £000 | Reason for Variation |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| Highways, Traffic and Transport | 2,100 | 67,114 | <p>Dealing with storm and flooding emergency. The department has incurred significant additional costs responding to the storm and flooding emergencies in the final quarter of the year. The overspend relates to costs it was not possible to absorb within existing budget provision and in addition to the £650,000 of costs contained within the highways maintenance budget a further £1.2m of orders for other highways works were cancelled to maximise the resources available to deal with the flooding response. The County Council will be seeking to reclaim eligible costs from the Government under the Bellwin Scheme and payments under that scheme would be received by the County Council during 2014/15. It is proposed that the overspending as a result of dealing with these emergency situations is funded corporately.</p> <p>Other. The overspend is the result of a number of factors including the balance of redundancy & pension strain costs arising from the major departmental restructure together with higher spend on agency and technical consultants which has been partly offset by lower spend on Concessionary Fares reimbursements where the adverse weather has had an impact in reducing the number of journeys undertaken.</p> |
| | 497 | | |

| Service Area | (Under) / Over spend £000 | Adjusted Cash Limit £000 | Reason for Variation |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Waste, Planning and Environment | 883 | 42,448 | Waste disposal contract. The overspend relates to landfill tax now confirmed as owing under the waste disposal contract despite earlier assurances that the amount originally billed and paid was correct. The lower payment in 2012/13 were a major contributing factor in amounts returned from ETE's cash limit to the waste contract contingency provision held corporately and it is therefore proposed that the backdated landfill tax costs be covered corporately. |
| | (66) | | Other. Minor net under spending on staffing and operational support budgets. |
| Economic Development | (15) | 1,082 | Other. Lower than expected external spend with more activity able to be undertaken in-house following appointments to the new structure. |
| Departmental and Corporate Support | 1 | 3,776 | |
| Total | 3,401 | 114,420 | |

Policy & Resources

Revenue Expenditure 2013/14

Major variations in cash limited expenditure – underspend of £1.798m against the adjusted cash limit.

Main variations

| Service Area | (Under) / Over spend £000 | Adjusted Cash Limit £000 | Reason for Variation |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Corporate Services | (946) | 45,959 | Corporate Services continues to implement a strategy of robust vacancy management and short term actions around strong budgetary control in order to generate savings, which will support the cost of implementing the Corporate Services Review. After absorbing costs relating to the IBC change programme and the cost of redundancies in 2013/14 Corporate Services will generate a contribution of £946,000 towards the cost of future change and investment. |
| Culture, Communities and Business Services | 0 | 43,084 | Robust financial management and higher than expected income for example from registration, trading standards and culture and heritage services, together with a planned draw from the cost of change reserve, has enabled CCBS to cover the cost of the 2013/14 pay award, additional costs associated with adverse weather and one-off costs relating to service investment and change programmes, resulting in an overall breakeven position. |

| Service Area | (Under) / Over spend £000 | Adjusted Cash Limit £000 | Reason for Variation |
|---------------------|--|---|---|
| Other budgets | (852) | 9,180 | The variance is a result of savings across a number of budgets including a reduction in the external audit fee and the corporate expenses budget which represents a continuation of trends in recent years to fund fewer events. A number of other budgets have had lower expenditure during the year and the balance will be carried forward to match the re-phased planned expenditure, these include the Supporting Troubled Families, World War Commemorations and Olympic Legacy budgets. Members individual grant balances will also be carried forward this year in accordance with the scheme rules. The rural affairs fund has been under review this year and the remaining balance will be available in 2014-15. |
| Public Health | 0 | 33,115 | For Public Health, the outturn position is £3.6m below the ring-fenced grant. The cash limit has been adjusted by the unspent portion of the 2013/14 grant which has been transferred to the Revenue Grants Unapplied Reserve and will be available in future years for spend which meets the Public Health grant conditions, consequently there is no variance against the adjusted cash limit. The main reasons for spend being lower than the grant include, lower than budgeted uptake of Health Checks, the impact of significant vacancies through out the year, the re-phasing of expenditure plans as a result of the time required to properly develop plans for newly approved areas of spend during the year and an underspend in the difficult to predict area of Sexual Health Non-Contracted spend. |
| Total | (1,798) | 131,338 | |

CORPORATE OR LEGAL INFORMATION:**Links to the Corporate Strategy**

| | |
|--|-----|
| Hampshire safer and more secure for all: | Yes |
| Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate): | |
| Maximising well-being: | Yes |
| Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate): | |
| Enhancing our quality of place: | Yes |
| Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate): | |

Section 100 D - Local Government Act 1972 - background documents

The following documents discuss facts or matters on which this report, or an important part of it, is based and have been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report. (NB: the list excludes published works and any documents which disclose exempt or confidential information as defined in the Act.)

DocumentLocation

None

IMPACT ASSESSMENTS:

1. Equalities Impact Assessment:

1.1. Equality objectives are not considered to be adversely affected by the proposals in this report but the Council's budget and the services that it provides are delivered in a way that ensures that any impact on equalities issues are fully taken into account.

2. Impact on Crime and Disorder:

2.1. The proposals in this report are not considered to have any direct impact on the prevention of crime, but the County Council through the services that it provides through the revenue budget and capital programme ensures that prevention of crime and disorder is a key factor in shaping the delivery of a service / project.

3. Climate Change:

3.1. How does what is being proposed impact on our carbon footprint / energy consumption?

The revenue budget and capital programme contain measures that will assist in reducing our carbon footprint.

3.2. How does what is being proposed consider the need to adapt to climate change, and be resilient to its longer term impacts

The County Council in designing its services will ensure that climate change issues are taken into account.