

# Agenda SPARSE Rural Services Network Special Interest Group meeting

Hosted: Online via Zoom

Date: Monday, 25th January 2021

Time: 11:00am - 12:30pm

Joining instructions and final agenda will be circulated to those who register.

- 1. Attendance & Apologies
- 2. Notes from the previous SPARSE Rural meeting. (Attachment 1)
  Held on 12<sup>th</sup> October 2020 to consider any relevant updates and approve the minutes.
- 3. Notes from the previous RSN Executive meeting. (Attachment 2) Held on 11<sup>th</sup> January 2021 to consider any relevant updates.
- 4. Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement 2021-2022.
  RSN Response to consultation and final letter. (Attachment 3 & 3A)

Presentation by Graham Biggs MBE, Chief Executive at Rural Services Network.

5. Any Other Business.

The next SPARSE Rural meeting is scheduled for Monday, 21<sup>st</sup> June 2021. <u>Please click here to register your attendance.</u><sup>1</sup>

Providing a voice for rural communities and service providers

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> https://sparseruralmeeting2021june.eventbrite.co.uk





### **Notes of last SPARSE Rural meeting**

Title: SPARSE Rural Meeting

**Rural Services Network Special Interest Group** 

**Date:** Monday, 12<sup>th</sup> October 2020

Venue: Hosted Online via Zoom

#### Item Decisions and Actions

1 Attendance & Apologies for absence.

Cllr Cecilia Motley (Chair) welcomed members to the meeting. The group noted apologies for the meeting. A list of attendees/apologies can be found in **Appendix A**.

Notes from the previous SPARSE Rural meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> January 2020.

(Attachment 1)

Notes from the previous SPARSE Rural meeting which took place on 27<sup>th</sup> January 2020 were accepted as an accurate record.

Notes from the previous RSN Executive meeting on 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2020. (Attachment 2)

Notes from the previous RSN Executive Meeting which took place on 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2020 were noted.

Graham Biggs MBE (Chief Executive, Rural Services Network) noted that the RSN AGM/Rural Assembly will receive a formal report on the Executive's decisions on Item 2 *Thoughts for the Future of the Network*.

4 Notes from the previous RSN Executive on 28<sup>th</sup> September 2020. (Attachment 3)

Notes from the previous RSN Executive Meeting which took place on 28<sup>th</sup> September 2020 were noted.

Graham Biggs updated on several items from the minutes:

- Item 5: As stated above further feedback on the decisions regarding member engagement will be reported to the AGM.
- Item 6: Special discussion on planning white paper is being held on 20/10/2020. A paper will be presented to this meeting on the draft RSN response on planning proposals and final member consultation will take place immediately following the meeting.
- Item 16: A Rural Services APPG meeting with Chief Secretary of the Treasury is being held on 13/10/20 to discuss the Comprehensive Spending Review.
- Item 16: The meeting planned for 28/10/20 with Matt Warman MP (Minister for Digital Infrastructure) has been postponed due to Parliamentary recess and will Providing a voice for rural communities and service providers

#### **Rural Services Network**





be rearranged.

### 5 Presentation on Local Government Finance by Adrian Jenkins, Founder and Chief Analyst at Pixel Financial Management.

The Chair invited Adrian Jenkins (Founder & Chief Analyst, Pixel Financial Management) to present on Local Government Finance. Adrian explained that COVID has increased uncertainty around local government finance and exacerbated existing issues.

Please note that full notes outlining what was discussed in this item are available only to <u>SPARSE member of the RSN</u>. If you are a SPARSE member of RSN and would like to view the full notes, please email us at <u>admin@sparse.gov.uk</u> with the title of this meeting and date and a request for full notes and presentation, and we will forward you this information.

#### 6 Any Other Business.

There was no other business.

The next SPARSE Rural meeting will be held on Monday, 25<sup>th</sup> January 2020.

Providing a voice for rural communities and service providers





#### Appendix A

#### **Attendance**

Cllr Cecilia Motley (Chair) Rural Services Network and Shropshire Council

Cllr Giles Archibald
Cllr Philip Atkins
Cllr Owen Bierley
Graham Biggs MBE
Steve Blatch
Kerry Booth
Cllr Markus Campbell-Savours
South Lakeland District Council
Staffordshire County Council
West Lindsey District Council
Rural Services Network
North Norfolk District Council
Rural Services Network
Allerdale Borough Council

Cllr Marion Chapman-Allen Breckland Council

Cllr Stephen Clarke South Northamptonshire Council

Sam Corcoran Cheshire East Council
Lois Dale Shropshire Council

Michelle Drewery Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk

Cllr John Evans

Cllr Marion Fitzgerald

Martin Flitcroft

Rebecca Floyd

Cllr Richard Good

Cllr Michael Harris

Uttlesford District Council

Allerdale Borough Council

Teignbridge District Council

Malvern Hills District Council

Richmondshire District Council

Nik Harwood Young Somerset

Simon Hewings South Oxfordshire & Vale of White Horse District Councils

John Hewitt Durham County Council
David Heyes Torridge District Council

George Hill Stratford-on-Avon District Council

Claire Holt Durham County Council

Sophie Hosking Cornwall Council

David Inman Rural Services Network
Adrian Jenkins Pixel Financial Management
Richard Kember Local Government Association

Sonia Lambert East Suffolk Council

Alice Mason Wychavon District Council
Toby Matthews Norfolk County Council
Andrea McCallum Hampshire County Council
Sean McGrath Lancashire County Council

Guy McQueen Lewes District & Eastbourne Borough Councils

Cllr Suzie Morley Mid Suffolk District Council
Cllr John Nutley Teignbridge District Council
Cllr Yvonne Peacock Richmondshire District Council

Cllr Roger Phillips Herefordshire Council

Providing a voice for rural communities and service providers

**Rural Services Network** 

Kilworthy Park, Tavistock, Devon PL19 0BZ Tel: 01822 813693





Sarah Pochin Cheshire East Council
Cllr Aaron Powell Wychavon District Council
Sheryle Price-Jones North Lincolnshire Council
Toyubur Rahman Chichester District Council
Cllr Rupert Reichhold East Northamptonshire Council
Louise Richardson Leicestershire County Council

Cllr Jeremy Savage South Norfolk Council Melanie Sealey Devon County Council

Cllr Peter Seib

Cllr Richard Sherras

Cllr Margaret Squires

Cllr Peter Stevens

Cllr Virginia Taylor

Anthony Thomas

South Somerset District Council

Ribble Valley Borough Council

Mid Devon District Council

West Suffolk Council

Eden District Council

Lichfield District Council

Rural Services Network

Scarborough Borough Council

Cllr Lynda Turner Breckland Council
Richard Weigh Craven District Council
Cllr Mark Whittington Lincolnshire County Council
Dan Worth Rural Services Network

Richard Wyles South Kesteven District Council

#### **Apologies**

Cllr Sue Tucker

Cllr Paul Arnott East Devon District Council

Cllr Timothy Birt Breckland Council
Cllr Roy Brame Breckland Council

Sarah Butikofer North Norfolk District Council

Cllr Gwilym Butler Shropshire council

Jo Calvert South Somerset District Council Cllr Ian Carrington North Kesteven District Council Fatima de Abreu Local Government Association Cllr Alan Dean **Uttlesford District Council** James Easter South Norfolk Council Cllr Richard Foss South Hams District Council Dawn French **Uttlesford District Council** Cllr Virginia Gay North Norfolk District Council

Lorraine Gore Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk

Alan Gray North Kesteven District Council
Cllr Roger Habgood Somerset West and Taunton Council

Cllr Paul Hayward East Devon District Council
Anton Hodge Ryedale District Council
Cllr Gordon Hook Teignbridge District Council
Cllr Ken James Torridge District Council

Providing a voice for rural communities and service providers

#### **Rural Services Network**

Kilworthy Park, Tavistock, Devon PL19 0BZ Tel: 01822 813693





Cllr David Jeffes North Yorkshire County Council and Scarborough Borough Council

Cllr Patrick Kimber West Devon Borough Council
Cllr Phil King Harborough District Council
Sue Kirby Rutland County Council
Kevin Larner Cherwell District Council

Cllr Carl Les North Yorkshire County Council Caroline Lingham Sevenoaks District Council Cllr Eileen Lintill Chichester District Council Cllr James MacCleary Lewes District Council **Emily MacDowell** Harrogate Borough Council Stafford Borough Council Martyne Manning Alistair Neill Herefordshire County Council Catherine Nicholson Allerdale Borough Council Wendy Perera Isle of Wight Council **Cotswold District Council** Jenny Poole **Gary Powell** Teignbridge District Council **Emily Preston** Hampshire County Council

Julia Raven South Northamptonshire Council

Rose Rouse Eden District Council

Cllr John Raper

Russell Stone

James Tennant

Anthony Thomas

Kevin Thomas

Cllr Peter Thornton

North Kesteven District Council

Enterprising East Northants

Lichfield District Council

Rutland County Council

South Lakeland District Council

Cllr Peter Thornton South Lakeland District Council
Cllr Cosi Towneley Lancashire County Council

Cllr Anthony Trollope-Bellew Somerset West and Taunton District Council

Ryedale District Council

Cllr John Ward Babergh District Council
Cllr Sarah Whalley-Hoggins Stratford District Council

Helen Wright East Riding of Yorkshire Council



#### **Minutes**

### SPARSE Rural and Rural Services Network Executive and Board of Director of the Rural Services Partnership Ltd meeting

Hosted: Online via Zoom

Date: Monday, 11th January 2021

Time: 11:15am - 2:30 pm

#### 1. Attendance & Apologies.

#### Attendance:

Cllr Cecilia Motley (Chair) Shropshire Council / Rural Services Network

Graham Biggs Rural Services Network

John Birtwistle FirstGroup plc UK Bus Division

Cllr Malcolm Brown (on behalf of

Cllr Adam Paynter Cornwall Council

Kerry Booth Rural Services Network

Martin Collett English Rural Housing Association
Cllr Robert Heseltine North Yorkshire County Council

David Inman Rural Services Network
Cllr Roger Phillips Herefordshire Council
Cllr Jeremy Savage South Norfolk Council

Cllr Peter Thornton South Lakeland District Council

Apologies:

Nik Harwood Young Somerset
Cllr Adam Paynter Cornwall Council
Cllr Mary Robinson Eden District Council

Cllr Mark Whittington Lincolnshire County Council

#### 2. Notes from the previous RSN Executive meeting held on 28th September 2020.

(Attachment 1)

Agreed as a correct record.

#### **Matters Arising:**

#### 2.1 **Subscriptions for 2020-2021**

In view of the public sector 'pay freeze' the 2021/22 subscriptions should, it is recommended, revert to a 2% increase – plus the final year of the staged increases (rather than 2.75% previously agreed). This was proposed by Councillor Roger Phillips and approved by all in attendance.

#### 2.2 Special Executive on Housing Policies

There was due to be a Special Executive Meeting focusing on the further development of our rural housing policies. Due to other work pressures this has not taken place but will be scheduled soon.

2.3 The special **APPG** which will look at Rural Planning issues is going to take place on 27<sup>th</sup> January and the Housing Minister is going to attend from MCHLG to discuss this.

#### Providing a voice for rural communities and service providers

**Rural Services Network** 



#### 3. Rural Service Groupings withing the RSN Structures. (Attachment 2)

Report to RSN Executive by David Inman, Corporate Director.

David outlined the main points in his report and confirmed:

- 3.1 The RSN has capacity to deliver the services specified in the report.
- 3.2 The approach would be developed on an area-by-area basis, targeting the villages of a specific size (generally 2750 population but with discretion to 2000 population). Areas where there are no SPARSE or Rural Assembly members would be targeted first.
- 3.3 The Village initiative would introduce the opportunity for smaller parishes that don't identify as 'market towns' but are nevertheless service hubs for their rural area the ability to join the RSN.

Members discussed various elements of the proposal and the Executive approved the creation of a Rural Village Service Group and the renaming of the current wider group to Community Associates group.

Progress on the group would be reported to the RSN Executive on a regular basis.

**4. Provisional Settlement 2021/22 Draft Consultation Response.** (Attachment 3) Draft consultation response. (Attachment 3A)

Graham Biggs set out the main implications for rural areas regarding the proposals of increases in spending power to be funded primarily by Council Tax increases, and the detrimental impact on rural areas which already pay more on average than urban areas per head.

Frustration was noted on behalf of all by the delays to the Fairer Funding Review which has been progressing for several years without seeing any conclusions to the work from Government. It had now been pushed back further to 2022/23 'at the earliest'.

It was agreed by all present that the Chief Executive should finalise the response to the Government consultation on the Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement, due by 16<sup>th</sup> January 2021 and can be quite forceful in arguing against the unfair settlement for rural authorities.

#### 5. Revitalising Rural: Realising the Vision.

Please click here to access campaign papers.

Graham Biggs provided an update on the Revitalising Rural Launch event, which is being organised in conjunction with Lexington. The launch on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2020 will be aimed not at the RSN membership but at influencing key decision makers in Parliament and other organisations. A separate meeting will be held with the Membership in late March (to replace the Rural Assembly that was due to be held in April) to update members on the campaign.

#### 6. Rural/Market Town Group update. (Attachment 4)

David Inman, Corporate Director discussed the report and updated the RSN Executive on the Rural/Market Town Group.

Providing a voice for rural communities and service providers

Rural Services Network

Kilworthy Park, Tavistock, Devon PL19 0BZ

Tel: 01822 813693



This item was only considered briefly due to the long discussion which included the RMTG in item 3.

David confirmed that there are currently 156 Town or larger Parish Councils in membership of the group spread out across England. November 2020 saw two membership meetings of the group, one for the Councillor representatives (RMTG meetings) and one for the Clerks of the Councils (RMTG Clerks Advisory Panel meeting) which were well attended.

#### 7. RSN Budget Reports.

- 7.1 Budget vs actual as mid-December 2020 & estimate 2021/22. (Attachment 5)
- **7.2** Draft Estimates for the four years 2021/22 to 2024/25. (Attachment 6)

Graham Biggs provided an overview of the two budget reports and responded to questions from the Executive including in relation to training and development of staff. Kerry Booth updated the Executive on some free training and support that has been accessed by the RSN recently for staff on areas such as social media and hosting meetings online through the ERDF. David Inman is still chasing outstanding invoices for the year 2020-2021 although there are now few of these.

#### 8. Review of Recent Government Publications 'Through a Rural Lens'.

Graham Biggs outlined the current approach of the RSN to provide a 'Rural Lens' of any key Government publications which are released, and three recent ones are below.

In relation to the issue of the rollout of Broadband, Graham advised the Executive that the Public Accounts Committee had recently published a fairly critical report on the rollout of Broadband which highlights the difficulties of rural areas in accessing decent broadband. Graham is working with the Chair of the APPG for Rural Services to send a letter to the Digital Minister, Matt Warman MP, on the issues for rural areas. The Rural Coalition is meeting next week and will also consider the issue of Rural Broadband.

There was a discussion amongst the Executive of the problems that rural areas face in the lack of decent broadband and that the RSN has long been campaigning on this as an issue on behalf of the membership.

#### 8.1 Spending Review 2020.

<u>Please click here to access article 'Comprehensive Spending Review – Key Rural</u> Concerns'

- 8.2 National Infrastructure Strategy through a Rural Lens.
  - <u>Please click here to access article 'The National Infrastructure Strategy 2020 Through a</u> Rural Lens'.
- 8.3 The Ten Point Plan for a Green Industrial Revolution.

  Please click here to access the 'Ten Point Plan for a Green Industrial Revolution'.
- 9. Review of the Green Book: Towards a Greener Green Book Process Introductions and Summary Section. (Attachment 7)

Graham Biggs explained that he has received the report by Pragmatix Advisory on the review of the Green Book. The report has been written for the Treasury and is in the language that is

Providing a voice for rural communities and service providers

Rural Services Network

Kilworthy Park, Tavistock, Devon PL19 0BZ

Tel: 01822 813693



relevant to the Green Book. Graham has developed a summary for wider circulation in due course – once considered by all the Funders. The results of the review will also be sent to Rural MP's so that they can understand that whilst recent changes are welcome, there is still a long way to go until Rural and its particular characteristics are properly considered in decision making.

#### 10. National Rural Conference 2020. (Attachment 8)

Kerry Booth, Assistant Chief Executive discussed the report.

Kerry outlined her approach to the National Rural Conference 2021 as an online conference, over the course of several days in the Autumn which would be free to Rural Services Network members. It is felt that the RSN can build on the success of the online conference in 2020 having learnt some lessons about the best approach and what works well and what does not. The Executive discussed some areas for the conference, such as the ability to attract high profile speakers due to the convenience of it being run online, saving on time and cost of travel and the idea of including session on broadband and community broadband.

The Executive approved the recommendation of a National Rural Conference being held online in 2021 in accordance with the Revitalising Rural Campaign themes.

Whilst the importance of networking in person was also discussed, the benefits of the engagement from the conference, across the membership and the significant increase in delegates compared to an in-person conference was highlighted. It was decided that in future perhaps an alternative approach could be explored to enable in person networking at the Annual Meeting. Proposals on this would be brought back to a future Executive when the pandemic allows.

#### 11. Any Other Business.

Councillor Jeremy Savage raised the issue of **the distance that rural residents may have to travel to get the vaccine** in the coming months. It was suggested that Councils may be able to assist with the provision of spaces for vaccine centres such as leisure centres.

It was noted that it is possible that the **May elections** to Councils would be delayed until later in the year.

An item discussed for consideration at a future meeting was the roll out of a greater **electricity network** to support the move towards electric vehicles, heat pumps etc. Not all rural properties had wiring which would be adequate to provide enough electricity to charge vehicles overnight. There should be a coordinated approach to the utility companies on this issue. This should be considered and explored at a future Executive meeting in the context of the recently published Energy White Paper.

The next RSN Executive meeting date is Monday, 15th March 2021.

Providing a voice for rural communities and service providers

### **Consultation response pro-forma**

#### Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement 2021-22

If you are responding to this consultation by email or in writing, please reply using this questionnaire pro-forma, which should be read alongside the consultation document.

You should save the pro-forma on your own device, from which you can complete the survey at your own pace and submit when you are ready.

There are 9 questions. You do not have to answer every question should you not wish to.

Should you wish to attach further evidence or supporting information, you may attach and send this with the pro-forma.

#### Please email responses to:

LGFsettlement@communities.gov.uk

#### Alternatively, written responses should be sent to:

Local Government Finance Settlement Team
Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
2nd floor, Fry Building
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

Your opinions are valuable to us. Thank you for taking the time to read the consultation document and respond.

#### Your Details (Required details are marked with an asterisk (\*))

Full Name*	Graham Biggs
Organisation*	Rural Services Network
Address*	c/o WDBC, Kilworthy Park
Address 2	
Town/City*	Tavistock
Postcode*	PL19 0BZ
Country	
Email address*	admin@sparse.gov.uk
Phone Number	01822 851370

### Are the views Expressed on this form an official response from a:

London Borough	
Metropolitan District	
Unitary Authority	
Shire County	
Shire District	
Fire and Rescue Authority	
Greater London Authority	
Combined Authority	
Parish or Town Council	
Local Authority Association or Special Interest Group - YES	
Other Local Authority Grouping	
Local Authority Officer	
Local Authority Councillor	
Member of Parliament	
Other Representative Group	
Business	
Business Organisation	
Valuation Organisation	
Voluntary Organisation	
Member of the Public	

#### **Question 1**

Do you agree with the Government's proposed methodology for the distribution of Revenue Support Grant in 2021-22?

<u>No</u>

#### **Additional comments**

As an interim measure, applying inflation to Revenue Support Grant (RSG) is a reasonable approach but RSN does not support the underlying methodology used to distribute the Settlement Funding Assessment (and resulting RSG). The increases in sparsity – which were introduced in 2012-13 – have not been fully implemented and were largely "damped away". Rural authorities have therefore received lower funding allocations than they deserved for over 8 years. RSN looks forward to the implementation of the Fair Funding Review and the correction of the historic underfunding of rural authorities.

#### Question 2

Do you agree with the proposed package of council tax referendum principles for 2021-22?

No

#### **Additional comments**

RSN supports the proposals to give greater scope to local authorities to increase council tax in 2021-22. Authorities are coping with severe financial and service pressures, and increases in council tax will help authorities to manage these pressures. However, we are concerned that the burden of funding local services is being placed largely on local taxpayers with central government providing very little additional funding. We estimate that the local taxpayer is funding 82% of the additional resources for local government in 2021-22.

This is unfair nationally, but particularly in rural areas where a larger share of the burden is already on local taxpayers. Band D is higher in rural than in urban areas, and the higher increases will place a further burden on rural taxpayers.

There are also specific concerns for district councils and fire authorities. Increases for these authorities are lower than for those with social care responsibilities. We would urge ministers to allow these councils to increase their Band D in line with social care authorities, or to increase the minimum cash increase (currently £5 for district councils, with nothing for fire authorities).

#### Question 3

Do you agree with the Government's proposals for the Social Care Grant in 2021-22?

<u>No</u>

#### **Additional comments**

Whilst it is reasonable that the ability to generate income from the Adult Social Care precept should be taken into account in the allocations, the assumptions used in the 2021-22 allocations are too extreme. For instance, many authorities will not use their full 3% increase in precept (indeed, there is the flexibility to spread the increase over 2 years) and it is, therefore, unreasonable to use the full amount. This effectively penalises authorities with large taxbases irrespective of whether councils make use of the full precept increase.

Furthermore, councils with low Band D – particularly those in inner London – have a smaller equalisation adjustment. This is a perverse incentive and subsidises councils with low Band D council tax.

#### **Question 4**

Do you agree with the Government's proposals for iBCF in 2021-22?

<u>Yes</u>

#### **Additional comments**

We support the Government's proposals for iBCF.

#### **Question 5**

Do you agree with the Government's proposals for New Homes Bonus in 2021-22?

<u>Yes</u>

#### **Additional comments**

RSN supports the proposal to add a further one-off allocation (year 11) in 2021-22. But we need to have much clearer guidance on the replacement to NHB. Many of our members rely on the income from NHB and both the uncertainty and year-on-year reductions make financial planning very difficult. It is good to hear that the government will be consulting on new options in the Spring but we would like to see much more urgency on these replacement proposals.

We were very concerned that ministers have decided not to return the NHB surplus to local government in 2021-22. A clear principle was established when the RSG top-slice was introduced in 2012-13 and which has been confirmed in subsequent settlements. Clearly the surplus has been used to fund the other increases in grant (RSDG, RSG, social care grant) and the new grant (LTSG). To redirect resources in this way is misleading and makes it very difficult for authorities to make budget preparations.

#### Question 6

Do you agree with the Government's proposal for a new Lower Tier Services Grant, with a minimum funding floor so that no authority sees an annual reduction in Core Spending Power?

<u>Yes</u>

#### Additional comments

RSN supports the Lower Tier Services Grant (LTSG) because it provides some support to district councils at the margins within the settlement. For those who will receive the grant – some of which are rural authorities – it provides much-needed funding, and ensures that their core spending power does not reduce in cash terms. The bulk of the grant will, however, be received by urban authorities. In practical terms, the grant largely provides support to councils who are losing NHB (and not receiving increases in social care resources). Again, this is a sensible principle for authorities suffering NHB losses.

Our criticism of the grant is that it is an ad hoc arrangement. There was no consultation with authorities about its introduction and it feels very much a one-off support mechanism.

#### **Question 7**

Do you agree with the Government's proposals for Rural Services Delivery Grant in 2021-22?

Yes

#### **Additional comments**

RSN is grateful for the increase in RSDG in 2021-22, even though it is a very small amount. It will make very little difference to rural authorities' actual financial circumstances. But it does demonstrate some support from ministers for the needs of rural authorities. We are grateful for any increase in funding! RSN continues to have concerns about the methodology that has been used to distribute the RSDG. There are some authorities with large rural areas who do not receive any RSDG allocations.

Please see our attached letter for further comments on the Settlement in relation to Rural Local Authorities.

#### **Question 8**

Do you have any comments on the Government's plan not to publish Visible Lines?

<u>No</u>

#### **Additional comments**

We support the decision not to publish Visible Lines because they lacked credibility within the sector.

#### **Question 9**

Do you have any comments on the impact of the proposals for the 2021-22 settlement outlined in this consultation document on persons who share a protected characteristic, and on the draft equality statement published alongside the consultation document? Please provide evidence to support your comments.

Yes

#### Additional comments

The Equalities Statement in respect of the Provisional Settlement states "The Government has considered the impact of the funding distribution on protected characteristics by assessing the distribution of Core Spending Power (CSP) between local authorities and the characteristics of the people that live in the local authorities".

We note the absence of any statement about rural proofing. Core Spending Power should not be the only factor taken into account. The amount people have to pay for their services through Council Tax (in both absolute terms and in terms of the proportion of their services they are having to pay for through Council Tax) is also of critical importance. If rural people and communities were classed as having protected characteristics, then the proposals would be judged as having failed an objective equalities assessment.



Local Government Finance Settlement Team MHCLG,
2nd Floor, Fry Building,
2, Marsham Street
LONDON,
SW1P 4DF

14th January 2020

### PROVISIONAL LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE SETTLEMENT 2021 TO 2022: CONSULTATION RESPONSE

This letter sets out the detailed response of the Rural Services Network (RSN) to the above consultation.

Our concerns do not relate to the overall quantum of resources, although we share concerns raised on behalf of local government generally by the Local Government Association in that regard. Our concerns relate to the fact that once again rural councils (and the communities they serve) are not receiving a fair share of the resources being made available by the Government to support local authority services.

#### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

#### (a) Generally

The RSN once again finds itself unable to support either the proposed distribution methodology or the impact on rural residents of the proposals in relation to Council Tax increases.

Through the proposals, rural residents, communities and businesses will, through their principal local authorities find themselves in comparison to their urban counterparts both:

- Overcharged through higher Council Tax in rural areas (16% higher in rural areas); and
- Short-changed through the flawed urban biased funding formula/distributional methodology

The Equalities Statement in respect of the Provisional Settlement states "The Government has considered the impact of the funding distribution on protected characteristics by assessing the distribution of Core Spending Power (CSP) between local authorities and the characteristics of the people that live in the local authorities".

We note the absence of any statement about rural proofing. Core Spending Power should not be the only factor taken into account. The amount people have to pay for their services through Council Tax (in both absolute terms and in terms of the proportion of their services they are having to pay for through Council Tax) is also of critical importance. If rural people and communities were classed as having protected characteristics, then the proposals would be judged as having failed an objective equalities assessment.

#### (b) Council Tax Principles

Providing a voice for rural communities and service providers

Graham Biggs MBE, FCG, Chief Executive PO Box 101, Craven Arms, SY7 7AL Tel: 01588 674922



For our District Council members with relatively low levels of Council Tax for their own purposes (that is excluding precepts) the Council Tax Principles are still not flexible enough in the light of less government grant and less spending power than their urban counterparts.

The average (Band D 2 adult equivalent) council tax for 2020-21 for Shire Districts was £167.75 (just £3.23 per week). The 2% or £5 permitted increase is too low to protect services (2% of a low amount is a small amount as is a £5 a year increase) and should be increased to £10. This will then enable the democratically elected councillors to reach local decisions on the balance between council tax affordability and services levels in their local area. A £10 a year increase is less than 20p a week per household.

#### 2.0 HEADLINE ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSALS

The RSN's analysis of the Provisional Settlement proposals shows rural residents in comparison to residents in urban areas will:

- > Still pay over £96 per head **more** in Council Tax
- ➤ Get £107 (61%) per head **less** from Settlement Funding Assessment (SFA) (general grant)
- > Get £11 per head less in specific social care support
- ➤ Get £28 per head of the new social care grants whilst urban get £32 per head (a 16% gap)
- Face a gap between urban and rural SFA per head, which has risen from 41% in 2015/16 to 61% for 2021/22 (although in monetary terms the gap has closed by just under £10 per head)
- ➤ Get over £112 (42%) per head **less** in Government Funded Spending Power (which excludes Council Tax).
- > (Despite all of the above) still have over £16 per head (2%) less overall Spending Power.

The conclusion of the above is that once again Principal Councils serving rural areas in comparison to urban:

- ❖ Get less government grant per head of population
- ❖ Are required to pay more per head of population in Council Tax (through lower incomes when earned in the rural economy)
- ❖ Are required to pay for more of their essential services through Council Tax (69.48% compared to 57.44%); and yet
- Get fewer services which are often more expensive to access

#### 3.0 RURAL IS BEING OVERCHARGED

Based on the facts set out in Section 2.0 above, we argue that once again – as has been the case for many, many years - rural residents, communities and business will, through their Principal local authorities, find themselves penalised by being **Overcharged** in comparison to their urban counterparts.

Providing a voice for rural communities and service providers

Graham Biggs MBE, FCG, Chief Executive PO Box 101, Craven Arms, SY7 7AL Tel: 01588 674922



#### 4.0 RURAL IS BEING SHORT-CHANGED: BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

We reiterate that we are calling for rural areas to get a fair share of the resources being made available by the Government to support local authority services – not per se for additional new money for rural areas.

Again, the facts to support our position are set out in Section 2.0 above.

Our comments and concerns are, however, set against the background and context that for decades, under successive governments, rural areas have received substantially less government funding per head of population for their local government services compared to urban areas. A consequence of this is that rural local authorities have, over the years, found it necessary to increase Council Tax more than their urban counterparts (but have still had less Spending Power overall).

Rural areas also have significantly greater older populations. Over the next five years, the number of older residents in shire areas is projected to rise at an average annual rate of 2.0%, compared to an English average of 1.8%, London Boroughs 1.9%, and metropolitan boroughs 1.5%

Government recognised the rural case through decisions in the 2013/14 Settlement to increase various sparsity weightings in the formula but, on average, only about 25% of the financial gains which should have flowed from that decision actually materialised. The rest was lost through damping which 9 years on (to 2021/22) is still the case. With all the delays to the Fair Funding/Needs and Resources Review (and especially in the light of the recent announcement that the review will be delayed until 2022/23 at the earliest) the Government must now introduce in full the 2013/14 formula changes to sparsity weightings.

So, who has gained from the non-implementation in full of the formula changes referred to above? Well, Inner London plus Surrey and Hertfordshire are still receiving funding from damping more than the formula says they should and they have been receiving this damping benefit since 2013-14 (which was worth £214m per year in 2013-14). More people live in rural areas of England than live in Greater London.

#### **RURAL SERVICES DELIVERY GRANT (RSDG)**

We, of course, welcome the extra £4M in Rural Delivery Grant in 2021/22 and that the Government has again recognised additional cost pressures in rural areas.

In response to the 2019/20 Provisional Settlement, we said "The RSN welcomes the Government's recognition that cost pressures associated with service delivery in rural sparse areas, such as lack of private sector providers and poor broadband coverage should be met with a more consistent package of funding over the course of this Parliament". This is a clear acceptance by the Government that sparsity costs relate to much more than just travel related costs.

The proposals for 2021/22 once again pay lip-service to the recognition referred to above especially as the Government also said in respect of 2019/20 "that it is possible that altering the weightings in 2013/14 may

Providing a voice for rural communities and service providers

Graham Biggs MBE, FCG, Chief Executive PO Box 101, Craven Arms, SY7 7AL Tel: 01588 674922



have only partially reflected the challenges faced in delivering some services in rural areas". The RSN both then and now considers this to be the actuality rather than just a possibility.

We regard RSDG as a form of recompense for rural authorities for the non-implementation in full of the sparsity changes introduced in 2013/14.

It is however massively less than the value of the combined effects of changes as exemplified in the Government's Summer 2012 Consultation of £247.3M. On average, 75% was 'lost to damping' meaning £185M remained due. The 2021/22 increase of RSDG to £85M is clearly insufficient.

The additional weightings for sparsity referred to above created a much larger list of 163 (including 18 Fire & Rescue Services) beneficiaries than the 94 (including 5 Fire & Rescue Services) upper quartile of authorities based on the super sparsity indicator.

It recognised that sparsity costs apply across the spectrum of rural areas and do not suddenly manifest themselves at the boundary of super sparse areas. We do not accept that super sparsity is the best available proxy for rurality across the spectrum of rural areas, but instead that, for distribution of resources purposes, the data used in the 2012 Consultation produces the most appropriate minimum outcome within the basis of the present formula.

#### **LEVELLING UP**

The Government's Levelling Up agenda, if it is to succeed, must be about far more than capital projects. People and Communities must not be disadvantaged by where they live.

In a debate on 26th November 2020 the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State at Defra, Lord Gardiner of Kimble, said "My Lords, our vision remains that rural communities should prosper, benefiting from the full range of government policies designed to level up opportunity and take the country forward…"

Until there is a fair distribution of the resources Government provides to support local government services rural services will continue to get less, pay more and receive fewer services – they will be held down not levelled up. Reductions in essential statutory services will continue as will service cuts to non-statutory services such as bus service support, economic development activity, sport and leisure activities and support to the community and voluntary sector.

Levelling up is about equitable treatment. That is a feature missing from this Provisional Settlement when viewed through a rural lens.

Graham Biggs MBE

( Salan & Biggs

Chief Executive, Rural Services Network

Providing a voice for rural communities and service providers

Graham Biggs MBE, FCG, Chief Executive PO Box 101, Craven Arms, SY7 7AL Tel: 01588 674922