

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

Response to the consultation on The Fair Funding Review 2.0

Name: Adam Richens

Type of Organisation: Local Authority

Name of Organisation: Bournemouth, Christchurch, and Poole

Position: Director of Finance

Address: Civic Centre, Bourne Avenue, Bournemouth, BH2 6DY

Email address: adam.richens@bcpcouncil.gov.uk

Telephone number: 01202 123027

Question 1. What are your views on the updated SFA resulting in zero allocations, and the use of mitigations to avoid zero allocations?

Response: Xx

Question 2. Do you agree with how the government proposes to determine the Council of the Isles of Scilly's Settlement Funding Assessment?

Response: Xx

Question 3. Do you agree with the government's plans to simplify the grant landscape?

Response: Xx

Question 4. Do you agree with the formulae for individual services the government proposes to include?

Response: Xx

Question 5. Do you agree with the areas of need the government proposes to no longer include in the assessment through the Foundation Formula?

Response: Xx

Question 6. Do you agree with the government's approach to calculating the control total shares for the relative needs formulae?

Response: Xx

Question 7. Do you agree with the Labour Cost Adjustment (LCA) and Rates Cost Adjustment (RCA) equations set out in this chapter?

Response: Xx

Appendix C

Question 8. What are your views on the proposed approach to the Area Cost Adjustment (ACA)?

Response: Xx

Question 9. Do you agree or disagree with the inclusion of the Remoteness Adjustment?

Response: Xx

Question 10. Do you agree with the government's proposal to set a notional Council Tax level at the national average level, to achieve the objective of full equalisation?

Response: Xx

Question 11. Do you agree with the government's proposal to fully include the impact of mandatory discounts and exemptions in the measure of taxbase?

Response: Xx

Question 12. Do you agree with the government's proposal to use statistical methods to proxy for the impact of Working Age Local Council Tax Support in the measure of taxbase?

Response: Xx

Question 13. What are your views on the proposed statistical approach to proxy for the impact of Working Age Local Council Tax Support?

Response: Xx

Question 14. Do you agree with the government's proposal to assume that authorities make no use of their discretionary discount and premium schemes in the measure of taxbase?

Response: Xx

Question 15. Do you agree with the government's proposal to apply a uniform Council Tax collection rate assumption to all authorities?

Response: Xx

Question 16. Do you agree with the government's proposal to split or allocate the resource adjustment in multi-tier areas according to the average share in council tax receipts in multi-tier areas?

Response: Xx

Question 17. Noting a potential trade-off of an increased levy charged on business rate growth for some local authorities, do you agree that the level of Safety Net protection should increase for 2026-27?

Response: Xx

Question 18. Do you agree with the government's proposal to end the New Homes Bonus in the LGFS from 2026-27 and return the funding currently allocated to the Bonus to the core Settlement, distributed via the updated Settlement Funding Assessment?

Response: Xx

Appendix C

Question 19. What measures could the government use to incentivise local authorities to specifically support affordable and sub-market housing?

Response: Xx

Question 20. Are there any further flexibilities that you think could support local decision-making during the transitional period?

Response: Xx

Question 21. What are the safeguards that would need to go alongside any additional flexibilities?

Response: Xx

Question 22. Do you agree or disagree that we should move local authorities to their updated allocations over the three-year multi-year Settlement?

Response: Xx

Question 23. Do you agree or disagree that we should use a funding floor to protect as many local authorities' income as possible, at flat cash in each year of the Settlement?

Response: Xx

Question 24. Do you agree or disagree with including projections on residential population?

Response: Xx

Question 25. Do you agree or disagree with including projections on Council Tax level?

Response: Xx

Question 26. Do you agree or disagree with including projections on Council Tax base?

Response: Xx

Question 27. Please provide any additional information, including any explanation or evidence for your response and any views on technical delivery. If you agree, what is your preferred method of projecting residential population, Council Tax level and Council Tax base?

Response: Xx

Question 28. Do you agree with the above approach to determining allocations for areas which reorganise into a single unitary authority along existing geographic boundaries?

Response: Xx

Question 29. Do you agree that, where areas are reorganising into multiple new unitary authorities, they should agree a proposal for the division of existing funding locally based on any guidance set out by central government?

Response: Xx

Question 30. Do you agree that the government should work to reduce unnecessary or disproportionate burden created by statutory duties?

Response: Xx

Question 31. Do you agree with the proposed framework outlined at paragraph 11.2.3 for assessing whether a fee should be changed?

Response: Xx

Question 32. The government invites views from respondents on how best to balance the need to maintain fee values and the original policy intent of the fee whilst minimising cost of living impacts for service users.

Response: Xx

Question 33. Do you agree that the measures above provide an effective balance between protecting charge payers from excessive increases, while providing authorities with greater control over local revenue raising?

Response: Xx

Question 34. Do you agree that we should take action to update fees before exploring options to devolve certain fees to local government in the longer term?

Response: Xx

Question 35. Do you agree or disagree that these are the right Relative Needs Indicators? Are there any other Relative Needs Indicators we should consider? Note that we will not be able to add additional indicators for a 2026-27 update.

Response: Xx

Question 36. Do you agree or disagree with including population projections in the ASC formula, when published, that have been rebased using Census 2021 data?

Response: Xx

Question 37. Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to include a Low-Income Adjustment (LIA) for the older adults component of the ASC RNF model?

Response: Xx

Question 38. Do you agree or disagree that the overall ASC RNF should combine the two component allocation shares using weights derived from the national ASC net current expenditure data on younger and older adults (in this case 2023 to 2024)?

Response: Xx

Question 39. Do you agree that ethnicity should be removed as a variable in the CYPs formula?

Response: Xx

Question 40. Do you agree overall that the new formula represents an accurate assessment of need for children and family services?

Response: Xx

Question 41. Do you believe that the components of daytime population inflow should be weighted to reflect their relative impact on demand for services?

Response: Xx

Question 42. Do you agree with/have any comments on the design of the Foundation Formula?

Response: Xx

Question 43. Do you agree with/have any comments on the design of the Fire and Rescue Formula?

Response: Xx

Question 44. Do you agree with/have any comments on the design of the formula for Highways Maintenance?

Response: Xx

Question 45. Do you agree with/have any comments on the design of the formula for Home-to-School-Transport?

Response: Xx

Question 46. Do you have any views on the potential impacts of the proposals in this consultation on persons who share a protected characteristic?

Response: Xx