

### 1. East Sussex Strategic Wider Partners

1.1 The Leader and Deputy Leader, supported by officers, met with representatives of the public, private and voluntary and community sectors (VCS) and service user groups on 12 December 2018. The meeting provided an opportunity to update partners on the Council's Core Offer approach, continuing challenging financial position and to gather views on the planning being undertaken in response. The presentations included the budget plans and priorities for 2019/20 and the medium term financial period (2019/20-2021/22). 21 partner organisations and service user groups were represented at the meeting and ESCC is grateful to all partners for the comments and feedback provided.

1.2 The following issues were discussed in the meeting:

- The Core Offer approach was broadly welcomed by partners who also appreciated the honesty and transparency about the scale of the financial challenge. It was confirmed that the Core Offer set out in the Reconciling, Policy and Performance papers agreed by Cabinet on 13 November covered all services delivered by the Council and outlined the services that were proposed not to be included in the Core Offer.
- The Core Offer engagement survey that had been published in mid-November was discussed and it was noted that detailed consultation, including Equality Impact Assessments, would be undertaken on any savings proposals in the 2019/20 budget that would result in service changes.
- Concerns were raised that Question 2 of the survey, '*Which of these options would you prefer to keep East Sussex within its financial means?*', had limited engagement as respondents were deterred by the requirement to select the option to either raise Council Tax by 23% over the next three years to maintain services or reduce the range of services on offer. While it was appreciated that the question was difficult to answer, it had helped raise awareness of the real and very difficult decisions Members faced to deliver a balance budget. Although business rates and housing growth could improve the Council's financial position over the long term, they would not generate the revenue urgently needed. It was suggested that it could be clarified that the 23% increase would apply only to ESCC's element of Council Tax, but as ESCC's precept formed the largest part of residents' Council Tax bills the increase would still be significant.
- There were concerns that the proposed Core Offer for Special Education would exacerbate challenges already in the system, including delays in assessment of SEN, reducing trust families had in the service; and increase costs by reducing preventative activity to encourage schools to remain inclusive. ESCC acknowledged that reducing early help and preventative services was counterintuitive and could result in additional future costs (on ESCC and partners) but there was a balance to be struck to maintain urgent services for those children with the highest needs and some early help services where their loss would result in an immediate escalation in need. ESCC would continue to work with schools to promote inclusivity, including through trying to improve schools' allocations through the Dedicated Schools Grant to enable them to be as

inclusive as possible. Any changes to the Special Education service offer would be subject to detailed consultation before they were adopted and relevant partners and representative groups would be consulted as part of that to identify and mitigate possible adverse outcomes.

- ESCC was concertedly lobbying Government - individually, with partners and with others in the sector - for sustainable funding and had emphasised that cuts to preventative and early intervention services were counterproductive. The message appeared to be being heard and it was hoped that the Comprehensive Spending Review and new Fair Funding Formula would go some way to address the sustainable funding of Local Government. The Council modelled future costs and pressures and specific work undertaken in Children's Services had demonstrated the link between prevention and curbing rising service costs.
- Changes to services across sectors and providers were having a cumulative impact on residents and driving crisis situations for some, including in housing for younger people. ESCC was aware that all parts of the public sector were expected to do more with less and worked closely with the Borough and District Councils to make the best use of resources to support vulnerable residents across services. ESCC had also made numerous bids for grants and funding streams to maximise funding and had received additional funding for homelessness prevention among Care Leavers.
- The impact of savings on provision for vulnerable children was also raised and ESCC was acutely aware of the pressure being placed on Foster Carers and vulnerable children. No reductions in support for Looked After Children were proposed in the 2019/20 budget cycle in recognition of the rising number of Looked After Children and the continued need to recruit new Foster Carers. The language used in reports would be reviewed to clarify that changes to legal obligations for care leavers had created financial pressures rather than 'burdens.'
- The Council remained committed to recognising Social Value in its tendering process. ESCC commissioned services at a range of levels and geographies with partners, including health, to achieve the best outcomes possible within available resources. ESCC was working with the Clinical Commissioning Groups through East Sussex Better Together to integrate health and social care services and Delayed Transfers of Care had significantly improved as a result. A Care Quality Area Review in 2018 had also commended the joint working across the East Sussex Healthcare System. Ongoing work was needed to ensure all additional funding, including the additional funding for Winter Pressures, was used appropriately and did not increase costs in any part of the system.
- ESCC would continue to collaborate with partners in response to the financial challenge. It was agreed by all that residents' continued to have needs even if resources were no longer available to provide services or eligibility changed. It was agreed to be vital for all sectors to work together to make best use of the resources available. The important role that the VCS played as service providers was acknowledged and welcomed. The joint review that was underway to reset the way the two sectors worked together was highlighted. This annual partner engagement meeting only formed part of an ongoing conversation between sectors and providers. East Sussex strategic partners also met regularly collectively and separately in other forums. It was reinforced that any changes to

services was subject to detailed consultation with full consideration given to all relevant issues.

- The lobbying partners and service user groups were doing, including through national alliances, to raise awareness of the need for sustainable funding for services was welcomed.
- The significant contribution older residents made in the county and the value that they provided to organisations such as Healthwatch through volunteering was recognised.
- ESCC had worked hard to significantly reduce its agency spend while recognising that agency workers helped to meet need and specialist skills, particularly in hard to recruit areas.

## **2. Public Sector Partners**

The Chief Executives of the Borough and District Councils and representative of the East Sussex Fire and Rescue Authority met on 18 December and welcomed the presentation on the budget proposals and the core offer given by Becky Shaw. Chief Executives commented that;

- The growth in use of one off funding pots made planning difficult and were very difficult to use sensibly
- Agreed interest in councils discussing:
  - Joint working on housing /homelessness
  - complaints/LGO/FOI (in context of social activism)
  - Looking at most expensive families and
  - Working with wider Public sector leaders about impact of all partners' changes on localities

## **3. Scrutiny Committees**

### People Scrutiny Committee RPPR Board

3.1 The People Scrutiny RPPR Board discussed in detail the savings and draft Portfolio Plans for the Adult Social Care and Children's Services Departments at its meeting on 10 December 2018. The meeting was attended by Councillors Davies (Chair), Clark, Ensor, Field, Galley, Sheppard and Webb. Set out below is a summary of the key matters on which the Board sought clarification, together with its concluding remarks in relation to each Department.

#### Adult Social Care

3.2 With regard to the savings plan, the Director clarified that the average spend on the social needs element of the Working Age Adults activity is significantly higher in East Sussex than in other local authorities in the region. Furthermore, initial findings indicate other local authorities have achieved these lower levels of demand via the deployment of more effective signposting practices. It was also clarified that there is no direct evidence that savings in this area will be shunted across to other organisations, such as voluntary groups. However, the Director confirmed that the Department will, if the saving is agreed, undertake consultation and an Equality

Impact Assessment so as to ensure it understands the implications of savings for this area of activity.

3.3 With regard to Meals in the Community, it was clarified that the full cost of the meals is between £4 and £8 and that the withdrawal of the £4.10 subsidy will mean clients will need to meet the full cost themselves. The Director also confirmed that the saving for the Meals in the Community activity will be a part-year saving and that with regard to the Working Age Adults activity, the Department expects to make a full year saving in 2019/20.

3.4 With regard to the Adult Social Care and Health draft Portfolio Plan, the Director confirmed that funding for the Better Care Fund for 2019/20 is in place. However, the Director also confirmed that the additional £2.6m funding for the following year will be managed through the Better Care Fund assurance process and that this will mean the NHS will have greater control over how this funding is spent in future.

3.5 The Director clarified that the reductions in Income and Net Recharges listed in the Revenue Budget are the result of changes in how the Department and the NHS work together. For example, more NHS nursing staff are now seconded to the Department.

#### Concluding Comments to Cabinet

3.6 Given the scale of savings previously required of Adult Social Care, the Board agreed that the savings identified for the next financial year are relatively modest. Furthermore, Members were grateful for the work undertaken by the Department and agreed that in the context of the Core Offer, the proposals are realistic. However, the Board expressed a particular concern regarding the proposed removal of the subsidy described under the Meals in the Community activity. The Board therefore asked that Cabinet are mindful of the potential impact of this proposal on the finances of the most vulnerable service users which this subsidy supports.

3.7 In addition, the Board asked that the wording under the Operating Principles section of the Adult Social Care and Health Portfolio Plan be amended so that the Strong Partnership item includes reference to working in partnership with voluntary organisations.

#### Children's Services

3.8 With regard to the Safeguarding Services activity listed in the savings plan, the Director informed Members that the Department had developed a proposal which represents the 'least worst option' available to it. The only other significant potential source of savings within the Safeguarding service area available to the Department relates to the number of social workers it can deploy. However, the Department is clear that reductions in this area would have a much greater negative impact on the vulnerable children and young people this activity area supports.

3.9 In response to a query regarding the savings plan for Early Help activities, the Board were informed that the Department's strategic review of this area is ongoing.

As a result, Members would be given an opportunity to comment on a detailed Early Help savings plan early next year.

3.10 The Board expressed concerns about the impact of proposed savings on school attendance (under the I-SEND: Inclusion Services activity). In response, the Department agreed that attendance in East Sussex is a particular challenge. However, given the necessary reduction in funding for preventative services, the Department had reluctantly concluded that it would not be able to provide the same level of direct working with parents as before. The Department also confirmed that it retains some statutory responsibility in this area and support for this will continue (for example, with regard to instances of very poor school attendance). Members were also informed that schools retain a responsibility to promote high levels of school attendance.

3.11 In response to the Board's questions regarding the impact of the savings plan for the Standards and Learning Effectiveness Service (SLES) activity, the Department confirmed that its strategy in recent years had been to focus on supporting schools to support themselves. The Department believes this strategy had left schools better placed to cope with the reduced levels of support it will be able to offer in future, although the Department was clear that there was an increased risk that some schools will underperform in future.

3.12 The Board queried the lower than national average target relating to the proportion of pupils in all schools who will achieve the expected standards at Key Stage 2 (Performance Measures and Targets in the draft Portfolio Plan). In response, the Board were informed that this was an area of continuing challenge for the Department and schools. Whilst the Department was ambitious and there had been some improvements this year, the targets represent a realistic picture of what it believes can be achieved in the coming three year period.

#### Concluding Comments to Cabinet

3.13 The Board understood the difficult funding position facing the Children's Services Department. Within this context therefore, the Board recognised that officers and the relevant Lead Members had worked hard to deliver a realistic 'Core Offer' savings plan. However, and whilst accepting the difficult situation facing the Department, Members asked that Cabinet note the Board's regret at the impact of the proposed savings on services that support children in the county.

#### **Place Scrutiny Committee RPPR Board**

3.14 The Place Scrutiny RPPR Board reviewed in detail the proposed savings and draft Portfolio Plans covering the Communities Economy and Transport (CET), Business Services and Governance Services Departments at its meeting on 17 December 2018. The board was attended by Councillors Richard Stogdon (Chair), Godfrey Daniel (Vice Chair), Martin Clarke, Chris Dowling, Claire Dowling, Nigel Enever, Pat Rodohan and Barry Taylor. The Board sought further information in relation to a number of the proposed savings and further clarification with regard to impact. In particular the Board examined how the savings, or additional income, are to be achieved and made comments about the timing of some of the proposed

savings in year 3 of the MTFP. Set out below are the Board's agreed comments to Cabinet.

3.15 The Board highlighted two areas that it would wish to comment on to Cabinet:

- The Place Scrutiny Committee would like more detail of the proposed Orbis savings and their impact when they are available; and
- The timing of significant changes to CET services need to be carefully considered.

3.16 The Board considered that it could not comment fully on the RPPR process without seeing the draft Council budget. The Board agreed that it would like to hold another RPPR Board meeting in January to discuss and comment on the draft budget when it is available.

3.17 The Place Scrutiny Committee RPPR Board met for a second time on 15 January 2019 to consider the Council's draft budget for 2019/20. The board was attended by Councillors Godfrey Daniel (Chair), Martin Clarke, Chris Dowling, Simon Elford, Nigel Enever, Pat Rodohan, Stephen Shing and Barry Taylor. The Board discussed the revised Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) and the proposed savings for Communities, Economy and Transport (CET) and Business Services (Orbis).

3.18 The Board noted that the Council has made up the gap in savings by a variety of movements in the MTFP totalling round £11m, and is not looking at having to make additional savings affecting front line services. Some of the savings and additional funding are one-off amounts and therefore there may be a need for further savings if the Council's financial position does not change in the longer term following the Government's Fair Funding Review.

3.19 The Place Scrutiny Committee RPPR Board made the following additional comments to Cabinet on the proposed Council budget for 2019/20:

- The Board is relieved that the savings needed to close the budget gap and the impact on front line services, are not as severe as thought.
- It noted that some of the additional savings had been achieved through oneoff measures or increases in specific areas of funding, which may not be repeated in future years.
- The Board remains concerned about the financial position in the longer term and the possibility of the need to make further savings from front line services in future years, for example, from the Library Service in 2021/22.

#### **4. Trade Union Representatives**

4.1. A meeting was held with Trade Union representatives on 15 January 2019 to consult on the Council's 2019/20 spending and savings proposals.

4.2. The Leader of the Council opened the meeting and thanked the Trade Union representatives, and through them the staff, for another year of impressive and hard work. He reminded those in attendance that, although the last year had been challenging, staff's dedication had ensured the Council continued to provide many

excellent services in difficult financial circumstances. For example, the work of the Children's Services Department had been recognised by an outstanding Ofsted rating. The Deputy Leader and Lead Member for Children and Families offered similar praise to the staff for their hard work.

4.3. The Leader said that the financial position for 2019/20 had been improved by the receipt of one-off Government funding. He believed that intensive lobbying by the Council over the past year had helped secure this funding and at the same time raised the Government's awareness of the growing pressures facing local authorities. Nevertheless, the financial position was still very challenging and would remain so over the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) period up to 2022. He explained that the Council had a legal duty to balance its budget and that meant difficult decisions would continue in the coming years.

4.4. The Chief Executive summarised the contents of the Cabinet RPPR report and its appendices. The Chief Executive explained that it was important to consider the savings plans in the context of the £129m savings already made since 2010, the financial uncertainty ahead, and the increasing demand for services. Officers and Members were acutely aware of the impact that savings had had on staff, businesses and residents.

4.5. The Chief Executive said that the Council was committed to continuing to lobby Government, including in partnership with other local authorities and organisations where possible, and would focus its efforts on securing long term funding through the Comprehensive Spending Review, Fairer Funding Review, and Older People's Green Paper which were all expected in 2019.

4.6. The Trade Union representatives thanked Cabinet Members and officers for the opportunity to meet. It was agreed that, if required, further questions and comments from representatives who had been unable to attend the meeting could be submitted in writing ahead of the County Council meeting on 5 February.

4.7. The Trade Union representatives raised a number of questions and issues which were addressed as set out below.

#### Lobbying Central Government

4.8. Trade Union representatives welcomed the active lobbying the Council was undertaking and asked for details of the lobbying activities to date.

4.9. The Leader said that the recent year of lobbying Central Government for funding had been the most successful to date, particularly following the publication of the Core Offer in July and the subsequent press coverage it received. During the course of the year the Leader had written to a range of Government Ministers, including James Brokenshire, Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, requesting the opportunity to meet. Meetings had subsequently taken place with Rishi Sunak, Minister for Local Government; Liz Truss, Chief Secretary to the Treasury; and Matt Hancock, Secretary of State for Health and Social Care, to discuss the pressures facing the Council, the urgent need for transitional funding for 2019/20, as well as the case for longer-term sustainable funding. In some cases the meeting included leaders of other local authorities. The Leader was assured that the Ministers had listened to and understood the Council's concerns, however, as all additional funding announced for 2019/20 was one-off, the job was not done and lobbying to convert the funding into long-term sustainable resources would be a priority for 2019.

4.10. The Trade Unions confirmed they had also been lobbying Government and the Leader thanked them and encouraged them to continue.

#### Core Offer

4.11. The Trade Union representatives welcomed the honesty of the Core Offer but were concerned that its publication had distressed some staff and created concern about the future of their roles and the organisation.

4.12. The Leader assured those in attendance that rather than being a 'bare minimum', the Core Offer represented the minimum service the local authority could provide whilst still delivering its duties and key priorities. He said that the Council would continue to provide support to those who needed it most.

4.13. The Leader apologised for any distress the publication of the Core Offer had caused members of staff. He said that it had been intended to start a conversation with a range of stakeholders about what level of service they could expect to receive from the Council in future years.

4.14. The Chief Executive added that the Corporate Management Team had worked hard to reassure staff about the purpose of the Core Offer but understood the potential for it to cause concern. The Council has robust employment policies and staff would be involved in any proposed changes to services, but the future funding level of local authorities, and therefore potential services the Council could offer, remained uncertain making the production of the Core Offer necessary.

4.15. The Deputy Leader recognised that the authority relied on the good will of staff in implementing difficult savings plans and that this good will was being stretched due to the number of years that savings had been required. He thanked them for their patience.

#### Unitary Authority

4.16. Trade Unions asked about the question of the future of the County Council and Local Government, which had been raised in the public conversation that had followed the launch of the Core Offer.

4.17. The Leader confirmed that there were no plans to create a unitary authority in East Sussex – which would only happen if there were agreement from all six local authorities – not least because it would be disruptive and costly at a time when difficult savings were being implemented across the Council.

#### English as an Additional Language service (EALS)

4.18. The Trade Union representatives had concerns that proposed savings in Children's Services were eroding the years of investment in good practice that had delivered good outcomes. In particular, representatives were disappointed and concerned about the impact of the proposal to discontinue the English as an Additional Language service (EALS).

4.19. The Leader said that it was regrettable that the Council was proposing to no longer provide an EALS from April 2019, but he explained that it was a traded service that schools no longer wished to purchase. The Director of Children's Services added that the EALS had been valued by its users, however, secondary schools at a Schools Forum meeting voted not to allocate funding to EALS from the de-delegated pooled budget. He confirmed that regrettably the service would not be



viable as a primary school-only service; the Council was not in a position to provide the funds itself; and academies had declined to purchase from the service when approached. The Lead Member for ISEND has written to schools in light of their decision to request confirmation as to how they would continue to support children for whom English was not their first language. The potential closure of the service was now subject to formal consultation.

4.20. The Director of Children's Services confirmed, that guided by the concept of a Core Offer, the department would continue to provide core services for those in greatest need. The one-off funding for social care received for 2019/20 had enabled proposals to delay some savings to the 2020/21 financial year.

#### Council Tax referendum

4.21. Trade Union representatives noted that schools also lacked access to sustainable funding and there were concerns that schools were increasingly losing the ability to purchase important external services, including HR support. Given that there was ongoing national restriction in resources for public services, Trade Union representatives asked whether consideration had been given to costing ESCC's ideal service provision and funding it through holding a public referendum on a significant Council Tax increase.

4.22. The Leader explained that ESCC already has the fifth highest Council Tax rate of all county councils and one of the lowest wage economies. The Council had modelled the increase in Council Tax which would be required to avoid any savings over the MTFP period and it was around 23%. This would put a considerable strain on residents.

4.23. The Leader explained that around two thirds of the Council's budget is spent on children's and adult's social care, but those services were used by a small proportion of the population. It was therefore unlikely that residents would approve a Council Tax increase of 23% for no increase in the services they access on a day-to-day basis. Any such referendum would cost around £1m to conduct. The Deputy Leader added that in response to the Core Offer engagement survey, 78% of people consulted said that central government should pay for increases in the demand for services.

4.24. Finally, the Leader said that the main driver of ESCC's funding gap was the ongoing increasing demand for adult and children's social care. This meant that even a 23% increase in Council Tax would only be a temporary fix and future increases would be necessary. The Leader said he believed that the only viable long term solution would be for Central Government to find an appropriate and sustainable approach to providing and funding social care.

#### Orbis and other partnership working

4.25. Given the change in Leader at Surrey County Council, Trade Union representatives sought confirmation that all partners remained committed to the Orbis partnership.

4.26. The Leader confirmed that the new leader of Surrey County Council was committed to the partnership, interested to know more detail and to keep under review how Orbis worked.

4.27. Trade Union representatives also queried whether there was any intention to re-start devolution work.

4.28. The Leader explained that, as the Government had have moved away from encouraging local authorities to submit formal devolution proposals, the focus was now on taking up other opportunities to work together on strategic issues, such as the Transport for the South East Sub National Transport Body that would increase access to infrastructure funding in the region.

#### Health and Wellbeing of staff

4.29. Trade Union representatives raised concerns about the serious impact that closure and restructure of services had had on staff health and wellbeing and morale.

4.30. The Chief Executive confirmed that ESCC was very aware, particularly in the challenging financial circumstances, of the need to support the health and wellbeing of staff and confirmed that a number of initiatives were in place to assist with this. The Head of Human Resources and Organisational Development added that the wellbeing initiatives included the ability to 'purchase' days off; the availability of a staff discount platform; and a range of learning and development opportunities. These initiatives were well received but senior managers were mindful more could be done and welcomed further ideas from staff. Trade Union representatives confirmed that the arrangements in place were helpful.

#### Redundancies and redeployment

4.31. Trade Union representatives requested confirmation of the number of redundancies and redeployments made in 2018 and the number of projected redundancies as a result of proposed savings plans.

4.32. The Chief Executive confirmed that from January to December 2018 there had been a total of 253 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) redundancies of which 113 were in the Adult Social Care Department – due mainly to the changes to the Assessment and Care Management Service – and 71 were in schools. 28 people had been successfully redeployed, although the ability to redeploy staff had become more difficult as savings continued. It was expected that there would be a further 130 FTE redundancies during 2019/20; and a total of 230 redundancies were expected over the MTFP period.

#### Business Rates Retention pilot

4.33. Trade Union representatives requested further information and detail on the Business Rates Retention pilot that had been secured.

4.34. The Chief Finance Officer explained that East Sussex authorities had successfully bid to be a 75% business rate retention pilot. The pilot included the District and Borough Councils and East Sussex Fire and Rescue Service, and would give authorities 75% of the growth in business rates in the County providing £4.3m additional funding. Of this, ESCC would receive £4.6m. The pilot built on the existing East Sussex Business Rates pool and would be administered by Wealden District Council. The Pilot was for one year only and came with requirements to report to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government.

4.35. The Chief Finance Officer clarified that the pilot did not represent the potential income the Council would receive under the future business rate retention model, because it provides a share of the gains in business rate growth since 2013/14. The future business rates model, expected to come into force in April 2020, will not include this benefit. The Government's future model was subject to consultation and ESCC's response would be agreed by the Lead Member for Strategic Management and Economic Development in February.

#### Fees and Charges

4.36. Trade Union representatives queried whether the delegation to the Chief Finance Officer to approve increased fees and charges was for 2019/20 only or ongoing.

4.37. The Chief Finance Officer confirmed he had delegated authority to increase fees and charges for future years. Fees and charges which increased above inflation would be published as part of the RPPR budget report and quarterly monitoring for the Cabinet and County Council.

#### Adult Social Care and Health

4.38. Trade Union representatives asked what plans were in place in Adult Social Care to respond to ongoing demographic growth.

4.39. The Director of Adult Social Care and Health confirmed that demographic projections for East Sussex indicated a continued increase in the number of older people. The subsequent increase in demand for adult social care would require significant investment, which had been factored into the Medium Term Financial Plan. In addition, the cost of care homes will continue to increase above the rate of inflation due to wage growth.

4.40. The Director explained that within the context of this increased demand and increased cost of services, a number of funding streams would begin to fall away after 2019/20. These include the end of the one-off winter pressure funding provided for 2018/19 and 2019/20, and reduction in the amount received as part of the Better Care Fund (BCF), and Improved Better Care Fund (IBCF). It was also expected that the conditions the Government placed on BCF and IBCF funding after 2020 would include the need to focus their use on improving patient flows out of hospital, reducing the resources available for supporting other people in need, such as those with learning disabilities.

4.41. Local health and care organisations were required to produce a five year plan by October 2019 which included setting out how further integration between the NHS and local authorities would take place in line with the NHS Long Term Plan. In the absence of an Older People's Green Paper setting out the national direction for sustainable provision and funding of social care, and with reduced resources from 2020/21, this would be challenging. Nevertheless, ESCC and local health partners remained fully committed to integration to improve outcomes and reduce costs and a revised programme for integration would be considered by the Clinical Commissioning Groups' (CCGs) Governing Boards and ESCC Cabinet later in the year.

## 5. Young People

5.1 Becky Shaw joined the East Sussex Youth Cabinet's first meeting of the year on 20 January to discuss the role the Council plays East Sussex, the current context and the difficult choices the Council is having to make as a result of reduced funding from central government and growth in demand for services. The young people asked a number of questions about the Council's future prospects and the issues they felt the Council needed to consider in setting its spending and savings plans. The Youth Cabinet were keen to hear more about the choices facing the Council in future and to work with it in raising issues.

5.2 The key questions raised and discussed are set out below:

- Why is there less money?
- Can you explain the core offer?
- How will we measure who the most vulnerable are?
- How do you help parents who are struggling, but their needs aren't presenting as serious enough?
- What are other ways for ESCC to bring money in?
- Will it be effective to cut preventative services and focus on emergency/response services?
- When will the need for a core offer be over? Will the council ever be able to re-expand its services?
- How is mental health being prioritized in the core offer?
- Will funding be allocated to ensure a fully rounded education for young people?
- What can the Youth Cabinet do to help, especially with lobbying?
- What will be the impact of Brexit?
- How are you working with other organisations in East Sussex to help people?