



Department
of Health

Local authority public health grant allocations 2015/16

Government response to public consultation on
in-year savings

and

Equality and health inequalities analysis

<p>Title:</p> <p>Local authority public health grant allocations 2015/16</p> <p>Government response to public consultation on in-year savings and equality and health inequality analysis</p>
<p>Author:</p> <p>Public Health Policy and Strategy Unit, Department of Health</p>
<p>Document Purpose:</p> <p>Engagement and transparency</p>
<p>Publication date:</p> <p>4th November 2015</p>
<p>Target audience:</p> <p>Local authorities in England</p>
<p>Contact details:</p> <p>Public Health Policy and Strategy Unit</p> <p>Room 165</p> <p>Department of Health</p> <p>Richmond House</p> <p>79 Whitehall</p> <p>London SW1A 2NS</p> <p>consultation.laphallocations@dh.gsi.gov.uk</p>

You may re-use the text of this document (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/

© Crown copyright

Published to gov.uk, in PDF format only.

www.gov.uk/dh

Local authority public health grant allocations 2015/16

Government response to public consultation on in-year savings

and

Equality and health inequalities analysis

Prepared by:

Public Health Policy and Strategy Unit, Department of Health

Contents

1. Background and context	5
2. Summary of responses:.....	7
Question 1.....	7
Question 2.....	8
Question 3.....	10
4. Government position, including equality.....	12
and health inequality analysis	
5. Conclusion.....	20
Annex - revised 2015/16 allocations.....	21

Background and context

Since 2013 local authorities (LAs) in England have had a duty to take the steps that they believe are appropriate to improve the health of their populations. The Department of Health (DH) funds LAs for this with a grant. Other than requirements to discharge a limited number of public health functions prescribed in regulations and to comply with certain conditions that DH attaches to the grant, it is for LAs to determine how best to invest these resources.

In 2015/16 the total grant amounted originally to £2.8 billion, supplemented by a further £430 million when responsibility for services for children aged 0 – 5 transferred to LAs from NHS England on 1 October.

On 4 June 2015 the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced a package of savings to be made across government in 2015/16, the current financial year, to reduce public debt. These savings amount to £3 billion across government and include £200 million to be saved from the public health grant.

The distribution of the grant between LAs is informed by a ‘fair shares’ formula developed by the Advisory Committee on Resource Allocation (ACRA) and intended to reflect relative need for public health services across England. ACRA is an independent committee and its members include public health experts, GPs, NHS managers and academics.

The ACRA formula produces a ‘target’ share for each LA of the overall national allocation, intended to reflect local needs for public health interventions. In most cases this is higher or lower than the grant that LAs have actually received. This is because LAs’ grants were originally based on the previous level of local NHS spending on a given set of public health activities (in order to provide a stable background for the transfer of responsibilities to LAs). All LAs benefitted from growth in their public health grants in 2013/14 and 2014/15, with those below their target allocations gaining the most.

DH is currently consulting separately on proposed adjustments to the ACRA formula designed to reflect variations in need more closely.

Between 31 July and 28 August DH invited views on three questions:

- how best to distribute the £200 million saving between the LAs affected;
- what DH, the NHS and Public Health England (PHE) can do to support LAs through the challenge of implementing the saving; and
- how DH can best assess the impact of the saving.

This document describes the responses to those questions that DH received and sets out how it will take matters forward in the light of those responses. It also analyses the impact of the Department's plans on inequalities in health and on people with characteristics protected by equalities legislation.

Summary of responses

The consultation exercise closed on the 28th August. DH received 219 responses from LAs, stakeholders, third sector organisations and individual members of the health and care workforce. Out of the total of 152 LAs in England with public health duties, 123 (81 per cent) responded.

Question 1

How should DH spread the £200 million saving across the LAs involved?

The consultation document suggested that DH could, for example:

- A. Devise a formula that claims a larger share of the saving from LAs that are significantly above their target allocation.
- B. Identify LAs that carried forward unspent reserves into 2015/16 and claim a correspondingly larger share of the savings from them.
- C. Reduce every LA's allocation by a standard, flat rate percentage. Nationally the £200 million saving amounts to about 6.2 per cent of the total grant for 2015/16, so that would also be the figure DH applies to individual LAs.
- D. Reduce every LA's allocation by a standard percentage unless any can show that this would result in particular hardship, taking account of the following criteria:
 - inability to deliver savings legally due to binding financial commitments;
 - substantial, disproportionate and unavoidable adverse impact on people who share a protected characteristic within the meaning of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010;
 - high risk that, because of its impact, the decision would be incompatible with the Secretary of State's duties under the NHS Act 2006 (in particular the duty to have regard to the need to reduce inequalities between people with regard to the benefits they can receive from public health services);
 - the availability of funding from public health or general reserves; or
 - any other exceptional factors.

The consultation document made clear that, subject to the outcome of the consultation, DH's preferred option was C.

Out of the 123 LA responses, two did not respond to this question and one preferred a combination of options A and C. Thirteen LAs and two other respondents

suggested a new option - to use a weighted need based per head of population figure to calculate each LA's saving – and 107 LAs selected one of the options A to D. The table below sets out the response to the different options.

Table 1

Question 1 – Preferred option	Number of LAs and if above or below target allocation	Other respondents	All respondents
A – Take larger sum from LAs above target	54 (52 below target) (2 above target)	14	68
B – Take proportionate to reserves	10 (2 below target) (8 above target)	4	14
C – Take flat rate 6.2%	31 (15 below target) (16 above target)	11	42
D – Flat rate unless hardship	12 (9 below target) (3 above target)	11	23
New option - take per head of population based on weighted need	13 (8 below target) (5 above target)	2	15
Nil or no response	32 (18 below target) (14 above target)	54	86
Total	152	97	249
Notes:			
Two LAs submitted responses but did not select any of the options and stated that they would prefer no cuts. 30 LAs did not respond to the consultation.			
One other respondent would prefer a combination of option A and C. Not shown in table but included in total number of responses.			

Question 2

How can DH, Public Health England and NHS England help LAs to implement the saving and minimise any possible disruption to services?

Some LAs were keen to look at what can be achieved with the remaining budget and asked for support in identifying innovative interventions that offer value for money. Others felt that there was little that DH, PHE or NHS England can do to ease this process. They expressed concerns on the timing of the budget reduction and the

challenges this poses in planning public health services. Some LAs felt legal support would be helpful in looking at how services could be decommissioned.

LAs felt that the decision to make the saving was inconsistent with the emphasis of the NHS Five Year Forward View on prevention. Some highlighted the fact that between 40 per cent and 80 per cent of their public health budgets go to NHS providers.

This table lists suggestions from all respondents and the numbers making them.

Table 2

Early funding announcement for better planning.	25
Tools to help commissioners identify interventions that offer greatest VFM.	24
Appropriate time and legal support required to renegotiate contracts and give notice.	15
Be more aware of the impact of the saving on NHS services.	14
Saving should not be recurrent.	13
Savings should be shared with PHE.	10
Act a focal point or broker for discussions about economies of scale and other efficiencies. To help address fall out from staffing, contractual issues, etc.	9
Keep ring-fence around the grant for clarity.	9
Work with CCGs to minimise impact.	6
NHS commissioners/trusts to supplement health programmes to ease the challenges.	6
Clarity on health visitor target numbers.	5
Permit a targeted approach to NHS Health Checks and support with more national marketing campaigns.	5

Remove prescription in regulations of steps that all LAs must take.	5
Redirect Health Premium Incentive Scheme budget to reduce the saving.	4
PHE, DH, LGA and NHS England could model the saving's impact.	3
Carry out equality analysis to review the impact.	3
Implement payment by results, using data which are currently available, in order to drive change.	1
NHS could be asked to reduce waste.	1
Clarify performance assessment.	1

Question 3

How best can DH assess and understand the impact of the saving?

The three options that DH suggested were:

- to undertake a national survey of directors of public health and other key stakeholders;
- commission PHE centre directors to review the local impact and contribute to a national report for DH; and
- work through representative bodies to gather feedback on local impact.

All were favoured by some LAs and other respondents, and the table below lists further suggestions from respondents and the numbers making them.

Table 3

A national survey of directors of public health and other key stakeholders and PHE centre directors to review Local impact.	60
Conduct a health impact assessment on the social and economic impact of the budget reductions for each local authority.	35
Link the assessment or survey to the Public Health Outcomes Framework to evaluate the potential impact.	31

Ask how each LA made up its share of savings in the planning phase.	21
Discuss this with CCGs and NHS service providers to identify the impact on all services and third sector providers.	19
Request evidence from LGA, DCLG, ADPH and Faculty of Public Health regarding the impact as well as undertake benchmark studies to understand impact on savings (including on the NHS).	12 12
Speak to service user groups who have direct experience.	2
Ensure the assessment is not burdensome for LAs.	2
Improve data sharing between the various agencies involved in the commissioning and delivery of public health services.	1
Seek specific information through the annual Public Health Grant Statement of Assurance.	1

Government position

DH is grateful for the helpful and constructive responses to its questions. It has made its decisions after considering them carefully in the light of the three underpinning principles that it set out in the consultation document:

- the need to save £200 million from this year's grant as an important contribution to reducing the national deficit;
- the need to do so in a way that is consistent with the Department's public sector equality duty and the Secretary of State's health inequalities duty; and
- the need to do so in a way that minimises any disruption to public health services.

Equality and health inequality analysis

Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 sets out the public sector equality duty (PSED) which requires public authorities, including the Secretary of State for Health and LAs, to (among other things):

"... have due regard to the need to -

(a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;

(b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;

(c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it."

Section 1C of the NHS Act 2006 requires the Secretary of State to:

"... have regard to the need to reduce inequalities between the people of England with respect to the benefits that they can obtain from the health service."

A condition that DH attaches to the public health grant confers the same requirement on LAs in the way that they use the money.

From the outset of this exercise the Department's priority has been to make the saving in a way that:

minimises disruption by preserving as far as possible the important public health services used by vulnerable people, including those with characteristics protected by equalities legislation or who experience inequalities in their health; and complies with all its policies and statutory duties on equality.

To support this objective, its consultation document stated specifically that:

“Views on the questions from all will be carefully considered and are equally welcome, particularly in relation to any people sharing a protected characteristic as defined in the Equality Act 2010. Please include in responses any views about ways to minimise possible disruption to services and adverse impacts on public health.”

As well as the responses to the consultation, and to set the issue in the appropriate context, DH has considered other existing evidence on the effect on inequalities in health and between people with protected characteristics of the distribution of available resources between LAs.

Distribution

DH undertook an equality analysis when allocating the grant between LAs for 2013/4 and 2014/15 (a two-year settlement). The settlement for 2015/16 was the same in cash terms as in 2014/15 and was distributed on the same basis (with minor adjustments to correct some local anomalies).

The table below summarises the factors related to health inequalities and protected characteristics that ACRA took into account when it considered the impact of the allocation formula. ACRA uses standardised mortality ratio for people aged under 75 years of age (SMR<75) as a robust indicator of the whole population’s health status, and hence need for public health services. It should not be interpreted as meaning that the allocation should not reflect the needs of those aged over 75, or that morbidity is not important. ACRA’s analysis showed that the SMR<75 is highly correlated with other measures of population health, such as disability free life expectancy and healthy life expectancy.

More details are available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ring-fenced-public-health-grants-to-local-authorities-2013-14-and-2014-15>.

Summary of equality analysis of the public health grant distribution:

Characteristic	Considerations in the ACRA formula
Age	For younger people aged 19 or under, substance misuse and sexual health services have a formula component adjustment.
Sex	Adjustments, or weights, for sex are applied to the same functions as age.
Race	Race may be correlated with the SMR<75. ACRA explored the Health Survey for England data on smoking, alcohol, and fruit and vegetable consumption by ethnicity and age, but the sample numbers were too small to provide robust data by ethnicity for allocations purposes.
Disability	ACRA considered using Disability Free Life Expectancy (DFLE), and the Healthy Life Expectancy (HLE) which more explicitly measure morbidity and disability than the SMR<75. However, SMR<75, DFLE and HLE are very highly correlated so the use of the SMR<75 does capture morbidity.
Gender reassignment	Gender reassignment data within the healthcare context is complex and incomplete. There was a lack of data on the group's public health needs suitable for use in an allocations formula.
Sexual orientation	The 2007 Citizenship Survey showed no difference in self-reported good health between heterosexual and gay/lesbian people. The Lesbian and Gay Foundation highlighted that LGB&T people are more likely than heterosexual people to smoke and drink alcohol and so could potentially have a higher need for public health services. Due to the lack of robust data available on sexual orientation within LA areas that are suitable for allocations purposes no adjustment was made for this factor.
Religion and belief	There is a lack of robust data suitable for allocations purposes on the public health needs of groups with different

	beliefs. No adjustment was made.
Pregnancy and maternity	Care through pregnancy and the early years impacts upon health and healthcare needs throughout life, but LAs are not directly responsible for pregnancy and maternity services. ACRA recognised that a good start in life can influence future health, educational and social outcomes, and recommended an age weight for children under five years old. The weight is approximated from the behaviour of the parental age group, as an indicator of likely future public health need.
Carers	Carers play a vital role in supporting the healthcare system, but often have poorer health outcomes. Allocations indirectly account for carers through the SMR as this is correlated with, for example, DFLE.
Other identified groups	<p><u>Seasonal workers</u> ACRA considered seasonal workers, who may be at risk of inequity of opportunity to access public health services. ACRA considered data from the ONS on the estimates of short-term migrants which were mapped to administrative sources provided by other government departments in order to accurately allocate short-term migrants to local authorities. In the majority of LAs the number of short-term residents is very small in comparison with the usually resident population (less than 0.5%). Those with a proportion higher than 0.5% are predominantly in London but without data on the intention of length of stay we cannot predict their pattern of public health demand. For this reason no adjustment is made.</p> <p><u>Deprived populations within affluent areas</u> Deprivation impacts heavily upon public health need and more affluent areas, all else being equal, are less likely to need the same level of public health services. The SMR is highly correlated with deprivation and as the SMR is applied at ward level it takes account of the relative deprivation between and within LAs. Higher deprivation is therefore associated with higher allocations per head.</p> <p><u>Travellers</u> Travellers may not have full access to public health services because of their non-permanent status. Public health allocations can help promote equity of access by ensuring LAs with relatively higher populations of travellers receive a higher share of available resources. Analysis was undertaken to calculate the traveller population as a proportion of each LA's total population. This was shown to be very low, as was</p>

	the variation across local authorities. In addition, the Office for National Statistics undertook a special exercise to ensure that the 2011 population census included travellers, who are therefore included in the population base for public health grants. For these reasons, no adjustment was recommended by ACRA.
--	---

Consultation responses

Twenty-seven LAs and other respondents commented directly on the potential impact of the saving on health inequalities or on people with protected characteristics. All believed that removing £200 million from the grant in 2015/16 by any of the four options that DH suggested would have some level of negative impact on inequalities in health. Some suggested that the saving would have a substantial, disproportionate and unavoidable adverse impact on people who share a protected characteristic under the Equality Act 2010. Several argued that implementing the reduction at all is incompatible with the Secretary of State's duties under both the NHS Act 2006 and the Equality Act 2010 (DH does not accept these arguments, for the reasons described below). Others were disappointed that DH had not completed an equality analysis before publishing the consultation document.

A number of respondents made points about the impact on health inequalities or protected characteristics of the four specific options for making the saving suggested in the consultation document. Others suggested a different option. These responses are summarised below.

Option	Responses
A. Take a larger proportion of the saving from LAs that are significantly above their ACRA target allocation.	ACRA allocations do not take into account cost pressures in commissioning service in rural areas, creating disadvantages in the way allocations are calculated that option A would exacerbate. Fairer, creates equality.
B. Take a larger proportion of the saving from LAs that carried forward unspent reserves into 2015/16.	Reserves are earmarked for programmes that would reduce inequalities in health.

C. Take a standard rate of 6.2% from every LA's allocation.	There are difficulties in cancelling contracts which will affect front line services, leading to increased health inequalities in key areas.
D. Take a standard rate unless any LA can demonstrate that doing so would cause it particular hardship or would contravene DH's PSED or its health inequalities duty.	<p>The saving will have an unavoidable adverse impact on people who share a protected characteristic within the meaning of Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.</p> <p>Aging population or levels of child poverty are greater in some LAs; other significant health inequalities within others.</p>
New option – a standard, cash per capita reduction from every LA.	This was suggested by LAs who argued that it would have the least detrimental impact on areas with the highest levels of economic deprivation.

Analysis

The Government believes that taking action to reduce the deficit is vital to the long-term health of our economy and to all of the public services that it supports. A reduction (or, indeed, increase) in the size of the available national budget for the public health grant need not in itself affect relative inequalities. Far more influential are the formula by which resources are divided between LAs and the decisions that LAs themselves make on how to use their grants. This applies now, to the decision on how to implement savings, as much as it does to the original distribution of the grant. For these reasons, DH does not accept that the decision to make the saving is inconsistent with its equality duties and has taken account of the impact on health inequalities.

Each of the five options for making the saving that this analysis considers has merits and drawbacks in terms of their impact on health equalities and the PSED.

Option A would accelerate the pace of change of LAs towards the 'fair share' target allocations determined by the ACRA formula. It would, though, do so in a negative way, without increasing any LA's grant and by decreasing others' by a larger amount than they might be planning for, with consequent disruption to services used by people with protected characteristics or who experience health inequalities (especially when the time available to implement savings is so limited). It would also

pre-empt the current review of the ACRA formula. This review will make the formula more reflective of local need and is highly likely to affect the distance from target of many LAs, possibly moving some from above target to below and vice versa.

Option B might seem to minimise the impact on services by simply collecting unspent money. However DH does not have accurate figures for all LAs' carry-forward into 2015/16, nor does it have any quick or reliable way to obtain that information. As the responses to the consultation show, 'unspent' is not the same as 'uncommitted' – LAs carry forward resources for good reasons, and some intend the reserves to be used in ways that address inequalities in health or for long term projects.

Option C – the Department's initial preference – was seen by some respondents as a blunt instrument that does not adequately reflect local health inequalities or other circumstances. Nevertheless, as other respondents acknowledged, it remains the quickest and simplest option to implement, giving LAs the maximum clarity as quickly as possible about what is required and so minimising disruption to services (a priority for DH from the outset). The importance of rapid clarity was emphasised by a number of respondents, including the Local Government Association (LGA). Reducing each LA's grant by the same percentage is consistent with the ACRA formula and the approach taken to distribute the original allocations (itself based on an equality analysis and reflecting health inequalities through using standardised mortality ratio as a proxy for need) in that it leaves unchanged LAs' funding relative to each other.

Option D offers a mechanism for adjusting some LAs' required savings to mitigate potential adverse impact on equalities or on health inequalities, but that could only work at the expense of other LAs – the imperative to save a total of £200 million nationally would remain. The evidence that 20 LAs submitted would not allow DH to calculate adjustments that were demonstrably fair to the large majority of LAs that chose not to submit evidence. Nor does the evidence enable us to determine with confidence that the impacts these LAs cited are significantly different from those described by a number of other respondents who neither favoured this option nor submitted evidence.

The respondents putting forward the **new option** of a fixed per capita cash reduction argue that it would be fairer by taking less from areas of higher deprivation – and deprivation is associated with health inequalities. The savings required from LAs under this option would range from 1.7 per cent to 12.2 per cent. It would be inconsistent with the ACRA formula, which is designed to reflect local public health needs and has broad support. Just as with options A, B and D, the option would mean that some LAs would have to make larger savings within the current financial year (up to double the average of 6.2 per cent) and at very short notice. Again, as with options A, B and D, DH believes that there is a high risk that the effects of the

disruption that this would cause, to health inequalities and services in those areas for people with protected characteristics or who experience health inequalities, would outweigh the potential benefits for other areas.

In conclusion, DH has considered carefully both the existing evidence and the responses to its consultation document. In the light of this, and while it accepts that the decision is not straightforward, it believes that option C remains preferable to any other identified option and is fully consistent with its duties under section 1C of the NHS Act 2006 and section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010.

Impact on services

The factors that DH has taken into account when considering impact on services are very similar to those it considered in relation to equalities and health inequalities, and lead to the same conclusion: that option C remains the most viable and overall the least disruptive way of delivering this saving. The arguments that respondents expressed in favour of options A, B and D reflected points that the Department had considered before publishing its consultation document and expressing a preference.

Given that **option A** was the preference of the largest number of respondents, the Department gave it very careful consideration. While it understands the arguments in the option's favour, DH remains concerned about the likely impact on the planning of services of the uncertainty that would inevitably continue while DH arrived at an appropriate formula. For option A to produce a materially different outcome to option C it would also require some LAs to find savings significantly greater than 6.2 per cent, and with significantly less time to manage the effects. Finally, the review of the ACRA formula is very likely to change many LAs' target allocations for 2016/17 and beyond, meaning that making adjustments now on the basis of the current targets would risk producing avoidable anomalies.

Option B received the least support and DH believes it is the least practical, for the reasons it describes in the equality analysis. It too would prolong the uncertainty for LAs to an unacceptable degree.

DH has considered the evidence of hardship submitted by 20 LAs under **option D** but is not satisfied that the evidence described exceptional hardship or could support a robustly calculated adjustment that would be fair to the LAs whose contribution would have to increase. The Equality Analysis section of this document sets out why DH believes its preferred option C complies with the PSED and its health inequality duty.

The **new option** that a number of respondents proposed attempts to relate individual authorities' contribution to the overall saving more closely to the local need for public health interventions. Although some LAs mentioned disadvantages in the current

ACRA formula, it is the established and broadly accepted mechanism for bringing target resources into line with need. Adopting a per capita approach now would be inconsistent with that, and would produce a wide disparity in the proportion of their grant that LAs were required to save – from 1.7 percent to 12.2 per cent. DH is currently consulting on proposed refinements to the ACRA formula that should make it more reflective of local circumstances.

On balance, **option C** – a flat rate reduction of 6.2 per cent – remains DH's preference. It is the option most consistent with the underpinning principles for managing the saving that the Department has set out: it delivers the £200 million, it is the least disruptive to services and it is compliant with the PSED and the health inequality duty. The Annex (A) sets out revised 2015/16 allocations, subject to final technical checks.

Questions 2 and 3

The responses to questions 2 and 3 in the consultation will help DH to facilitate the saving and understand its consequences.

The government will address questions about the 2016/17 grant and the future of the ring-fence later this autumn, at the conclusion of the current spending review. DH will also consider the prescription in regulations of certain functions and the future of the Health Premium Incentive Scheme in the same light.

To assist LAs in managing the saving in the current year DH will bring forward the January instalment of the grant and make it available to LAs shortly, net of the £200 million saving.

PHE will continue to develop the advice it can offer to LAs on the cost effectiveness of specific public health interventions. PHE will also work with the LGA, the Association of Directors of Public Health, individual LAs and clinical commissioning groups to both mitigate and monitor the effect of the saving on public health outcomes. DH fully accepts the need for a process that makes optimum use of existing sources of information and does not place additional burdens on LAs.

Conclusion

The Department will save £200 million from the 2015/16 public health grant by reducing each LA's grant by an equal percentage – option C in its consultation document. The saving will be implemented through a reduction in the fourth quarterly instalment of the grant, which will be brought forward from January 2016. DH will continue working with its partners in PHE, NHS England, and the local government and public health sectors to support LAs and monitor the impact of the saving.

Annex A

Public Health Allocations to local authorities: total in-year savings for each LA in 2015/16 including 0-5 children's budget (£'000s)

	ONS LA Name	Total PH allocation for 2015/16	0-5 allocation transferred in October 2015	Overall PH allocation for 2015-16	LA share of the £200m savings	2015-16 allocation after reduction
1	Barking and Dagenham	14,213,237	2,512,000	16,725,237	1,035,222	15,690,015
2	Barnet	14,334,819	2,592,000	16,926,819	1,047,699	15,879,119
3	Barnsley	14,242,619	2,549,000	16,791,619	1,039,331	15,752,288
4	Bath and North East Somerset	7,384,124	1,387,000	8,771,124	542,896	8,228,228
5	Bedford	7,343,324	1,291,000	8,634,324	534,429	8,099,895
6	Bexley	7,574,129	1,720,000	9,294,129	575,268	8,718,861
7	Birmingham	80,837,885	11,210,000	92,047,885	5,697,380	86,350,505
8	Blackburn with Darwen	13,133,537	1,880,000	15,013,537	929,275	14,084,262
9	Blackpool	17,945,705	1,551,000	19,496,705	1,206,765	18,289,941
10	Bolton	18,790,153	2,835,000	21,625,153	1,338,507	20,286,646
11	Bournemouth	8,296,225	1,818,000	10,114,225	626,028	9,488,197
12	Bracknell Forest	3,048,757	774,000	3,822,757	236,613	3,586,144
13	Bradford	35,333,383	6,133,000	41,466,383	2,566,596	38,899,787
14	Brent	18,848,206	2,763,000	21,611,206	1,337,643	20,273,563
15	Brighton and Hove	18,694,566	2,111,000	20,805,566	1,287,778	19,517,788
16	Bristol, City of	29,122,290	3,799,000	32,921,290	2,037,690	30,883,600
17	Bromley	12,953,607	1,901,000	14,854,607	919,438	13,935,169
18	Buckinghamshire	17,249,355	3,061,000	20,310,355	1,257,126	19,053,229
19	Bury	9,619,149	1,806,000	11,425,149	707,169	10,717,980
20	Calderdale	10,678,751	2,190,000	12,868,751	796,522	12,072,229
21	Cambridgeshire	22,154,665	3,861,000	26,015,665	1,610,261	24,405,404
22	Camden	26,367,561	2,121,000	28,488,561	1,763,323	26,725,238
23	Central Bedfordshire	10,149,481	1,902,000	12,051,481	745,936	11,305,545
24	Cheshire East	14,274,388	2,353,000	16,627,388	1,029,166	15,598,222
25	Cheshire West and Chester	13,889,354	2,107,000	15,996,354	990,108	15,006,246
26	City of London	1,697,640	75,000	1,772,640	109,719	1,662,921
27	Cornwall	20,748,603	3,673,000	24,421,603	1,511,595	22,910,008
28	County Durham	45,780,066	4,894,000	50,674,066	3,136,513	47,537,553
29	Coventry	19,414,829	2,807,000	22,221,829	1,375,438	20,846,391
30	Croydon	18,824,626	2,748,000	21,572,626	1,335,255	20,237,370
31	Cumbria	15,593,793	2,599,000	18,192,793	1,126,058	17,066,735
32	Darlington	7,184,380	1,215,000	8,399,380	519,887	7,879,493
33	Derby	15,710,355	3,094,000	18,804,355	1,163,911	17,640,444
34	Derbyshire	35,562,209	5,140,000	40,702,209	2,519,297	38,182,912
35	Devon	22,060,181	4,513,000	26,573,181	1,644,769	24,928,412
36	Doncaster	20,198,220	3,450,000	23,648,220	1,463,726	22,184,494
37	Dorset	12,889,219	2,267,000	15,156,219	938,107	14,218,112

	ONS LA Name	Total PH allocation for 2015/16	0-5 allocation transferred in October 2015	Overall PH allocation for 2015-16	LA share of the £200m savings	2015-16 allocation after reduction
38	Dudley	18,973,608	2,453,000	21,426,608	1,326,218	20,100,391
39	Ealing	21,974,206	2,863,000	24,837,206	1,537,319	23,299,886
40	East Riding of Yorkshire	9,175,170	1,536,000	10,711,170	662,977	10,048,193
41	East Sussex	24,066,702	3,500,000	27,566,702	1,706,264	25,860,438
42	Enfield	14,257,386	2,447,000	16,704,386	1,033,932	15,670,454
43	Essex	48,192,200	10,981,000	59,173,200	3,662,574	55,510,626
44	Gateshead	14,849,745	1,987,000	16,836,745	1,042,124	15,794,621
45	Gloucestershire	21,793,338	3,141,000	24,934,338	1,543,331	23,391,006
46	Greenwich	19,061,080	3,574,000	22,635,080	1,401,017	21,234,063
47	Hackney	29,817,502	4,009,000	33,826,502	2,093,719	31,732,782
48	Halton	8,776,382	1,410,000	10,186,382	630,495	9,555,887
49	Hammersmith and Fulham	20,855,104	1,996,000	22,851,104	1,414,388	21,436,716
50	Hampshire	40,363,150	8,843,000	49,206,150	3,045,655	46,160,495
51	Haringey	18,189,355	2,422,000	20,611,355	1,275,757	19,335,599
52	Harrow	9,145,841	1,577,000	10,722,841	663,699	10,059,142
53	Hartlepool	8,485,921	761,000	9,246,921	572,346	8,674,575
54	Havering	9,716,741	1,372,000	11,088,741	686,347	10,402,394
55	Herefordshire, County of	7,969,756	1,266,000	9,235,756	571,655	8,664,101
56	Hertfordshire	37,641,677	8,200,000	45,841,677	2,837,408	43,004,269
57	Hillingdon	15,709,099	2,137,000	17,846,099	1,104,599	16,741,500
58	Hounslow	14,084,327	1,935,000	16,019,327	991,529	15,027,797
59	Isle of Wight	6,087,689	1,226,000	7,313,689	452,687	6,861,002
60	Isles of Scilly	72,934	37,000	109,934	6,804	103,130
61	Islington	25,429,199	2,092,000	27,521,199	1,703,447	25,817,751
62	Kensington and Chelsea	21,213,729	1,342,000	22,555,729	1,396,105	21,159,624
63	Kent	53,264,150	11,894,000	65,158,150	4,033,017	61,125,132
64	Kingston upon Hull, City of	22,559,438	2,682,000	25,241,438	1,562,340	23,679,098
65	Kingston upon Thames	9,302,262	1,112,000	10,414,262	644,599	9,769,662
66	Kirklees	23,526,634	3,049,000	26,575,634	1,644,921	24,930,713
67	Knowsley	16,419,145	1,593,000	18,012,145	1,114,877	16,897,269
68	Lambeth	26,437,379	4,652,000	31,089,379	1,924,303	29,165,076
69	Lancashire	59,800,693	9,034,000	68,834,693	4,260,580	64,574,113
70	Leeds	40,540,416	4,993,000	45,533,416	2,818,328	42,715,087
71	Leicester	21,911,758	4,288,000	26,199,758	1,621,656	24,578,102
72	Leicestershire	21,929,530	3,202,000	25,131,530	1,555,537	23,575,993
73	Lewisham	20,088,116	3,790,000	23,878,116	1,477,956	22,400,160
74	Lincolnshire	28,505,899	4,166,000	32,671,899	2,022,254	30,649,645
75	Liverpool	41,436,497	4,845,000	46,281,497	2,864,631	43,416,866
76	Luton	13,286,092	2,114,000	15,400,092	953,201	14,446,891
77	Manchester	48,303,303	5,441,000	53,744,303	3,326,548	50,417,755
78	Medway	14,280,296	2,522,000	16,802,296	1,039,992	15,762,304
79	Merton	9,236,209	1,476,000	10,712,209	663,041	10,049,168
80	Middlesbrough	16,378,046	1,398,000	17,776,046	1,100,263	16,675,783
81	Milton Keynes	8,787,929	2,079,000	10,866,929	672,618	10,194,312

	ONS LA Name	Total PH allocation for 2015/16	0-5 allocation transferred in October 2015	Overall PH allocation for 2015-16	LA share of the £200m savings	2015-16 allocation after reduction
82	Newcastle upon Tyne	21,301,487	2,749,000	24,050,487	1,488,625	22,561,862
83	Newham	26,111,908	4,644,000	30,755,908	1,903,662	28,852,245
84	Norfolk	30,590,244	6,893,000	37,483,244	2,320,056	35,163,188
85	North East Lincolnshire	9,971,250	1,299,000	11,270,250	697,581	10,572,669
86	North Lincolnshire	8,463,882	1,078,000	9,541,882	590,603	8,951,279
87	North Somerset	7,593,001	1,636,000	9,229,001	571,237	8,657,764
88	North Tyneside	10,807,248	1,674,000	12,481,248	772,537	11,708,711
89	North Yorkshire	19,732,463	2,535,000	22,267,463	1,378,263	20,889,200
90	Northamptonshire	29,523,176	5,033,000	34,556,176	2,138,883	32,417,293
91	Northumberland	13,360,947	2,547,000	15,907,947	984,636	14,923,312
92	Nottingham	27,839,162	5,319,000	33,158,162	2,052,352	31,105,811
93	Nottinghamshire	36,119,039	5,815,000	41,934,039	2,595,542	39,338,497
94	Oldham	14,914,949	2,164,000	17,078,949	1,057,116	16,021,833
95	Oxfordshire	26,085,601	4,333,000	30,418,601	1,882,784	28,535,817
96	Peterborough	9,290,735	1,563,000	10,853,735	671,801	10,181,934
97	Plymouth	12,275,720	2,575,000	14,850,720	919,198	13,931,523
98	Poole	6,056,683	1,287,000	7,343,683	454,543	6,889,140
99	Portsmouth	16,178,091	2,013,000	18,191,091	1,125,953	17,065,139
100	Reading	8,212,085	1,446,000	9,658,085	597,795	9,060,289
101	Redbridge	11,411,297	2,112,000	13,523,297	837,036	12,686,262
102	Redcar and Cleveland	10,917,052	1,117,000	12,034,052	744,858	11,289,195
103	Richmond upon Thames	7,890,916	1,334,000	9,224,916	570,984	8,653,932
104	Rochdale	14,777,309	2,299,000	17,076,309	1,056,952	16,019,357
105	Rotherham	14,176,442	2,150,000	16,326,442	1,010,539	15,315,904
106	Rutland	1,079,845	195,000	1,274,845	78,908	1,195,938
107	Salford	18,776,639	2,444,000	21,220,639	1,313,469	19,907,170
108	Sandwell	21,804,621	3,175,000	24,979,621	1,546,134	23,433,487
109	Sefton	19,951,833	2,216,000	22,167,833	1,372,096	20,795,737
110	Sheffield	30,747,852	3,724,000	34,471,852	2,133,664	32,338,189
111	Shropshire	9,843,029	1,474,000	11,317,029	700,477	10,616,552
112	Slough	5,486,504	1,546,000	7,032,504	435,283	6,597,222
113	Solihull	9,643,689	1,407,000	11,050,689	683,992	10,366,698
114	Somerset	15,513,281	3,843,000	19,356,281	1,198,073	18,158,208
115	South Gloucestershire	7,345,093	1,655,000	9,000,093	557,068	8,443,025
116	South Tyneside	12,917,315	1,392,000	14,309,315	885,687	13,423,628
117	Southampton	15,048,535	2,103,000	17,151,535	1,061,608	16,089,926
118	Southend-on-Sea	8,059,740	1,355,000	9,414,740	582,733	8,832,007
119	Southwark	22,945,551	3,464,000	26,409,551	1,634,641	24,774,910
120	St. Helens	13,099,360	1,582,000	14,681,360	908,715	13,772,646
121	Staffordshire	33,312,601	5,330,000	38,642,601	2,391,816	36,250,785
122	Stockport	13,189,341	2,426,000	15,615,341	966,524	14,648,817
123	Stockton-on-Tees	13,066,842	1,403,000	14,469,842	895,623	13,574,219
124	Stoke-on-Trent	20,241,824	1,811,000	22,052,824	1,364,978	20,687,846

	ONS LA Name	Total PH allocation for 2015/16	0-5 allocation transferred in October 2015	Overall PH allocation for 2015-16	LA share of the £200m savings	2015-16 allocation after reduction
125	Suffolk	25,742,445	4,206,000	29,948,445	1,853,684	28,094,761
126	Sunderland	21,036,161	2,750,000	23,786,161	1,472,264	22,313,897
127	Surrey	28,976,865	6,528,000	35,504,865	2,197,603	33,307,262
128	Sutton	8,619,161	1,280,000	9,899,161	612,717	9,286,444
129	Swindon	8,558,074	1,472,000	10,030,074	620,820	9,409,254
130	Tameside	13,463,108	1,771,000	15,234,108	942,928	14,291,180
131	Telford and Wrekin	10,912,917	1,572,000	12,484,917	772,764	11,712,153
132	Thurrock	8,631,426	1,956,000	10,587,426	655,317	9,932,108
133	Torbay	7,395,615	1,494,000	8,889,615	550,230	8,339,385
134	Tower Hamlets	32,261,008	3,855,000	36,116,008	2,235,430	33,880,578
135	Trafford	10,828,746	1,642,000	12,470,746	771,887	11,698,859
136	Wakefield	21,104,747	3,267,000	24,371,747	1,508,509	22,863,237
137	Walsall	15,827,336	2,146,000	17,973,336	1,112,474	16,860,861
138	Waltham Forest	12,276,566	2,908,000	15,184,566	939,861	14,244,705
139	Wandsworth	25,430,861	2,871,000	28,301,861	1,751,767	26,550,094
140	Warrington	10,439,495	1,467,000	11,906,495	736,962	11,169,532
141	Warwickshire	19,477,466	3,326,000	22,803,466	1,411,439	21,392,027
142	West Berkshire	4,819,114	919,000	5,738,114	355,165	5,382,948
143	West Sussex	27,445,328	5,582,000	33,027,328	2,044,254	30,983,075
144	Westminster	31,234,925	2,242,000	33,476,925	2,072,082	31,404,843
145	Wigan	23,665,026	2,761,000	26,426,026	1,635,661	24,790,365
146	Wiltshire	14,586,557	2,584,000	17,170,557	1,062,786	16,107,771
147	Windsor and Maidenhead	3,510,716	957,000	4,467,716	276,533	4,191,183
148	Wirral	28,164,025	2,522,000	30,686,025	1,899,337	28,786,688
149	Wokingham	4,222,796	930,000	5,152,796	318,937	4,833,859
150	Wolverhampton	19,295,997	2,198,000	21,493,997	1,330,389	20,163,608
151	Worcestershire	26,528,285	3,342,000	29,870,285	1,848,846	28,021,439
152	York	7,304,752	916,000	8,220,752	508,830	7,711,922
	England	2,801,472,723	429,763,000	3,231,235,723	200,000,000	3,031,235,723