



## EXECUTIVE

YOU ARE REQUESTED TO ATTEND A MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE TO BE HELD IN THE JOHN MEIKLE ROOM, THE DEANE HOUSE, BELVEDERE ROAD, TAUNTON, TA1 1HE ON THURSDAY 4TH DECEMBER 2008 AT 18:15.

---

### **AGENDA**

1. Apologies.
2. Minutes of the meeting of the Executive held on 12 November 2008 (attached).
3. Public Question Time.
4. Declaration of Interests. To receive declarations of personal or prejudicial interests, in accordance with the Code of Conduct.
5. Proposed Civil Parking Enforcement Partnership. Report of the Parking and Civil Contingencies Manager (attached). John Lewis
6. Fees and Charges 2009/2010. Report of the Financial Services Manager (attached). Paul Carter
7. Savings Delivery Plans 2009/2010. Report of the Principal Accountant (attached). Emily Collacott
8. Council Tax Base 2009/2010. Report of the Financial Services Manager (attached). Paul Carter
9. Task and Finish Review into the Planning Department's Role in Delivering Large Housing Schemes. Consideration of the Final Report and recommendations. Report of the Democratic Services Manager (attached). Richard Bryant

Tonya Meers  
Legal and Democratic Services Manager  
26 November 2008

Executive Members:-

Councillor Henley (Chairman)  
Councillor Brooks  
Councillor Coles  
Councillor Horsley  
Councillor R Lees  
Councillor Mullins  
Councillor Prior-Sankey  
Councillor Mrs Smith  
Councillor A Wedderkopp

PLEASE NOTE THE CHANGED DATE OF THIS MEETING



Members of the public are welcome to attend the meeting and listen to the discussion. Lift access to the main committee room on the first floor of the building is available from the main ground floor entrance. Toilet facilities, with wheelchair access, are also available. There is a time set aside at the beginning of the meeting to allow the public to ask questions



An induction loop operates to enhance sound for anyone wearing a hearing aid or using a transmitter. If you require any further information, please contact Greg Dyke on:

Tel: 01823 356410  
Fax: 01823 356329  
E-Mail: [g.dyke@tauntondeane.gov.uk](mailto:g.dyke@tauntondeane.gov.uk)

Website: [www.tauntondeane.gov.uk](http://www.tauntondeane.gov.uk) (Council, Executive, Review Board & Review Panel Agenda, Reports and Minutes are available on the Website)

## **Executive – 12 November 2008**

**Present:** Councillor Henley (Chairman)  
Councillors Brooks, Coles, Horsley, R. Lees, Mullins, Prior-Sankey  
and Mrs Smith

**Officers:** Penny James (Chief Executive), Shirlene Adam (Strategic Director),  
Brendan Cleere (Strategic Director), Tonya Meers (Legal and  
Democratic Services Manager), James Barrah (Chief Environmental  
Health Officer), Nigel Kerr (Operations Manager, Environmental  
Health), Sarah Taylor (Scientific Officer – Air Quality), Ralph  
Willoughby-Foster (Forward Plan Manager), Phil Bissatt (Senior  
Planner – Forward Plans), Juliette Dickinson (Managing Director,  
Tone Leisure) and Richard Bryant (Democratic Services Manager)

**Also present:** Councillors Bowrah, Mrs Court-Stenning, Edwards and Williams.

(The meeting commenced at 6.15 pm.)

### **211. Apology**

Councillor A Wedderkopp.

### **212. Minutes**

The minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 9 and 15 October 2008, copies of which had been circulated, were taken as read and were signed.

### **213. Public Question Time**

Mrs G Cautley stated that although she supported the proposals for free swimming, she hoped that this would not be provided at the expense of concessions for old aged pensioners at the Sports Centres. She added that a petition containing over 1,600 signatures had already been collected against any reduction in the concessions and hoped the Council would keep them as they were.

In response the Chairman, Councillor Ross Henley, confirmed that there were no plans to scrap subsidies. He added that the Council would endeavour to keep them at the current set level.

### **214. Declarations of Interest**

The Chairman and Councillors Brooks and Prior-Sankey declared personal interests as Members of Somerset County Council. Councillor Coles declared a personal interest as a Director of Southwest One.

### **215. Air Quality Strategy**

Considered report previously circulated, concerning the production of the Somerset Air Quality Strategy by the six Councils that formed the administrative region of Somerset.

Air pollution in the United Kingdom was estimated to reduce the life expectancy of every person by an average of 7-8 months with associated estimated health costs of up to £20 billion each year.

The Environment Act 1995 had established a national framework for air quality management and placed obligations on Local Authorities to undertake reviews of the air quality in their particular areas. If objectives were not met, Air Quality Management Areas would be established and Action Plans implemented to improve air quality.

The Government had recommended that all Local Authorities should consider developing a Local Air Quality Strategy in order to maintain good air quality and where appropriate, improve air quality locally.

Reported that the air quality across the County was generally good, with the only pollutant to pose a problem being nitrogen dioxide resulting from traffic pollution.

The focus of the review and assessment process had therefore been primarily focussed on areas where the local population was exposed to pollution above acceptable levels.

The aim of the County-wide Air Quality Strategy was to complement the Local Air Quality Management process by working collectively and ensuring consistency. It also encouraged a holistic approach to the problems of air quality, rather than targeting particular areas. It aimed to raise the issue of air quality within a wide range of Local Government and Regional Planning frameworks.

The Strategy had recognised the significant growth experienced in the South West, which brought the need for additional accommodation, transport networks, health, education and other services.

The Strategy also recognised that air quality and Climate Change should be integrated into policy to meet the expectation of Government to deal with these two considerable environmental issues.

Proposals for the provision of information to the public were set out and would enable people to make informed choices.

The Strategy made a number of recommendations for action by Local Authorities and various stakeholders, relating to work that was fundamentally important to improving air quality.

The effectiveness of the Strategy would be monitored to ensure that the aims and objectives were being met.

**Resolved** that the Somerset Air Quality Strategy be adopted.

## 216. **Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document**

Considered report previously circulated, which summarised the responses that had been received during the statutory consultation period on the draft Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

The SPD was originally commissioned to provide guidance for securing contributions from developers towards the major town centre development proposals in Taunton.

In parallel with the production of the SPD, the Government had abandoned its proposals for a Planning Gain Supplement, replacing it instead with a proposed Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, even if the CIL was implemented, it could not be adopted in the absence of a Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy. This meant that, without the SPD, there would be an absence for a number of years of detailed policy on planning obligations in Taunton Deane. This omission could become important given that the Council had now adopted the Taunton Town Centre Area Action Plan (TTCAAP), which the SPD was required to amplify.

Further reported that there was also a need for detailed guidance to secure the repayment of any monies awarded to the Borough Council under the Regional Infrastructure Fund (RIF). In addition, discussions with the Government Office for the South West had made clear that the Council needed to make serious efforts to secure contributions from developers. Failure to do so could affect the availability of grant funding for projects.

Taunton's designation as a New Growth Point (NGP), and the scale of development allocated to the Taunton Deane in the Regional Spatial Strategy, meant that a comprehensive policy framework for planning obligations was required. In major urban areas, the days of site-by-site negotiation for each developer contribution had now gone and other local authorities in growth areas were already well ahead in developing policy.

Reported that a team of consultants (Three Dragons, Roger Tym and Michael Beaman) had been appointed in March 2007 to prepare the SPD. The consultants had assembled a range of information on service and infrastructure requirements from numerous stakeholders who might be expected to seek contributions from developers.

The draft SPD document was published and was the subject of a six week statutory consultation period in June – July 2008.

Whilst a substantial number of replies were received during the consultation period, the issues raised fell under a number of main headings which were detailed in the report together with the Council's response to these matters.

It was felt that many of the issues could be addressed by making the amendments set out below to the SPD to enable it to proceed to adoption:-

- (i) The SPD be modified to acknowledge that 100% affordable housing schemes might need to be given special consideration;
- (ii) In the case of schemes comprising a mixture of market and affordable dwellings, the SPD be clarified to state that the overall quantum of community facilities needed for the total number of dwellings, must be provided;
- (iii) The SPD be amended to state that the timing of payment of obligations might need to be different for different types of development, and that payments might be staged;
- (iv) The SPD be amended to make clear that planning obligations had to reflect the differing impact of particular dwelling types and floorspace and could not be purely based on an outline proposal;
- (v) The SPD be amended to ensure that residential and non-residential developments were treated similarly, as far as this was possible;
- (vi) The SPD made reference to the conservation of biodiversity as something that needed to be addressed at a site-specific level, and that other requirements might be introduced when the SPD was reviewed;
- (vii) The text of the SPD be revised to explicitly state that equivalent contributions in kind would be acceptable;
- (viii) That clarification be included in the SPD to state that where brownfield sites had an established development value, where a developer could demonstrate that they could not afford to pay planning obligations, these could be waived or reduced;
- (ix) The SPD be amended to state that contributions would only be used for the purposes specified in the relevant Section 106 Agreement;
- (x) The SPD be amended to reflect Policy ED2 of the TTCAAP, which retained the 1% figure but incorporated the development size thresholds;
- (xi) The requirement in the SPD to contribute towards the cost of allotment provision be removed;
- (xii) The level of contributions sought for public realm works took account, as far as possible, of the availability of public funding;

- (xiii) The SPD be amended to state that – at least until it was reviewed in parallel with the preparation of the Core Strategy - contributions towards education would continue to be negotiated on a site-by-site basis;
- (xiv) The SPD be amended to remove the requirement for developers to contribute to transport measures (apart from the town centre road schemes and Silk Mills Park and Ride), but to state that these would be reconsidered when the SPD was reviewed.

**Resolved** that Full Council be recommended to formally adopt the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.

## 217. **National Free Swimming Programme**

Considered report previously circulated, concerning the Government's Free Swimming 'offer'.

The Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) had recently announced that it intended to fund Councils to provide free swimming for over 60s and under 16s for the financial years 2009/2010 and 2010/2011.

The grant enabled participating local authorities to offer either:-

- (a) Free swimming for those aged 60 or over; or
- (b) Free swimming for those aged 60 and over and free swimming for those aged 16 or under.

Authorities that chose option (b) would be offered £60m under the Government's Free Swimming Capital Modernisation Programme. £10m would be available in 2008/2009 and £25m in subsequent years. The programme aimed to support capital projects designed to modernise pool provision, which were integrated with providing free swimming.

Noted that Government guidance stated that the revenue grant funding available nationally would cover 75 to 100 per cent of the revenue costs.

DCMS had fixed the grant offered to the Council for over 60s at £37,420 per annum. This was based on the population of Taunton Deane. In addition the Primary Care Trust (PCT) had offered a grant of £31,500 over two years to part fund the Council's participation in the scheme. The funding from the PCT could be used for both elements of the scheme. Over 60s would be able to swim free of charge, at any time, throughout the year.

For under 16s, the grant offered by DCMS had been fixed at £52,766 per annum, based on the resident population of Taunton Deane. Under this part of the programme, under 16s could swim out of normal school hours through the year, free of charge.



The Government funding for free swimming would be ring-fenced for this purpose until the end of 2010/2011 and local monitoring of the success of the schemes would determine future funding and delivery arrangements.

A share of a £10m one-off capital reward grant would be available in 2008/2009 for local authorities who signed up for both the over 60s and under 16s elements of the scheme. For this Council, the grant would be £24,440 and this could be used to meet swimming related project development costs for capital bids in 2009/2010 and 2010/2011. Further funding bids could be made for the development of capital infrastructure. The closing date for capital funding bids for 2009/2010 (Round 1) was 24 October 2008 and details of Round 2 would be published in April 2009.

Discussions were taking place with Tone Leisure Limited regarding a bid under Round 2.

Details of the financial implications were submitted and included:-

- Lost income to Tone Leisure for which they would require some recompense;
- Increased costs through, for example, life-guarding, utility costs and cleaning;
- The level of external funding to cover the scheme; and
- An unknown level of take-up of the scheme in either age group.

Expected annual costs, based on an estimated increase in usage of 50% were as follows:-

<b>Heading</b>	<b>Over 60's £000</b>	<b>Under 16's £000</b>	<b>Total £000</b>
Lost Income	41	94	<b>135</b>
Additional Staffing Costs	4	35	<b>39</b>
Cleaning/Water costs	3	5	<b>8</b>
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>182</b>
PCT Grant	(8)	(8)	<b>(16)</b>
DCMS Grant	(37)	(53)	<b>(90)</b>
<b>Net Cost to TDBC/TL</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>76</b>

Government funding had been offered for an initial 2 year period. Funding beyond this period would depend on the outcome of a national evaluation of the programme. If funding was withdrawn, the Council would have to consider whether to continue with the scheme and fund it entirely. The expected annual cost of the scheme was £182,000 and if discontinued, it would have to be recognised that swimming for over 60s and under 16s could suffer a decline in participation.

The Council expected the funding to fully cover the cost of the over 60s swimming but that the under 16s swimming would run at a deficit and would have to be funded by the Council and Tone Leisure.

The budget gap that had been previously reported did not allow for this new initiative.

It was not clear if other Somerset District Councils would support free swimming and there was a probability of people coming from outside Taunton Deane to swim.

It was proposed that for 2009/2010 the Council should reimburse Tone Leisure for the lost income that free swimming would cost them at a rate of 60p for a 0-5 age group swim, £2.10 for a 5-15 age group swim, £2.40 for a fun swim and £2.50 for an over 60s swim. This liability, after taking into account the external Government and PCT grant would be capped at £45,000.

This was the equivalent of £1.12 on a Band D Council Tax (0.85%). This assumed an increase in usage of 50% over current levels. For Taunton Deane this equated to 60% of the expected net cost of the scheme, with Tone Leisure bearing the remaining 40%, including full liability for all additional costs, for example staff, which the scheme might incur.

Tone Leisure would need to review its swimming programme in order to accommodate an introduction of free swimming in April 2009. The current programme of restricted swimming sessions to over 50s would need to be looked at as part of this review. There were no plans to extend opening hours at swimming pools to accommodate free swimming.

During 2009/2010 the Council would work with Tone Leisure to develop a model for 2010/2011 which more accurately shared the additional costs, and risks based on actual usage data. However, any commitment to offer free swimming would be for the two years up to and including 2010/2011. It was therefore proposed for budget setting purposes that the Council's share of the financial risk for providing free swimming to both age groups in 2010/2011 should not exceed £46,350, pending development of a model based on actual usage. Considerations for such a model would include:-

- Auditable usage data across all age groups;
- Scheme review frequency, probably quarterly;
- Actual costs incurred;
- Actual income lost by Tone Leisure; and
- Income gained by Tone Leisure (such as increased vending and participation by paying adults accompanying free swimmers).

Should the Council decide to participate in either element of the free swimming scheme, Tone Leisure advised the introduction of a simple 'card entry' system for eligible members of the public from April 2009, to assist with the administration of the scheme and to provide reliable data for the Council

and Government. Tone Leisure would charge a small one-off fee to eligible customers wishing to take part in free swimming, to cover the cost of introducing this card system.

Noted that the Overview and Scrutiny Board had considered the National Free Swimming Programme at its meeting on 30 October 2008. Although the Board had recommended the Executive to support the introduction of free swimming for both the over 60s and the under 16s, Members had expressed the view that it had been a difficult recommendation to make without knowing how the current budget gap was to be reduced.

**Resolved** that:-

- (1) The views of the Overview and Scrutiny Board be noted;
- (2) Having considered the proposed model for operating free swimming in Taunton Deane, it be agreed to participate in the National Free Swimming Programme for both over 60s and under 16s for the 2009/2010 and 2010/2011 financial years; and
- (3) The position in respect of capital funding as described above, be noted.

## 218. **Housing and Planning Delivery Grant**

Reported that the Council had recently received notification that the Housing and Planning Delivery Grant (HPDG) allocation for 2008/2009 would be:-

Revenue: £88,905                      Capital: £43,789

When added to sums brought forward from 2007/2008, the total amount to be allocated was therefore:-

Revenue: £282,208                      Capital: £59,561

It was proposed to allocate some of the funding for 2008/2009 as follows:-

<b>Revenue items</b>	<b>Cost</b>
Continue to fund staff in Forward Plan and Development Control for 2008/2009	£87,000
Consultants' studies including:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document</li> <li>• Core Strategy Appropriate Assessment</li> <li>• Hestercombe Appropriate Assessment</li> <li>• Green Infrastructure Strategy</li> <li>• Wellington Urban Fringe Landscape Character Assessment</li> </ul>	£10,000 £ 3,000 £ 7,500 £10,000 £ 4,000

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment</li> <li>• Affordable Housing Protocol</li> </ul>	£12,000 £16,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>£149,500</b>

<b>Capital items</b>	<b>Cost</b>
Firepool Weir Study (in partnership with Environment Agency)	£10,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>£10,000</b>

If the above proposals were approved this would leave unallocated:-

Revenue: £132,708                      Capital: £49,561

Further reported that a proportion of this money could be allocated to funding requirements identified for 2009/2010. This would be finalised during the budget setting process.

**Resolved** that the proposed 2008/2009 allocation of the Housing and Planning Delivery Grant be approved.

(The meeting ended at 7.14 p.m.)

# **Taunton Deane Borough Council**

**Executive - 4 December 2008**

## **Report of the Parking and Civil Contingencies Manager**

### **Proposed Civil Parking Enforcement Partnership (This matter is the responsibility of Executive Councillor Coles)**

#### **1.0 Introduction**

- 1.1 The Traffic Management Act 2004 has given a duty and responsibility to Somerset County Council as Highway Authority to consider the future of Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) across the county. At present CPE is carried out only in Taunton Deane, with the Police still being the responsible authority in the other four Districts.
- 1.2 An Officer group from all six Councils has been meeting to consider the options. This group met recently with Portfolio Holders to present these and to seek guidance on the way forward. Following on from this all Districts are considering reports through their current cycles about the introduction of CPE in their areas. The main body of these has been agreed across the group, with each District presenting it in accordance with their own requirements. A copy of the report considered by Sedgemoor is attached.
- 1.3 The situation in Taunton Deane is slightly different as we do not need to consider all the aspects of CPE itself. The issues here are the implications of the proposal to form a Civil Parking Enforcement Partnership to provide a county-wide service as opposed to continuing with our present operation.

#### **2.0 Executive Summary**

- 2.1 This report outlines the proposal for a county-wide Civil Parking Enforcement Partnership and seeks the Executive's support to the formation of a steering group, management board and delivery team to take the project to the next stage.

#### **3.0 The Proposal**

- 3.1 The proposal is for one organisation to carry out on- and off-street parking enforcement across the whole county, seeking economies of scale across various activity streams not achievable in single district operations. The background information, options and proposals are set out in the attached report. Even though Taunton Deane is already operating CPE there are financial and operational implications if a partnership is formed. At this stage these are not clear as there is a lot more investigative work to be done.

- 3.2 It is important to say at the outset that the scope of activities being considered does not include the setting of off-street charges themselves. This would remain with the Districts.
- 3.3 The project divides into two stages. The first, and the subject of this report, is the investigative and exploratory work needed to establish the advantages and disadvantages, operationally and financially, of a partnership. The issues to be addressed are listed in Appendix A to the report and the split of work between the partners and estimated resource requirements at Appendix B.
- 3.4 The proposal was considered by the Overview & Scrutiny Board on 27 November. Their comments and views will be reported verbally.

#### **4.0 Recommendations**

The Executive is recommended to support the proposal and

- give approval to the consideration of the introduction of a Somerset Civil Parking Enforcement Partnership;
- nominate a Member to join the steering group and officers to join the management board and delivery teams; and
- give approval to officers contributing time towards the investigative stage (Stage 1) work items as detailed in the Appendix B.

Contact Officer: John Lewis, Parking & Civil Contingencies Manager  
Tel 01823 356501 email [j.lewis@tauntondeane.gov.uk](mailto:j.lewis@tauntondeane.gov.uk)

**COMMITTEE:** Executive

**DATE:** 26<sup>th</sup> November 2008

**SUBJECT:** Introduction of Civil Parking Enforcement

**REPORTING OFFICER:** Adrian Gardner (Group Manager, Environment)

**CONTACT:** Tom Dougall, Transport Policy Officer (01278 – 435257) tom.dougall@sedgemoor.gov.uk

**PORTFOLIO HOLDER:** Cllr Andrew Gilling

**WARDS AFFECTED:** All

## **1 Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 To request agreement for this Council to continue to work with other Somerset local authorities to develop detailed proposals to deliver Civil Parking Enforcement.
- 1.2 The working group will evaluate options and make recommendations about delivery of Civil Parking Enforcement throughout the county. These recommendations will be brought back to this Council with details of the financial, resource and governance implications at point where approval is required to move forward with the delivery stage of the project.

## **2 Background**

- 2.1 Parking enforcement is carried out in a variety of ways across Somerset. In most districts, the Police manage on-street enforcement and district councils manage off-street public car parks. Some district councils operate limited on-street charging schemes or residents parking schemes.
- 2.2 The top priority for the Police is the prevention and detection of crime. The Police therefore cannot give parking enforcement the level of attention that the public might expect. Some district councils make a financial contribution towards the Police Community Support Officer service to alleviate this problem. However, PCSOs have a wide range of duties and can't focus solely on parking issues. The Police support the introduction of CPE in Somerset.
- 2.3 Higher levels of enforcement are available through Civil Parking Enforcement. Under this arrangement, the majority of on-street parking offences come under civil law, rather than under criminal law. Legislation allows the government to transfer enforcement powers to the highway authority. Somerset County Council received these powers for the area of Taunton Deane in 2001 and the Borough Council exercises the powers under a delegation agreement. CPE for the remaining districts of Somerset

has been under discussion for some time.

- 2.4 Civil Parking Enforcement covers all parking within the designated area. This includes offences in publicly owned off-street car parks as well as on-street parking offences. Income from penalty charges is used to fund the enforcement operation but off-street ticket income remains with the car park operator. Evidence from areas with CPE shows that such a regime –
- Increases compliance with on-street waiting restrictions
  - Reduces traffic congestion
  - Increases the use of off-street car parks
  - Provides a visible presence of authority on the street

### **3 Current Position**

- 3.1 The Traffic Management Act 2004 introduced new powers and duties for traffic authorities to reduce traffic congestion. Poor parking enforcement can lead to traffic congestion and the subsequent problems of delay and pollution. Commuters parking all-day in short-stay shopper parking bays can restrict the commercial life of towns. It is therefore in the interests of both the County Council and district councils to achieve effective parking enforcement.
- 3.2 The Department for Transport has issued a document titled 'Operational Guidance on Parking Policy and Enforcement'. This document gives guidance on implementing and operating Civil Parking Enforcement. In two-tier areas, the guidance recommends one enforcing authority for the area, rather than the county operating on-street enforcement and the district operating off-street enforcement. This should lead to clarity for the public and efficiencies for the operating authority.
- 3.3 The guidance makes provision for district councils to operate CPE under an agency agreement with the highway authority as currently happens with Taunton Deane. An alternative to the agency agreement model is a Parking Enforcement Partnership operating across the whole of Somerset. Under this model, a parking partnership would employ the Civil Enforcement Officers to patrol both streets and car parks. The partnership would also process penalty charges. District Councils would buy a patrol service for off-street car parks and the County Council buy a patrol service for on-street enforcement. This model offers potential for economies of scale and consistency in on-street enforcement across the county. In addition, the operation would be of sufficient size to provide the option to contract-out the enforcement service to a private company.
- 3.4 Somerset County Council favour the Parking Enforcement Partnership model and have invited district councils to consider combining enforcement functions into a single body. A joint portfolio holder meeting of 25<sup>th</sup> September 2008 concluded that further investigations and discussions on this option are needed to identify risks and advantage. This explorative stage of the project needs joint governance by all the authorities, which could be achieved by adopting the arrangements shown below.



Portfolio Steering Group	(Portfolio Holder)
--------------------------	--------------------

Project Management Board	(Group Manager/Director)
--------------------------	--------------------------

Project Delivery Team	(officer)
-----------------------	-----------

## 4 Options Considered

### 4.1 *Keep the Existing Arrangements*

At present, police parking enforcement cannot meet public expectations and in some cases there is an assumption that no enforcement will take place. This allows commuters to park all-day in limited waiting areas, leading to a shortage of space for visitors and shoppers. Some drivers persistently park in no-waiting areas, causing inconvenience to other road users. As traffic levels continue to increase we can expect these problems to get worse. On-street charging schemes and residents parking schemes are not effective without consistent enforcement of all on-street restrictions. Keeping the present arrangements would not improve the quality of life to residents.

### 4.2 *District-wide Parking Enforcement*

This option is similar to the current arrangements in the Borough of Taunton Deane. Somerset County Council, as transport authority, delegates enforcement powers to the district council. The two authorities agree enforcement priorities and strategies. The district council would need to cover any operating loss. The two authorities would need to come to an agreement concerning any surplus from on street enforcement and charging.

This option achieved the aims of CPE within Taunton Deane but required the Borough Council to subsidise the service. Expansion of this 'stand alone' model to every district could result in -

- A lost opportunity to have flexible resources large enough to meet peak demands on enforcement and notice processing. This would particularly affect authorities with smaller parking operations;
- A failure to achieve economies of scale, particularly if contracting out all or part of the service proved to be the sensible option; and
- Several variations in enforcement procedures and policies across the county. This would not be in the best interest of the motoring public.

### 4.3 *A Civil Parking Enforcement Partnership*

This option involves the creation of a new body to create a common notice processing and enforcement service. District Councils and the County

Council would in effect purchase a patrol service and notice processing from the CPE Partnership. Such a partnership would introduce a certain degree of resilience to the operation compared with a district-based scheme as a larger number of staff could cope better with leave, sickness or changes in volume of Penalty Charge Notices. The partnership could afford to employ staff with experience of CPE and so give an improved service.

Staff currently employed as car park inspectors by district councils would transfer to the partnership and be designated 'Civil Enforcement Officers'. However, the situation is not as clear-cut with back-office staff as ticket processing forms just a part of several peoples' jobs in all but the larger authorities. The proposal would free up some existing back-office staff time for other duties.

Some functions would probably remain with the district councils, such as maintenance of car parks, cleaning, setting of tariffs etc. Others could transfer to the partnership where there is business case for joint working. The Project Management Board will need to clarify responsibility for items listed in Appendix A and identify areas for potential joint working. The work streams needed to progress the project are shown in Appendix B. The joint Parking Officer Working Group proposes that each council takes responsibility for some of the work streams. This will share the load and promote the sense of partnership.

## **5 Financial Implications**

- 5.1 Consultants have produced a cost model for various modes of CPE provision within the county. Initial indications are that CPE could be provided at a lower cost by a county-wide enforcement and notice processing partnership rather than a district-based team. For the Sedgemoor District Council, this saving could be £5,000 in initial costs and £63,000/year in revenue costs. If the enforcement element is contracted out by the county-wide partnership, this saving could rise to £52,000 in initial costs and £81,000/year in revenue costs.
- 5.2 The final cost model will depend a great deal on recommendations of the Project Management Board on the items in Appendix A, such as cash collection arrangements, income from residents parking schemes and the level of parking enforcement in each town. These recommendations and detailed financial implications will be brought back to this council for consideration. This will allow the Council to decide whether or not to commit to the delivery stage of the project through an inter-authority agreement.

## **6 Human Resources Implications**

- 6.1 The CPE parking partnership option would involve transfer under TUPE of district council parking inspectors and possibly some back office staff to the parking partnership or private contractor. It will be important to keep staff, HR officers and unions informed of the progress of the project.

- 6.2 There will be a requirement to contribute officer time towards to project, which may require adjustment of workload priorities.

## **7 Link to Corporate Priorities**

- 7.1 Proposals for CPE should be developed to align with the corporate strategy, and specifically the regeneration objectives.
- 7.2 CPE must be an integral part of the Local Development Framework and development management policies. In key growth towns like Bridgwater, the framework and regime of any CPE must assist in the delivery of the higher-level objectives of the town. The future of on-street and off-street car parks will be considered as part of the Bridgwater Vision process and the integrated transport strategy work being led by the County Council.
- 7.3 The proposal could support regeneration initiatives by making the district a more pleasant place in which to live and a more attractive place to visit. Efficiency could be improved by generating additional income from cars diverting from on-street parking to off-street car parks.

## **8 Finance Comments**

- 8.1 At this stage the financial implications are not clear. As the project develops it will be essential to investigate the financial implications before any decisions are made.

## **9 Legal Comments**

- 9.1 The legal issues are dealt with in the body of the report.

## **10 Human Resources Comments**

- 10.1 The HR implications have been dealt with in paragraph 6 of the report.

## **11 Environmental and Community Safety Implications**

- 11.1 Efficient enforcement of parking regulations should improve both the environment and community safety.

## **12 Risk Management Implications**

- 12.1 Detailed risk management implications will form part of the project initiation document to be considered by a future Executive. However, the table below shows risks associated with the development stage.

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Consequence</b>	<b>Probability</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Treatment</b>
Councils fail to agree on the way to proceed with the	Loss of good reputation  No CPE and no	2	4	Take part in discussions with other authorities

investigation work	improvement in congestion for public			
A Council decides not to proceed with the investigation work	No CPE and no improvement in congestion for the public of that authority	2	4	Promote a partnership which is advantageous to all authorities

### 13 Equalities Issues

13.1 There are no equalities issues.

### 14 Scrutiny Committee

14.1 The Scrutiny Committee of 4<sup>th</sup> November 2008 considered the proposals in this report. The committee's recommendations to the Executive are –

- Give approval to officers contributing time towards the investigation stage of all options for the introduction of Civil Parking Enforcement.
- Would expect a further report from the Officers giving alternative methods of working with the other Districts & County with the option of Districts having fully delegated authority to operate their own Enforcement regimes. The report will include financial comparisons between the different schemes.

14.2 Section 4.2 was added to this report to meet the concerns of the Scrutiny Committee and some financial information added to section 5. Both Scrutiny Committee and Executive will receive further reports as the project develops.

### 15 Conclusion

15.1 The current level of on-street parking enforcement does not meet the community's needs or expectations. A Civil Parking Enforcement Partnership may provide an opportunity for the councils within Somerset to deliver an improved level of service to the public.

15.2 Local authorities within Somerset can best influence the nature and direction of the partnership by taking part in the discussions of the portfolio steering group, management board and delivery team.

15.3 Members will receive details of the financial, resource and governance implications at a point where approval is required to move forward with the delivery stage of the project.

## **16 Recommendations**

16.1 This report recommends the Executive to -

- Approve the investigation and development of detailed proposals for the delivery of Civil Parking Enforcement Partnership in Sedgemoor in partnership with Somerset CC. This will include evaluation of district-wide and county-wide delivery options.
- Nominate a member to join the steering group and officers to join the management board and delivery team.
- Give approval to officers contributing time towards the investigation stage (Stage 1) work items as detailed in Appendix B

## **17 Background Papers**

17.1 Operational Guidance to Local Authorities: Parking Policy and Enforcement Traffic Management Act 2004 (Department for Transport) March 2008

17.2 Financial Summary – Parking Service Delivery Options (*Sedgemoor paper not relevant to Taunton Deane*)

## **18 Appendices**

18.1 Appendix A – Issues to be addressed by the project management board.

18.2 Appendix B – Estimate of officers time needed to develop Stage 1 of the project

# Appendix A

## Issues to be addressed by the Project Management Board

Which authority will be the administering authority

Parking partnership governance arrangements

Proposals for the sharing of costs and income

Arrangements for cash collection and banking

Administration of Penalty Charge Notices

External and internal communication strategy

Arrangements for management and implementation of on-street residents parking schemes

Use of income from on-street charging

Number of patrol hours needed in each town

Rate per hour charged for enforcement

Employ Civil Enforcements Officers direct or out-source to a commercial company

Provide a new IT system or use one of the existing district council IT systems.

Arrangements for the public to pay penalty charges

Provide new accommodation or use existing local authority hosts

Which JE system to use for partnership staff

Details of the inter-authority agreement

Selling season tickets

Enforcement policy and procedure

Arrangements for existing external contracts for cash collection, notice processing etc

Procurement arrangements

## Appendix B

### Estimate of Officer time (hrs) needed to Progress Stage 1 of the Partnership

Note – all the partners will contribute towards all the work streams, but each authority will lead on a number of them, as set out below.

<b>Stage 1 (Up to August 2009) Approximate officer time required</b>	<b>Project work streams</b>
Somerset County Council Officer time 1153 hrs	Project Management Set Up Interim Governance Arrangements Approval Of First Stage Resources & PID County Parking Strategy Consultation on CPE Application Application For Designation Order Option - Contracted Out Enforcement Traffic Sign And Road Marking Review TRO Review Prepare District wide T.R.O.s Amend/Update Signs & Markings Final pre-CPE Review and Go Live
Avon and Somerset Police Officer time 127 hrs	Not leading a workstream
Mendip Officer time 413 hrs	Delegation to Parking Board Publicity Appoint management team
Sedgemoor Officer time 368 hrs	Cost and income sharing Formula (Regeneration) Inter-authority agreement (Legal Services)
South Somerset Officer time 399 hrs	Enforcement policy Enforcement procedures Staffing requirements Recruit staff
Taunton Deane Officer time 377 hrs	Enforcement delivery options IT requirements, assess and develop systems In-house enforcement options
West Somerset Officer time 375 hrs	Enforcement delivery review Accommodation and equipment





# Taunton Deane Borough Council

Executive - 4 December 2008

## Report of the Financial Services Manager

### Fees and Charges 2009/2010

This matter is the joint responsibility of Executive Councillors Mullins, Smith and Prior-Sankey

#### **1 Executive Summary**

- 1.1 The proposed fees and charges for 2009/10 are laid out in this report. The Executive is requested to recommend these charges to Full Council.

#### **2 Introduction**

- 2.1 The purpose of this report is for the Executive to consider the proposed fees and charges for 2009/10 for the following services:
- Cemeteries & Crematorium,
  - Waste Services,
  - Land Charges,
  - Housing,
  - Licensing,

#### **3 Proposed Increases for 2009/2010**

- 3.1 Appended to this report are the detailed proposed charges for each service as outlined above. The results of both the 2006 and 2007 public consultation events "Your Council, Your Views" clearly indicated that the public prefer to see increases in fees and charges, rather than in Council Tax, as a way for the Council to raise income. Therefore, where possible, fees have been increased to take these views into account.

##### **3.2 Cemeteries & Crematorium (Appendix A)**

It is proposed that the main cremation fee be increased by £27 to £536. This will generate additional income of an estimated £60k. Other fees have been largely increased by 5.3%, which will generate a further £10k of income. Members should note that this increase is included within the savings plans considered by the Executive elsewhere within this agenda and is ranked as a category 2 saving.

##### **3.3 Waste Services (Appendix B)**

For Garden Waste Bins the fees are proposed to increase from £25 to £35, this is expected to generate a further £79k in income. The £35 fee is still £10 below the economic cost of providing the service to users. In addition the charge for paper sacks is proposed to increase from £10 to £15. The charge for the bulky household waste service is also proposed to increase to £15.

##### **3.4 Land Charges (Appendix C)**

Given the current economic climate it is proposed to keep land charges fees the same as the current year. This coupled with the recent downturn in

demand for the service should mean that the land charges service breaks even overall, which is in line with Government expectations, and which will be brought into legislation in the near future.

3.5 Housing (Appendix D)

For 2009/10 in an attempt to ensure that the Housing Revenue Account follows the same timetable as the General Fund it is proposed to request members approval now on the proposed increases in charges rather than incorporating it into the overall budget proposals which will be considered in detail in the new calendar year.

- 3.6 The Council has received the draft subsidy determination for 2009/10 from DCLG and in line with the formula used to set rents it is proposed that Housing fees and charges be increased by September 2008 RPI plus 0.5%. For 2009/10 this equates to increases of 5.5%. Should the final subsidy determination change then revised fees will be submitted to Members in January. Council House Rents will continue to be set as per the previous timetable.

3.7 Licensing Fees (Appendix E)

Many Licensing fees particularly those in relation to the Licensing Act 2003 are set nationally, and the majority of income derived from licensing activities results from these fees. For those licensing fees where there is local flexibility to set an appropriate amount Officers have been working to ensure that the Council's costs in administering and enforcing such licenses are adequately met from the subsequent income received, also that our fees are reasonable. It is not possible to set a standard increase across all areas. As can be seen from Appendix E the activities of the Licensing Unit are many and varied. Each activity has to be considered on the basis of the nature of the activity, location and number of existing traders and other market factors and an individual fee or charge proposed accordingly.

- 3.8 Licensing fees are delicately balanced, put these rates up too much and this will suppress the market and lead to an overall reduction in activity and therefore a reduction in income. This is particularly important at the current time due to the economic downturn, we are already seeing closure of many licensed premises and reduction in the number of street traders. This also may encourage more illegal and therefore unregulated trading; resulting in greater risks to public safety and consequently may result in more costly investigations into this activity by the Licensing Unit. However if the fee is reasonable and affordable, people will be more inclined to pay it, and this will therefore afford a greater level of protection of public safety in the Borough. In summary, income from the proposed increases in fees is expected to generate an additional £10,850 in 2009-10.
- 3.9 The Car Parks service fees and charges will be considered at a TRO Panel on 17 December.
- 3.10 The Overview and Scrutiny Board considered these fees and charges at their meeting on 27 November and a verbal update on their comments will be given at the meeting. Once agreed by the Executive the fees and charges will be referred to Full Council.

#### **4 Recommendations**

- 4.1 The Executive are requested to recommend the proposed fees and charges for 2009/10 to Full Council as set out in this report.

**Contact Officer:** Paul Carter  
Financial Services Manager  
Tel: 01823 356418  
Email: [p.carter@tauntondeane.gov.uk](mailto:p.carter@tauntondeane.gov.uk)

**TAUNTON DEANE  
CEMETERIES AND  
CREMATORIUM  
TABLE OF FEES  
AND CHARGES**

***Proposed from 1st April 2009***



# **TAUNTON DEANE** **CEMETERIES & CREMATORIUM**

## **Part 1 - Cremation**

For the Cremation:-	£ 2008/9	£ 2009/10
(i) of the body of a stillborn child or of a child whose age at the time of death did not exceed one month;	18.00	19.00
(ii) of the body of a child whose age at the time of death exceeded one month but did not exceed sixteen years;	95.00	100.00
(iii) of the body of a person whose age at the time of death exceeded sixteen years;	509.00	536.00
(iv) a surcharge will be made when the service does not take place between the hours of 9.00 am and 4.00 pm Monday to Friday;	57.00	60.00
(v) use of Chapel for additional service time.	132.00	139.00
(vi) Chapel Attendant pall-bearing fee.	16.00	17.00

NOTE:- The Cremation fee includes:-

Use of Chapel, waiting room etc.  
 Services of organist and use of organ  
 Services of chapel attendant, which includes playing CDs, tapes, etc.  
 Medical referee's fee  
 Disposal of cremated remains in Garden of Rest  
 Certificate for burial of cremated remains  
 Provision of Polytainer when required

## **Part 2 - Urns**

<b>Supply of Urn or Casket:-</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>
Stratford	35.00	37.00
Avon/Stirling	40.00	43.00
Malvern	50.00	53.00
Metal Postal	45.00	48.00

## **Part 3 - Cremated Remains**

(i) Temporary deposit of cremated remains:-		
First month	18.00	19.00
Each subsequent month	22.00	23.00
(ii) Forwarding cremated remains excluding carriage	23.00	24.00
(iii) Collection of cremated remains on a Saturday (when available)	54.00	57.00

## **Part 4 - Memorials**

(i) Entries in Book of Memory:-		
Two line inscription	52.00	55.00
Five line inscription	72.00	75.00
Eight line inscription	99.00	104.00
Flower ) with five or eight	46.00	50.00
Badge or Coat of Arms ) line inscription only	58.00	70.00
(ii) Memorial Cards:-		
Two line inscription	25.00	27.00
Five line inscription	32.00	34.00
Eight line inscription	35.00	37.00
Flower ) with five or eight	50.00	50.00
Badge or Coat of Arms ) line inscription only	68.00	70.00
(iii) Miniature Books:-		
Two line inscription	52.00	55.00
Five line inscription	65.00	68.00
Eight line inscription	68.00	72.00
Flower	49.00	50.00
Badge or Coat of Arms	68.00	70.00

Subsequent inscriptions	17.00	18.00
Per line	42.00	50.00
Flower	56.00	70.00
Badge or Coat of Arms		
(iv) Cornish Granite tablet for a ten year period		
Standard memorial tablet	310.00	326.00
Memorial tablet with vase	360.00	378.00
Provision of flower container in existing tablet	50.00	52.00
Cost of renewal 50% of current fee	155.00	163.00
(v) Memorial plaque for a five year period	220.00	232.00
Cost of renewal 50% of current fee	110.00	116.00
(vi) Baby memorial plaques for a ten year period	70.00	72.00

#### **Part 5 - Other Fees and Charges**

(i) Certified extract from Register of Cremations	17.00	18.00
(ii) Floral Arrangements:- Small arrangement	33.00	35.00
Large arrangement	38.00	40.00

NOTE:- The charges in Part 4 and 5 (ii) include VAT

# **CEMETERIES**

## **TABLE OF FEES AND CHARGES**

Table of fees and other charges fixed by the Taunton Deane Borough Council for and in connection with burials in the Taunton Deane St. Mary's, St. James and Wellington Cemeteries.

The fees indicated for the various parts set out below apply where the persons to be interred or in respect of who the right is granted is, or immediately before this death, was an inhabitant of Taunton Deane District, or in the case of a stillborn child where one of the parents is or at the time of the interment was such an inhabitant or parishioner. In all other cases the fees, payments and sums will be doubled with the exception that those set out in Parts 3 and 4 will not be so doubled.

Interment fees out of normal hours will be doubled.

### **Part 1 - Interments**

The fees indicated for the various heads of this part include the digging of the grave but do not include the walling of a vault or walled grave.

	£ 2008/9	£ 2009/ 10
1. For the interment in a grave in respect of which an exclusive right of burial has not been granted:-		
(i) of the body of a stillborn child or a child whose age at the time of death did not exceed one year;	106.00	110.00
(ii) of the body of a child or person whose age at the time of death exceeded one year.	276.00	290.00
2. For any interment in a grave in respect of which an exclusive right of burial has been granted:-		
(i) of the body of a stillborn child or a child whose age at the time of death did not exceed one year:-		
at SINGLE depth	120.00	126.00
at DOUBLE depth	144.00	152.00
at TREBLE depth	160.00	177.00



(ii)	of the body of a child or person whose age at the time of death exceeded one year but did not exceed ten:-	£	£
	at SINGLE depth	233.00	245.00
	at DOUBLE depth	274.00	288.00
	at TREBLE depth	297.00	312.00
(iii)	for the body of a person whose age exceeds ten years:-		
	at SINGLE depth	350.00	368.00
	at DOUBLE depth	412.00	433.00
	at TREBLE depth	464.00	488.00
3.	For the interment of cremated remains:-		
(i)	in Garden of Remembrance (where cremation has not taken place at Taunton Deane Crematorium)	47.00	49.00
(ii)	in any grave in respect of which an exclusive right of burial has been granted	87.00	92.00
(iii)	Saturday interment (when available)	83.00	88.00
(iv)	To witness interment in Garden of Rest when cremation has taken place at Taunton.	18.00	20.00

## **Part 2 - Exclusive Rights of Burial in Earthen Graves**

### **1. Taunton Deane Cemetery:-**

For the exclusive right of burial for a period of 75 years in an earthen grave 2.3 m by 1.2 m

(i)	in Division L	421.00	442.00
(ii)	in Division A	464.00	487.00
(iii)	in Division B	443.00	465.00
(iv)	Cremated remains grave 78 cm by 76 cm	297.00	312.00

### **2. St. Mary's and St. James Cemeteries:-**

For the exclusive right of burial for a period of 75 years in an earthen grave 2.6 m by 1.2 m

443.00	465.00
--------	--------

	£	£
<b>3. Wellington Cemetery:-</b>		
For the exclusive right of burial for a period of 75 years in an earthen grave		
(i) 2.3 m by 1.2 m	443.00	465.00
(ii) 1.2 m by 0.6 m	297.00	312.00

The fees indicated in Part 2 include the Deed of Grant and all expenses thereof.

### **Part 3 - Memorials and Inscriptions**

For the right to erect or place on a grave or vault in respect of which an exclusive right of burial has been granted.

1. In any "Traditional Section":-		
(i) a flat stone, kerbstone or any other form of memorial;	158.00	166.00
(ii) a headstone or cross with base, bases or tablet;	141.00	148.00
(iii) an inscribed stone vase.	54.00	57.00
2. In any "Lawn Section":-		
(i) a headstone;	141.00	148.00
(ii) an inscribed vase.	54.00	57.00
3. Cremated remains flat tablet	141.00	148.00
4. Each removal of memorial for additional inscriptions.	54.00	57.00

### **Part 4 - Other Fees and Charges**

1. Certified extract from the Register of Burials.	18.00	19.00
2. Burial service in Crematorium Chapel (fee includes the use of Chapel, organ and the organist's fee);	132.00	138.00
3. Register search.	18.00	19.00

## Waste Services – Proposed Fees & Charges 2009/10

Waste Collection Authorities (WCA) are empowered by the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and by regulations to charge for the collection of certain types of household wastes. These include bulky items and household garden wastes. The authorities are also empowered to charge for the provision of waste containers.

The proposed charges for the 2009/10 financial year are shown in the table below.

Bulky items and garden waste can be taken to the HWRCs free of charge.

	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10
	£	£	£	£
<b>Garden Waste Service</b>				
Garden Waste Bin	15.00	20.00	25.00	35.00
Garden Waste sack (£ per bundle of 10)	5.00	7.50	10.00	15.00
<b>Bulky Waste Service</b>				
First Item	10.00	10.00	10.00	15.00
Subsequent Items	2.50	5.00	5.00	7.50
Max Number of items per collection	5	5	5	5
<b>Refuse Collection Service</b>				
Bin delivery/exchange charge	15.00	15.00	15.00	20.00

**Local Land Charges Searches and Enquiries**

One parcel of land -	£85.00
Several Parcels of Land	
First parcel of land	£85.00
Each additional parcel of land	£12.00
Optional Enquiries.	
Each printed Enquiry	£8.00
Solicitors Own Enquiry.	£12.00
Statutory Search Fee on Form LLC1	£30.00
Highway Authority Charge	£25.55
Personal Search Fee	£11.00

This makes the charge for a basic full search £140.55.

## Housing Fees and Charges 2009/10

### Service Charges

	<u>2008/09</u>	<u>2009/10</u>
Communal Area Service Charge	£0.47	£0.50
Grounds Maintenance	£0.60	£0.63
<u>Supporting People Service Charges (Draft):</u>		
Specialised (Extra Care) Sheltered Housing	£34.51	£36.41
Sheltered Housing	£9.78	£10.32
Hardwired Sheltered Housing	£3.48	£3.67

### Garage Rents

Council Tenants	£4.71 per week
Private Tenants and Owner Occupiers	£5.36 per week (+ VAT at the standard rate)

### Hire Charges for Sheltered Scheme Meeting Halls

The following charges are currently in place for 2008/09:

First Hour	£8.50
Each half hour thereafter	£3.40
6 hours plus	£43.30 maximum
For residents in a scheme and community organisations the total charge is £11.20	

The proposed increase of 5.5% and rounded to the nearest 10p for ease of administration would produce the following charges:

First Hour	£9.00
Each half hour thereafter	£3.60
6 hours plus	£45.70 maximum
For residents in a scheme and community organisations the total charge is £11.80.	

### Hire Charges for Sheltered Scheme Guest Rooms

It is proposed this year that the increase should reflect the increase applied to service charges. Officers are also proposing to round the charges to the nearest 50p for ease of administration. As agreed previously, some flexibility will still be provided for those relatives or friends who are staying due to compassionate reasons. The table below shows both the present charges and those proposed for 2009/10:

<u>No. of Nights per Person</u>	<u>2008/09 Charge</u>	<u>2009/10 Charge</u>
1	£9.50	£10.00
2	£15.00	£16.00
3	£21.00	£22.00
4	£26.50	£28.00
5	£32.50	£34.50
6	£38.00	£40.00
7	£44.00	£46.50

## Hostels

Members will recall that last year a 4.4% increase was applied. For 2009/10 it is recommended that a 5.5% increase be applied and for information the existing and new rent levels will be:

	2008/09 Rent (per day)	2009/10 Rent (per day)
40 Humphreys Road	7.06	7.45
1 Gay Street	7.06	7.45
Outer Circle		
113 and 113a (studios)	6.01	6.34
115 and 115a (3 bedroom)	7.82	8.25
Snedden Grove		
Unit 1 (2 bedroom)	7.06	7.45
Unit 2 (2 bedroom)	6.46	6.82
Unit 3 (2 bedroom)	6.46	6.82
Unit 4 (3 bedroom)	8.46	8.93
Unit 5 (3 bedroom)	8.46	8.93
Unit 6 (2 bedroom)	7.06	7.45
Winckworth Way		
Unit 1 (2 bedroom)	6.46	6.82
Unit 2 (2 bedroom)	6.46	6.82
Unit 3 (3 bedroom)	8.46	8.93
Wheatley Crescent (4 studios)	6.01	6.34

## Deane Helpline Trading Account

It is proposed that we increase the charges by 5.5% across the board, which is in line with the increases applied to service charges under the direction of the Department of Communities and Local Government.

The proposed charges for 2009/10 are shown below:

	<b>2008/09 Current (£)</b>	<b>2009/10 Proposed (£)</b>	<b>Increase (£)</b>
Public Sector/Private Sector Subscribers	3.48	3.67	0.19

FEES & CHARGES 2009/10 - LICENSING UNIT			APPENDIX E
SERVICE	Fees for 2008 - 2009	Proposed fees for 2009 - 2010	Comments
Licensing Act 2003	All fees fixed by statute	No change statutory fee	
Gambling Act 2005	Statutory Fee first year of operation of this Act	No change statutory fee	
Gaming Machines	Fixed By Statute	No change statutory fee	
Lotteries	Fixed By Statute	No change statutory fee	
Sex Establishment-Grant	£12,000.00	£12,000.00	
Sex Establishment - renewal	£6,500.00	£6,500.00	
Sex Establishment Licence Variation	£95 and £600 if determined by Licensing Committee	£95 and £600 if determined by Licensing Committee	
Sex Establishment Licence Transfer	£60.00	£60.00	
			Having carried out a desktop review of skin piercing we cannot justify the amount charged as this is not expended on enforcement. Skin piercing attracts little enforcement and therefore to carry on with an annual fee is disproportionate. Therefore it is proposed only to charge new application fees and not an annual fee in line with all other neighbouring councils. The fee increase reflects the projected enforcement activity for new applicants. Overall this change will reduce income by £4400.
Skin Piercing Registration-New Premises Registration	£55.00	£82.00	
Skin Piercing Registration-New Individual Registration	£55.00	£55.00	
Admin - uncleared cheques	£35.00	£35.00	
Admin charge - request for info (non FOI and non Public Regulations)	£35.00	£35.00	
Duplicate Licence	£15.00	£25.00	
Street Trading -Market House,High St,Castle Bow,North St (non food)	£1980.00	£2500.00	
Street Trading -Market House,High St,Castle Bow,North St (food)	£2400.00	£3,000.00	
Street Trading - Paul St, Billet St	£1,080.00	£1,500.00	
Street Trading - Laybys	£1680-£2640	£1920 to £2880	
Mobile Traders	£300.00	£350.00	
Permanent Site private land	£300.00	£350.00	
Daily rate	£25-£55	£30.00 per day or £55 per week	
Promotional Events	£150.00	£150.00	
Pavement Cafes Less than 10m2 (Grant/Renewal)	£410/£220	£540/£340	
Pavement Cafes less than 20m2 (Grant/Renewal)	£460/£270	£590/£390	
Pavement Cafes less than 30m2 (Grant/Renewal)	£595/£405	£725/£525	
Pavement Cafes less than 40m2 (Grant/Renewal)	£650/£460	£780/£580	
Pavement Cafes in excess of 40m2 (Grant/Renewal)	£870/£680	£1000/£800	
Hackney Carriage Vehicle Licence	£175.00	£185.00	
Private Hire Vehicle Licence	£175.00	£185.00	
Change of number plate	£30.00	£40.00	
Meter Test	£18.00	£21.00	
Replacement Plate	£25.00	£25.00	
Internal Identification Sticker	£3.50	£3.50	
Private Hire Operator Licence	£100.00	£100.00	
New Drivers Licence	£120.00	£130.00	
Additional Knowledge Test	£20.00	£20.00	
Driver renewal 1 year	£100.00	£110.00	
Driver renewal 3 year	£270.00	£300.00	
Replacement badge	£15.00	£20.00	
Advertising on Vehicles	£50.00	£70.00	
Motor Salvage Operator Registration	£70.00	£80.00	
Certified copy of Motor Salvage Operator Register	£35.00	£40.00	
Pet Shop Licence	£120.00	£130.00	
Animal Boarding Licence	£120.00 *	£130.00	
Home Boarding Licence	£30.00 *	£130.00	This has been increased to the same as an animal boarding licence as it is the same process and the same level of enforcement is required and adoption of model conditions recently by lic cmte allows us to now enforce this.



SERVICE	Fees for 2008 - 2009	Proposed fees for 2009 - 2010	Comments
Dog Breeding	£120.00 *	£130,00	
Dangerous Wild Animals	£150.00 *	£150,00	
Riding Establishments	£150.00 *	£150,00	
Zoos	£500.00 *	There can be no charge for this licence just actual cost recovery	
	*plus vets fees where appropriate.		

# Taunton Deane Borough Council

Executive - 4 December 2008

## Report of the Principal Accountant

This matter is the responsibility of Executive Councillor Henley

### Savings Delivery Plans 2009/2010

#### **1 Executive Summary**

- 1.1 Managers, as part of the budget setting process for 2009/2010, have produced savings delivery plans. The Overview & Scrutiny Board will consider the draft savings delivery plans on 27 November. The Executive is requested to consider which savings plan items they wish to take in order to help close the budget gap.

#### **2 Background**

- 2.1 The Chief Executive and Directors have issued savings targets totalling £530k to Managers.
- 2.2 The Overview & Scrutiny Board will consider the delivery plans on 27 November.

#### **3 Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) Update**

- 3.1 The estimated budget gap reported to the Overview & Scrutiny Board on 30 October 2008 was £1,020k. Since then, the Financial Services team have been progressing the detailed budget spreadsheets with Managers. This is the detail behind many of the assumptions in the MTFP, and until this task is completed, the "budget gap" is still very much an estimate.
- 3.2 The latest predicted budget gap is £1,548k. The main reasons for this increase of £528k are shown in the table below:-

Item	Impact On Budget Gap £000	Current Gap £000
Gap as reported to Overview & Scrutiny on 30 October		1,020
<b>MTFP Changes – Good News</b>		
Members Allowances – cost of scheme proposed by panel is slightly lower than MTFP assumptions.	(3)	
Taunton TIC – expected loss of ticket income during 0809 has been revised down.	(32)	
Executive Councillors propose to increase the garden waste service charges to £35 pa. Please see the Fees & Charges report considered earlier on this agenda.	(79)	
		(114)
<b>MTFP Changes – Bad News</b>		

Qtr2 0809 budget monitoring update – reduced income for Land Charges.	40	
Free Swimming for Over 60s and Under 16s, as recently agreed by the Executive.	45	
Council Tax Base - the draft tax base is lower than anticipated with growth being only 0.6% when compared to the 1.7% assumed in the MTFP. This will be subject to a separate report to Executive in December.	60	
Collection Fund deficit - the forecast deficit is £763k and this is shared amongst all of the major preceptors, TDBC's share is just over 10%.	79	
Inflation - the recommended inflation allowance for electricity & gas is 80% & 90% respectively - unsurprisingly this is well above MTFP assumptions.	68	
Investment returns - with the recent 1.5% cut in interest rates we need to further revise downwards our expected investment returns for 2009/10. Our Treasury Management advisors are now forecasting rates to drop to 1.5% during 2009.	350	
		642
<b>Budget gap 27<sup>th</sup> November 2008</b>		<b>1,548</b>

- 3.3 A further update on the budget gap position will be provided in the budget consultation packs issued to all Councillors towards the end of December.

#### 4 Savings Delivery Plans

- 4.1 Details of the draft General Fund savings delivery plans are set out in appendices A-N. Each saving has been considered for its "acceptability" in terms of both operational and public perception aspects.
- 4.2 The savings plans are now presented for consideration by the Executive. It is understood that the Executive are minded to take all of the public category 1 & 2 items and may consider some category 3 items listed below, if appropriate. The table below shows the impact on the current budget gap of these items:

	<b>Savings £'000</b>	<b>Budget Gap £'000</b>
<b>Revised budget gap</b>		1,548
<b>Public Category 1</b>	(272)	
		1,276
<b>Public Category 2</b>	(166)	
		1,110
<b>Public Category 3 items:</b>		
Planning: D1 (reduction in Heritage & Landscape grants)	(1)	

Environmental Health: D6 (reduction in dog bin budget)	(2)	
Policy: D3 (relocatable CCTV)	(4)	
<b>Revised budget Gap assuming all savings above are taken</b>		<b>1,103</b>

- 4.3 A verbal update will be given regarding any comments from the Overview & Scrutiny Board meeting on 27 November 2008.

## **5 Housing Revenue Account**

- 5.1 The only change to the HRA MTFP is regarding the subsidy payable and the rents position. DCLG have issued a consultation paper outlining 2 options for rents:

1. That rent convergence takes places in 2011/12 as originally planned this pushes up rents over 9% and subsidy payable increases – under this scenario the funding gap in 2010/11 over the minimum acceptable working balance is largely unchanged from that previously reported at £590k.
2. That rent convergence is pushed back several years and that rents are capped at a maximum increase of 7% - this scenario is much more favourable to the HRA and means that there is no funding gap over the next 5 years.

Officers will be responding to the consultation document requesting that DCLG go ahead with option 2.

- 5.2 Although no formal target has been issued to the HRA, proposed savings of £64k have been identified, these are detailed in appendix O. The impact of the proposed savings (if all are taken) are included in the figures above.

## **6 Conclusion**

- 6.1 The Authority must ensure that it is able to delivery a sustainable budget. The Savings Delivery Plans along with the Core Council review will help the Council to achieve this target.

## **7 Recommendation**

- 7.1 The Executive are requested to :-

- (a) note the updated budget gap for 2009/10 and
- (b) review the savings plans and confirm which items they wish to be incorporated into the 2009/10 budget.

**Background Papers**

Overview and Scrutiny Board 13 October 2008, Budget Setting 2009/10

Overview and Scrutiny Board 30 October 2008, Budget Strategy 2009/10

Overview and Scrutiny Board 27 November 2008, Savings Delivery Plans 2009/10

Contact Officers: Emily Collacott, Principal Accountant  
Tel 01823 356421  
Email: [e.collacott@tauntondeane.gov.uk](mailto:e.collacott@tauntondeane.gov.uk)

# SUMMARY OF PROJECTED SAVINGS 2009/10

# Appendix A

CLUSTER	OPERATIONAL					PUBLIC			
	CAT1	CAT2	CAT3	TOTAL		CAT1	CAT2	CAT3	TOTAL
	£	£	£			£	£	£	
<b>Development:</b>									
Economic Development	11,000	31,730	0	42,730		6,000	10,800	25,930	42,730
Planning & Building Control	36,090	21,300	1,000	58,390		30,290	27,100	1,000	58,390
Forward Plan	45,000	0	0	45,000		45,000	0	0	45,000
<b>Environment &amp; Leisure:</b>									
Enironmental Health	8,690	44,650	0	53,340		36,690	14,650	2,000	53,340
Leisure & Sport	34,190	0	0	34,190		12,965	15,300	5,925	34,190
Parks Service	36,810	25,000	0	61,810		27,000	11,510	23,300	61,810
Highways	30,000	15,000	0	45,000		30,000	5,000	10,000	45,000
Cemeteries and Crematorium	70,000	0	0	70,000		0	70,000	0	70,000
Car Parks and Civil Contingencie	122,000	0	0	122,000		10,000	2,000	110,000	122,000
<b>Housing GF:</b>									
Private Sector and Enabling	17,020	0	0	17,020		17,020	0	0	17,020
<b>Policy &amp; Performance</b>	12,500	0	4,000	16,500		3,500	9,000	4,000	16,500
<b>Legal &amp; Democratic</b>	41,500	0	0	41,500		40,500	1,000	0	41,500
<b>Other Savings</b>	13,000	0	0	13,000		13,000	0	0	13,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>477,800</b>	<b>137,680</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>620,480</b>		<b>271,965</b>	<b>166,360</b>	<b>182,155</b>	<b>620,480</b>

**DETAILS OF PROJECTED SAVINGS 2009/10**
**SERVICE AREA - ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT UNIT**
**Appendix B**

Ref	DESCRIPTION OF SAVING	VALUE OF SAVING			DIFFICULTY CATEGORY		BRIEF COMMENT & EXPLANATION
		09/10 £	10/11 £	11/12 £	ACCEPTABILITY Operational      Public Easier (1) to harder (3)		
A: INCOME GROWTH							
A1							
A2							
Subtotal group A		0	0	0			
B: PRICE INCREASES							
B1							
Subtotal group B		0	0	0			
C: EFFICIENCY SAVINGS							
C1	Economic Development Brochure	1,000	1,000	1,000	1	1	Electronic promotion of services through enhanced website
C2	Commercial Property Register	1,000	1,000	1,000	1	1	Service already cut in favour of referral to agent's websites which are technologically more advanced and up to date. This year's allocation has been used to cover the TDBC contribution to the cost of the Global Networks contract which in future years should be covered by inward investment activity.
C3	Industrial Estates Directory	1,000	1,000	1,000	1	1	Service already cut in favour of direct referral to developers, greater dependence upon developer promotional activity and collaborative working with inward investment activity. This year's allocation has been partly used to cover the TDBC contribution to the cost of the Global Networks contract which in future years should be covered by inward investment activity.
C4	Social Enterprise Adviser	3,000	3,000	3,000	1	1	Contribution toward post employed within SCC Communities Unit. This delivery is subject to Business Support Simplification Programme and the responsibilities have been passed to Regional Infrastructure Social Enterprise SW under a Business Link branded contract.
C5							
Subtotal group C		6,000	6,000	6,000			
D: FRONT-LINE SERVICE CUTS							
D1							
D2	Westival	10,800	10,800	10,800	2	2	Westival has been funded for 3 years and has managed to secure some sponsorship. With current economic climate there is a risk that without public funding the event will not take place in 09/10.
D3	Floodlighting	5,000	5,000	5,000	1	3	This allocation from the Tourism budget is used to offset the cost of floodlighting churches and should be considered seriously as both a potential cost and environmental impact saving. Other authorities, and perhaps TDBC as part of this budget review process, are considering reducing streetlighting on the basis of reducing their carbon footprint and the power usage of floodlights may well justify this item being viewed as a priority environmental action.
D4	Wellington Christmas Lights, Wiveliscombe Christmas Lights, Christmas Illuminations - storage	20,930	20,930	20,930	2	3	The quote from DLO to erect, remove and store the Christmas illuminations for 08/09 is £23,802.00, which is £2,872 over budget. Additionally, £2,080 of this years allocation has already been committed, giving a potential total overspend of £4,952 for this FY. On this basis the actual saving could be £25,882 plus inflation in 09/10. The electricity consumption of these illuminations must also be viewed as an environmental impact.
D5							
Subtotal group D		36,730	36,730	36,730			

TOTAL with category 1s	6,000	6,000	6,000
TOTAL with category 1s and/or 2s	10,800	10,800	10,800
TOTAL with category 3s	25,930	25,930	25,930
Total available	42,730	42,730	42,730
Check (should equal zero!)	0	0	0

**DETAILS OF PROJECTED SAVINGS 2009/10**
**SERVICE AREA - PLANNING AND BUILDING CONTROL**
**Appendix C**

Ref	DESCRIPTION OF SAVING	VALUE OF SAVING			DIFFICULTY CATEGORY		BRIEF COMMENT & EXPLANATION
		09/10 £	10/11 £	11/12 £	ACCEPTABILITY Operational   Public		
					Easier (1) to harder (3)		
A: INCOME GROWTH							
A1	Discharge of planning conditions	10,000	10,000	10,000	1	1	New fee introduced by the government.
A2							
Subtotal group A		10,000	10,000	10,000			
B: PRICE INCREASES							
B1							
B2							
Subtotal group B		0	0	0			
C: EFFICIENCY SAVINGS							
C1							
C2							
Subtotal group C		0	0	0			
D: FRONT-LINE SERVICE CUTS							
D1	Reduction in Heritage and Landscape grants	1,000	1,000	1,000	3	3	Reduction in local nature reserve budget. The budget was cut last year and any further reduction will have impact upon the quality of environmental management that can be provided.
D2	Reduce contributions to Quantock Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (ANOB) service	5,800	5,800	5,800	1	2	TDBC SDC and WSDC each contribute towards the Quantock Hills AONB service. The Quantock AONB service is a 'gold plated' service that is far more expensive than that of the majority of other AONB's nationally. It is considered that this should be subject to review. Sedgemoor have already decided to reduce their contribution.
D3	Postpone Design Awards	1,500	1,500	1,500	1	1	The public acceptability will increase to 2 in the second year and 3 thereafter
D4	Saving from shared management of Building Control	1,510	1,510	1,510	1	1	The employment costs of the Building Control Manager have been split between TDBC and Sedgemoor DC. Although part of this saving will be taken up by the recruitment of a shared Building Control Surveyor the arrangement represents a net saving of £1,510.
D5	Reduced Building Control Admin Hours	2,460	2,460	2,460	1	1	Administrative support costs have been reduced.
D6	Reduced Building Control Surveyor Hours	4,900	4,900	4,900	1	1	Two members of the surveying team are enjoying flexible working/progressive retirement arrangements. The result is a reduction in hours equivalent to 0.6FTE.
D7	Continue to freeze Clerk Plotter post	9,920	9,920	9,920	1	1	It was agreed to freeze this post with the impending introduction of the Acolaid IT system which is designed to reduce workload of the Planning Admin team. With economic downturn the impact of not filling this post in the short term should be minimal, though if workload were to increase this could impact on service delivery.
D8	Leave Land Charges post vacant and bring work into Validation Team if necessary	8,000	8,000	8,000	2	2	With economic downturn workloads have reduced in terms of land charges work. Such that one part time officer is currently sufficient. The Planning Validation team could assist if there are short term peaks in workload.
D9	Saving from Development Management team restructure including deleting one post from the existing structure	13,300	13,300	13,300	2	2	I am proposing to use the Planning Officer vacancy to realign resources and taking away capacity at the Support Officer level where changes to permitted development should result in a reduction in workload.
D10							
Subtotal group D		48,390	48,390	48,390			

TOTAL with category 1s	30,290	30,290	30,290
TOTAL with category 1s and/or 2s	27,100	27,100	27,100
TOTAL with category 3s	1,000	1,000	1,000
Total available	58,390	58,390	58,390
Check (should equal zero!)	0	0	0



**DETAILS OF PROJECTED SAVINGS 2009/10**
**SERVICE AREA - FORWARD PLAN**
**Appendix D**

Ref	DESCRIPTION OF SAVING	VALUE OF SAVING			DIFFICULTY CATEGORY		BRIEF COMMENT & EXPLANATION
		09/10 £	10/11 £	11/12 £	ACCEPTABILITY		
					Operational	Public	
					Easier (1) to harder (3)		
A: INCOME GROWTH							
A1							
A2							
A3							
Subtotal group A		0	0	0			
B: PRICE INCREASES							
B1							
B2							
B3							
Subtotal group B		0	0	0			
C: EFFICIENCY SAVINGS							
C1	Contribution to Local Development Framework can be reduced from £97,240 to £52,240	45,000	45,000	45,000	1	1	09/10 revenue costs expected about £31k, but 10/11 expected to be about £100k with Core Strategy Inspector and Programme Officer - currently there is £220k in the reserve. Agreed funding from both Housing & Planning DeliveryGrant (HPDG) and New Growth Point (NGP) is enabling us to reduce the amount we have to put into the reserve for at least two years. The position for 2011/12 and beyond depends on future HPDG and NGP grant funding.
C2							
C3							
Subtotal group C		45,000	45,000	45,000			
D: FRONT-LINE SERVICE CUTS							
D1							
D2							
D3							
Subtotal group D		0	0	0			

TOTAL with category 1s	45,000	45,000	45,000
TOTAL with category 1s and/or 2s	0	0	0
TOTAL with category 3s	0	0	0
Total available	45,000	45,000	45,000
Check (should equal zero!)	0	0	0

**DETAILS OF PROJECTED SAVINGS 2009/10****SERVICE AREA -ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH**

Ref	DESCRIPTION OF SAVING	VALUE OF SAVING			DIFFICULTY CATEGORY		BRIEF COMMENT & EXPLANATION
		09/10 £	10/11 £	11/12 £	ACCEPTABILITY Operational      Public Easier (1) to harder (3)		
A: INCOME GROWTH							
A1							
	Licensing Income Growth	30,000	30,000	30,000	2	1	Increase income by 30K further move to cost neutrality for Licensing based on budget history band arising from growth. Increases risk of underachievement on income budget.
A2							
Subtotal group A		30,000	30,000	30,000			
B: PRICE INCREASES							
B1	Increase in Licensing Fees	10,850	10,850	10,850	2	2	
B2							
Subtotal group B		10,850	10,850	10,850			
C: EFFICIENCY SAVINGS							
C1							
	Dog Warden Contract Payment	3,000	3,000	3,000	1	1	Growth allocation last year for new stat duties for out of hours dogs has been undertaken more cost effectively than initially thought by working with other Somerset DC's, resulting in return of some of this budget.
C2							
Subtotal group C		3,000	3,000	3,000			
D: FRONT-LINE SERVICE CUTS							
D1	Licensing Act/Gambling Act Implementation	1,000	1,000	1,000	2	2	Reduced need for budget due to completion of implementation.
D2	Environmental Protection Enforcement Expences	1,500	1,500	1,500	2	2	Reduction leaves some remaining funds, risk of overspending is offset to a degree for the potential for award of TDBC costs in Court proceedings, should this be necessary.
D3	Dog Enforcement	1,000	1,000	1,000	1	1	DW Enforcement costs are also incorporated into the DW contract.
D5							
	Dog Bins	2,000	2,000	2,000	1	3	This reduction will leave only sufficient funds to replace 3 damaged or worn out bins per year and/or undertake repairs to existing bin stock where required. It will result in no new bins at new sites being provided by TDBC.
D6	Dog Wardens Publicity	2,690	2,690	2,690	1	1	Under utilised budget, reduction in DW contract hours mean that there is not capacity in the service to support promotional events.
D7	Health & Saftey Business Partnership Publicity	1,300	1,300	1,300	2	2	Reduction in officer capacity due to frozen post reduce the ability to utilise this budget.
D8							
Subtotal group D		9,490	9,490	9,490			

TOTAL with category 1s	6,690	6,690	6,690
TOTAL with category 1s and/or 2s	44,650	44,650	44,650
TOTAL with category 3s	2,000	2,000	2,000
Total available	53,340	53,340	53,340
Check (should equal zero!)	0	0	0

**DETAILS OF PROJECTED SAVINGS 2009/10****SERVICE AREA - LEISURE DEVELOPMENT & SPORT**

Ref	DESCRIPTION OF SAVING	VALUE OF SAVING			DIFFICULTY CATEGORY		BRIEF COMMENT & EXPLANATION
		09/10 £	10/11 £	11/12 £	ACCEPTABILITY Operational   Public		
					Easier (1) to harder (3)		
A: INCOME GROWTH							
A1	Levy £50 admin charge for charities open space hirers permits	750	750	750	1	3	Charities don't pay an admin or hire fee currently Breakdown C16 = £400 C18 = £350
A2	Levy admin charge on major non charity hirers on top of space hire charge	750	750	750	1	1	Major hirers pay a per area fee but no admin charge Breakdown C16 = £200 C18 = £550
A3	Increase Gate Licence Charges	175	175	175	1	1	
A4	Increase Ice Cream Concession Sales	825	825	825	1	1	
A5	Charge for Circus	4,315	4,315	4,315	1	1	
A6	Charge for Major Concert	4,600	4,600	4,600	1	1	
A7							
Subtotal group A		11,415	11,415	11,415			
B: PRICE INCREASES							
B1	Increase non charity admin charge for permits from £50 to £100	800	800	800	1	1	Small non charity hirers only pay admin fee and this does not reflect amount of work to administer the hiring. Breakdown C16 = £550 C18 = £250
B2	Reinstate space hire charge for charities	3,000	3,000	3,000	1	3	Breakdown C16 = £400 C18 = £2,600
B3							
Subtotal group B		3,800	3,800	3,800			
C: EFFICIENCY SAVINGS							
C1	Reduction in Events	1,000	1,000	1,000	1	1	
C2							
Subtotal group C		1,000	1,000	1,000			
D: FRONT-LINE SERVICE CUTS							
D1	Reduce event funding to Friends groups and others by 25%	2,175	2,175	2,175	1	3	£550 French Weir, £375 Wellington, £50 Victoria, £200 Vivary Breakdown C16 = £1,175 C18 = £1,000.
D2	Cease revenue funding to sports organisations	7,300	7,300	7,300	1	2	£6500 SASP, £600 SPFA, £300 SASW as support to organisatoins delivering a service to the local community.
D3	Cease support for art club in Victoria Park - to become self funding or paid for by clients	5,000	5,000	5,000	1	2	SLA has ended and group has been operating long enough to be able to become self financing. Number of registered attendees is 17.
D4	Reduce Printing Budget by 50%	500	500	500	1	1	
D5	Cease signage budget	3,000	3,000	3,000	1	2	Used for new interpretation boards and signage that isn't able to be provided as part of a bigger project such as a new play area.
D6							
Subtotal group D		17,975	17,975	17,975			

TOTAL with category 1s	12,965	12,965	12,965
TOTAL with category 1s and/or 2s	15,300	15,300	15,300
TOTAL with category 3s	5,925	5,925	5,925
Total available	34,190	34,190	34,190
Check (should equal zero!)	0	0	0

**DETAILS OF PROJECTED SAVINGS 2009/10****SERVICE AREA - PARKS SERVICE**

Summary of PrSavings

Ref	DESCRIPTION OF SAVING	VALUE OF SAVING			DIFFICULTY CATEGORY		BRIEF COMMENT & EXPLANATION	
		09/10 £	10/11 £	11/12 £	ACCEPTABILITY			
					Operational	Public		
					Easier (1) to harder (3)			
A: INCOME GROWTH								
A1	Charge for car parking at Courtland Road Expenditure Code C04C215000.		10,000	10,000	10,000	2	3	Impacts on current users - car parking is free at present. Historical Costing based on 40 spaces.
A2								
A3								
Subtotal group A			10,000	10,000	10,000			
B: PRICE INCREASES								
B1	Increase the cost of senior football games by £10 income code C04C350000		8,000	8,000	8,000	1	2	The cost of providing a pitch is £22.00 more that the current pitch charge 800 matches per year.
B2	Increase the cost of junior football games by £7.50 income code C04S350000		1,010	1,010	1,010	1	2	The cost of providing a pitch is £40.00 more that the current pitch charge 135 matches per year.
B3								
Subtotal group B			9,010	9,010	9,010			
C: EFFICIENCY SAVINGS								
C1	Saving from increased partnership working with Sedgemoor Services ie. Shared management between the two organisations using TDBC Highways and Parks management.		15,000	15,000	15,000	2	1	This would require the approval of both council's members agreeing to the A38 project proposals.
C2								
C3								
Subtotal group C			15,000	15,000	15,000			
D: FRONT-LINE SERVICE CUTS								
D1	Remove the bird aviary from Vivary Park, donate birds to a cage bird enthusiast Cost code C18P100		3,300	3,300	3,300	1	3	The aviary will need refurbishment in the future and the keeping of exotic wild birds in a cage is not popular will all park users. Some park users will miss this attraction. Good PR will be needed to prevent any bad press.
D2	Reduce the Vivary Park events budget. Cost code C18S524		2,000	2,000	2,000	1	1	Can be achieved without reducing the events programme in the park
D3	Reduce the number of hanging baskets in Taunton and Wellington by 15% for 2009/10 cost code C04P100000		10,000	10,000	10,000	1	3	This would have some impact on the Britain in Bloom efforts of both towns, with the reduction of 125 hanging baskets
D4	Reduce the contribution to the SCC highway grass cutting in Taunton and Wellington. Cost code F03P100301		2,500	2,500	2,500	1	2	This would reduce the number of the grass cutting frequency from 9 times a year to 8. This would have a detrimental effect on street appearance with longer grass and would impact on Britain in Bloom.
D5	Reduce tree and shrub replacement planting. Cost code C04P100000		5,000	5,000	5,000	1	1	Little or no impact on the community
D6	Reduce shrub bed maintenance costs. Cost code C04P100000		5,000	5,000	5,000	1	1	Some low impact areas will be selected for the removal of shrubs and beds grassed over. Little or no impact on the community
D7								
Subtotal group D			27,800	27,800	27,800			

TOTAL with category 1s	12,000	12,000	12,000
TOTAL with category 1s and/or 2s	26,510	26,510	26,510
TOTAL with category 3s	23,300	23,300	23,300
Total available	<b>61,810</b>	<b>61,810</b>	<b>61,810</b>
Check (should equal zero!)	0	0	0

**DETAILS OF PROJECTED SAVINGS 2009/10****SERVICE AREA - HIGHWAYS**

Summary of PrSavings

Ref	DESCRIPTION OF SAVING	VALUE OF SAVING			DIFFICULTY CATEGORY		BRIEF COMMENT & EXPLANATION
		09/10 £	10/11 £	11/12 £	ACCEPTABILITY Operational    Public		
					Easier (1) to harder (3)		
A: INCOME GROWTH							
A1							
A2							
A3							
Subtotal group A		0	0	0			
B: PRICE INCREASES							
B1							
B2							
B3							
Subtotal group B		0	0	0			
C: EFFICIENCY SAVINGS							
C1	Partnership working with Clean Surrounds of Sedgemoor District Council	15,000	15,000	15,000	2	1	Subject to member approval of recommendation from working party. The estimated sum of £30,000 has been split between Highways/Cleansing and Parks DLOs for proposed shared management but no formal decisions have taken place to agree the amount.
C2							
C3							
Subtotal group C		15,000	15,000	15,000			
D: FRONT-LINE SERVICE CUTS							
D1	Reduce maintenance of recycling sites	15,000	15,000	15,000	1	1	Number of sites being reduced as Somerset Waste Partnership increase door step collections
D2	Closure of public toilets x 4	10,000	10,000	10,000	1	3	Propose closure of Rockwell Green, Milverton Recreation Ground, French Weir Park and Sand Wedge (Wilton Lands) toilets. May not be a popular move after this years closure
D3	Reduce street cleaning budget	5,000	5,000	5,000	1	2	Would have detrimental effect on street cleanliness due to inability to employ contractors for weed spraying and other operations.
D4							
Subtotal group D		30,000	30,000	30,000			

TOTAL with category 1s	15,000	15,000	15,000
TOTAL with category 1s and/or 2s	20,000	20,000	20,000
TOTAL with category 3s	10,000	10,000	10,000
Total available	45,000	45,000	45,000
Check (should equal zero!)	0	0	0

**DETAILS OF PROJECTED SAVINGS 2009/10****SERVICE AREA - CEMETERIES & CREMATORIUM**

Ref	DESCRIPTION OF SAVING	VALUE OF SAVING			DIFFICULTY CATEGORY		BRIEF COMMENT & EXPLANATION
		09/10 £	10/11 £	11/12 £	ACCEPTABILITY		
					Operational	Public	
					Easier (1) to harder (3)		
A: INCOME GROWTH							
A1							
A2							
A3							
Subtotal group A		0	0	0			
B: PRICE INCREASES							
B1	Cremation Fee £27 increase	60,000	60,000	60,000	1	2	Fee Increase for 2009/10 from £509 to £536 = £27 (5.3% over 08/09). If the fees were to be increased further it could impact on the volume of cremations received.
B2	Minor Cem & Crem Fees	10,000	10,000	10,000	1	2	
B3							
Subtotal group B		70,000	70,000	70,000			
C: EFFICIENCY SAVINGS							
C1							
C2							
C3							
Subtotal group C		0	0	0			
D: FRONT-LINE SERVICE CUTS							
D1							
D2							
D3							
Subtotal group D		0	0	0			

TOTAL with category 1s	0	0	0
TOTAL with category 1s and/or 2s	70,000	70,000	70,000
TOTAL with category 3s	0	0	0
Total available	70,000	70,000	70,000
Check (should equal zero!)	0	0	0

**DETAILS OF PROJECTED SAVINGS 2009/10****SERVICE AREA - PARKING & CIVIL CONTINGENCIES**

Summary of PrSavings

Ref	DESCRIPTION OF SAVING	VALUE OF SAVING			DIFFICULTY CATEGORY		BRIEF COMMENT & EXPLANATION
		09/10 £	10/11 £	11/12 £	ACCEPTABILITY		
					Operational	Public	
					Easier (1) to harder (3)		
A: INCOME GROWTH							
A1	Reinstate parking charges for 'blue badge' holders	100,000	100,000	100,000	1	3	Already considered and not supported by Executive Cllrs.
A2	Introduce car park charges in Wiveliscombe: 20p for 2 hours, 50p all day	10,000	10,000	10,000	1	3	Will be unpopular with residents and business community but will bring the control measures we are constantly asked for
A3	Introduce parking charges on Sundays, evenings and weekends	?			2	3	Would require increased enforcement capacity/investment and revised on-street parking regime. Will produce opposition.
A4	Removal of free Visitor Permit - <b>included in corporate gap reductions</b>	0	0	0	1	2	Agreed by O&S and Executive. Subject to TRO.
A5	Additional income generated through Option A off-street increase (over and above sum already assumed) <b>Included in 'corporate' gap reduction measures.</b>				1	2	Subject to TRO and PFH decision.
Subtotal group A		110,000	110,000	110,000			
B: PRICE INCREASES							
B1	Increase long-stay on-street £3.00 to £3.50 - <b>included in corporate gap reductions</b>	0	0	0	1	2	Not dealt with as part of off-street discussion, but needed to maintain tariff relationship. Proposed by Leader & PFH. Subject to TRO.
B2	Increase short-term on-street charge from 40p to 50p for 30 minutes - <b>included in corporate gap reductions</b>	0	0	0	1	2	Already proposed by Leader and PFH. Subject to TRO.
B3	Increase off-street season ticket charges - <b>included in corporate gap reductions</b>	0	0	0	1	2	Being done as part of the daily off-street charges TRO but not included in additional income declared.
B4	Increased price for 2nd Visitor Permit - <b>included in corporate gap reductions</b>	0	0	0	1	2	Agreed by O&S and Executive. Subject to TRO.
B5	Increased OMC private parking fee	2,000	2,000	2,000	1	2	Follows naturally from increase in off-street season tickets.
B6							
Subtotal group B		2,000	2,000	2,000			
C: EFFICIENCY SAVINGS							
C1	Reduced costs of P&D ticket printing	5,000	5,000	5,000	1	1	Advertising income raised by ticket supplier reduces purchase costs
C2	Reduced costs of Traffic Penalty Tribunal	5,000	5,000	5,000	1	1	2008/09 budget figure too high
Subtotal group C		10,000	10,000	10,000			
D: FRONT-LINE SERVICE CUTS							
D1							
Subtotal group D		0	0	0			

TOTAL with category 1s	10,000	10,000	10,000
TOTAL with category 1s and/or 2s	2,000	2,000	2,000
TOTAL with category 3s	110,000	110,000	110,000
Total available	122,000	122,000	122,000
Check (should equal zero!)	0	0	0

**DETAILS OF PROJECTED SAVINGS 2009/10**

**SERVICE AREA - PRIVATE SECTOR & ENABLING**

Summary of PrSavings

Ref	DESCRIPTION OF SAVING	VALUE OF SAVING			DIFFICULTY CATEGORY		BRIEF COMMENT & EXPLANATION
		09/10	10/11	11/12	ACCEPTABILITY		
		£	£	£	Operational	Public	
		Easier (1) to harder (3)					
A: INCOME GROWTH							
A1							
A2							
A3							
Subtotal group A		0	0	0			
B: PRICE INCREASES							
B1							
B2							
B3							
Subtotal group B		0	0	0			
C: EFFICIENCY SAVINGS							
C1							
C2							
C3							
Subtotal group C		0	0	0			
D: FRONT-LINE SERVICE CUTS							
D1	Reduction in Housing Standards Enforcement Expenses	15,020	15,020	15,020	1	1	This reduction will leave £10,480 in the Enforcement Budget which should be sufficient to cope with anticipated enforcement activity
D2	Reduction in the Temporary Staffing Budget	2,000	2,000	2,000	1	1	This will leave £10,000 in the Temporary Staffing budget which should be sufficient to provide frontline interviewing and visiting services if members of staff are on long term sickness and cover is required.
D3							
Subtotal group D		17,020	17,020	17,020			

TOTAL with category 1s	17,020	17,020	17,020
TOTAL with category 1s and/or 2s	0	0	0
TOTAL with category 3s	0	0	0
Total available	17,020	17,020	17,020
Check (should equal zero!)	0	0	0



**DETAILS OF PROJECTED SAVINGS 2009/10****SERVICE AREA - POLICY & PERFORMANCE**

Summary of PrSavings

Ref	DESCRIPTION OF SAVING	VALUE OF SAVING			DIFFICULTY CATEGORY		BRIEF COMMENT & EXPLANATION
		09/10 £	10/11 £	11/12 £	ACCEPTABILITY Operational    Public		
					Easier (1) to harder (3)		
A: INCOME GROWTH							
A1							
A2							
A3							
Subtotal group A		0	0	0			
B: PRICE INCREASES							
B1							
B2							
B3							
Subtotal group B		0	0	0			
C: EFFICIENCY SAVINGS							
C1							
C2							
C3							
Subtotal group C		0	0	0			
D: FRONT-LINE SERVICE CUTS							
D1	Equalities standard	3,500	3,500	3,500	1	1	Under the Equalities Framework for Local Government we no longer need to pay for an external inspection. All future inspections will be by peer review. Acceptability to be confirmed by RJ
D2	Relocatable CCTV	4,000	4,000	4,000	3	3	There have been ongoing technical problems with the relocatable CCTV and it has never been used as it should due to design failures. The remaining £2000 will allow a limited use.
D3	Performance initiatives budget	2,000	2,000	2,000	1	2	Unfortunately, there is no other option but to reduce the allocation in the initiatives budgets for the old areas in Policy and Performance. Alternatives are being investigated but these will not be ready in time to the deadline. As soon as alternatives have been investigated Finance will be updated on the position.
D4	Communications initiatives budget	3,500	3,500	3,500	1	2	Reduction in monies available for projects
D5	Strategy & Partnerships initiatives budget	3,500	3,500	3,500	1	2	Reduction in monies available for projects
D6							
D7							
Subtotal group D		16,500	16,500	16,500			

TOTAL with category 1s	3,500	3,500	3,500
TOTAL with category 1s and/or 2s	9,000	9,000	9,000
TOTAL with category 3s	4,000	4,000	4,000
Total available	16,500	16,500	16,500
Check (should equal zero!)	0	0	0

## DETAILS OF PROJECTED SAVINGS 2009/10

## SERVICE AREA - LEGAL & DEMOCRATIC SERVICES

## Appendix M

Summary of PrSavings

Ref	DESCRIPTION OF SAVING	VALUE OF SAVING			DIFFICULTY CATEGORY		BRIEF COMMENT & EXPLANATION
		09/10 £	10/11 £	11/12 £	ACCEPTABILITY		
					Operational	Public	
					Easier (1) to harder (3)		
A: INCOME GROWTH							
A1	Claim costs from County on Traffic Orders	1,000	1,000	1,000	1	2	Currently we do not claim anything from the County Council on this and it is felt that we should cover our costs.
A2							
Subtotal group A		1,000	1,000	1,000			
B: PRICE INCREASES							
B1	Increase in fees for s106 agreements and leases,licenses etc	15,000	15,000	15,000	1	1	Currently we do not charge a sufficient amount for these agreements which results in the council tax payer picking up the bill which should not be the case see below for calculation
B2	Increase income on footpath diversion orders	2,000	2,000	2,000	1	1	Required to cover the increase in admin costs
B3							
Subtotal group B		17,000	17,000	17,000			
C: EFFICIENCY SAVINGS							
C1	Postages from Elections	10,000	10,000	10,000	1	1	Extra money put into the budget in 2008/09 to fund the cost of the changes to ROP & Electoral Admin Act but not as costly as we were expecting
C2							
C3							
Subtotal group C		10,000	10,000	10,000			
D: FRONT-LINE SERVICE CUTS							
D1	Deletion of Wendy Sharland's post	13,500	13,500	13,500	1	1	This has been as a result of a re-structure.
D2							
Subtotal group D		13,500	13,500	13,500			

TOTAL with category 1s	40,500	40,500	40,500
TOTAL with category 1s and/or 2s	1,000	1,000	1,000
TOTAL with category 3s	0	0	0
Total available	41,500	41,500	41,500
Check (should equal zero!)	0	0	0

### CALCULATION FOR S106 AGREEMENT FEES

IN THE LAST YEAR WE HAVE COMPLETED APPROX 20 AGREEMENT WHICH HAVE BEEN CHARGED OUT AT £350 PER AGREEMENT GENERATING AN INCOME OF £7000. THE PROPOSAL IS TO CHARGE OUT AN HOURLY RATE OF £165 PER HOUR WITH A MINIMUM CHARGE OF £350. THIS FIGURE IS BASED ON THE CIVIL COURT GREEN BOOK FOR NON-CONTENTIOUS COSTS THEREFORE HAS SOME BASIS.

CALCULATION IF WE HAD CHARGED OUT AT £165 PER HOUR WOULD BE AS FOLLOWS:-

12 AGREEMENTS WHICH TOOK 4 HOURS TO COMPLETE TALLING £660 PER AGREEMENT THIS WOULD GENERATE £7,920 INCOME  
8 AGREEMENTS WHICH TOOK APPROX 6 HOURS TO COMPLETE £990 PER AGREEMENT GENERATING AN INCOME OF £7,920 (COINCIDENCE)

TOTAL INCOME FROM THESE AGREEMENTS ALONE WOULD HAVE BEEN £15840

IN ADDITION THERE HAVE BEEN SOME AGREEMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN MORE COMPLEX AND HAVE TAKEN BETWEEN 20 HOURS TO 100 HOURS

OTHER INCOME IS BEING LOOKED WITH A VIEW TO INCREASING THE INCOME FOR THE SECTION BUT IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT OBVIOUSLY IN THIS CURRENT CLIMATE THE LIKLIHOOD IS THAT THE NUMBER OF S106 AGREEMENTS WILL DECREASE IN THE NEXT YEAR AND THEREFORE A CONSERVATIVE ESTIMATE SHOULD BE MADE.

# DETAILS OF PROJECTED SAVINGS 2009/10

# SERVICE AREA - OTHER SAVINGS

Appendix N

Summary of PrSavings

Ref	DESCRIPTION OF SAVING	VALUE OF SAVING			DIFFICULTY CATEGORY		BRIEF COMMENT & EXPLANATION
		09/10 £	10/11 £	11/12 £	ACCEPTABILITY		
					Operational	Public	
					Easier (1) to harder (3)		
A: INCOME GROWTH							
A1							
A2							
A3							
Subtotal group A		0	0	0			
B: PRICE INCREASES							
B1							
B2							
B3							
Subtotal group B		0	0	0			
C: EFFICIENCY SAVINGS							
C1	Reduction in Council Tax Payments Card Budget	5,000	5,000	5,000	1	1	This budget is forecast to be underspent in 08/09 and is an ongoing saving.
C2	Reduction in Flooding Hotspts Budget	8,000	8,000	8,000	1	1	If this budget is reduced then if there are any flooding issues which arise in the future which exceed the budget left then they would have to be funded from General Reserves
C3							
Subtotal group C		13,000	13,000	13,000			
D: FRONT-LINE SERVICE CUTS							
D1							
D2							
D3							
Subtotal group D		0	0	0			

TOTAL with category 1s	13,000	13,000	13,000
TOTAL with category 1s and/or 2s	0	0	0
TOTAL with category 3s	0	0	0
Total available	13,000	13,000	13,000
Check (should equal zero!)	0	0	0

# DETAILS OF PROJECTED SAVINGS 2009/10

# SERVICE AREA - HRA

Appendix O

Ref	DESCRIPTION OF SAVING	VALUE OF SAVING			DIFFICULTY CATEGORY		BRIEF COMMENT & EXPLANATION
		09/10 £	10/11 £	11/12 £	ACCEPTABILITY		
					Operational	Public	
					Easier (1) to harder (3)		
A: INCOME GROWTH							
A1							
A2							
Subtotal group A		0	0	0			
B: PRICE INCREASES							
B1							
B2							
Subtotal group B		0	0	0			
C: EFFICIENCY SAVINGS							
C1	Reduction in training budget	2,000	2,000	2,000	1	1	
C2	Reduction in housing estates budget	2,910	2,910	2,910	2	1	Projected underspend, non-routine works on estates
C3	Reduction in sheltered housing budget.	4,000	4,000	4,000	1	1	Projected underspend, miscellaneous sheltered housing
C4	Reduction in vandalism budget	30,000	30,000	30,000	1	1	Vandalism - less lead stolen from roofs than expected
C5	Reduction in repair and maintenance of shops and comercial premises budget	10,000	10,000	10,000	1	1	Projected underspend, repairs on shops and commercial premises
C6	Reduction in repairs & maintenance contingency	15,000	15,000	15,000	1	1	Reduce Contingency Sum, working balance may need to be used in future for any issues.
C7							
Subtotal group C		63,910	63,910	63,910			
D: FRONT-LINE SERVICE CUTS							
D1							
D2							
Subtotal group D		0	0	0			

TOTAL with category 1s	61,000	61,000	61,000
TOTAL with category 1s and/or 2s	2,910	2,910	2,910
TOTAL with category 3s	0	0	0
Total available	63,910	63,910	63,910
Check (should equal zero!)	0	0	0

# Taunton Deane Borough Council

Executive - 4 December 2008

## Report of the Financial Services Manager

### Council Tax Base 2009/2010

This matter is the responsibility of Executive Councillor Henley, Leader of the Council

#### **Executive Summary**

To approve the Local Council Tax Base for 2009/10, which is calculated at 40,399.85, an increase of 246.78 (0.61%) on the 2008/09 Tax Base.

#### **1 Purpose**

- 1.1 To request approval by the Executive of the Council Tax Base for the Borough and for each parish for 2009/10.

#### **2 Introduction**

- 2.1 The Council Tax Base, which is calculated annually, has to be set between 1 December and 31 January each year.
- 2.2 The Council tax base is the "Band D" equivalent of the properties included in the Valuation Officer's banding list as at 15 October 2008, as adjusted for voids, appeals, new properties etc., and the provision for non-collection.
- 2.3 The Band D equivalent is arrived at by taking the laid down proportion of each Band as compared to Band D, and aggregating the total. This is shown in Appendix A.
- 2.4 The approved base has to be notified to the County Council, the Police Authority, the Fire Authority, and to each of the parishes.

#### **3 Other adjustments and rate of collection**

- 3.1 Adjustments have also been included for new dwellings and for initial void exemptions for empty properties.
- 3.2 The Council Tax Base also has to reflect the provision for losses on collection. The rate for 2009/10 is 0.8%, as in the previous year, giving an anticipated collection rate of 99.2%.
- 3.3 Appendix A sets out in summary form the totals for each band. The adjustments for appeals and property movements is then shown and the total for each Band expressed as "Band D equivalents".
- 3.4 Appendix B sets out the same information but analysed over each parish and the unparished area and the further reduction for the non-collection provision is shown.

3.5 Appendix C sets out the Band D equivalent for each parish with the parish reduction for non-collection provision and the resultant Local Tax Base.

3.6 The Council Tax Base for 2008/09 is 40,153.07 and the recommended base for 2009/10 of 40,399.85 represents an increase of 246.78 or 0.61%.

#### 4 Recommendations

4.1 The Executive is recommended to approve the following:-

- a) That the report of the Financial Services Manager for the calculation of the Council Tax base for the whole and parts of the area for 2009/10 be approved.
- b) That, pursuant to the Financial Services Manager's report, and in accordance with the Local Authority (Calculation of Tax Base) Regulations 1992, the amount calculated by Taunton Deane Borough Council as its Tax Base for the whole area for the year 2009/10 shall be 40,399.85 and for the parts of the area listed below shall, for 2009/10 be: -

Ash Priors	76.70
Ashbrittle	91.34
Bathealton	81.32
Bishops Hull	1,072.93
Bishops Lydeard/Cothelstone	1,942.94
Bradford on Tone	288.20
Burrowbridge	202.22
Cheddon Fitzpaine	639.44
Chipstable	126.92
Churchstanton	323.50
Combe Florey	122.10
Comeytrowe	2,087.85
Corfe	133.16
Creech St Michael	947.91
Durstun	58.80
Fitzhead	125.72
Halse	144.89
Hatch Beauchamp	262.64
Kingston St Mary	448.44
Langford Budville	235.70
Lydeard St Lawrence/Tolland	201.80
Milverton	597.33
Neroche	252.56
North Curry	730.57
Norton Fitzwarren	807.63
Nynehead	156.97
Oake	334.07
Otterford	166.56

Pitminster	457.35
Ruishton/Thornfalcon	618.09
Sampford Arundel	130.44
Staplegrove	725.08
Stawley	130.96
Stoke St Gregory	382.12
Stoke St Mary	204.74
Taunton	16,154.15
Trull	1,006.54
Wellington	4,658.68
Wellington (Without)	299.17
West Bagborough	162.97
West Buckland	441.31
West Hatch	141.84
West Monkton	1,113.54
Wiveliscombe	1,112.63
<b>Total</b>	<hr/> 40,399.85 <hr/>

**Contact Officer:** Paul Carter  
Financial Services Manager  
Tel: 01823 328864  
Email: [p.carter@tauntondeane.gov.uk](mailto:p.carter@tauntondeane.gov.uk)

## Council Tax 'T' Figure Calculation for 2009/10 Charge

## Appendix A

## TOTALS - ALL PARISHES

Description of information	Band A (disabled)	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Totals
Total no of banded dwellings	0	6,924	15,006	9,222	6,873	5,306	3,183	1,435	91	48,040
Additions	0	142	273	145	98	53	28	11	0	750
Exempt dwellings	0	368	458	250	175	106	56	21	8	1,441
Demolished dwellings	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disabled relief aggregate	10	51	1	-10	-9	-17	-5	3	-24	0
<b>Total no of banded dwellings</b>	<b>10.00</b>	<b>6,749.00</b>	<b>14,822.25</b>	<b>9,107.00</b>	<b>6,787.40</b>	<b>5,236.03</b>	<b>3,150.00</b>	<b>1,428.00</b>	<b>59.00</b>	<b>47,349</b>
25% discounts	3	4,054	5,756	2,935	1,844	1,090	524	180	6	16,392
50% discounts	0	67	65	61	44	51	38	42	7	375
10% discounts	0	95	97	54	58	24	11	6	0	345
<b>Discounts deduction</b>	<b>0.75</b>	<b>1,056.50</b>	<b>1,481.20</b>	<b>769.65</b>	<b>488.80</b>	<b>300.40</b>	<b>151.10</b>	<b>66.60</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>4,320</b>
MOD properties (exemption clas	0	0	52	12	11	16	7	2	2	102
Net dwellings	9.25	5,692.50	13,392.99	8,349.39	6,309.60	4,951.66	3,005.89	1,363.38	55.65	43,130
Band D equivalents	5.14	3,795.00	10,415.44	7,421.69	6,309.19	6,051.69	4,343.19	2,272.31	112.00	<b>40,725.66</b>



## TAX BASE - BAND D EQUIVALENTS

Band	A (disabled)	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Totals
Taunton Deane Borough	5.14	3,795.00	10,415.44	7,421.69	6,309.19	6,051.69	4,343.19	2,272.31	112.00	40,725.66
Ash Priors	0.00	3.77	2.33	2.22	6.75	17.11	28.89	16.25	0.00	77.32
Ashbrittle	0.00	4.00	7.39	13.33	15.00	16.50	24.77	9.58	1.50	92.08
Bathealton	0.00	4.00	1.56	8.89	5.50	25.67	28.53	5.83	2.00	81.97
Bishops Hull	0.56	72.37	276.62	205.82	229.30	167.14	67.53	58.75	3.50	1,081.58
Bishops Lydeard/Cothelstone	0.00	79.67	315.31	501.56	336.50	331.52	245.05	145.00	4.00	1,958.61
Bradford on Tone	0.00	10.53	6.81	28.67	52.50	64.78	73.16	52.08	2.00	290.53
Burrowbridge	0.00	6.67	17.89	21.33	46.80	51.03	47.31	10.83	2.00	203.86
Cheddon Fitzpaine	0.00	14.50	92.75	186.44	103.90	129.86	88.47	26.67	2.00	644.59
Chipstable	0.00	5.33	11.39	15.11	18.00	36.54	32.14	7.92	1.50	127.94
Churchstanton	0.00	14.00	31.35	36.00	71.40	80.54	60.16	30.67	2.00	326.11
Combe Florey	0.00	0.83	5.44	11.78	14.25	28.11	39.00	21.67	2.00	123.08
Comeytrowe	0.00	44.60	364.12	676.71	395.95	421.36	149.86	52.08	0.00	2,104.68
Corfe	0.00	2.50	5.56	15.11	12.90	14.36	36.47	45.83	1.50	134.24
Creech St Michael	0.42	9.77	87.42	252.13	224.80	253.18	92.08	33.75	2.00	955.56
Durston	0.00	0.50	5.64	15.11	4.00	12.83	11.19	10.00	0.00	59.28
Fitzhead	0.00	0.50	7.97	17.56	25.65	31.47	22.75	20.83	0.00	126.73
Halse	0.00	1.33	3.50	9.33	21.25	46.75	31.06	30.83	2.00	146.06
Hatch Beauchamp	0.00	4.67	30.53	40.13	36.25	63.13	60.31	27.75	2.00	264.76
Kingston St Mary	0.00	16.37	49.51	36.27	35.50	75.47	87.03	142.92	9.00	452.06
Langford Budville	0.00	2.33	21.20	32.23	45.75	34.40	63.19	32.50	6.00	237.60
Lydeard St Lawrence/Tolland	0.00	4.17	25.28	16.22	22.90	48.28	62.83	23.75	0.00	203.43
Milverton	0.00	27.93	92.36	79.11	84.50	101.75	150.08	64.42	2.00	602.15
Neroche	0.00	3.93	16.72	35.69	32.75	41.86	84.14	32.50	7.00	254.59
North Curry	0.00	52.27	62.61	58.05	115.65	209.61	140.11	94.17	4.00	736.47
Norton Fitzwarren	0.00	172.60	165.97	193.81	139.65	77.08	34.66	25.38	5.00	814.15
Nynehead	0.00	7.17	9.33	22.00	24.15	38.19	31.06	23.33	3.00	158.23
Oake	0.00	28.43	19.83	35.78	64.25	66.31	89.92	26.25	6.00	336.77
Otterford	0.00	10.77	5.83	11.24	24.00	58.06	47.67	8.33	2.00	167.90
Pitminster	0.00	8.33	18.20	30.67	43.95	104.81	121.33	128.75	5.00	461.04
Ruishton/Thornfalcon	0.56	72.67	50.17	112.36	154.30	154.61	53.08	23.33	2.00	623.07
Sampford Arundel	0.00	3.83	7.58	15.69	24.15	42.96	18.78	16.50	2.00	131.49
Staplegrave	0.00	41.17	150.23	116.80	99.40	167.50	101.33	52.50	2.00	730.93
Stawley	0.00	2.17	8.09	13.47	11.00	30.74	37.56	22.50	6.50	132.02
Stoke St Gregory	0.00	11.50	73.69	38.44	78.65	87.69	58.14	37.08	0.00	385.21
Stoke St Mary	0.00	18.83	18.39	14.44	16.00	25.67	66.81	46.25	0.00	206.39
Taunton	3.06	2,246.93	6,171.02	3,008.09	2,305.04	1,294.92	927.36	324.00	4.00	16,284.43
Trull	0.00	16.77	50.17	101.78	150.75	239.62	240.50	209.58	5.50	1,014.66
Wellington	0.56	567.03	1,660.29	907.69	728.50	594.06	190.62	47.50	0.00	4,696.25
Wellington (Without)	0.00	7.83	7.58	26.13	40.50	88.61	105.08	25.83	0.00	301.58
West Bagborough	0.00	1.83	30.53	17.56	21.40	27.19	31.78	30.00	4.00	164.29
West Buckland	0.00	10.17	96.95	65.24	51.15	97.17	74.03	49.17	1.00	444.87
West Hatch	0.00	6.67	3.89	9.33	24.00	33.18	45.50	20.42	0.00	142.99
West Monkton	0.00	90.33	99.21	123.60	162.55	337.27	218.47	87.08	4.00	1,122.52
Wiveliscombe	0.00	83.44	227.23	242.76	188.05	182.78	123.43	71.92	2.00	1,121.60
	5.14	3,795.00	10,415.44	7,421.69	6,309.19	6,051.69	4,343.19	2,272.31	112.00	40,725.66
Non Collection Provision (0.8%)	0.04	30.36	83.32	59.37	50.47	48.41	34.75	18.18	0.90	325.81
COUNCIL TAX BASE	5.10	3,764.64	10,332.12	7,362.32	6,258.72	6,003.28	4,308.44	2,254.13	111.10	40,399.85

## APPENDIX C

**TAX BASE**  
**LOCAL TAX BASE (WHOLE/PART AREAS)**

	<b>Band D Equivalents</b>	<b>Provision for Non Collection ( at 0.8%)</b>	<b>Local Tax Base</b>
Taunton Deane Borough Council - whole area	40,725.66	325.81	40,399.85
Ash Priors	77.32	0.62	76.70
Ashbrittle	92.08	0.74	91.34
Bathealton	81.97	0.66	81.32
Bishops Hull	1,081.58	8.65	1,072.93
Bishops Lydeard/Cothelstone	1,958.61	15.67	1,942.94
Bradford on Tone	290.53	2.32	288.20
Burrowbridge	203.86	1.63	202.22
Cheddon Fitzpaine	644.59	5.16	639.44
Chipstable	127.94	1.02	126.92
Churchstanton	326.11	2.61	323.50
Combe Florey	123.08	0.98	122.10
Comeytrowe	2,104.68	16.84	2,087.85
Corfe	134.24	1.07	133.16
Creech St Michael	955.56	7.64	947.91
Durston	59.28	0.47	58.80
Fitzhead	126.73	1.01	125.72
Halse	146.06	1.17	144.89
Hatch Beauchamp	264.76	2.12	262.64
Kingston St Mary	452.06	3.62	448.44
Langford Budville	237.60	1.90	235.70
Lydeard St Lawrence/Tolland	203.43	1.63	201.80
Milverton	602.15	4.82	597.33
Neroche	254.59	2.04	252.56
North Curry	736.47	5.89	730.57
Norton Fitzwarren	814.15	6.51	807.63
Nynehead	158.23	1.27	156.97
Oake	336.77	2.69	334.07
Otterford	167.90	1.34	166.56
Pitminster	461.04	3.69	457.35
Ruishton/Thornfalcon	623.07	4.98	618.09
Sampford Arundel	131.49	1.05	130.44
Staplegrove	730.93	5.85	725.08
Stawley	132.02	1.06	130.96
Stoke St Gregory	385.21	3.08	382.12
Stoke St Mary	206.39	1.65	204.74
Taunton	16,284.43	130.28	16,154.15
Trull	1,014.66	8.12	1,006.54
Wellington	4,696.25	37.57	4,658.68
Wellington (Without)	301.58	2.41	299.17
West Bagborough	164.29	1.31	162.97
West Buckland	444.87	3.56	441.31
West Hatch	142.99	1.14	141.84
West Monkton	1,122.52	8.98	1,113.54
Wiveliscombe	1,121.60	8.97	1,112.63
	<b>40,725.66</b>	<b>325.81</b>	<b>40,399.85</b>



## **Executive : 4 December 2008**

### **Task and Finish Review into the Planning Department's Role in Delivering Large Housing Schemes**

#### **Report of the Democratic Services Manager**

(This matter is the responsibility of Councillor Simon Coles)

##### **Executive Summary**

This Task and Finish review has now been concluded. The final report has been submitted to the Overview and Scrutiny Board and was approved subject to some amendments (detailed below) being recommended.

This cover sheet provides directions on how the Executive should deal with the Task and Finish report into large housing schemes, particularly its 7 recommendations.

The final report of the Task and Finish review follows this cover report.

#### **1. Recommended Changes to the Task and Finish Report suggested by the Overview and Scrutiny Board**

1.1 The final report of the Task and Finish Group was considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Board at its meeting on 13 October 2008. During the discussion of this item, a number of suggested changes to the report were made. These were:-

- In Recommendation 2, the word appropriate be removed from the final sentence;
- In the same sentence of Recommendation 2, "at an early stage" be replaced with the words "at the pre-application stage";
- In Recommendation 3, the words "or another consultant" be added after the word "Sector"; and
- A further recommendation be added to recognise the fact that the Planning Department needed to be adequately resourced to deliver large planning schemes more quickly.

#### **2. The Executive is asked to do the following:-**

- 2.1 Consider the above recommended changes of the Overview and Scrutiny Board and agree whether or not these should be included in the report.
- 2.2 Then consider the report and its recommendations, and decide which, if any, of the recommendations it wishes to adopt.
- 2.3 If the Executive agrees to adopt any of the recommendations of the review, it should state who will be responsible for delivering each of the adopted recommendations. The Corporate Management Team (CMT) has had prior sight of the report and has identified a CMT member to take responsibility for each recommendation, if adopted.
- 2.4 If the Executive decides **not** to adopt any of the recommendations, it must specifically state why, as prescribed by the Local Government Act 2007.

### **3. Contact Details**

Richard Bryant  
Democratic Services Manager  
Taunton Deane Borough Council  
T: 01823 356414 (internal ext. 2307)  
e: [r.bryant@tauntondeane.gov.uk](mailto:r.bryant@tauntondeane.gov.uk)



**Overview and Scrutiny**

## **Task and Finish Review**

**A Review into The Planning Department's Role in  
Delivering Large Housing Schemes**

**October 2008**



**“A house is a home when it shelters the body and comforts  
the soul”**

**- Phillip Moffitt**

Founder of the Life Balance Institute

# **Taunton Deane Borough Council: Overview & Scrutiny**

## **A Task and Finish Review into the Planning Department's Role in Delivering Large Housing Schemes**

---

Introduction by Councillor Cliff Bishop  
Chair of the Planning Delivery Task and Finish Review



“Since we started this review we have seen a significant downturn in the housing market, with sites being moth-balled or delayed, and it is evident that developers are, or will be seeking ways of improving the viability of schemes.

PPS3 advises that testing viability should enable councils to “reflect an assessment of the likely economic viability of land for housing in the area, taking account of risks to delivery and drawing on informed assessments of the likely levels of finance available for affordable housing, including public subsidy and the level of developer contribution that can reasonably be secured”. At a recent Local Development Framework inquiry the inspector varied the details in a draft Development Plan Document to give more weight to viability in line with the requirements of PPS3 and he also stated that “viability should be of paramount importance”.

It is therefore essential that the Council should prepare a Large Application Charter which could also include particularly complex applications. The project management structure must be able to cope with any dispute and be adequately resourced and led.

I also feel strongly that a protocol should be agreed regarding the involvement of Members in pre-application discussions on major applications – the Arup Report, prepared for DCLG on “Councillors Involvement in Planning Decisions” and recent documents issued by ATLAS suggest that Members have a vital role to play.

”

**Councillor Cliff Bishop**

Chair

Planning Delivery Task and Finish Review

## Acknowledgements

Jim Claydon - Past-President of the Royal Town Planning Institute

Jeff Copp – Somerset County Council Highways

Paul Brockway - ATLAS

Phil Lowndes - Somerset County Council Highways

Ian White - ATLAS

Michael Sudlow - Cushman and Wakefield property consultants

Ken MacNeill - Sector

Michael Griffin - South West Home Builders Federation

## Definitions and Abbreviations

**ATLAS** – “Advisory Team for Large Applications.” ATLAS is funded by Central Government and offers direct support to individual local authorities to deliver key Government objectives such as large scale housing developments

**RTPI** - Royal Town Planning Institute

**Section 106** – A section of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 that allows for Local Planning authorities and persons interested in land to agree contributions, arrangements and restrictions as Planning Agreements or Planning Obligations

**Sector** - Sector is the leading provider of treasury management, risk and capital financial advisory services to UK public service organisations.



# Contents

Acknowledgements .....	4
Definitions and Abbreviations .....	4
Contents .....	5
Background to the Review .....	6
Membership of the Review .....	7
Terms of Reference.....	7
Evidence Taken, Key Findings and Recommendations .....	8
Conclusion .....	13
Contact Details .....	13
Appendix A – Full List of Recommendations .....	14

## **Background to the Review**

This review was set up in response to calls from several Councillors to investigate the role of the Council's Planning Department in realising large housing developments, and what if anything could be done to improve or speed up the process.

### Councillors identified three perceived or real problems

- More affordable housing is needed but is not being delivered
- Large housing schemes are perceived to be taking too long to complete
- There is a general belief that the planning / Planning Obligations process is part of the problem

This review was set up to verify these assumptions, and if they are true, to recommend ways to deal with them

### Three aims were identified as a starting point for this review

- To understand what the difficulties actually are, as recognised by those involved in the process: the planning department, developers, architects etc
- To recommend ways to deliver planning decisions more quickly on major housing and affordable housing sites. "Major" is used in this sense as a general term distinct from "major planning applications" defined by planning targets.
- To find ways to speed up Planning Obligations negotiations so schemes are not unnecessarily delayed.

## **Why do a review on this subject?**

There are several obstacles that prevent the Council from achieving Planning Obligations agreements within what might commonly be termed a "reasonable" timescale. But how could the Council overcome those obstacles?

Councillors named three principle objectives that are foremost in their minds:

1. To deliver more affordable housing
2. To complete housing schemes within a reasonable timescale, regardless of tenure
3. To establish a climate between developers and the Council that encourages quicker delivery of housing schemes.

Clearly there is much debate to be had on what "reasonable" means.

There was also a desire by Councillors to focus on what had caused some of the more high-profile large housing schemes to be held up, or perceived to be held up, because for one reason or another, agreement on the Planning Obligations is not easily reached.

Affordable housing delivery is also one of the Council's corporate priorities. Councillors also reported a feeling amongst communities that something is not being done that

should be, which is wrapped up in a general desire to “get it sorted” and “get the houses built.”

## Membership of the Review

Councillor Bishop – elected to Chair the review  
Councillor Brockwell  
Councillor Mrs Court-Stenning  
Councillor Farbahi  
Councillor Mrs Hill  
Councillor House  
Councillor Smith

## Terms of Reference

It was agreed that the Task and Finish Group’s Terms of Reference should be to:

- Define “large” housing schemes;
- Consider the difficulties being experienced under current practice;
- Identify practicable ways of improving the current system of operating;
- Make recommendations to the Executive for consideration.

The review chose to focus on the following difficulties:

- 1) We can’t choose the developers on sites we don’t control
- 2) We can’t force a developer to build, even after planning consent.
- 3) The credit crunch has reduced developer’s ability and / or desire to build large numbers of homes.

But we **can** influence developers through;

- Planning obligations
- Stricter rules for developers. But is flexibility more productive?
- Our culture as an authority.

Members discussed the type of information that they would require at future meetings and this included:

- Inviting a representative from ATLAS (the Advisory Team for Large Applications)) to attend a future meeting
- Inviting “Sector” to attend a future meeting
- Inviting a developer to talk about their experiences of working with a local authority in connection with large residential housing schemes.

# Evidence Taken, Key Findings and Recommendations

## What is “Large”?

Ralph Willoughby-Foster, the Forward Plan and Regeneration Manager informed the review group that in a strategic sense, for a village 100 homes is large. The regional spatial strategy talks of c.18000 new dwellings in Taunton alone, including 4000 in Monkton Heathfield.

Nevertheless, there is no need to pin down the term too much. More than 500 homes in a Taunton context is clearly large physically and socially, regardless of the terms used in a strategic planning context.

There is the issue of complexity on a site. “Large” doesn’t mean that Planning Obligations will automatically be difficult to negotiate and achieve. There are other roles of planning in this – employment, mixed-use developments, and community sustainability. The thrust of government policy is to stop bolting-on estates to the side of communities, but instead to build sustainable communities. This means building-in employment, community uses, recreation, health and education. This is done using a range of critical thresholds, e.g. 700 or more houses might require a new primary school. Thresholds include provision of highways. This creates complexity.

Ralph Willoughby-Foster and Tim Burton (Development Manager) agreed that it can take 7 to 8 years to get from a plan proposal to physical appearance of buildings. This is clearly not a speedy process. Outline and full planning consents last for several years so developers may not necessarily begin construction as soon as they are granted permission.

Councillor Bishop stated that the majority of policy issues will have been looked at before plans are submitted. He suggested that the objective of this review should be to pursue better implementation.

## ATLAS

Paul Brockway and Ian White gave Members a presentation on the role of the Advisory Team for Large Applications (ATLAS).

ATLAS is an independent advisory service. An experienced and dedicated team, ATLAS works with local authorities and the private sector to deliver quality, large-scale development. In particular, the team offers advice to local authorities that are experiencing the pressures of increased development activity in their area.

It currently operates across the South East, South West, East of England, East Midlands, West Midlands and London Government Office regions. The team is sponsored by the Department of Communities & Local Government. ATLAS acts in response to one of the Planning Advisory Service key objectives, namely to offer direct

support to individual Local Authorities to deliver key Government objectives such as large scale housing developments or regeneration projects.

The ATLAS team are experienced town planners who have been advising and assisting Local Planning Authorities across a wide variety of projects all of which contain a significant number of residential units. The team has rapidly expanded to offer guidance and assistance across a wide range of planning and technical development issues. ATLAS only engages where requested by the local authority on a case by case basis, at any stage of the development process. Generally the team becomes involved in large-scale or complex residential development projects which have some form of emerging or established planning status. Given the importance and extent of work required pre-application, the team is often involved well in advance of any formal planning application.

The advice they provide is based upon background knowledge, experience from project work and other good practice together with the specific circumstances of each individual case. Whilst the team work primarily on behalf of the Local Planning Authority, their advice reflects what the team feels is reasonable and good practice, and as such may be supportive of the position of any stakeholder involved in the process. It is important to stress that ATLAS provides independent (and where necessary confidential) advice.

The ATLAS team has expanded considerably over the last year, bringing in a range of new specialisms including transport and engineering, social infrastructure planning and delivery, Environmental Impact Assessments, urban design, and master-planning. In light of recommendations in the Barker Report and Planning White Paper, the ATLAS team will expand further to broaden its scope of work and geographic coverage.

ATLAS has had a central role in the development of the Planning Performance Agreement concept from the initial pilot onwards and in conjunction with the Government has produced a guidance note entitled "Implementing Planning Performance Agreements", which provides further details of how these agreements can be established and how they will work for the benefit not only of local planning authorities and the applicant, but for other interested parties.

Details of Planning Performance Agreements and the guidance ATLAS could provide were presented to the review group. ATLAS seeks successful outcomes by bringing the various parties together to agree in advance how a development proposal could be taken through the planning process.

The Large Application Charter suggested by ATLAS would:-

- State the local planning authority's commitment to a collaborative process, good project management and achieving high quality sustainable development (agreed among parties therein);
- State the pre-agreed commitment of local planning authority departments, statutory agencies and service providers to the Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) process;

- Set out the key requirements for the statutory application process and expected content of a PPA;
- Set out the approach and actions that applicants were expected to commit to;
- Set out how the local planning authority would engage with members;
- State the local planning authority's expectations for community involvement;
- Set out the local planning authority's approach to resources and, if relevant, their expectations of support to deliver the PPA process from the private sector; and
- Set out any pre-application fee charges.
- Involvement of Councillors at an early stage of development is also encouraged

Members discussed the presentation made by ATLAS to the meeting and decided to make the following recommendations to the Executive:

#### **Recommendation 1**

The Council should seek advice from, and work with, ATLAS on major housing or mixed use developments.

#### **Recommendation 2**

The Council should enact the Large Application Charter suggested by ATLAS. The Charter should also be developed in consultation with the Overview and Scrutiny Board for later inclusion in the Statement of Community Involvement. A protocol should be developed to facilitate appropriate Member involvement in major planning applications at an early stage.

#### **Sector**

Ken MacNeill from "Sector" and Michael Sudlow from Cushman and Wakefield gave the review group a presentation on the role of Planning Obligations in bringing forward major schemes.

Sector is the leading provider of treasury management, risk and capital financial advisory services to UK public service organisations. Cushman and Wakefield are a leading property consultancy.

The principle behind Planning Obligation agreements is that developers should contribute towards the cost of the additional strain on public services generated by the development. They should be relevant to planning, necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the present development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development, and reasonable in all other respects.

The overall situation is that the major growth in Taunton Deane would create cumulative demand for infrastructure investment. Costed infrastructure planning is essential, with spatial planning at the heart of the process. Pre-application discussions and a corporate approach is the best way to consider schemes, in their entirety.

Members discussed the presentation made by Sector at a later meeting and decided to make the following recommendations to the Executive:-

**Recommendation 3**

Sector should be used to support the needs of Taunton Deane Borough Council on viability issues.

**Recommendation 4**

Wherever possible, “Heads of Terms” for Planning Obligations should be agreed with the developer before a planning application is submitted.

**Recommendation 5**

The “clawback” process should be used in appropriate cases to protect Council interests where necessary. If such arrangements were made benefits should accrue on the actual rather than the forecast returns.

**Recommendation 6**

The Overview and Scrutiny Board should be consulted on the suggested Planning Obligations procedure to be incorporated in the Local Development Framework.

**Recommendation 7**

The “open book” procedure will be mandatory as part of the guidelines.

**The Home Builder’s Federation**

Michael Griffin, Chairman of the Homebuilders Federation South West Planning Forum gave the presentation to the review group on the role of the developer in delivering major schemes.

Mr Griffin explained the role of the developer from the identification of potential sites through to the after-sales service. He also gave details as to how a development was funded including how a potential site’s land value was appraised. He further detailed a typical distribution of funds and gave examples of distribution in cash terms and after both a 20% and 30% per cent drop in revenue.

It was felt that for all stakeholders to benefit from the delivery of new homes there would need to be managed systems in place. It was also agreed that partnership working between all parties involved would be the best way forward.

Large developers look for a net profit of 15-18%. The notion of “thirds” is out of date because costs have changed. Nowadays it’s 20% gross profit for developers, about 15-18% net.

Issues for the industry and for planning are the same now as they have been for many years.

Mr Griffin outlined some issues with the planning process as it currently stands:

- We accept that the system can't be changed, except Supplementary Planning Guidance.
- Regulations and Planning Obligations are pretty standardised across the country but often interpreted in different ways by different councils. This can be a real frustration for developers.
- Everybody involved in the planning process knows their part of it but not necessarily all the other parts. Nobody has read and understands the entire 'manual.' We need to start sharing experiences with each other. It's not about procedures; it's about talking to each other and working together.
- Without land value, no houses will be built. Too high a demand on developers for affordable housing could mean zero new homes of any kind. The system must be flexible – land owners simply will not sell if they don't think the price is right. This requires consistency of officers. High staff turnover is a pain for everyone.
- Clawback would have to work both ways because the developer also takes a massive risk.

### **Jim Claydon**

Jim Claydon is a consultant for Terence O'Rourke, a town planning consultancy. He is also a past-President of the Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI). He was invited to speak to the review group because of his vast experience in the planning field. Mr Claydon made several comments on the findings that the review group had so far made:

- ATLAS are an extremely useful service when it comes to out-of-the-ordinary planning applications.
- Planning Performance Agreements are good for the private sector because there is a degree of certainty. Delivery is measured against milestones so everyone knows where they are.
- The RTPI view is that there is a need for this level of housing but the private sector can't meet it. Local authorities, housing associations, government funding agencies all have a big role to play.
- In hard times, housebuilders might not build, but they do tend to – and are advised to – submit planning applications in advance of better times.
- House prices are set by the market which is mostly dominated by the second hand market. New build is unlikely to bring down costs or keep homes affordable. Plus, a reduction in house prices means less money for the landowner.
- Developers don't like paying for pre-application advice. They do like planning delivery agreements but are not so happy about paying for pre-application advice.
- There must be liaison between all the groups and organisations involved in planning issues and planning consents.
- Progress your Core Strategy as rapidly as possible. It will make it more difficult for developers to "get in quick" before it is firmed up.
- Look at the pre-application advice charging structure to ensure no time is lost on large developments.



## **Conclusion**

Since this review began, the economy has been subjected to the effects of the credit crunch. This has had a major impact on housebuilders, who have significantly reduced construction of new homes, or stopped entirely.

The impact and lasting damage to the housebuilding sector is still to be determined but levels of construction will almost certainly pick up again as the market stabilizes and recovers. Hopefully the recommendations of this report will help the Council and its partners prepare for this so that we can obtain the kinds of developments that Taunton needs.

## **Chair of the Review**

Councillor Cliff Bishop

Email: [cllr.c.bishop@tauntondeane.gov.uk](mailto:cllr.c.bishop@tauntondeane.gov.uk)

## **Scrutiny Officer**

Alastair Higton

Email: [a.higton@tauntondeane.gov.uk](mailto:a.higton@tauntondeane.gov.uk)

## **Contact Address and Telephone**

Scrutiny Task and Finish Reviews

Democratic Services Team

Taunton Deane Borough Council

Belvedere Road

Taunton

TA1 1HE

Tel:01823 356415

## **Appendix A – Full List of Recommendations**

### **Recommendation 1**

The Council should seek advice from, and work with, ATLAS on major housing or mixed use developments.

### **Recommendation 2**

The Council should enact the Large Application Charter suggested by ATLAS. The Charter should also be developed in consultation with the Overview and Scrutiny Board for later inclusion in the Statement of Community Involvement. A protocol should be developed to facilitate appropriate Member involvement in major planning applications at an early stage.

### **Recommendation 3**

Sector should be used to support the needs of Taunton Deane Borough Council on viability issues.

### **Recommendation 4**

Wherever possible, “Heads of Terms” for Planning Obligations should be agreed with the developer before a planning application is submitted.

### **Recommendation 5**

The “clawback” process should be used in appropriate cases to protect Council interests where necessary. If such arrangements were made benefits should accrue on the actual rather than the forecast returns.

### **Recommendation 6**

The Overview and Scrutiny Board should be consulted on the suggested Planning Obligations procedure to be incorporated in the Local Development Framework.

### **Recommendation 7**

The “open book” procedure will be mandatory as part of the guidelines.