

## **Taunton Deane Borough Council**

At a meeting of Taunton Deane Borough Council held in the John Meikle Room, The Deane House, Belvedere Road, Taunton on 21 February 2012 at 6.30 pm.

**Present**      The Mayor (Councillor Brooks)  
The Deputy Mayor (Councillor Hall)  
Councillors Mrs Adkins, Mrs Allgrove, Mrs Baker, Beaven, Bishop, Bowrah, Cavill, Coles, Denington, D Durdan, Ms Durdan, Edwards, Farbahi, Mrs Floyd, Gaines, A Govier, Mrs Govier, Hayward, Henley, Mrs Herbert, C Hill, Mrs Hill, Horsley, Hunt, Miss James, R Lees, Mrs Lees, Ms Lisgo, Meikle, Mrs Messenger, Morrell, Mullins, Nottrodt, Ms Palmer, Prior-Sankey, D Reed, Mrs Reed, Ross, Mrs Smith, P Smith, Mrs Stock-Williams, Swaine, Tooze, Mrs Warmington, Watson, Mrs Waymouth, Ms Webber, A Wedderkopp, D Wedderkopp, Williams and Wren

Also present : Mrs Anne Elder, Chairman of the Standards Committee.

The meeting was preceded by a prayer offered by the Mayor's Chaplain, The Reverend David Fayle.

### **1. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting of Taunton Deane Borough Council held on 13 December 2011, copies having been sent to each Member, were signed by the Mayor.

### **2. Apologies**

Councillors Gill Slattery, T Slattery and Stone.

### **3. Communications**

The Democratic Services Manager reported on two matters.

Firstly, that the Boundary Commission had issued its Draft Recommendations for Somerset Council. The relevant extract concerning Taunton Deane had been photocopied and circulated to each Member of the Council,

Secondly, that two communications from Ms Jan Cave, a former Taunton Deane Elector, had been received asking a number of questions in relation to a housing issue and the practice of a prayer being said at the beginning of Full Council meetings. Responses to these questions would be sought and these would be sent to Ms Cave.

### **4. Declaration of Interests**

Councillors Brooks and D Wedderkopp declared personal interests as Members of Somerset County Council. Councillor A Govier declared personal interests both as a Member of the Somerset County Council and a NHS

Somerset Board Member. Councillor Henley declared personal interests both as a Member of the Somerset County Council and as an employee of Job Centre Plus. Councillor Prior-Sankey declared personal interests both as a Member of the Somerset County Council and as a tenant of a Council-owned garage. Councillors Mrs Hill, Mrs Smith and Stone declared personal interests as employees of Somerset County Council. Councillor Mrs Hill also declared a personal interest as a Council Tenant. Councillor Miss James declared a personal interest as an employee of Viridor. Councillor Wren declared personal interests as an employee of Natural England and as Clerk to Milverton Parish Council. Councillors Hayward and Ross declared personal interests as the Council's representatives on the Somerset Waste Board. Councillor Ross also declared a personal interest as the alternate Director of Southwest One. Councillor Nottrodt declared a personal interest as a Director of Southwest One. Councillors D Durdan declared a personal interest as a Tone Leisure Board representative. Councillor Tooze declared a personal interest as an employee of the UK Hydrographic Office. Councillor Swaine, as a part-time swimming instructor at St James Street Pool, declared a personal interest. Councillor Mullins declared a personal interest as EDF Energy at Hinkley Point was his employer. Councillor Ms Lisgo declared a personal interest as Chief Executive of Age UK Somerset Limited. Councillors Mrs Allgrove, Coles, R Lees and Mrs Lees declared prejudicial interests as "Blue Badge" holders. They all stated that they would leave the meeting if any discussion was likely to take place in connection with the proposals to introduce parking charges for drivers who were disabled.

## **5. Public Question Time**

(1) Susan Comer-Jones of Take Art stated that in 2011/2012 the Council cut the small arts grants fund from £35,000 to £20,000. The proposed further cut for 2012/2013 would reduce this fund by a further £8,000. Over two years this represented a cut of 66%.

It was accepted that these were difficult times. However, the proposed cut for the next financial year felt like the arts were suffering disproportionately in relation to cuts across Taunton Deane as a whole despite the Secretary of State saying that the voluntary sector should not suffer in this way.

Ms Comer- Jones informed Councillors of the work across the district Take Art would be undertaking over the forthcoming months including working with the Hollies and Acorns Children's Centres in areas of deprivation in Taunton.

Take Art had had reorganised themselves in the face of the County Council cuts last year and would prioritise work in the districts that continued to provide funding at a level requisite to their historic funding patterns.

Cutting the arts budget further next year would be shortsighted and would further de-stabilise Take Art and other arts organisations in the area.

As such she asked Councillors to vote for the alternative budget which supported a reinstatement of the arts budget next year.

(2) Mr Philip Shepherd, representing Somerset Film, endorsed the points made by Ms Comer-Jones. He felt that the arts were fundamental to life – they created aspirations and taught people how to be tolerant.

He felt that although the sum of money the subject of the cuts was small, the ability to lever in further arts funding from other sources would be significantly affected. As such, he too supported the alternative budget which sought to retain the current level of funding for the arts.

In response to both these questions, Councillor Cavill confirmed that Taunton Deane did view cultural activities very highly and that communities needed a strong cultural background. Nevertheless, the Council was under severe financial pressure and reductions in spending had to be made. He promised though that he would look at ways of maximising contributions towards the arts from all possible sources.

(3) Mrs Dorothea Bradley asked the following questions:-

- (i) What were the reasons for selecting Monkton Heathfield with its Grade 1 land over Comeytrowe for an urban extension? How did this relate to Taunton's Transition Town Status?
- (ii) Why is the Council not considering identifying a site for a totally new settlement given:-
  - The new Localism Bill;
  - The evolving nature of the Core Strategy;
  - The Council's responsibility for the overall economic, social and environmental well being of Taunton Deane;
  - The Core Strategy Objectives of Inclusive Communities and Accessibility;
  - The problems of anonymity, identity and social interaction in large housing estates such we have created elsewhere; and
  - The success of Cotford St Luke in developing itself as a new community?
- (iii) Since 1997/1998 how many collective brain storming sessions, in particular on the Core Strategy and the future of Taunton Deane have been held with Councillors?
- (iv) What training were Councillors being given in promoting the Council and its policies given that the Councillors are the public face of Taunton Deane?
- (v) Over the last 10 years how many Councillors have attended the Planning Summer School run each year by the Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI)?

Councillor Edwards responded as follows:-

- (i) The Urban Extension Study (Terence O'Rourke, 2004) undertook an initial strategic seiving exercise of the surrounding Taunton urban area and identified two potential areas to deliver the scale of housing needed to support the development of Taunton as a Principal Urban Area, as designated in Regional Planning Guidance (2001). These sites were Comeytrowe and Monkton Heathfield.

These two sites were assessed against a number of factors. Whilst Comeytrowe covered land of lower agricultural quality, Monkton Heathfield scored much better in terms of accessibility to employment and services, promotion of non-car modes of transport, attracting new employment and making the most effective use of land by comprehensively planning for infrastructure provision alongside the existing housing commitments.

The Taunton Sub Area Study (Baker Associates 2005) further refined the development of potential options for the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and the area around Monkton Heathfield identified in the published RSS.

As part of the Core Strategy, the Council had further incorporated and developed these options within its own Sustainability Appraisal.

All documents had undergone extensive stakeholder and public consultation.

- (ii) "New settlements" such as Cotford St Luke were no longer regarded as 'sustainable' as urban extensions. They would generally have a greater visual impact on the countryside compared with extending the urban area, would not provide a form of development that would reduce the need for private car use (they would still primarily look to Taunton for jobs, shops and leisure - as Cotford St Luke currently did) and they would not benefit from existing infrastructure - public transport, sewage infrastructure, schools, jobs and local services - all of which having cost and thus viability implications on a totally new settlement.
- (iii) I have no record of how many 'brainstorming' sessions there have been with Councillors on the Core Strategy. However, the process has been entirely iterative, be it through discussions with various Portfolio-holders, the Local Development Framework Steering Group and workshops to develop themes. Ultimately, the Core Strategy has, at certain milestones such as publication, passed through the Executive and Full Council.
- (iv) Councillors have the opportunity to attend a variety of training courses, events and briefings on a regular basis all aimed at increasing their depth of knowledge as to the work and policies of the Council.
- (v) In recent years neither Councillors nor officers have attended the RTPi Summer School.

- (4) Mr Richard Froggatt referred to the recent decision of the Executive to withdraw its support for Into Somerset. As a Board Member he felt that Into Somerset had exceeded expectations as to what it had delivered. What sort of message was being given to potential investors in the County by Taunton Deane's recent actions? He added that Into Somerset deserved support, not undermined.
- (5) Mr Gavin Eddy felt that Into Somerset was a good example of a public and private sector partnership. The lack of unity between all six Councils would, in his view, be divisive. He also felt that it was unfair for the Council to withdraw its funding particularly as Taunton, as the County Town, would continue to be promoted. He asked the Councillors to reconsider the position.

Councillor Cavill responded that Taunton Deane had supported Into Somerset financially since its inception. However, this investment had seen a poor return and the decision had therefore been taken to pull out of Into Somerset and invest in Taunton Deane ourselves. Discussions with Somerset County Council about parallel projects, such as marketing, had been held and these projects were likely to be continued with.

- (6) Brenda Weston asked about the Council's Leaders' latest proposal regarding this year's Council Tax.

She had understood that Councillor Williams' original announcement was not the result of a rebellious outburst, but was the outcome of careful deliberation, based on the advice of officers and compelling evidence that this would be in the wider and longer-term interests of our community.

- I would like to know whether I was mistaken in this assumption?
- I would also like to know, had the advice from officers changed?
- What new evidence had emerged in such a short space of time that was more compelling than that on which the original decision was made, and on what basis had this invalidated the Council Leader's previous deliberations and conclusions?
- Am I right in believing that freezing the Council Tax this year would result in greater financial pressures in future years – larger Council Tax increases and/or more severe service cuts?

In response, Councillor Williams stated that he had a double apology to make - to those that supported an increase and to those that did not support any increase.

He assured Ms Weston that neither decision was an easy one to make, but he had tried to take the most pragmatic route that would do least harm for the community and for the Council's future budget setting.

In answer to your specific points:-

- My original decision was taken based on clear advice from the officers that to accept the grant would be detrimental to our finances in future years.
- Officers offered this view but also advised that if we decided to accept the Government's Tax Freeze funding this ought to be used for one-off funding, not added to our base budget. This advice had not changed.
- It became apparent from the reaction of quite a number of Councillors across the Council that declining to take the funding being offered was not an agreeable way forward. Therefore before the decision was made at Executive, I accepted the need to reconsider.
- Yes, it is correct to say that freezing Council Tax increases financial pressures in future years but we have time to consider how we deal with it and, in the intervening period, we must all work together to ensure that impact is minimised. We have already experienced (with more to come) major changes and reductions in our central Government grant funding. In four years we are likely to lose 40% of our traditional grant funding streams so we have to seek alternative opportunities for funding sources.

This is mentioned because this year, we set out to achieve a balanced budget without major cuts to front line services, despite a budget gap rising to £2,100,000. I believe we have successfully achieved this and also planned forward for investment in our assets for the future. I assure you we will approach next year's budget setting with the same objectives in mind, to ensure efficient operation of the Council whilst delivering the front line services that were a statutory duty and those that were affordable that the community desired.

- (7) Mr Martin Aldred, the Chairman of the Halcon North Tenants and Residents' Association, referred to how the recent Council Tax increase was announced on the local TV news on one day and removed the following day! Why therefore can't Option 1 of the proposed regeneration of Halcon North be removed as over 70% of the people in the area have signed a petition and said "no" to this option?

The tenants were looking for a rolling regeneration scheme that improved the area but did not remove them from their homes, their extended families and their community. After living in limbo for nearly two years now, did the Council have any idea what it felt like to have your present and future taken away?

It was clear that this flawed regeneration option was causing stress and anxiety to many people in the community, including himself.

Many had put off jobs in our homes that needed to be done - what was the point if your home was going to be knocked down?

The Residents' Association was more than willing to work with the Council on a regeneration scheme that benefitted the community of Halcon North.

In Mr Aldred's opinion, a single Council employee had managed to mislead not only tenants, but Councillors too, by suggesting that the majority of tenants were happy to move out of their houses. This was despite the local Housing Officers being fully aware that the majority of the tenants were not happy with Option 1.

He asked again, on behalf of the tenants and residents of Halcon North, for the Council to remove Option 1 tonight, and give us back our lives our present and our future!

In reply, Councillor Mrs Adkins stated that she was not aware of a petition yet being submitted. She added that the Halcon Project had been conceived several years ago but such a large scheme was always going to take a long time to bring firm proposals forward.

Currently, the Council was considering ways of engaging with the local residents with a view to making the scheme more palatable. She warned however, that funding for anything other than Option1 was not available.

Councillor Mrs Adkins also denied that any officer had misled tenants and Councillors.

## **6. Motion – Proposed further funding for the Small Grants Fund**

Moved by Councillor A Govier, seconded by Councillor Mrs Govier.

“This Council believes it is crucial, especially in these difficult economic times, to support and invest in the excellent work being done across Taunton Deane by voluntary and community sector organisations and to this end agrees to commit an additional sum of £10,300 to the Small Grants Fund which represents the salary savings accrued to the general fund as a result of the National day of Action held on 30 November 2011.”

The motion was put and was carried.

## **7. Written Questions to Members of the Executive**

### **(i) From Councillor Horsley to Councillor Williams - Economic Matters and Project Taunton**

Could the Leader of the Council explain why there was so little reference to either Project Taunton or Into Somerset in either his report or that of the Portfolio Holder for Economic Development? Whilst there were a few mentions of some of the delivery work that had been achieved over the past months – which was acknowledged and we were grateful for – why was there

so little about the future and how Taunton Deane was intending to promote and market itself in the future?

Would he agree with me that now we had withdrawn from Into Somerset we should have a real hard think how we promoted this district to attain the economic goals that had so far eluded us? Firepool was a non starter, we did not even have a five year supply of land to meet the National Planning Policy Guidelines and we were in danger of being at the beck and call of the National Housebuilders Federation in pre-empting our Core Strategy. There was no sign that we had begun to handle the chronic skill shortages that affected the district by attaining Skills Academies here and developing such creative centres as the Genesis one at Somerset College.

Finally, why had he failed to inform the Council of the moves afoot to lay down the Project Taunton administrative structures and replace it with a form that would widen the democratic deficit when there was more than ever a crying need to work co-operatively and consensually in achieving what we aspired to – namely a return to prosperity and increased employment for the people of Taunton Deane?

Where was the inspiration and the vision going to come from now we were moving to Phase 2 of the regeneration of Taunton Deane?

**Reply** - In respect of the Project Taunton regeneration works, the Delivery Team Report had only recently been circulated which covered all of the different aspects of the Project Taunton regeneration works and this could be circulated to the wider membership if so wished. As this was a comprehensive update in respect of the Project Taunton Team's work, I did not consider it necessary to include details within my report as well.

Although as a Council we agreed to withdraw from Into Somerset, we were presently working with the Somerset County Council as to how we could best go forward and ensure Taunton Deane was fully promoted. Initiatives were also in hand to ensure we worked with Project Taunton and our partners across the district to fully promote Taunton Deane as a welcoming place for investment.

I am unable to agree that Firepool was a non-starter. There was serious interest but we needed to ensure that the Inner Distributor Road was constructed at the earliest possible time. This will ensure the site was fully accessible and its benefits as a strategic employment site would become evident.

In respect of the requirement for a five year supply of land for housing building, I am unable to agree that we did not have sufficient. We did suffer a small shortfall but only recently we had taken forward an Interim Sites Policy which provided us with the required five year supply of land.

I must refute that we had failed to inform Council of the moves to change the Project Taunton administrative structures. Changes were necessitated by the need to make extensive budget savings and all this formed part of the Core

Council Review which had been clearly set out and agreed through the democratic process. It was fully consulted on with Elected Members and the Private Sector and its organisation retained the ability to move quickly to meet the demands of the Private Sector but with a reporting chain back through the democratic structure by way of the Project Taunton Steering Group.

**(ii) From Councillor Farbahi to Councillor Williams - Somerset Clinical Commissioning Group**

Could the Leader of the Council explain exactly what he was asking the Council to do in respect of the item in his report to Full Council concerning the Somerset Clinical Commissioning Group?

It was unclear where the “excitement” and the “challenges” were going to come from. Was he trying to ride on the back of some other institution’s idea and claim credit for it or was he genuinely going to devote this Council’s resources and capacity to addressing the question of areas of deprivation and poor housing? At the moment it read little more than “padding” for a rather thin report. Why did he not start by giving greater support to the Halcon Link Centre and the Priorswood Resources one if he wished to make a real impact on the local communities?

**Reply** - Far from riding on the back of some other institution’s idea and attempting to claim credit for it, the Council was attempting to work with an important new organisation, the Somerset Clinical Commissioning Group, to ensure we gained maximum benefit for our community in Taunton Deane.

The Chief Executive and I attended this preliminary meeting to better understand what it meant for our community and for us as a Council and I can only reiterate what I said in my report, we have “a long way to go to get this up and running but the prospects of all working together for the common good are both exciting and challenging”. I can only reiterate I believe it was very important we worked with this group to gain maximum benefit in the future.

In respect of the Halcon Link and Priorswood Resource Centres, it was felt we were making a real impact on the local communities as we invest a lot in kind by providing resources and £5,000 per annum under a three year Service Level Agreement - for which there had not been any request for an increase. By all means if you were aware of where extra funding might be required, please do let us know for consideration.

**(iii) From Councillor Mrs Baker to Councillor Mrs Herbert - Swimming Parties and ‘Mini Madness’**

Could Councillor Mrs Herbert report how many children’s swimming parties had been booked using the scooters and water walkers at Taunton and Wellington Pool? How long had these parties been available? I understand they were only available at Taunton Pool and because they were held there they could not be exclusively used for the party. Could Councillor Mrs Herbert find out whether these parties or similar could be held at St James Pool as well? This could be a way of generating income for the pool as it was losing

money due to many local schools leaving it and could fill in the gaps in the timetable.

Also, could Councillor Mrs Herbert ask Tone Leisure about the Mini Madness sessions that were held at the Blackbrook site? I have had complaints that the staff running it were closing it up to 20 minutes earlier than advertised on a regular basis, while still charging the full amount for parents and children to go. They are losing customers because of this.

**Reply** - Taunton Pool birthday parties using the water walkers and scooters had run from January 2012 - So far they had made four party bookings. (January x 1, February x 2 and March x 1). Each party had an average of 12 children.

So that we really maximised the equipment, the sea scooters were also transferred across to St James Street for the February half term; three sessions took place with 10 children on each course. We also have scheduled three sessions for the Easter holidays. Early indications show that this will sell out and extra sessions included onto the programme.

Wellington has run birthday parties since August 2011 and to date have catered for 10 x sea scooter parties and 5 x water walker parties (again minimum of 12 on each). The site manager is also planning to use the sea scooters for her Swimskool Programme.

Yes, the bouncy castle was let down 5-10 minutes before the end of the Mini Madness sessions to allow for change-overs but it did not finish 20 minutes early. The manager would keep an eye on this going forward.

**(iv) From Councillor R Lees to Councillor Mrs Herbert - Britain in Bloom : National Finals**

Did the Portfolio Holder agree with me that it was an extraordinary achievement of Taunton that they had reached again the National Britain in Bloom finals to be held in Guernsey on Saturday, 6 October 2012?

Did she further agree with me that in reaching this prestigious event we were paying back all our sponsors of roundabout displays and other sites throughout the district by demonstrating that Taunton was a wonderful town to live in and enjoyed some of the most pleasing landscapes and roadsides in the country?

Did she therefore recognise the significance of this marketing achievement and would she therefore ensure that Taunton Deane was represented, in Guernsey, on this occasion – Just as I did when we won Britain in Bloom when I was the portfolio holder?

**Reply** - Of course it was very good that we had been invited to participate in the National Britain in Bloom Competition this year. This was excellent for our sponsors, Deane DLO, the schools and all the voluntary groups whose hard work and dedication to their parks, gardens and allotments had brought Taunton success in Britain in Bloom.

Of course it would be lovely for us all to jolly over to Guernsey, but at a cost of approximately £300 per person for flights and accommodation only, it was felt that this was unaffordable in the current financial situation, and would not be positively received by the Council Tax payer.

However if the Mayors budget would stretch to it, then I am sure we would all be proud for him to represent us at the event.

**(iv) From Councillors Coles and Farbahi to Councillor Edwards – Somerset Environmental Records Centre**

It was noted that our Biodiversity Officer was working with the Somerset Environmental Records Centre (SERC) with a system of checking planning application sites against protected species records. How much was Taunton Deane receiving for this service on either a daily or hourly basis?

If there was no payment, would the Portfolio Holder take steps to ensure that the expertise we had in the Council was properly remunerated for these specialist services as we should be moving towards maximising income generation from whatever source?

**Reply** - Unfortunately it appeared Members had misunderstood. We did not receive any remuneration from SERC but in fact paid SERC via a 'service level agreement' for the information that we received. The information had species data that was not already available. Bioplan also highlighted planning applications that we might not have considered to be important with our own search criteria.

It was not about selling our expertise but benefitting from others - quite the opposite to the questioners understanding of the report and whilst not generating income, was certainly saving money for the authority.

**(vi) From Councillor Coles to Councillor Edwards – Future control of Off Street Car Parks**

Could the Portfolio Holder let us know what steps he had taken to ensure that we would be effectively monitoring the management and financial controls of our off street car parks when the staff were transferred to County Hall in June this year?

Was he concerned that there could be a lessening of the checking of the car parking (possibly, for example, less over time tickets being issued) if their new employers (Somerset County Council) asked them to give priority to on street parking matters? How would he be sure that we would be receiving the time devoted to our off street parking sites?

**Reply** - Could I remind Members that it was mainly the enforcement and notice processing activities that were subject to the new arrangements. All policy and tariff setting decisions remained with this Council, as did the off-street income stream. We had provided the County Council with the number

of enforcement hours we wanted to see in our car parks and that was what we would pay for, at an all-inclusive rate.

Our contract would be with the County Council itself and not with their Service Provider. The Service Provider's contract included robust and formal monitoring and reporting requirements on all aspects of business delivery, Key Performance Indicators to be met, hours spent where, numbers of Parking Control Notices issued and so on. These would be reflected in our agreement with the County Council. Our own Client Side would meet regularly with the County Council to review performance. It would also carry out some spot checking and scrutinise the reports provided. We would also be able to compare performance under the new arrangements with that over past years.

Any deviations, other than minor, from the specified enforcement levels would have to be agreed by our Client Side in advance. It was the Service Provider's responsibility to ensure he had sufficient resources to deliver. Like everyone else I am keen that we received the service we have asked for. At this point I have no reason to think that we will not.

**(vii) From Councillor Mrs Lees to Councillor Mrs Stock-Williams – Southwest One**

Would the Portfolio Holder care to comment on the comments made by the Leader of Somerset County Council made during the County Council meeting on Wednesday 15 February 2012 and reported on the County Gazette's website the same day?

To remind her, he said at least three times that Southwest One (SW1) was failing and that its procurement package had been a disaster. It was failing to deliver for the County Council, had lost £31million in the previous financial year and that it was going nowhere fast.

Did she also agree with him that like the County Council we should attempt to put out more and more of our services to the private sector where possible? What steps was she taking to unscramble this and take forward the problems or was she going to behave like an ostrich and bury her head in the sand about the future of the back office support we currently enjoyed from SW1?

**Reply** - As you are aware the Leader of Somerset County Council recently expressed significant concern about the effectiveness of SW1 for Somerset County Council. Additionally, I am aware that some of Taunton Deane's Members had expressed concern regarding the level of losses recently posted in SW1's accounts for 2010.

I think it is important therefore to clarify the position from this Authority's perspective.

The financial arrangements in our contract with SW1 were substantially different to those between the County Council and SW1. We received a cumulative 2.5% annual reduction in the amount we paid for the provision of

SW1 services. Over the lifetime of the 10 year contract this would amount to savings in excess of £5.7million.

The Procurement savings project, whilst being behind target, had delivered actual savings to date in excess of £1million. The current forecast by the Strategic Procurement Service indicated that savings totalling £5.8million were achievable by the end of the contract. This was still a significant saving. Obviously procurement was an area which had been and would continue to be very heavily impacted by the recession and consequent reduction in Council spending.

We must also not forget that partnering and sharing service delivery with larger organisations had brought us resilience in service delivery in many areas. Customer Services was a prime example of this and had seen significant service improvements.

There were issues with service delivery in some areas, but these were being addressed within the existing contractual arrangements.

SW1 had recently submitted its accounts for 2010 which showed a significant total loss of £31million. This sum included a pre-tax loss of £14.5million. The 2010 accounts also included a one-off item of £17million, which accounted for the remaining transition and transformation costs needed to create SW1 and implement major new systems, work which was substantially completed during 2010. This was obviously of concern. However, it needed to be clearly understood that this was SW1's and NOT the Council's loss and could not be passed onto us. Ultimately IBM, as the majority shareholder, would bear any losses.

SW1 had recognised that ongoing losses were not sustainable and were in the process of implementing changes to remedy the position. These changes would NOT impact on service delivery to this Authority or the other partners.

Whilst there were areas of concern with SW1 we had to balance these against the benefits that we were receiving from being in the partnership. It was felt that the partnership was not failing for us and it was believed we should continue to support and work with the partnership to maximise the benefits for this Authority and our partners.

Finally, Taunton Deane had no formal policy to outsource services. The Council had always approached this on a service by service basis and had employed the most appropriate means to deliver cost-effective services. SW1, the Somerset Waste Partnership and Tone Leisure were good examples of this.

**(viii) From Councillor Coles to Councillor Mrs Stock-Williams – Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme**

Would the Portfolio Holder care to comment on the article in the Financial Times on Friday, 17 February 2012 by the Managing Director of Capita, who provided the software for some 150 or more local authorities, that there was

no chance that the necessary adjustments would be ready for the handover of the Council Tax benefit operation under the Localism Act by April 2013.

Had she checked with the Welfare and Benefits Officer to ascertain whether there was going to be a problem for this Council and, if there was, what steps was she taking to overcome the significant disorganisation this would cause for Taunton Deane?

Was she also aware that the Government had now twice refused to delay the implementation of the transfer of this aspect of the Localism Bill in negotiations that had been taking place nationally?

**Reply** – SW1’s Revenues and Benefits software was not provided by Capita but by one of their competitors, Civica. Consequently Taunton Deane was not impacted in any way by Capita’s ability, or otherwise, to deliver the changes necessary to introduce a Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme for their clients.

The Council had been provided with a written update from Civica which included the statement below:-

“The biggest piece of work however is the second set of changes, namely the abolition of Council Tax Benefit to be replaced by localised Council Tax Support from 1 April 2013.

Civica would like to advise customers that we disassociate ourselves from the views expressed in the recently leaked email from a competitor software house which was discussed in the House of Commons. Civica are fully aware of the scale of changes coming up and are actively taking steps to ensure the timely delivery of, not just the solution for Council Tax Support, but a range of utilities to assist customers in the preparation for their new support scheme.”

Taunton Deane was fully aware of the challenging deadline for implementing a new system to support Council Tax for those on limited means and had recently set up a project to ensure the smooth implementation of this and other changes brought about by Finance and Welfare reform.

The project was on the Change Members Steering Group’s agenda on 22 February 2012 and progress would be monitored through that group.

The portfolio holder was aware that there had been calls from certain quarters nationally for there to be a delay in implementing the new Council Tax Reduction Scheme but, so far, there had been a consistent message from Government that the timescale of 1 April 2013 would stand.

## **8. Recommendations to Council from the Executive**

### **(a) Planning Obligations Interim Policy**

The Taunton Deane Core Strategy, Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and Sustainability Appraisal had been submitted to the Secretary of State on 14

November 2011. The IDP provided details of the infrastructure that local service providers and the Council had identified as key to supporting growth in Taunton Deane.

Although the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) would provide the mechanism to collect developer contributions towards the provision of infrastructure identified in the future, until the CIL was adopted the Planning Obligations Interim Policy would provide a framework for developer contributions.

The IDP had identified that the level of infrastructure required to support development was unlikely to be funded fully from developer contributions. The interim policy had therefore identified a number of actions which would need to be taken in order that the growth outline in the Core Strategy was accompanied by sufficient infrastructure.

The IDP viability assessment indicated that with a £15,000 per dwelling contribution package, 25% affordable housing would be possible.

Consultation on the CIL draft charging schedule was anticipated for Spring 2012, with submission in the Summer, Examination in the Autumn and adoption during the Winter 2012/13. The CIL would apply to most new buildings and charges would be based on the size and type of development.

The Interim Policy related to the first phase of infrastructure requirements (from 2011 – 2016) identified in the IDP. Where the level of contribution adversely affected development viability, the Council would consider a reduced level of contribution, subject to an open book viability appraisal, so as not to affect the overall pace of development.

The Interim Policy had advantages over the usual Section 106 Agreement negotiations because it would speed up the process of getting planning permission and would create a level playing field where all developments were making infrastructure contributions on the same basis.

On the motion of Councillor Edwards, it was

**Resolved** that the Planning Obligations Interim Policy be adopted.

**(b) Theme 5 of the Core Council Review – Legal and Democratic Services**

Proposals had recently been considered concerning the creation of a new Corporate Support Unit for the Council which would be required to deliver:-

- a service that was resilient, flexible and responsive;
- different ways of working to ensure that stakeholders' needs were met and within resource capacity;

- a service that met the need of the key stakeholders, namely, the Leader of the Council, the Mayoralty, the Chief Executive, Directors, Theme 1 Managers and Councillors as a whole; and
- a minimum of £50,000 savings per annum.

To ensure the success of the new unit, officers would be nominated to certain areas in order to provide some consistency and responsibility. However all officers within the structure would be required to understand the different work-streams that the unit needed to support, including areas that had not previously been supported.

A number of officers had been put at risk of redundancy due to the proposed new structure whilst others had been slotted into new posts.

On the motion of Councillor Mrs Stock-Williams, it was

**Resolved** that:-

- (1) the proposed structure of the new Corporate Support Unit be approved; and
- (2) a Supplementary Budget allocation of up to £72,000 in 2011/2012, funded from reserves, relating to likely redundancy costs be also approved.

**(c) Localism Act 2011 – Pay Policy Statements**

Under Section 38(1) of the Localism Act 2011, all Local Authorities were required to prepare a Pay Policy Statement for 2012/2013 and for each subsequent year thereafter.

The Statement had to include policies on which remuneration of its Chief Officers and its lowest paid employees (and the relationship between them) were based.

The Statement was also required to:-

- Set out arrangements for the remuneration of Chief Officers on appointment;
- Set out arrangements for payments on termination of employment for Chief Officers even if covered by other approved policies;
- Set out arrangements for the re-employment of Chief Officers; and
- Be published on the Council's website.

The draft of Taunton Deane's first Pay Policy Statement had been prepared to meet the minimum requirements of the Localism Act but it was not the final document as the formal guidance on the preparation of such Statements was

still awaited from the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG).

The DCLG had indicated that the production of a provisional Pay Policy Statement would be acceptable as it could be treated as a “living document” – one that could be amended in the future, once the guidance was to hand.

On the motion of Councillor Mrs Stock-Williams, it was

**Resolved** that the draft Pay Policy Statement for 2012/2013 appended to these minutes, be approved.

**(d) General Fund Revenue Estimates 2012/2013**

The Executive had considered its final 2012/2013 budget proposals which had been prepared in the face of unprecedented financial challenges and uncertainty. It contained details on:-

- (i) the General Fund Revenue Budget proposals for 2011/2012, including the proposed Council Tax increase and the Prudential Indicators;
- (ii) draft figures on the predicted financial position of the Council for the following four years.

The Corporate Scrutiny Committee had also considered the draft budget proposals at its meeting on 26 January 2012.

The Council Tax calculation and formal tax setting resolution was to be considered separately. The proposed budget for Taunton Deane contained a proposed Council Tax Freeze for 2012/2013 which meant that the Band D Council Tax would remain at £135.19. The Band D taxpayer would, therefore, receive all the services provided by the Council in 2012/2013 at a cost of £2.59 per week.

It was a requirement for the Council to prepare not only budgets for the following financial year but to also provide indicative figures into future years. The Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) provided an indication of the expected budget gap going forward into 2013/2014 and beyond and a summary of this position is reflected in the following table:-

	2012/13 £m	2013/14 £m	2014/15 £m	2015/16 £m	2016/17 £m
Net Expenditure	11,342	12,561	14,145	15,042	15,728
<i>Financed By:</i>					
External Government Support	5,310	4,779	4,301	4,301	4,301
Council Tax Freeze Grant	277	137	137	0	0
Council Tax	5,755	5,740	5,913	6,091	6,275
<b>Predicted Budget Gap</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,905</b>	<b>3,794</b>	<b>4,650</b>	<b>5,152</b>

These figures included the following assumptions relating to funding:-

- Government Grant would be reduced by the following rates: 2012/2013 by 11.2%; 2013/2014 by 10%; and 2014/2015 by 10%. No change has been assumed for 2015/2016 onwards;
- The Council Tax Freeze Grant relating to 2011/2012 would be receivable for four years; and
- Council Tax would increase by 2.5% each year from 2013/2014.

The Proposed Budget for 2012/2013 would maintain reserves well above the acceptable minimum reserves position of £1,250,000 or £1,000,000 if funds were allocated to 'invest to save' initiatives, but the MTFP indicated that the Council would face significant financial pressures in the medium term as shown in the following table:-

#### General Reserves Forecast

	2012/13 £m	2013/14 £m	2014/15 £m	2015/16 £m	2016/17 £m
Estimated Balance B/F	2,793	2,833	928	(2,866)	(7,516)
Transfers – Previous Years commitments	40	0	0	0	0
Predicted Budget Gap	0	(1,905)	(3,794)	(4,650)	(5,152)
<b>Estimated Balance C/F</b>	<b>2,833</b>	<b>928</b>	<b>(2,866)</b>	<b>(7,516)</b>	<b>(12,668)</b>

The estimated expenses chargeable to the non-parished area of Taunton in 2012/2013 amounted to £47,380, which represented a 0% increase in the special expenses per Band D equivalent of £2.92 per property per year in the Unparished Area.

As part of the Prudential Code for Capital Finance there was a requirement for Full Council to approve the indicators as set out in the report to the Executive. These were important as they detailed the expected borrowing requirement for both the General Fund and the Housing Revenue Account. They also set

the operational boundaries for both the borrowing and investment levels and interest rate exposure for the Council.

Before the start of each financial year, the Council was required to determine the basis on which it would make provision from revenue for the repayment of borrowing undertaken for the purpose of financing capital expenditure. This annual provision, known as Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP), was designed to ensure that authorities made prudent provision to cover the ongoing costs of their borrowing.

The proposed Policy for 2012/2013 was for the calculation of MRP to be fundamentally the same as the current year.

The Council's Section 151 Officer had a duty to comment, as part of the budget setting process on the robustness of the budget and the adequacy of reserves. In her response, Shirlene Adam had stated that she believed the Council's reserves to be adequate and the budget estimates used in preparing the 2012/2013 budget to be as robust as possible.

Moved by Councillor Henley, seconded by Councillor Horsley that the budget proposals be amended as follows:-

**(i) Voluntary Sector Grants** – A proposal to retain the £30,000 budget to support the voluntary sector in 2012/2013;

**(ii) Climate Change Budget** – A proposal to retain the £10,000 budget for Climate Change initiatives for 2012/2013.

**(iii) Subsidy to Somerset County Council Highways Grass Cuts** – A proposal to retain Taunton Deane's subsidy for grass cutting rather than cutting the budget completely. This would add £17,000 to the budget.

**(iv) Hanging Baskets** - To maintain pride in the district and keep Taunton Deane competitive in the Britain in Bloom contests, reversal of the proposed £2,000 cut to the budget was recommended;

**(v) Arts Development Grants** - It was important that Taunton Deane was seen to promote creative and cultural organisations as part of the Economic Development programme. Reversal of the reduction of £8,000 from this budget was proposed.

**(vi) Pest Control Fees** – The proposed increase in fees to raise £4,000 could result in residents not engaging the rodent control services. It was proposed to halt the increase in fees.

**(vii) Maintenance of Open Space** – The proposed reduction in the budget of £64,000 would spoil the look of Taunton Deane and would have a particular affect on the maintenance of sports pitches. Retaining the existing budget was proposed;

**(viii) New Income Source – Firepool** – It was felt that approximately

£10,000 could be raised from one-off car parking and storage for vehicles on this redevelopment site.

**(ix) Kids Swimming For A Quid** – The sum of £40,000 was proposed to encourage young people to go swimming during the Olympic Year.

The mover and seconder of the amendment requested that a formal roll call of votes be taken and recorded in the Minutes in accordance with Standing Order 18(2).

The amendment was put and was lost with twenty Councillors voting in favour of the amendment and thirty three Councillors voting against, as follows:-

<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Councillor Mrs Baker	Councillor Mrs Adkins
Councillor Brooks	Councillor Mrs Allgrove
Councillor Coles	Councillor Beaven
Councillor Farbahi	Councillor Bishop
Councillor Mrs Floyd	Councillor Bowrah
Councillor Henley	Councillor Cavill
Councillor Mrs Hill	Councillor Denington
Councillor Horsley	Councillor D Durdan
Councillor Miss James	Councillor Ms Durdan
Councillor R Lees	Councillor Edwards
Councillor Mrs Lees	Councillor Gaines
Councillor Mrs Messenger	Councillor A Govier
Councillor Mullins	Councillor Mrs Govier
Councillor Prior-Sankey	Councillor Hall
Councillor Mrs Smith	Councillor Hayward
Councillor P Smith	Councillor Mrs Herbert
Councillor Swaine	Councillor C Hill
Councillor Tooze	Councillor Hunt
Councillor A Wedderkopp	Councillor Ms Lisgo
Councillor D Wedderkopp	Councillor Meikle
	Councillor Morrell
	Councillor Nottrodt
	Councillor Ms Palmer
	Councillor D Reed
	Councillor Mrs Reed
	Councillor Ross
	Councillor Mrs Stock-Williams
	Councillor Mrs Warmington
	Councillor Watson
	Councillor Mrs Waymouth
	Councillor Ms Webber
	Councillor Williams
	Councillor Wren

On the motion of Councillor Williams, it was

**Resolved** that the budget for General Fund services for 2012/2013 as outlined in the report to Full Council be agreed and that:-

- (a) the transfer of any under/overspend in the 2011/2012 General Fund Revenue Account Outturn to/from the General Fund Reserves be approved;
- (b) the Draft General Fund Revenue Budget 2012/2013, including a Basic Council Tax Requirement budget of £5,572,040 and Special Expenses of £47,380 be approved;
- (c) the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Policy with MRP calculated as follows, be approved:-
  - for supported borrowing, 4% on outstanding debt; and
  - for unsupported borrowing, the debt associated with the asset divided by the estimated useful life of the asset; and
  - for capital grants and contributions to third parties, 4% (or 1/25<sup>th</sup>) per year on a straight line basis;
- (d) the Prudential Indicators for 2012/2013 as set out in the appendix to these minutes be agreed;
- (e) the projected General Fund Reserve balance of £2,800,000 in 2012/2013, which was above the recommended minimum balance within the S151 Officer's Statement of Robustness, be noted; and
- (f) the forecast budget position within the Medium Term Financial Plan, as amended to reflect the proposed Council Tax Freeze in 2012/2013, be noted.

(Note – The version of the Prudential Indicators appended to the recommendation was incorrect. The version previously approved by the Executive is attached as an appendix to these minutes.)

### **(e) Capital Programme Budget Estimates 2012/2013**

Consideration had also been given to the proposed General Fund (GF) and Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Capital Programmes for the period 2012/2013 to 2016/2017.

Full Council had approved a Capital Programme for 2011/2012 General Fund schemes totalling £1,421,000 in February 2011. Slippage from the previous year and supplementary budget approvals during the year, including adding details of the Project Taunton schemes, had increased the Capital Programme to £8,660,000.

The Draft General Fund Capital Programme for 2012/2013 totalled £1,793,940.

One-off additional revenue funding of £164,250 had been included in the proposed budget to support emerging capital priorities. These included

remodelling The Deane House and potential works at Orchard Car Park, Taunton. Final spending on this would only be agreed when more information was available.

The funding position for General Fund capital priorities continued to rely on local resources, with ongoing reductions in external funding from the Government.

The Council approved the Housing Revenue Account Capital Programme for 2011/2012 totalling £4,299,000, in February 2011. There were no changes to the approved budget so far this year.

The proposed Draft HRA Capital Programme 2012/2013 totalled £5,500,000. This did not include slippage from the current financial year, although currently no slippage had been forecast. Any slippage on the current year programme would be recommended for a Budget Carry Forward.

Work had been done to prepare for the move to HRA Self Financing and the 30 Year Business Plan included capital investment requirements over the long term - £7,320,000 per year from 2013/2014 to 2016/2017.

The Corporate Scrutiny Committee had considered the draft programme at its January meeting and had made no formal suggestions for any changes to be made.

The motion of Councillor Williams to approve the Capital Programme Budget Estimates for 2012/2013 was put and was lost. Members were unhappy with the proposed Revenue Contribution of £164,250 from the 2012/2013 Annual Budget being allocated towards a provision for 'Capital Priorities'.

The Section 151 Officer, Shirlene Adam, stated that there would be serious implications if the Council could not agree its Capital Programme for the forthcoming financial year.

The Mayor adjourned the meeting to allow the matter to be further considered.

When the meeting resumed, Ms Adam reported that the proposed provision for Capital Priorities could be removed from the Motion, with decisions as to how this money could be allocated being deferred until a future meeting.

On the motion of Councillor Williams, it was

**Resolved** that:-

- (a) the General Fund Capital Programme 2012/2013 Budget of £1,629,690 be approved; and
- (b) the Housing Revenue Account Capital Programme budgets for 2012/2013 of £5,500,000 be also approved.

(During the consideration of the recommendations Members **resolved** that Standing Order 29(1) should be suspended to allow the meeting to continue for a further 30 minutes.)

**(f) Council Tax Setting 2012/2013**

The Localism Act 2011 had made significant changes to the Local Government Finance Act 1992, and now required the billing authority to calculate a Council Tax requirement for the year, not its Budget Requirement, as previously.

The Town and Parish Council Precepts for 2012/2013 totalled £529,689. The increase in the average Band D Council Tax for Town and Parish Councils was 3.14% and resulted in an average Band D Council Tax figure of £12.85 for 2012/2013.

Avon and Somerset Police Authority had met on 8 February 2012 and set its precept at £6,925,542.70, adjusted by a Collection Fund contribution of £209,624. This resulted in a Band D Council Tax of £168.03.

Somerset County Council had met on 15 February 2012 and set its precept at £204,297,500, adjusted by a Collection Fund contribution of £1,281,593. This equated to a 0% increase in Council Tax and resulted in the Band D Council Tax remaining at £168.03.

Devon and Somerset Fire Authority had met on 17 February 2012 and set its precept at £45,634,541, adjusted by a Collection Fund contribution of £89,536. This equated to a 3% increase in Council Tax and resulted in a Band D Council Tax of £73.92.

The estimated balance on the Council Tax Collection Fund was forecast on 15 January each year. Any surplus or deficit was shared between the County Council, the Police Authority, the Fire Authority and Taunton Deane, in shares relative to our precept levels.

The estimated balance on the Council Tax Collection Fund was a surplus of £1,764,952. Taunton Deane's share of this amounted to £184,199, and this had been reflected in the General Fund Revenue Estimates.

On the motion of Councillor Williams, it was

**Resolved** that:-

(a) The following formal Council Tax Resolution for 2012/2013 be approved:-

(1) That it be noted that on 7 December 2011 the Council calculated the Council Tax Base for 2012/2013:-

(i) for the whole Council area as 41,216.39 [Item T in the formula in Section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the "Act")]; and,

- (ii) for dwellings in those parts of its area to which a Parish precept related as in the attached Appendix B;
- (2) That the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2012/2013 (excluding Parish precepts) be calculated as £5,572,040;
- (3) That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2012/2013 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:-
- (i) £84,575,640 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimated for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils. (*Gross Expenditure including amount required for working balance*)
  - (ii) £78,473,910 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimated for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act. (*Gross Income including reserves to be used to meet Gross Expenditure*)
  - (iii) £6,101,730 being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above exceeded the aggregate at 3(b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year. (Item R in the formula in Section 31B of the Act). (*Total Demand on Collection Fund.*)
  - (iv) £148.04 being the amount at 3(c) above (Item R), all divided by Item T (1(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish precepts). (*Council Tax at Band D for Borough Including Parish Precepts and Special Expenses*)
  - (v) £529,690 being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish precepts) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act (as per the attached Appendix B). (*Parish Precepts and Special Expenses*).
  - (vi) £135.19 being the amount at 3(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 3(e) above by Item T (1(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no Parish precept related. (*Council Tax at Band D for Borough Excluding Parish Precepts and Special Expenses*);

(4) To note that Somerset County Council, Avon and Somerset Police

Authority and Devon and Somerset Fire Authority had issued precepts to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each category of dwellings in the Council's area as indicated in the table in Appendix A;

- (5) That the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby set the aggregate provisional amounts shown in the table in Appendix A as the amounts of Council Tax for 2012/2013 for each part of its area and for each category of dwelling;
- (6) Determine that the Council's basic amount of Council Tax for 2012/2013 was not excessive in accordance with principles approved under Section 52ZB of the Local Government Finance Act 1992; and

(b) Note that if the above formal Council Tax Resolution was approved the total Band D Council Tax would be as follows:-

	<b>2011/12</b> <b>£</b>	<b>2012/13</b> <b>£</b>	<b>Increase</b> <b>%</b>
Taunton Deane Borough Council	135.19	135.19	0.00%
Somerset County Council	1,027.30	1,027.30	0.00%
Avon & Somerset Police Authority	168.03	168.03	0.00%
Devon & Somerset Fire Authority	71.77	73.92	3.00%
<b>Sub-Total*</b>	<b>1,402.29</b>	<b>1,404.44</b>	0.15%
Town & Parish Council (average)	12.46	12.85	3.14%
<b>Total *</b>	<b>1,414.75</b>	<b>1,417.29</b>	0.18%

*This report was produced after the Executive Meeting on 9 February 2012 to reflect the final decisions taken at the meeting. The figures have been updated to reflect the final budget proposals of the Executive.*

Appendix

A

### Valuation Bands

Council Tax Schedule 2012/13	Band A £	Band B £	Band C £	Band D £	Band E £	Band F £	Band G £	Band H £
Taunton Deane Borough Council	90.13	105.15	120.17	135.19	165.23	195.27	225.32	270.38
Somerset County Council *	684.87	799.01	913.16	1,027.30	1,255.59	1,483.88	1,712.17	2,054.60
Avon & Somerset Police Authority	112.02	130.69	149.36	168.03	205.37	242.71	280.05	336.06
Devon & Somerset Fire & Rescue Authority *	47.85	55.82	63.80	71.77	87.72	103.67	119.62	143.54
Parish / Town only (a)	8.57	9.99	11.42	12.85	15.71	18.56	21.42	25.70
Parish / Town & District (b)	98.69	115.14	131.59	148.04	180.94	213.84	246.73	296.08
<b>Total (c)</b>	<b>943.43</b>	<b>1,100.66</b>	<b>1,257.90</b>	283.23	<b>1,729.62</b>	<b>2,044.09</b>	<b>2,358.57</b>	<b>2,830.28</b>
<b><u>Parish:</u></b>								
Ash Priors	934.87	1,090.67	1,246.49	1,402.29	1,713.91	2,025.53	2,337.16	2,804.58
Ashbrittle	947.40	1,105.29	1,263.20	1,421.09	1,736.89	2,052.69	2,368.49	2,842.18
Bathealton	938.60	1,095.03	1,251.47	1,407.89	1,720.75	2,033.62	2,346.49	2,815.78
Bishops Hull	948.02	1,106.02	1,264.03	1,422.02	1,738.02	2,054.03	2,370.04	2,844.04
Bishops Lydeard/Cothelstone	949.85	1,108.15	1,266.46	1,424.76	1,741.37	2,057.99	2,374.61	2,849.52
Bradford on Tone	947.34	1,105.22	1,263.12	1,421.00	1,736.78	2,052.56	2,368.34	2,842.00
Burrowbridge	948.46	1,106.53	1,264.61	1,422.68	1,738.83	2,054.98	2,371.14	2,845.36



	946.62	1,104.38	1,262.16	1,419.92	1,735.46	2,051.00		2,839.84
North Curry	949.70	1,107.98	1,266.27	1,424.54	1,741.10	2,057.67	2,374.24	2,849.08
Norton Fitzwarren	952.80	1,111.58	1,270.39	1,429.18	1,746.78	2,064.37	2,381.98	2,858.36
Nynehead	952.13	1,110.81	1,269.50	1,428.18	1,745.55	2,062.93	2,380.31	2,856.36
Oake	944.87	1,102.34	1,259.82	1,417.29	1,732.24	2,047.20	2,362.16	2,834.58
Otterford	934.87	1,090.67	1,246.49	1,402.29	1,713.91	2,025.53	2,337.16	2,804.58
Pitminster	948.51	1,106.58	1,264.68	1,422.75	1,738.92	2,055.08	2,371.26	2,845.50
Ruishton/Thornfalcon	947.67	1,105.60	1,263.56	1,421.49	1,737.38	2,053.26	2,369.16	2,842.98
Sampfurd Arundel	958.90	1,118.71	1,278.53	1,438.34	1,757.97	2,077.60	2,397.24	2,876.68
Staplegrove	944.41	1,101.80	1,259.21	1,416.60	1,731.40	2,046.20	2,361.01	2,833.20
Stawley	947.29	1,105.16	1,263.05	1,420.92	1,736.68	2,052.44	2,368.21	2,841.84
Stoke St Gregory	947.00	1,104.83	1,262.67	1,420.49	1,736.15	2,051.82	2,367.49	2,840.98
Stoke St Mary	944.38	1,101.77	1,259.17	1,416.56	1,731.35	2,046.14	2,360.94	2,833.12
Taunton	936.82	1,092.94	1,249.09	1,405.21	1,717.48	2,029.75	2,342.03	2,810.42
Trull	943.91	1,101.22	1,258.54	1,415.85	1,730.48	2,045.12	2,359.76	2,831.70
Wellington	949.27	1,107.47	1,265.69	1,423.89	1,740.31	2,056.73	2,373.16	2,847.78
Wellington Without	946.26	1,103.95	1,261.67	1,419.37	1,734.79	2,050.20	2,365.63	2,838.74

West Bagborough	944.69	1,102.13	1,259.58	1,417.02	1,731.91	2,046.81	2,361.71	2,834.04
West Buckland	946.76	1,104.55	1,262.35	1,420.13	1,735.71	2,051.30	2,366.89	2,840.26
West Hatch	945.73	1,103.34	1,260.97	1,418.58	1,733.82	2,049.06	2,364.31	2,837.16
West Monkton	950.44	1,108.84	1,267.25	1,425.65	1,742.46	2,059.27	2,376.09	2,851.30
Wiveliscombe	948.75	1,106.86	1,265.00	1,423.11	1,739.36	2,055.60	2,371.86	2,846.22

This report was produced after the Executive Meeting on 9 February 2012 to reflect the final decisions taken at the meeting. The figures have been updated to reflect the final budget proposals of the Executive.

Appendix

B

**TOWN AND PARISH COUNCIL PRECEPTS**

Parish/Town Council	2011/12			2012/13			Council Tax Increase
	Tax Base	Precept Levied	Council Tax Band D	Tax Base	Precept Levied	Council Tax Band D	
		£	(£)		£	(£)	
Ash Priors	78.84	-	-	84.83	-	-	0.00%
Ashbrittle	97.37	1,800	18.49	95.72	1,800	18.80	1.72%
Bathealton	88.08	500	5.68	89.28	500	5.60	-1.34%
Bishops Hull	1,075.48	22,000	20.46	1,114.92	22,000	19.73	-3.54%
Bishops Lydeard/Cothelstone	1,116.85	25,185	22.55	1,120.81	25,185	22.47	-0.35%
Bradford on Tone	290.50	5,500	18.93	293.94	5,500	18.71	-1.17%
Burrowbridge	205.44	4,000	19.47	205.99	4,200	20.39	4.72%
Cheddon Fitzpaine	639.63	7,000	10.94	643.53	10,203	15.85	44.87%
Chipstable	128.01	1,850	14.45	133.31	1,950	14.63	1.22%
Churchstanton	335.61	7,250	21.60	337.87	7,299	21.60	0.00%

Combe Florey	121.40	2,000	16.48	122.05	2,250	18.44	11.90%
Comeytrowe	2,092.08	25,000	11.95	2,111.95	25,000	11.84	-0.94%
Corfe	132.48	2,500	18.87	133.48	2,500	18.73	-0.75%
Cotford St Luke	800.55	15,000	18.74	821.67	16,000	19.47	3.92%
Creech St Michael	946.10	23,135	24.45	999.23	28,275	28.30	15.72%
Durston	59.57	600	10.07	59.10	600	10.15	0.79%
Fitzhead	123.27	2,995	24.30	122.29	2,995	24.49	0.81%
Halse	141.39	1,750	12.38	142.58	1,800	12.62	2.00%
Hatch Beauchamp	260.51	4,500	17.27	268.82	4,500	16.74	-3.09%
Kingston St Mary	452.76	6,000	13.25	463.52	6,000	12.94	-2.32%
Langford Budville	236.73	4,000	16.90	238.94	5,000	20.93	23.84%
Lydeard St Lawrence/Tolland	204.07	3,500	17.15	208.84	3,582	17.15	0.00%
Milverton	598.41	11,500	19.22	624.11	12,650	20.27	5.47%
Neroche	251.93	4,000	15.88	255.27	4,500	17.63	11.03%
North Curry	748.27	16,500	22.05	741.43	16,500	22.25	0.92%
Norton Fitzwarren	820.30	25,130	30.64	931.94	25,060	26.89	-12.22%

Nynehead	157.34	4,000	25.42	164.15	4,250	25.89	1.84%
Oake	333.62	4,750	14.24	333.34	5,000	15.00	5.35%
Otterford	170.04	-	-	174.06	-	-	0.00%
Pitminster	458.91	9,279	20.22	464.42	9,500	20.46	1.17%
Ruishton/Thornfalcon	614.50	12,000	19.53	624.94	12,000	19.20	-1.67%
Sampfard Arundel	132.51	4,600	34.72	127.60	4,600	36.05	3.84%
Staplegrove	713.43	10,000	14.02	748.42	10,710	14.31	2.09%
Stawley	130.08	2,400	18.45	128.82	2,400	18.63	0.98%
Stoke St Gregory	389.61	6,500	16.68	384.63	7,000	18.20	9.09%
Stoke St Mary	204.23	3,008	14.73	210.86	3,008	14.27	-3.15%
Taunton	16,033.53	46,820	2.92	16,226.62	47,380	2.92	-0.01%
Trull	1,029.79	14,000	13.59	1,032.39	14,000	13.56	-0.25%
Wellington	4,683.53	92,734	19.80	4,852.37	104,798	21.60	9.08%
Wellington Without	302.74	5,050	16.68	304.54	5,200	17.08	2.36%
West Bagborough	168.06	2,000	11.90	169.77	2,500	14.73	23.74%
West Buckland	444.62	8,000	17.99	448.31	8,000	17.84	-0.82%

West Hatch	141.96	2,330	16.41	143.00	2,330	16.29	-0.73%
West Monkton	1,116.84	31,599	28.29	1,184.22	27,664	23.36	-17.43%
Wiveliscombe	1,119.67	21,000	18.76	1,128.51	23,500	20.82	11.03%
<b>TOTAL / AVERAGE</b>	<b>40,390.60</b>	<b>503,265</b>	<b>12.46</b>	<b>41,216.39</b>	<b>529,689</b>	<b>12.85</b>	<b>3.33%</b>

**(g) Housing Services and Community Development – Restructure Proposals**

Proposals to change the staffing structure of Housing Services in preparation for issues likely to arise from the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) self-financing and the associated new 30 year Business Plan had recently been considered in detail. Changes to the current Community Development Team had also been considered.

Over the past few years, the Council's Housing Service had embarked on a modernisation programme to make it more outward looking, performance focussed and working to place tenants at the heart of scrutiny and decision making. Although steady progress has been made there was still more to be done.

Preparations for self-financing were going well with a robust project team and plan in place. Stage 1 of this process had been achieved with the completion of a new 30 year Business Plan.

The move to HRA self-financing in April 2012, would involve the Council taking on £85,198,000 of national housing debt, based on the final settlement figures.

Whilst modelling had suggested self-financing would be a good deal for Taunton Deane, it placed a significant responsibility on the HRA to ensure that governance, performance management and financial management arrangements were as good as they could be.

In addition, projections for the repairs and maintenance work required on the Council's housing stock indicated the need for a significant lift in capital expenditure and changes to housing policy and potential legislation would place new and different requirements on the service in future years.

It was therefore proposed to alter Housing Services to position the structure in a way that supported the new Business Plan and the future investment needs of the service.

The full-year cost to the HRA of the new structure was likely to be £1,935,000, 11.9% of the total HRA cost of £16,242,000. The increase would be modelled into the 30-year HRA Business Plan.

The proposed re-structure would have a number of implications for existing staff, including one possible redundancy.

The proposals had also been considered by the Community Scrutiny Committee and the Tenants Services Management Board who were both supportive of the re-structure.

On the motion of Councillor Mrs Adkins, it was

**Resolved** that:-

- (1) the proposed restructuring of Housing Services and the Community Development Team, be approved; and
- (2) a Supplementary Budget allocation of up to £22,000 in 2011/2012, funded from Housing Revenue Account reserves, related to likely redundancy costs, be also approved.

**(h) Housing Revenue Account Estimates 2012/2013**

The Executive had given consideration to the proposed Housing Revenue Account (HRA) estimates for the 2012/2013 Financial Year which showed a working balance of £1,312,070. It also includes details of the proposed increase in Average Weekly Rent for the year where a 7.45% increase had been recommended.

The 2011/2012 budget had been set using that year's data from the Government's Draft Subsidy Determination and in the expectation that HRA self financing would be introduced under the Localism Act.

With the move to a 'self-financing' model from 2012/2013 now happening, the Council's annual payment of 'negative subsidy' would end on 28 March 2012.

The final Settlement figures from the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) had set the Council's debt at £85,198,000 which would be repaid in 18 years (by 2029/2030).

The proposed HRA Budget for the next financial year was therefore based on assumptions and estimates on expenditure requirements and income projections. These assumptions had been reflected in the final Business Plan for the HRA.

The negative subsidy system required Local Authorities to raise their 'average weekly rent' to meet the 'target' or 'formula' rent by the convergence date of 2015/2016, with a 'guideline rent' being the amount the DCLG assumed should be charged, but to avoid unaffordable increases in any one year must not exceed the 'limit rent'.

This Central Government rent policy has remained unchanged despite the move to self-financing and abolition of the subsidy system.

With the Retail Price Index for 2011 at 5.60%, increasing the actual average weekly rent paid by tenants by the amount set under the subsidy determination would make the rent paid higher than the guideline rent.

It was therefore proposed that the average weekly rent for dwellings for 2012/2013 should be set at the guideline rent of £73.68. This was an increase of 7.45% or £5.11 per week.

The Dwelling Rents formed the major element of income for the HRA. Each ½% rent increase was equivalent to approximately £105,000. If the average

rent was set lower than the current proposal, the loss of income would have to be met by reducing expenditure.

The budget for non-dwelling rents and charges for services and facilities was based on a 5.6% increase.

The Corporate Scrutiny Committee considered the 2011/2012 draft budget at its meeting on 26 January 2012 where no formal recommendations to change the HRA budget were made. The Tenants Services Management Board has also considered the report.

On the motion of Councillor Mrs Adkins, it was

**Resolved** that:-

- (1) The Average Weekly Rent increase of 7.45% be approved; and
- (2) The Housing Revenue Account budget for 2012/2013 be agreed.

## 9. **Reports of the Leader of the Council and Executive Councillors**

The following reports were made to the Council on the main items of current and future business.

Due to Standing Order 28, Time Limits for all meetings, only sufficient time was available for the Leader of the Council to present his report and take questions from Members. The other Executive Councillor reports were submitted for information only.

### (i) **Leader of the Council (Councillor Williams)**

Councillor Williams's report covered the following topics:-

- Budget Setting;
- Taunton's Retail and Parking;
- Broadband Issues;
- Town Centre Works;
- Somerset Clinical Commissioning Group; and
- Somerset County Council A303/A30/A358 Initiative.

### (ii) **Corporate Resources (Councillor Mrs Stock-Williams)**

The report from Councillor Mrs Stock-Williams provided information on the following areas within her portfolio:-

- Customer Contact Centre;
- Legal and Democratic Services;
- Performance and Client Team;
- Revenues and Benefits; and

- Southwest One.

(iii) **Planning, Transportation and Communications (Councillor Edwards)**

The report from Councillor Edwards provided information on the following areas within his portfolio:-

- Core Strategy Examination;
- Annual Monitoring Report;
- Planning Enforcement;
- Heritage – Sandhill Park;
- Landscape Team;
- County-wide Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) Project; and
- Communications.

(iv) **Community Leadership (Councillor Mrs Jane Warmington)**

Councillor Mrs Warmington presented the Community Leadership report which focused on the following areas within that portfolio:-

- Police and Crime Panel;
- Community Policing Awards;
- Health;
- Priority Areas Strategy; and
- Grants Panel.

(v) **Economic Development, Asset Management, Arts and Tourism (Councillor Cavill)**

The report from Councillor Cavill covered:-

- Keeping Members informed;
- Stimulating Business Growth and Investment;
- Ensuring a Skilled and Entrepreneurial Workforce;
- Creating an Attractive Business Environment; and
- Taunton Tourist Information, Ticket and Travel Centre.

(vi) **Environmental Services and Climate Change (Councillor Hayward)**

The report from Councillor Hayward drew attention to developments in the following areas:-

- Waste Management;
- Climate Change / Carbon Management; and
- Crematorium.

(vii) **Sport, Parks and Leisure (Councillor Mrs Herbert)**

The report from Councillor Mrs Herbert dealt with activities taking place in the following areas:-

- Parks;
- Community Leisure and Play; and
- Tone Leisure (Taunton Deane) Limited Activities.

(viii) **Housing Services (Councillor Mrs Adkins)**

Councillor Mrs Adkins submitted her report which drew attention to the following:-

- Housing Property Services;
- Affordable Housing;
- Strategic Tenancy Policy;
- Estates Team and Anti-social Behaviour;
- Somerset West Private Sector Housing Partnership;
- Consultation;
- Self-Financing; and
- Housing Revenue Account 30 Year Business Plan.

10. **Kevin Toller**

Councillor Williams reported that Kevin Toller, one of the Strategic Directors, would shortly be leaving The Council's employment after more than 20 years service. On behalf of the Council, Councillor Williams thanked Kevin for his loyal service.

(Councillors D Durdan, Ms Durdan, A Govier, Mrs Govier, C Hill, Ms Palmer, D Reed, Mrs Smith, P Smith and Swaine all left the meeting at 9.54 pm.)

(The meeting ended at 10.07 pm.)

## Taunton Deane Borough Council

## Appendix

### Pay Policy Statement – 2012/13

The Pay Policy Statement for Taunton Deane Borough Council will apply to the following posts which collectively will be referred to as 'chief officers' for the purpose of this statement and for this statement only:

- Chief Executive Officer (Head of Paid Service)
- Strategic Director posts including the role of Section 151 Officer
- Theme Managers including the role of Monitoring Officer
- A person for whom the head of the authority's paid service is directly responsible.
- A deputy chief officer who, as respects all or most of the duties of his post, is required to report directly or is directly accountable to one or more of the statutory or non-statutory chief officers.

*Note: A person whose duties are solely secretarial or clerical or are otherwise in the nature of support services shall not be regarded as a non-statutory chief officer or a deputy chief officer.*

#### **1) The Level and Remuneration for each Chief Officer**

Details of the level and remuneration for the identified chief officer posts is set out in Appendix 1.

Salary information is also published on the Council's website to comply with the Accounts and Audit (Amendment) Regulations 2011 and the Code of Practice on Data Transparency 2011. It should be noted that there are different reporting dates and standards for this information.

#### **2) Remuneration of Chief Officers on Appointment**

- a) Chief Executive, Strategic Directors, Theme Managers, Regeneration Manager and Commercial Manager Posts

*The Leader of the Council will, after taking independent pay advice from South West Councils or similar, recommend the remuneration package on appointment to the above posts to Full Council prior to advertisement of the vacancy. The remuneration package will therefore be subject to the approval of Full Council.*

b) All other chief officer posts

*The salary for all other posts covered by this Pay Policy Statement will be set within the job evaluation scheme operated by the Council. All other elements of remuneration will follow either the National Joint Committee for Local Government Services' (NJC) National Agreement on Pay and Conditions or local policy approved by the Council.*

### **3) Increases and additions to remuneration for each chief officer**

a) Chief Executive and Strategic Director Posts

**The Leader of the Council may recommend to Full Council within the remuneration package prior to appointment how salary progression and any annual pay reviews will be administered or calculated. Any further changes to the remuneration package will be subject to Full Council approval.**

**Any annual pay award for the Chief Executive will follow the JNC for Chief Executives national pay award.**

**Any annual pay award for Strategic Director posts will follow the JNC for Chief Officers national pay award.**

b) Theme Managers, Regeneration Manager and Commercial Manager

**The Leader of the Council may recommend to Full Council within the remuneration package prior to appointment how salary progression and any annual pay reviews will be administered or calculated. Any further changes to the remuneration package will be subject to Full Council approval.**

**Any annual pay award for these posts will follow the NJC for Local Authority Services national pay award.**

c) All other Chief Officer posts

*The salary for all other posts covered by this Pay Policy Statement will be set within the Single Status Salary Scheme previously approved by Full Council. Any annual pay award increases will follow the NJC settlement. Any other increases or additions outside the approved Single Status Salary scheme and not specifically allowed for in this Statement will be subject to approval by Full Council.*

#### **4) Use of Performance Related Pay for Chief Officers**

*No performance related pay scheme is currently operated for chief officers. Should any performance related pay schemes for chief officers be implemented they will be subject to approval in advance by Full Council.*

#### **5) Use of Bonuses for Chief Officers**

Bonuses are not currently paid to chief officers. Bonuses to chief officers will only be paid if approved in advance by Full Council.

#### **6) Use of Honoraria**

The policy on the use of Honoraria is set out in the Council's Tartan Book (TDBC local terms and conditions of employment) and may be applied to any post.

#### **7) Use of Market Supplements**

Currently no market supplements are paid to chief officers. Approval must be obtained from Full Council before an award of a market supplement payment can be made to any chief officer post other than those covered by the approved Job Evaluation Scheme.

#### **8) Payment of chief officers on their ceasing to hold office under or be employed by the authority**

Any termination payments to chief officers on ceasing office will comply with the Redundancy and Severance Pay Policy current at that time which will have been approved by Full Council. No additional termination payments will be made without the approval of the Executive, this will include any Compromise Agreement settlements, which may be subject to a confidentiality clause. The current Taunton Deane Compensation Policy is attached in Appendix 2.

#### **9) Remuneration of chief officers who return to Local Authority employment**

Where the chief officer:

**a) was a previously employed chief officer who left with a severance payment and applies to comeback as a chief officer.**

Executive approval would be required to authorise re-employment within the authority of a previously employed chief officer who had left with a severance payment and is seeking re-employment within the severance payment payback period.

**b) was previously employed by the same authority and has comeback as a chief officer under a contract for services.**

The Executive will be required to approve any award of a 'contract for services' to a chief officer who has previously been employed by the authority.

**c) are in receipt of a Local Government Pension Scheme Pension**

If an employee receiving a pension from the Local Government Pension scheme becomes re-employed then their pension could be affected. If their pension plus the earnings from their new job is higher than the final pay their pension was calculated on, then their pension will be affected. For every pound that their earnings plus pension exceed previous pay, then their pension will reduce by a pound. This abatement will last for as long as the person exceeds their limit (so either when the new job ends or they reduce their hours so their earnings drop down below the acceptable level).

An abatement is not applied where the member's pension is less than £3000 per annum.

## **10) Employer Pension Discretions**

All posts are eligible to be in the Local Government Pension Scheme and employers contributions for 2012/13 are 17.3%. The employer pension discretions will be subject of approval by Full Council. The Pensions Discretions adopted by the authority are attached in Appendix D.

## **11) Publication of and access to information relating to remuneration of chief officers**

The remuneration of employees earning over a salary of £58200 per annum (the minimum level required by the Code of Practice on

Data Transparency 2011) will be published on the Taunton Deane Borough Council website.

## **12) Lowest paid staff**

The Council's lowest paid staff are defined as those on the lowest job evaluated grade within the authorities pay structure. Other than posts identified as chief officers within this Statement and recognised apprentices all posts within the Council have been subject to Job Evaluation to assess the value of job content and then, subject to that value, have been placed in the agreed Taunton Deane Borough Council pay scales (TDBC Grades A to L).

At present there are no posts evaluated within Grade A and therefore under the agreed pay structure the minimum starting salary for any staff member covered by the scheme will be the first incremental point of Grade B which is a full time equivalent salary of £12787.

Nationally the lowest pay point is National Spinal Column Point 4 (£12145).

## **13) Relationship between lowest pay and chief officer pay**

The principle of using 'pay multiples' to track and review salary relationships has been, through the Review of Fair Pay in the Public Sector 2011 and the CLG's guidance on transparency, recommended as a way forward for local authorities.

The current multiplier between the lowest paid employee and highest paid chief officer is 8.66:1.

The current multiplier between the mean FTE salary and highest paid chief officer is 4.5:1.

Should either the multiplier between the annual salary paid to a full time employee on the lowest spine point and the annual salary paid to the highest paid chief officer be greater than 1:10 or the multiplier between the mean FTE salary and highest paid chief officer be greater than 1:5 then this will be reported by the Leader of the Council to Full Council for consideration.

## **14) Payments for Elections**

Additional payments are made by Central Government to officers carrying out additional duties at elections. These payments will only be received when elections take place and will vary on the responsibility undertaken. Chief Officers to whom these payments are

made are identified above.

**15) Notes**

- i) All salary references are for full time equivalent salaries and pay multipliers are all calculated using FTE salaries without additional payments being included.
- ii) The statement excludes any posts seconded into Southwest One.

## The Level and Remuneration for each Chief Officer

Post	Statutory Role	Terms and Conditions and JE Status	Salary	Salary Progression	Bonus or Performance related pay	Other Benefits	Pension Enhancement in Year
Chief Executive	Head of Paid Service	JNC Chief Executives – Out of JE	£90,708 - £100,786	Annual Increment subject to satisfactory performance.	No	Lease Car  Payment of Professional Subscription  Election Payments – Returning Officer  Payments relating to LGPS Employer Contributions	No
Strategic Director	Section 151 Officer	JNC Chief Officers – Out of JE	£64,251 - £71,391	Annual Increment subject to satisfactory performance.	No	Honorary Payment for S151 Role  Lease Car  Payment of Professional Subscription  CMT Duty Roster  Payments relating to LGPS Employer	No

						Contributions	
Strategic Director		JNC Chief Officers – Out of JE	£64,251 - £71,391	Annual Increment subject to satisfactory performance.	No	Cash Alternative to Lease Car  Payment of Professional Subscription  CMT Duty Roster  Payments relating to LGPS Employer Contributions	No
Strategic Director		JNC Chief Officers – Out of JE	£64,251 - £71,391	Annual Increment subject to satisfactory performance.	No	Lease Car  Payment of Professional Subscription  CMT Duty Roster  Payments relating to LGPS Employer Contributions	No
Legal and Democratic Manager	Monitoring Officer	NJC Local Authority Services – Out of JE	Below £58,200	Spot Salary	No	Payment of Professional Subscription  CMT Duty Roster  Payments relating to LGPS Employer Contributions	No
Strategy Manager		NJC Local Authority	Below £58,200	Annual Increment subject to	No	Payment of Professional	No

		Services – Out of JE		satisfactory performance.		Subscription CMT Duty Roster  Payments relating to LGPS Employer Contributions	
Performance and Client Manager		NJC Local Authority Services – Out of JE	Below £58,200	Annual Increment subject to satisfactory performance.	No	Lease Car  Payment of Professional Subscription  CMT Duty Roster  Payments relating to LGPS Employer Contributions	No
Growth and Development Manager		NJC Local Authority Services – Out of JE	Below £58,200	Annual Increment subject to satisfactory performance.	No	Lease Car  Payment of Professional Subscription  CMT Duty Roster  Payments relating to LGPS Employer Contributions	No
Community Services Manager		NJC Local Authority Services – Out of JE	Below £58,200	Annual Increment subject to satisfactory performance.	No	Payment of Professional Subscription  CMT Duty Roster  Payments	No

						relating to LGPS Employer Contributions	
Regeneration Manager		NJC Local Authority Services – Out of JE	Below £58,200	Annual Increment subject to satisfactory performance.	No	Lease Car  Payment of Professional Subscription  Payments relating to LGPS Employer Contributions	No
Commercial Manager		NJC Local Authority Services – Out of JE	Below £58,200	Annual Increment subject to satisfactory performance.	No	Payment of Professional Subscription  Payments relating to LGPS Employer Contributions	No
Economic Development Manager		NJC Local Authority Services - In JE	Below £58200	Annual Increment subject to satisfactory performance.	No	Payment of Professional Subscription  Payments relating to LGPS Employer Contributions	No
DLO Lead		NJC Local Authority Services - In JE	Below £58200	Annual Increment subject to satisfactory performance.	No	Payment of Professional Subscription  Essential Car User  Payments relating to LGPS	No

						Employer Contributions	
Corporate Support Lead – Theme 1		NJC Local Authority Services - In JE	Below £58200	Annual Increment subject to satisfactory performance.	No	Lease Car Payment of Professional Subscription Election Payments Payments relating to LGPS Employer Contributions	No
Electoral Services Manager		NJC Local Authority Services - In JE	Below £58200	Annual Increment subject to satisfactory performance.	No	Payment of Professional Subscription Election Payments – Deputy Returning Officer Payments relating to LGPS Employer Contributions	No
Legal Services Manager		NJC Local Authority Services - In JE	Below £58200	Annual Increment subject to satisfactory performance.	No	Payment of Professional Subscription Payments relating to LGPS Employer Contributions	No
Parish Liaison Officer		NJC Local Authority	Below £58200	Annual Increment subject to	No	Election Payments	No

		Services - In JE		satisfactory performance.		Payments relating to LGPS Employer Contributions	
--	--	---------------------	--	------------------------------	--	---	--

1. The following policy on Compensation Payments applies to redundancies and early retirements on the grounds of efficiency of the service, which take effect after 31<sup>st</sup> March 2007.
2. The calculation of redundancy payments is on the basis of actual salary.
3. The Council exercises discretion under the Local Government (Early Termination of Employment) (Discretionary Compensation) Regulations 2006, to make compensatory payments to employees being made redundant based on a multiplier of three times the number of weeks an employee would be entitled to under the statutory redundancy formula, inclusive of any statutory redundancy payment, up to a maximum of 90 weeks' pay.
4. **The Council requires that the full cost of any redundancies is recovered within a period not exceeding five years or by the normal retirement age, whichever is sooner.**
5. **Employees who are eligible to be paid a compensation payment on being made redundant, and who are members of the Local Government Pension Scheme, are given the option of converting their compensation payment (excluding the statutory redundancy payment) into augmented pensionable service. Augmentation is not an option where the compensation payment (excluding the statutory redundancy payment) purchases more pensionable service than the maximum allowable at age 65.**
6. **No compensation payments are made to employees who are allowed to retire early on the grounds of interests of efficiency of the service, following a voluntary request from the employee.**

- |    |  |
|----|--|
| 7. | <p>Where early retirements in the interests of efficiency of the service are management instigated, the Council awards a lump sum compensation payment, which is based on the enhanced compensatory element (excluding the statutory redundancy payment) awarded on redundancy.<br/>(For example: 2 x Stat Red = Interests of efficiency)</p>  |
| 8. | <p><b>Employees who are eligible to be paid a compensation payment on early retirement in the interests of efficiency of the service and who are members of the Local Government Pension Scheme, are given the option of converting their compensation payment into augmented pensionable service.</b><br/><b><u>Augmentation is not an option where the compensation payment purchases more pensionable service than the maximum allowable at age 65.</u></b></p> |

## Appendix

### PRUDENTIAL INDICATORS

PRUDENTIAL INDICATOR	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
	<b>outturn</b>	<b>estimate</b>	<b>estimate</b>	<b>estimate</b>	<b>estimate</b>
<b>Capital Expenditure</b>					
General Fund	£4,884	£8,660	£1,847	£1,807	£2,014
HRA	£6,653	£4,300	£5,500	£7,316	£7,316
TOTAL	£11,537	£12,960	£7,347	£9,123	£9,330
<b>Ratio of financing costs to net revenue stream</b>					
General Fund	0.74%	0.67%	0.86%	0.89%	1.79%
HRA	2.85%	3.33%	17.05%	17.01%	16.60%
<b>Net borrowing projection</b>					
brought forward 1 April	£7,786	£3,670	£4,990	£4,990	£6,392
Carried forward 31 March	£3,670	£4,990	£4,990	£6,392	£8,001
in year borrowing requirement	<b>-£4,116</b>	£1,320	£0	£1,402	£1,609
<b>Capital Financing Requirement as at 31 March</b>					
General Fund	£8,240	£9,369	£9,181	£10,372	£11,741
HRA	£14,451	£14,451	£100,151	£100,151	£100,151
TOTAL	£22,691	£23,820	£109,332	£110,523	£111,892
<b>Incremental impact of capital investment decisions</b>	<b>£ p</b>	<b>£ p</b>	<b>£ p</b>	<b>£ p</b>	<b>£ p</b>
Increase in council tax (band D)	-1.36	5.47	-0.05	-0.05	0.19
<b>Authorised limit for external debt -</b>					
TOTAL	£40,000,000	£139,200,000	£139,200,000	£139,200,000	£141,200,000
<b>Operational boundary for external debt -</b>					
TOTAL	£30,000,000	£103,020,000	£103,020,000	£104,422,000	£106,031,000
<b>Upper limit for fixed interest rate exposure</b>					
Upper Limit for Fixed Interest Rate Exposure on Debt	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Upper Limit for Fixed Interest Rate Exposure on Investments	-100%	-100%	-100%	-100%	-100%
<b>Upper limit for variable rate exposure</b>					
Upper Limit for Variable Interest Rate Exposure on Debt	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%
Upper Limit for Variable Interest Rate Exposure on Investments	-50%	-50%	-50%	-50%	-50%
<b>Maturity Structure of Fixed Rate Borrowing</b> (Upper and lower limits)					
under 12 months	0% to 50%	0% to 50%	0% to 50%	0% to 50%	0% to 50%
12 months and within 24 months	0% to 50%	0% to 50%	0% to 50%	0% to 50%	0% to 50%
24 months and within 5 years	0% to 50%	0% to 50%	0% to 50%	0% to 50%	0% to 50%
5 years and within 10 years	0% to 50%	0% to 50%	0% to 50%	0% to 50%	0% to 50%
10 years and above	20% to 100%	20% to 100%	20% to 100%	20% to 100%	20% to 100%
<b>Upper limit for total principal sums invested for over 364 days</b> (per maturity date)					
	£2m or 20%	£3.5m or	£3.5m or	£3.5m or	£3.5m or

		20%	20%	20%	20%
<b>Gross and Net Debt</b>					
Outstanding Borrowing (at nominal value)	15,973,000	96,993,000	96,993,000	98,395,000	100,004,000
Other Long-term Liabilities (at nominal value)	45,417,000	45,417,000	45,417,000	45,417,000	45,417,000
<b>Gross Debt</b>	61,390,000	142,410,000	142,410,000	143,812,000	145,421,000
Less: Investments	12,300,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
<b>Net Debt</b>	49,090,000	136,410,000	136,410,000	137,812,000	139,421,000

### Credit Risk

Credit ratings remain an important element of assessing credit risk, but they are not a sole feature in the Council's assessment of counterparty credit risk.

The Council also considers alternative assessments of credit strength, and information on corporate developments of and market sentiment towards counterparties. The following key tools are used to assess credit risk:

- Published credit ratings of the financial institution
- Sovereign support mechanisms
- Credit default swaps (where quoted)
- Share prices (where available)
- Economic Fundamentals
- Corporate developments, news, articles, markets sentiment and momentum
- Subjective overlay