

Executive – 22 January 2007

Present: Councillor Williams (Chairman)
Councillors Bishop, Mrs Bradley, Cavill, Leighton and Mrs Lewin-Harris

Officers: Mrs P James (Chief Executive), Mr J J Thornberry (Strategic Director),
Ms J Wishlade (Strategic Director), Mrs D Durham (Democratic
Services Officer) and Mrs W Sharland (Administrative Officer)

Also Present: County Councillor P Buchanan (Deputy Leader, Somerset County
Council), Mr A Jones (Chief Executive, Somerset County Council),
Mr K Rickards (Chief Executive, Sedgemoor District Council) and
Mr D Bamsey (Sedgemoor District Council).

Also Present: Councillors Beaven, Mrs Biscoe, Bowrah, Miss Cavill, Coles, Croad,
Davies, Denington, Durdan, Floyd, Govier, Guerrier, Hayward, Henley,
C Hill, Mrs Marie Hill, Mrs M J Hill, The Mayor (Councillor Hindley),
House, Lees, Lisgo, Meikle, Morrell, Mullins, Murphy, Paul, Phillips,
Prior-Sankey, Slattery, Mrs Smith, P Smith, Stone, Stuart-Thorn, Vail,
Watson and Wedderkopp.

(The meeting commenced at 6 pm.)

5. Apologies

Councillors Clark, Garner and Hall.

6. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 December 2006 were taken as read
and were signed.

7. Public Question Time

Councillor Henley, as a member of the public, stated that in the light of the
result of the ballot in relation to the Housing Stock Transfer the position of the
Executive Councillor with responsibility for Housing was crucial. Could it
therefore be confirmed that Councillor Garner, the appropriate Executive
Councillor, had recently moved abroad.

Councillor Williams reported that the vote of the tenants had been accepted
and every effort would be made to minimise its impact on them. Councillor
Garner had worked overseas before and he would continue his duties as the
relevant portfolio holder.

8. **Declarations of Interest**

Councillors Prior-Sankey and Paul declared personal but not prejudicial interests as members of Somerset County Council. Councillors Govier and Henley declared personal but not prejudicial interest as members of Somerset County Council and Wellington Town Council, and Councillors Mrs Biscoe and Hindley declared personal but not prejudicial interest as members of Wellington Town Council.

9. **Response to the White Paper “Strong and Prosperous Communities” on the Proposed Alternatives for Local Government Structure in Somerset**

Reported that the White Paper challenged Local Government on its future delivery and how this could best be achieved. Council, at its meeting on 12 December 2006, had already taken the decision that they opposed the unitary bid for the whole of the County which had been proposed by Somerset County Council. All other Districts had been unanimous in their rejection of the single unitary proposal. There were now two further propositions to meet the White Paper objectives. A two unitary bid, East and West for Somerset and an enhanced partnership approach.

The Chairman reported that the County Council, at its meeting earlier that day, had agreed to submit a bid for unitary status for the whole of the county. County Councillor Paul Buchanan, Deputy Leader of the Council, and Alan Jones, Chief Executive, were present to speak in support of the County Council's bid and to answer any questions in relation to it.

Also present were Kerry Rickards, Chief Executive of Sedgemoor District Council and Doug Bamsey, Sedgemoor District Council, who submitted details of the two unitary bids.

With regard to the enhanced partnership approach option, all the Somerset districts had co-operated on producing a prospectus on how the aims of the White Paper could be achieved by developing a partnership approach. This would build on the excellent partnership working that everyone had been engaged in over the past years. All district Chief Executives and Leaders had been involved in this and had signed up to it as a valid and innovative way forward. It was taking partnership to the next level and whilst it built on what was currently carried out, it was also about a very different approach. The business case for savings made through this approach indicated a similar level of efficiency gains as those produced by the unitary bids. The key advantage was that it could deliver the outcomes required within the White Paper without the disruption of structural change and the reduction in democratic representation.

South Somerset District Council had been leading the work on an East Somerset Unitary Council. This would cover the area currently covered by themselves and Mendip District Council. Whilst they had to declare in their bid what would happen to the rest of the County, they could not put in a bid on behalf of another area. It was understood that, in the East Somerset bid a unitary authority for West Somerset (the areas currently covered by

Sedgemoor District Council, Taunton Deane Borough Council and West Somerset District Council) had been proposed.

Sedgemoor District Council were leading work on developing a view on what a West Somerset unitary authority would look like. This work was still emerging. Taunton Deane had been co-operating with this work to ensure that there was good representation of the issues within Taunton Deane.

The main advantage of this option was that there was less of a democratic deficit than in a single unitary. However, there would also be some partnership projects that this Council were currently in line to deliver that would need to be rethought if this approach was taken and there was therefore some concern about this option.

The final draft of the prospectus for the enhanced partnership was submitted together with the latest draft Executive summary in relation to two unitary councils' bid.

A full detailed discussion ensued on the merits of the various options that were being proposed.

RESOLVED that Council be recommended that the enhanced partnership approach be supported.

(The meeting ended at 7.50 pm.)

Executive – 7 February 2007

Present: Councillor Williams (Chairman)
Councillors Bishop, Mrs Bradley, Cavill, Clark, Hall, and
Mrs Lewin-Harris

Officers: Ms S Adam (Strategic Director), Ms J Wishlade (Strategic Director),
Mr P Carter (Financial Services Manager), Mrs E Collacott (Principal
Accountant), Mr S Haskell (Housing Accountant), Mr N T Noall (Head
of Development), Mr H Connery and Ms V Dale (Equalities Co-
ordinators), Mrs L Wyatt-Jones (Strategic Human Resources
Consultant), Mr M Western (Head of Housing) Mr A Higton (Overview
and Scrutiny Officer) and Mr G P Dyke (Democratic Services Manager)

Also Present: Councillors Hayward, House, Henley, Lisgo, Prior-Sankey, Mrs F
Smith, P Smith and Wedderkopp

(The meeting commenced at 6:15 pm.)

10. Apologies

Councillor Garner.

11. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 January 2007 were taken as read and
were signed.

12. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Mrs Lewin-Harris declared a personal interest in agenda item 5
“Facilitating the Norton Fitzwarren Dam” as an adjoining landowner and
because of occasional business dealings with the landowner.

Councillor Hayward declared a personal interest in agenda item 5 as the
owner of property on land situated on the border of properties affected by
flooding.

Councillor Prior-Sankey declared an interest in agenda item 5 as a member of
the Environment Agency Flood Defence Committee and a member of
Somerset County Council. She also declared a personal interest in agenda
item 10 “Housing Revenue Account” as the owner of a local authority garage
and in agenda item 15 “Land at Roughmoor” as a members of Somerset
County Council and the Environment Agency Flood Defence Committee.

Malcolm Western, Head of Housing declared a prejudicial interest in agenda
item 13 “Proposals to Refresh the Corporate Management Team”

13. Facilitating the Norton Fitzwarren Dam

Reported that the Taunton Deane Local Plan required that a comprehensive offsite flood alleviation scheme would be provided in order to facilitate the re-development of the former Cider Factory at Norton Fitzwarren.

Submitted reported previously circulated which explained the basis of an agreement between the Environment Agency, the Council and a consortium of developers whereby the consortium would provide and fund an off-site dam to the north of the village together with various works downstream of the dam which would enable the re-development of the Cider Factory site whilst also affording protection to existing properties at risk of flooding.

All costs would be born by the consortium. Subject to the signing of the Agreement it was hoped that the construction of the dam would begin by 1 April 2007. Consideration was given to the detailed terms of the agreement. It was felt to be in everyone's interest that the flood alleviation scheme was provided as soon as possible. The development would mean that the Council would be faced with a reduced affordable housing provision on the Cider Factory development owing to the increased costs associated with the flood alleviation scheme. However it was considered that the benefits of this scheme outweighed the reduction in a number of affordable housing units. Without the scheme no development would be able to take place and therefore there would be no benefit to the local community.

RESOLVED that:

1. the Council enter into an agreement based on the following terms.
 - The consortium commissions and builds the dam and pays for all the design and construction costs.
 - The consortium pays a commuted sum (up to a maximum of £1m) to the Environment Agency for the maintenance of the dam. Any residue to be used for community benefit.
 - The Environment Agency adopts the dam at the end of a three year monitoring period and upgrades the Halse water to a main river (which then falls under their control).
 - The Environment Agency maintains and operates the dam on behalf of the consortium over the three year monitoring period.
 - Taunton Deane Borough Council has the power to intervene under its Land Drainage Act responsibilities to make safe the unfinished dam in the unlikely event of the consortium or contractor not finishing the works (e.g. as a result of insolvency or leaving the site).
 - A bond or other financial mechanism was secured to indemnify the Council against any risk or cost.
 - The Environment Agency agrees to implement the residual works for the protection of existing properties at risk from the 1 in 100 year event (plus 20% allowance or climate change) funded by the consortium. The Environment Agency accepts responsibility for future maintenance.

2. the Head of Development and/or Chief Solicitor be authorised to approve any slight amendments to these terms in consultation with the Executive Members for Environmental Services and Planning Policy and Transportation.

14. Corporate Equality Scheme

Reported that the Council were required by legislation to produce a Race Equality Scheme, a Disability Equality Scheme and from April 2007 a Gender Equality Scheme. Rather than produce three separate schemes the Corporate Equality Scheme brought these requirements together in one comprehensive report.

Consultation on the proposed scheme had previously taken place and the Community Leadership Panel had scrutinised the proposed document at its meeting on 6 February 2007. Details of the Panel's views were submitted.

The Corporate Equality Scheme set out how the Council would meet its statutory public duties to promote equality and to eliminate all forms of direct or indirect discrimination.

RESOLVED that the Corporate Equality Scheme and Corporate Equality Action Plan 2007-2010 as submitted be adopted.

15. Pension Changes and the Implications for Taunton Deane

As a result of the recently introduced Age Discrimination Legislation the way in which the Council were able to pay redundancy compensation and retirement in the interest of efficiency packages had changed. Details of the implications of this legislation were submitted. Consideration was therefore given to the various options that were now available to the Council and which were detailed in the report.

The Staff side representatives and Unison had been consulted on the changes to the pension scheme and details of their views were taken into consideration. It was noted that UNISON had stated that the draft legislation made provision for the award of added years to continue. Advice had been taken from the Pension Fund Manager on this matter and his view was that this was not the case and that this provision would be discontinued.

RESOLVED that:

1. the option to enhance the redundancy and the retirement in the interest of efficiency packages by applying a multiplier of three to the redundancy lump sum and give staff the choice to augment the additional payment into augmented pensional years be agreed. Following discussions with the Council's Section 151 Officer, it had been confirmed that the proposed multiplier was within the Council's current budgets.

2. the proposed redundancy multiplier for all redundancies and retirements in the Interest of Efficiency which take effect from 1 April 2007 in line with Somerset County Council be implemented.
3. The compensation policy as submitted be agreed and work continue on the preparation of a new retirement policy.

16. Taunton Unparished Area Precept as Scrutiny Investigation

At its meeting on 3 August 2006 the Review Board had agreed to set up a Task and Finish Group to look at the current situation regarding to the Special Precept Working Balance and to consider how best this fund could be accessed resulting in equitable distribution across the Taunton unparished area (Minute No 43/2006).

The Task and Finish Review had now been completed and its final report was submitted for consideration. The report had also been considered by the Review Board and it had recommended that the recommendations of the Task and Finish Group be agreed .

RESOLVED that the following structure as proposed by the Task and Finish Group for allocating funds in the future be agreed:-

1. a short bidding process be put in place to deal with requests for money from the precept.
2. a bid pro-forma be developed to enable Councillors in the unparished area or the Executive to formally request funding for community based projects/needs in the unparished area. The information to be included on the pro-forma should require an estimated capital cost and details of any consequential revenue cost as a commuted sum.
3. bids should be considered by an advisory panel comprising five Councillors from the unparished area reflecting the political balance in the unparished area.
4. the Advisory Panel should meet in the first quarter of each financial year and as necessary over the remainder of the year. In order to begin allocating the large balance of the precept a one off bid round should take place in February or March 2007.
5. the final decision on whether to support the recommendations of the Advisory Group be with the Executive Member for Community Leadership and decisions be published in the Weekly Bulletin.
6. the precept should not be used as a first call for schemes that could be funded from other sources.
7. all scheme proposals to include an estimate of the revenue funding needed for the lifetime of the scheme not normally to be more than 20% of the capital cost. This amount will be transferred to the appropriate Taunton Deane Borough Council budget line as a commuted sum.
8. a collection of the precept continue at a level to be determined on a yearly basis by the Council as part of the normal budget setting process and this be used to fund appropriate schemes which fell under the broad headings listed in the report. Any unspent monies be rolled forward to following years.

17. **General Fund Revenue Estimates 2007/2008**

Considered report previously circulated regarding the Executives final 2007/2008 budget proposals prior to submission to Council on 20 February 2007 for consideration. The report contained details on:-

- (i) The General Fund Revenue Budget proposals for 2007/2008 including the proposed Council Tax increase and the Prudential Indicators and
- (ii) draft figures on the predicted financial position of the Council for the following four years.

The report had been considered in detail by the Review Board and details of its views were submitted. Consultation on the budget had taken place with the Taunton Chamber of Commerce, Wellington Chamber and Taunton Town Centre Company and an update of their comments was submitted. In addition, detailed consultation on the priorities of the Council had been carried out with the public with the public. All members had been presented with the initial budget pack and the feedback received had been considered as part of the budget setting process.

Details were submitted at the General Fund budget proposals for 2007/2008. The proposals would result in a total Council Tax increase of 2%.

The Council Tax calculation and formal tax setting resolution was to be considered separately. The proposed budget for Taunton Deane would result in a Band D Council Tax of £128.05 an increase of £2.51 (2%) on 2006/2007. This represented an increase of 4.8p per week. The Band D tax payer would therefore receive all the services provided by the Council in 2007/2008 at a cost of £2.46 per week.

It was a requirement for the Council to prepare not only budgets for the following financial year but also to provide indicative figures for the two years after that. The Medium Term Financial Plan provided an indication of the expected budget gap going forward into 2008/2009 and a summary of this position was submitted.

It was noted that these figures had been prepared on the assumption of a 4.5% increase in Council Tax each year including 2008/2009. In addition annual growth of 1% in government support had also been assumed. The figures took into account the ongoing impact of all the Executive budget proposals and the 2007/2008 proposed Council Tax level.

It was expected that despite the work done in recent years to close the budget gap and produce a sustainable revenue budget the increasing cost of staff (pay, pensions etc) and other demands on the Council would mean that there would continue to be a budget gap in future years. A report would be submitted early in the new financial year which would review the Medium Term Financial Plan position. The objective would be to draw up a plan to resolve the ongoing budget gap for the medium term.

The estimated expenses chargeable to the non-parished area of Taunton in 2007/2008 amounted to £27,870 an increase of 2% and this formed part of the total net expenditure of the Council. The precept in 2006/2007 was £27,320.

As part of the Prudential Code for Capital Finance there was a requirement for Council to approve the indicators set out in the report. These included the borrowing limits and details of the various indicators where submitted.

The Council's Section 151 Officer had a duty to comment as part of the budget setting process upon the robustness of the budget and the adequacy of reserves. Shirlene Adam (Strategic Director), the Council's 151 Officer had thoroughly reviewed the procedures outputs and outcomes of the budget setting process and felt that the Council's reserves were adequate and that the budget estimates used in preparing the 2007/2008 budget were sufficiently robust.

RESOLVED that the Council be recommended that the budget for General Fund services for 2007/2008 as outlined in the report be agreed and that

- (a) the transfer of any potential underspend in 2006/2007 back to General Fund reserves be agreed.
- (b) the proposed 2007/2008 budget be an Authority expenditure of £13,245,730 and Special Expenses of £27,870 be agreed in accordance with the Local Government Act 1992.
- (c) the predicted General Fund Reserve balance at 31 March 2007 of £1,442,400 be agreed.
- (d) the Prudential Indicators for 2007/2008 as set out in the report be agreed.
- (e) the revised forecast budget position for 2008/2009 onwards as outlined in the report be noted.

18. Housing Revenue Account, Revenue Estimates and Rent Levels, Deane Helpline and Deane Building DLO Account 2007/2008

Submitted report previously circulated which outlined the proposed Housing Revenue Account for 2007/2008. It also included details relating to the new rent level, service charges and other Housing related charges such as garage rents. Finally it provided information on the Deane Helpline Trading Account and the Deane Building DLO Trading Account.

It was explained that following the recent ballot on the future of the Housing stock there was a gap between the funding needed to deliver the Decent Homes Standard to the Council's Housing stock and the funding available of £1.85m per year. Details were submitted of how the service would deliver Decent Homes.

Both the Housing Review Panel and the Review Board had considered the 2007/2008 budget report and details of their views were submitted. The Housing Review Panel had proposed no formal amendments to the report but had asked that Officers sought to mitigate the removal of the grant to Neighbourhood Care of £11,000 by finding further equivalent savings elsewhere in the Housing Revenue Account.

The Review Board had supported this suggestion that the Neighbourhood Care grant be re-instated and had recommended that Officers sought to identify funding within the HRA to support this. Members of the Review Board had also commented on the increased staffing costs within the Deane Helpline and the effect that this had had on the Helpline's working balance.

RESOLVED that Council be recommended that the Housing Revenue Account budget for 2007/2008 be agreed.

19. **Capital Programme 2007/2008 Onwards**

Submitted report which detailed the proposed General Fund (GF) and Housing Revenue Account (HRA) capital programmes for the period 2007/2008 to 2010/2011.

For the General Fund, the estimated unallocated resources available were £17,000. The proposed new schemes amounted to £145,000 but were self funding leaving the same £17,000 of unallocated capital resources available for future schemes.

For all Housing schemes, both GF and HRA, the estimated resources available for 2007/2008 amounted to £6593k. The proposed capital programme for 2007/2008 amounted to £6402k. It was noted that it was proposed that the remaining £191,000 be carried forward to support the HRA Decent Homes capital programme into the future.

Details were submitted of the schemes that were currently in the capital programme and those which the Executive proposed to make a priority for the new programme.

Both the Housing Review Panel and the Review Board had considered the draft Housing Capital Programme and had made no formal recommendations.

RESOLVED that Council be recommended that both the General Fund and Housing Revenue Account Capital Programmes be agreed.

20. **Council Tax Setting 2007/2008**

Submitted report which made recommendations to the Council on the proposed level of Council Tax for 2007/2008. The Council was required to make an annual determination which set its gross expenditure (including the Housing Revenue Account and balances brought forward) and gross income (also including the Housing Revenue Account and balances brought forward) with the difference as its budget requirement. This determination is set out in the resolution.

The estimated expenses chargeable to the non parished area of Taunton in 2007/2008 amounted to £27,870 and this formed part of the total net expenditure of the Council. Details were also submitted of the parish precepts levied and the appropriate Council Tax at Band D.

The estimated balance on the Council Tax Collection Fund was a deficit of £45,136. Taunton Deane's share of this amounted to £4,830 and this was reflected in the Revenue Estimates.

The Council's budget requirement including parish precepts and non parished special expenses was £13,630,000. This amount was then reduced by the amount notified in respect of the Borough's Revenue Support Grant amounting to £1,172,035 and the Non Domestic Rates Distribution from the pool amounting to £6,983,855.

The net amount having taken the collection fund position into account of £5,478,940 was used to calculate the Council Tax at Band D reflecting the parish precepts by dividing it by the total of the Council Tax base as approved by the Executive in December 2006.

The Council Tax for the Borough (excluding parish precepts and special expenses for the non parished area) was £128.05, an increase of £2.51 (2%) compared to the 2006/2007 Council Tax. The total Council Tax including the County Council and Police and Fire Authority precepts was still subject to confirmation.

RESOLVED that Council be recommended that subject to final determination including the Council Tax for Somerset County Council and the Police and Fire Authorities which was still to be advised.

Recommendations

(i) That it be noted that at its meeting on 6 December 2006 the Executive calculated the following amounts for the year 2007/08 in accordance with the regulations made under Section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended):-

(1) 39,786.35 being the amount calculated by the Council, in accordance with regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992, as its Council Tax base for the year.

(2)

Ash Priors	74.00	Neroche	246.02
Ashbrittle	88.39	North Curry	717.91
Bathealton	80.85	Norton Fitzwarren	696.58
Bishops Hull	1,079.90	Nynehead	153.26
Bishops Lydeard / Cothelstone	1,919.98	Oake	329.74
Bradford on Tone	278.16	Otterford	166.26

Burrowbridge	203.46	Pitminster	454.24
Cheddon Fitzpaine	643.95	Ruishton / Thornfalcon	620.40
Chipstable	119.73	Sampford Arundel	131.54
Churchstanton	308.21	Staplegrove	711.86
Combe Florey	122.31	Stawley	120.43
Comeytrowe	2,088.55	Stoke St Gregory	384.75
Corfe	130.15	Stoke St Mary	210.55
Creech Michael St	943.89	Taunton	15,914.40
Durston	57.64	Trull	1,022.07
Fitzhead	123.31	Wellington	4,576.12
Halse	143.54	Wellington (Without)	297.40
Hatch Beauchamp	256.79	West Bagborough	157.33
Kingston St Mary	460.80	West Buckland	405.03
Langford Budville	215.56	West Hatch	141.36
Lydeard St Lawrence / Tolland	198.30	West Monkton	1,111.64
Milverton	593.29	Wiveliscombe	1,086.71

being the amounts calculated by the Council, in accordance with regulation 6 of the Regulations, as the amounts of its Council Tax Base for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.

- (ii) That the following amounts be calculated by the Council for the year 2007/08 in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:-

- (a) £69,913,650 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(2)(a) of the Act.
(Gross Expenditure including amount required for working balance).

- (b) £55,398,650 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(3)(a) to (c) of the Act. *(Gross Income including reserves to be used to meet Gross Expenditure).*
- (c) £13,630,000 being the amount by which the aggregate at (a) above exceeds the aggregate at (b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 32(4) of the Act, as its budget requirement for the year.
- d) £8,151,060 being the aggregate of the sums which the Council estimates will be payable for the year into its general fund in respect of redistributed non-domestic rates, revenue support grant, additional grant or SSA reduction grant (increased by the amount of the sums which the Council estimates will be transferred in the year from its Collection Fund to its General Fund in accordance with Section 97(3) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 (*Council Tax Surplus*) and increased by the amount of any sum which the Council estimates will be transferred from its Collection Fund to its General Fund pursuant to the Collection Fund (Community Charge) directions under Sec. 98(4) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 made on 7th February 1994 (*Community Charge Surplus*).
- (e) £137.71
$$\frac{(c) - (d)}{1(i)} = \frac{13,630,000 - 8,151,060}{39,786.35}$$
 being the amount calculated at (c) above less the amount at (d) above, all divided by the amount at 1(i) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 33(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year. *(Average Council Tax at Band D for Borough Including Parish Precepts and Special Expenses).*
- (f) £384,270 being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act. *(Parish Precepts and Special Expenses).*

(g) £128.05

$$(e) - \frac{(f)}{1(i)} = 137.71 - \frac{384,270}{39,786.35}$$

being the amount at (e) above less the result given by dividing the amount at (f) above by the amount at 9.2.1(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 special items relate.

(Council Tax at Band D for Borough Excluding Parish Precepts and Special Expenses).

(h)

Ash Priors	131.43	Neroche	141.87
Ashbrittle	142.76	North Curry	146.85
Bathealton	135.47	Norton Fitzwarren	151.82
Bishops Hull	142.87	Nynehead	148.60
Bishops Lydeard / Cothelstone	146.42	Oake	140.18
Bradford on Tone	145.11	Otterford	128.05
Burrowbridge	151.15	Pitminster	141.92
Cheddon Fitzpaine	137.37	Ruishton / Thornfalcon	144.17
Chipstable	138.91	Sampford Arundel	161.80
Churchstanton	150.62	Staplegrove	140.83
Combe Florey	142.77	Stawley	139.68
Comeytrowe	137.63	Stoke St Gregory	143.64
Corfe	136.50	Stoke St Mary	140.94
Creech St Michael	143.63	Taunton	129.80
Durston	128.74	Trull	139.79
Fitzhead	148.73	Wellington	144.31
	144.04		143.18

Halse		Wellington (Without)	
Hatch Beauchamp	141.29	West Bagborough	143.94
Kingston Mary St	141.07	West Buckland	148.42
Langford Budville	148.93	West Hatch	142.55
Lydeard Lawrence Tolland St /	138.19	West Monkton	139.29
Milverton	139.01	Wiveliscombe	144.25

being the amounts given by adding to the amount at (g) above, the amounts of the special item or items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area mentioned above divided in each case by the amount at 9.2.1(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act, as the basic amounts of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.

(Council Taxes at Band D for Borough, Parish and Special Expenses).

- (i) See overleaf

Figures in ***bold italics*** represent indicative data only

Valuation Band	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
<i>Ash Priors</i>	<i>87.62</i>	<i>102.22</i>	<i>116.82</i>	<i>131.43</i>	<i>160.64</i>	<i>189.84</i>	<i>219.05</i>	<i>262.86</i>
Ashbrittle	95.18	111.03	126.90	142.76	174.49	206.21	237.94	285.52
Bathealton	90.32	105.36	120.42	135.47	165.58	195.68	225.79	270.94
Bishops Hull	95.25	111.12	126.99	142.87	174.62	206.37	238.12	285.74
Bishops Lydeard/Cothelstone	97.62	113.88	130.15	146.42	178.96	211.49	244.04	292.84
Bradford on Tone	96.74	112.86	128.98	145.11	177.36	209.60	241.85	290.22
Burrowbridge	100.77	117.56	134.35	151.15	184.74	218.33	251.92	302.30
Cheddon Fitzpaine	91.58	106.84	122.10	137.37	167.90	198.42	228.95	274.74
Chipstable	92.61	108.04	123.47	138.91	169.78	200.65	231.52	277.82
Churchstanton	100.42	117.14	133.88	150.62	184.10	217.56	251.04	301.24
Combe Florey	95.18	111.04	126.90	142.77	174.50	206.22	237.95	285.54
Comeytrowe	91.76	107.04	122.34	137.63	168.22	198.80	229.39	275.26
Corfe	91.00	106.16	121.33	136.50	166.84	197.17	227.50	273.00
Creech St Michael	95.76	111.71	127.67	143.63	175.55	207.46	239.39	287.26
Durston	85.83	100.13	114.43	128.74	157.35	185.96	214.57	257.48
Fitzhead	99.16	115.67	132.20	148.73	181.79	214.83	247.89	297.46
Halse	96.03	112.03	128.03	144.04	176.05	208.06	240.07	288.08
Hatch Beauchamp	94.20	109.89	125.59	141.29	172.69	204.08	235.49	282.58
Kingston St Mary	94.05	109.72	125.39	141.07	172.42	203.77	235.12	282.14
Langford Budville	99.29	115.83	132.38	148.93	182.03	215.12	248.22	297.86
Lydeard St Lawrence/Tolland	92.13	107.48	122.83	138.19	168.90	199.61	230.32	276.38
Milverton	92.68	108.11	123.56	139.01	169.91	200.79	231.69	278.02
Neroche	94.58	110.34	126.10	141.87	173.40	204.92	236.45	283.74
North Curry	97.90	114.21	130.53	146.85	179.49	212.12	244.75	293.70
Norton Fitzwarren	101.22	118.08	134.95	151.82	185.56	219.29	253.04	303.64
Nynehead	99.07	115.57	132.09	148.60	181.63	214.64	247.67	297.20
Oake	93.46	109.02	124.60	140.18	171.34	202.48	233.64	280.36
<i>Otterford</i>	<i>85.37</i>	<i>99.59</i>	<i>113.82</i>	<i>128.05</i>	<i>156.51</i>	<i>184.96</i>	<i>213.42</i>	<i>256.10</i>
<i>Pitminster</i>	<i>94.62</i>	<i>110.38</i>	<i>126.15</i>	<i>141.92</i>	<i>173.46</i>	<i>204.99</i>	<i>236.54</i>	<i>283.84</i>
Ruishton/Thornfalcon	96.12	112.13	128.15	144.17	176.21	208.24	240.29	288.34
Sampford Arundel	107.87	125.84	143.82	161.80	197.76	233.71	269.67	323.60
Staplegrove	93.89	109.53	125.18	140.83	172.13	203.42	234.72	281.66
Stawley	93.12	108.64	124.16	139.68	170.72	201.76	232.80	279.36
Stoke St Gregory	95.76	111.72	127.68	143.64	175.56	207.48	239.40	287.28
Stoke St Mary	93.96	109.62	125.28	140.94	172.26	203.58	234.90	281.88
Trull	93.20	108.72	124.26	139.79	170.86	201.92	232.99	279.58
<i>Wellington</i>	<i>96.21</i>	<i>112.24</i>	<i>128.27</i>	<i>144.31</i>	<i>176.38</i>	<i>208.45</i>	<i>240.52</i>	<i>288.62</i>
Wellington Without	95.46	111.36	127.27	143.18	175.00	206.81	238.64	286.36
West Bagborough	95.96	111.95	127.94	143.94	175.93	207.91	239.90	287.88
West Buckland	98.95	115.43	131.93	148.42	181.41	214.38	247.37	296.84
West Hatch	95.04	110.87	126.71	142.55	174.23	205.90	237.59	285.10
West Monkton	92.86	108.33	123.81	139.29	170.25	201.20	232.15	278.58

21. **Proposals to Refresh the Corporate Management of the Council**

Consideration was given to a report which set out details of the drivers for change which would require a refresh of the Council's corporate management structure. The report reflected on the current arrangements and made proposals for the future. These included personnel changes including proposed early retirements/redundancies. A second phase further review of the entire organisation was also proposed.

Proposals were within existing budgets and could in large parts be carried out within the Chief Executives delegated powers. However, elements of the proposals required the agreement of Council and it was also important that the proposal in its entirety was supported by Members.

It was anticipated that the proposed changes would reflect the external and internal drivers which were detailed in the report. The proposals could be met within existing budget levels and after paying back the initial up front cost would return ongoing budget savings of approximately £61,000 per annum to the Council's General Fund. In addition there would be ongoing savings to the Councils Housing Revenue Account which would be detailed in a future report.

The total cost of the proposal was £302,000. The majority of this cost fell in 2006/2007 with the remainder falling in 2007/2008. Savings would start to accrue immediately and would be earmarked for paying back the upfront costs of the General Fund Reserve. This would be fully achieved by 2011/2012 meaning that the proposal had a pay back period of 4.9 years.

It was intended that the proposals would ensure that Corporate Management Team remained fit for future as the Council proceeded through a period of unprecedented change and the local government landscape shifted to reflect the issues arising from the White Paper. The proposals also anticipated appropriate support to elected members during this process.

RESOLVED that:

1. the proposals to refresh Corporate Management Team be agreed.
2. Council be recommended to agree the early retirements and voluntary redundancies contained within the proposal for the posts of (a) Head of Housing (b) Head of Environment and Leisure (c) Head of Development.
3. Council be recommended to agree a Supplementary Estimate of £263,000 from General Fund Reserves. This would be fully paid back to the General Fund Reserve by 2011/2012 and thereafter the Council's General Fund budget would benefit by approximately £61,000 a year.

22. **Exclusion of Press and Public**

RESOLVED that the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item because of the likelihood that exempt information would

otherwise be disclosed relating to Clause 7 of Schedule 12 (a) of the Local Government Act 1972. The press and public were also excluded from the meeting for part of the above item (Minute 21) because exempt information was disclosed relating to Clause 1 of Schedule 12(a) of the Local Government Act 1972.

Land at Roughmoor, Taunton

Submitted report previously circulated which identified two potential options for mitigating flood risk to the proposed regeneration sites in central Taunton. It was recommended that the initially more costly option be pursued which included the acquisition of land at Roughmoor because this option had a number of important wider benefits and represented best overall value for money.

Consideration was given to the nature and extent of those wider benefits and it was felt that although none of the higher initial costs of the preferred option would be borne by Taunton Deane, the Council and the public would both gain from its benefits.

The Environment Agency had procured a major report into flooding issues and mitigation measures as they affected the town centre regeneration sites in Taunton. This report, one of the most detailed of its kind ever commissioned by the Agency, had been completed last year and had been approved by the Project Taunton Executive Group at its meeting on 16 November 2006.

RESOLVED that:

1. the preferred option (as set out in the report and identified as option 1 (b)) as contained in the Taunton Vision Flood Risk Management Guidance Report dated October 2006 be pursued to address the flooding issues affecting the key regeneration sites in central Taunton.
2. the negotiations to acquire approximately 20 hectares of land at Roughmoor, Taunton be completed as soon as possible. The acquisition to be funded from monies received from the RDA.

(The meeting ended at 9.20 pm.)