

Executive – 6 February 2008

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

Officers: Shirlene Adam (Strategic Director) Joy Wishlade (Strategic Director),
Paul Carter (Financial Services Manager), Phil Webb (Housing
Manager – Property Services), John Williams (Chief Housing Officer),
Lydia Baker (Housing Accountant), Tim Burton (Development Control
Manager) and Greg Dyke (Democratic Services Manager)

Also present: Councillors Ms Brockwell, Cavill, Critchard, Mrs Lewin-Harris, Meikle,
Morrell and Stuart-Thorn.

(The meeting commenced at 6.15 pm.)

127. Apologies

Councillor R Lees

128. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 January 2008, copies of which had
been circulated, were taken as read and were signed.

129. Public Question Time

Councillor Stuart-Thorn, as a member of the public, asked that an end be
brought to what he felt was discrimination by the Tenants Forum. Their Constitution
stated that neither elected members or employees of the Council were eligible for
membership. He felt that Councillor/tenants should be permitted to become
members of the Forum providing they were careful to declare the necessary interests
at the appropriate time.

Councillor Hazel Prior-Sankey replied that having checked the position there was no
legal reason why a councillor should not be a member of the Tenants Forum.
However, the view had always been taken that the Forum should be independent of
the Council and that a separation of roles should be encouraged. The Constitution
was formulated by the Forum itself, at a time when Councillor Stuart-Thorn was
himself a member (before he became a councillor) and it was entirely up to them if
they wanted to change their Constitution.

Paul Partington stated that last year approval was given for the redevelopment of the
redundant Cider Factory at Norton Fitzwarren, planning application no: 25/2006/020.

In accordance with the Government and Taunton Deane Policies a comprehensive flood scheme is required to ensure no adverse flood risk arises to the development and third parties. As a consequence the flood scheme it will reduce the incidence of flooding in the locality, and this was one of the reasons to grant planning permission. Whilst I have no doubt about the purpose and safety of the Norton Fitzwarren Dam, the recent press release by the developers Barratt Homes about the success of the dam does not mention the other works of the comprehensive flood scheme which have not been started.

A 'Decision Certificate' was issued on 23 August 2007 by Taunton Deane Borough Council to Hammond Yates Ltd had a number of conditions relating to ensuring no adverse flood risks arising to the development and third parties.

There is a park home site, Beauford Park, Norton Fitzwarren. The southern end of this site has had the ground level raised significantly and park homes erected.

He then asked the following questions.

1. In relation to the flood prevention planning conditions of the development of the redundant cider factory, has there been any changes to these conditions?
2. What monitoring has been done by Taunton Deane Borough Council of compliance with planning conditions of the development of the redundant cider factory?
3. In relation to the flood prevention conditions of the redundant cider factory, have there been any breaches in planning conditions?
4. If there have been breaches of the planning conditions of the development of the redundant cider factory, has the developers had any form of notices served on them by Taunton Deane Borough Council?
5. At Beauford Park are all the park homes on the area covered by the site licence for Beauford Park?
6. At Beauford Park was/is planning permission required for the rise in ground level?

Councillor Henley replied that Mr Partington would have an opportunity to ask these questions at a forthcoming public meeting but in the meantime he would be provided with a written answer

130. Declarations of Interest

Councillors Brooks, Henley and Prior-Sankey declared general personal interests as members of Somerset County Council. Councillor Prior-Sankey also declared a personal interest as the tenant of a Council owned garage Councillor Fran Smith declared a personal interest as an employee of Somerset County Council, Councillor Horsley as a representative on the CAB and Councillor Mrs Lewin-Harris as the Council's representative on CAB.

131. Concessionary Travel

Submitted report, previously circulated, which provided information on the operation of the Council's Concessionary Travel Scheme. Also received a presentation from Mark Pedlar, Group Manager, Transporting Somerset. Since 1974 the Council had run two Concessionary Travel Schemes. The first was between 1974 and 1984 using Travel Tokens. The second was from 1990 to the present day, where there was now a statutory concessionary bus pass scheme or, in certain circumstances, a choice of travel vouchers.

The concessionary pass scheme for 2006-2008 established free passes across the County and also to a number of locations outside the county that were able to be reached by direct bus service and/or had a through fare available from a point in Somerset.

In April 2008 the bus pass scheme would change. The Concessionary Bus Travel Act 2007 provided that everyone aged 60 and over in England, and disabled people in England, would get free off peak travel on all local buses anywhere in England.

The authority responsible for the issuing of passes and the management of the scheme was the District or Unitary authorities. These authorities were known as TCAs (Travel Concession Authorities). Currently a TCA was responsible for reimbursing bus operators for concessionary trips made by its residents. The new legislation meant that from 1 April 2008 a TCA would be responsible for reimbursing operators for eligible journeys starting within its boundary, regardless of where the eligible person was resident.

In Somerset the district councils acted in a consortium with the County Council match funding administration costs and taking the role of overall scheme management.

Individual Districts retained responsibility for issuing passes although Mendip and Taunton Deane outsourced this responsibility to the County Council. The County Council had carried out this role for us since 2004.

The Council received partial funding of the scheme through the Revenue Support Grant system although many districts had complained that the additional amounts made available as a result of the 2006 scheme, and expected to be allocated for the 2008 scheme, were insufficient.

Bus companies were reimbursed for actual bus usage based on the number of times a pass was presented against an average fare travelled e.g. if 1000 passes were seen and the average fare (based on adult fare payers) was £2.30 then the company was reimbursed £2,300.00. This figure was modified to take into account the number of passholders who would not have travelled if no scheme existed (generated travel). In Somerset this figure was currently

72%, however, the County Council had negotiated a further reduction down to 70% for 2008/09. In the example above therefore the partnership would actually pay the operator £1,656.00.

In order to make their claim large operators must submit a claim based on a monthly return of pass-holders using the service and the monthly average fare on a route-by-route basis. By this method trends could be checked and unusual or outlandish claims monitored.

Resolved that the report be noted

132. Asset Management Plan 2008

The Asset Management Plan (AMP) was a key corporate planning document, and as such was refreshed on an annual basis.

The 2008 refresh had now been completed and details of the key points were submitted.

Over the next year, the format and content of the AMP would be thoroughly reviewed to ensure it continued to reflect best practice, was focused on the Council's priorities and enabled the Council's property assets to optimise their contribution to corporate goals and improved service delivery.

Resolved that the 2008 AMP be agreed and the intention to carry out a best practice review over the coming months be noted.

133. Planning – revised charges and potential impact of changes to the Householder Consents Scheme

Reported that the Overview and Scrutiny Board had previously considered a report on pre-application planning advice (i.e. requests for advice on the likelihood of planning permission being granted) at its meeting on 1 November 2007. The principle of increasing charges for this service and reinvesting additional receipts to improve the service provided were supported by the Board. It was also considered that the charge should apply to all requests.

Forthcoming changes to legislation in respect of householder development would inevitably have a significant negative impact on fee income and it was therefore important that the Council considered ways of mitigating this.

These issues were further considered by the Overview and Scrutiny board on 24 January 2008. Following that meeting, increased charges had been proposed, which it was estimated would raise an additional £15,000 income per annum. Potential to increase charges was limited by government guidance which indicated that such charges must reasonably relate to the service being provided and should not be used to subsidise other work. It was felt, therefore, that the additional income generated would be reinvested in the

Planning Service to increase resources both in terms of Planning Officer time as well as admin support to administer the pre-application service. This would form part of a wider restructure of the Development Management service aimed at increasing the resources available to respond to major applications as well as reducing response times generally. Full details of existing and proposed charges were submitted.

With the increase in charges, customers would rightly expect an improved service. It was therefore proposed to also introduce service standards where, if targets were not met, charges, or a percentage of charges, would be refunded.

Increased income was dependent upon having adequate staff available to meet these targets. At present there were three vacant planning officer posts and it would be impractical to introduce the charges until these were filled.

The Barker Review identified a major issue in terms of the ability of local planning authorities to meet the growth agenda. The report concluded that too much planning officer time was spent dealing with minor proposals and that in future resources should be redirected towards those proposals that delivered housing growth.

Following on from this, the Government had embarked on a review of Householder Consents. This was to reassess the General Permitted Development Order with a view to increasing permitted development rights for householder proposals such as domestic extensions. Such a proposal was likely to result in a reduction of planning applications received by up to 30% (i.e. 225 applications per year).

It was inevitable that an associated impact of the introduction of this legislation would be a significant increase in requests as to whether planning permission was required. Whilst there was provision within the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to seek a formal determination (s192 of the Act) Taunton Deane Borough Council had traditionally dealt with such requests on an informal basis.

The Householder Consents Review would therefore result in a shift away from application based work, which generated a planning fee (currently normally £135 per application) to work that did not generate any income. In order to continue support the resource necessary to provide a reasonable level of service to the public, ways had to be found to mitigate this potential loss of income.

It was increasingly common practice for local planning authorities to deal with all requests as to whether planning permission was required formally under s192. This not only had the advantage to the Council of a statutory fee (50% of the planning application fee for that category of development) but the certificate could also be of significant benefit to the householder as it provided them with a legal document that could often prove invaluable should they come to sell the property.

Resolved that:

- (i) subject to the vacant posts referred to above being filled, the revised charges set out in the report for pre application advice be agreed and introduced with effect from 1 April 2008; and
- (ii) the Council deals with all requests as to whether planning permission was required in accordance with s192 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

134. Capital Strategy 2008-11

Although there was no statutory requirement for the Council to prepare a Capital Strategy, in terms of setting direction for the use of the Council's capital resources the strategy was seen as a "must have" document.

The Capital Strategy was a summary of the Council's approach to capital investment including:-

- Our Vision,
- The identification of needs and our needs gap,
- The management and monitoring of the capital programme,
- The capital programme and the level of resources available,
- Our approach to procurement and partnership working,
- Linkages to other corporate plans.

The revised draft Strategy for 2008-11 was submitted. It had been updated from last year's version by incorporating new developments being undertaken by the Council and refreshing the financial data included within the document.

The Strategy and Performance Panel had considered the draft document at its meeting on 5 February and details of the comments made at that meeting were submitted.

Resolved that Council be recommended that the draft Capital Strategy for 2008-11 be agreed.

135. General Fund Revenue Estimates 2008/09

Considered report, previously circulated, regarding the Executive's final 2008/09 budget proposals, prior to submission to Full Council on 19 February 2008 for approval. The report contained details on:

- (i) The General Fund Revenue Budget proposals for 2008/09, 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.

A detailed consultation had been undertaken on the priorities of the Council with the public. A summary of the findings of "Your Council, Your Views" was included in the Councillors Consultation Pack. Further consultation sessions on the budget had also been arranged with the Taunton Chamber of Commerce, Wellington Chamber and Taunton Town Centre Company.

Details were submitted of the new initiatives proposed by the Executive, some further information on the budget gap projection, and a summary of the overall budget proposal. The proposals would result in a total Council Tax increase of 3.0%.

The Overview and Scrutiny Board had considered the Executive's draft budget proposals at its meeting on 24 January 2008. The Board made comments on some of the savings and new initiatives but made no formal request for changes to the budget proposals.

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 £131.89, an increase of £3.84 (3.0%) on 2007/08. This represented an increase of 7.4p pence per week. The Band D taxpayer would receive all the services provided by the Council in 2008/09 at a cost of £2.54 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 for the two years after that. The Medium Term Financial Plan provided an indication of the expected budget gap going forward into 2009/10 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 2009/10. Government support was based on the draft figures. The figures took into account the ongoing impact of all of the Executive's budget proposals and the 2008/09 proposed Council Tax level.

The estimated expenses chargeable to the non-parished area of Taunton in 2008/09 amounted to £29,190, an increase of 4.75%, and this formed part of the total net expenditure of the Council. The precept in 2007/08 was £27,870.

As part of the Prudential Code for Capital Finance there was a requirement for Council to approve the indicators as set out in the report. These included the expected spend on the capital programme and the expected borrowing requirement for both the General Fund and the Housing Revenue Account. They also set the operational boundaries for both borrowing/investment levels and interest rate exposures for the Council.

The Council's S151 Officer had a duty to comment, as part of the budget setting process on the robustness of the budget and the adequacy of reserves,

Shirlene Adam (Strategic Director), the Council's S151 Officer had thoroughly reviewed the procedures, outputs and outcomes of the budget setting process and felt that the Council's reserves were adequate and the budget estimates used in preparing the 2008/09 budget were sufficiently robust.

Resolved that the Council be recommended that the budget for General Fund services for 2008/09 as outlined in the report be agreed and that

- a) the transfer for any potential underspend in 2007/08 back to General Fund reserves be agreed;
- b) the proposed 2008/09 budget, being Authority expenditure of £13,614,270 and Special Expenses of £29,190 be agreed in accordance with the Local Government Act 1992;
- c) the predicted General Fund Reserve balance at 31 March 2008 of £844,203 be agreed;
- d) the Prudential Indicators for 2008/09 as set out in the report be agreed;
- e) the forecast budget position for 2009/10 onwards as outlined in the report be noted.

136. Housing Revenue Account, Revenue Estimates and Rent Levels, Deane Helpline and Deane Building DLO Account 2008/2009

Submitted report, previously circulated, which outlined the proposed Housing Revenue Account (HRA) for the 2008/09 Financial Year. 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 Deane Building DLO Trading Account.

The Overview and Scrutiny Board had considered the 2008/09 draft budget at its meeting on 24 January 2008. The Board discussed in detail the increase in negative subsidy payable and some other aspects of the service but made no formal suggestions for amendments to the draft budget.

The Tenants Forum had also consider the report at its meeting on 4 February 2008 and details of their comments were submitted.

Resolved that Council be recommended that the Housing Revenue Account budget for 2008/09 be agreed.

137. Capital Programme 2008/09 Onwards

Submitted report which detailed the proposed General Fund (GF) and Housing Account (HRA) capital programmes for the period 2008/09 and beyond.

For the General Fund the existing unallocated resources available were £43k. It was proposed to direct these resources entirely towards the replacement desktop hardware programme.

For all Housing schemes, both GF and HRA, the estimated resources available for 2008/09 amounted to £7,280k. The proposed capital programme for 2008/09 amounted to £6,576k. The unallocated resources of £704k were proposed to be carried forward to support the Housing Capital Programme in future years.

The Overview and Scrutiny Board had considered the draft programme at its meeting on 24 January and made no formal suggestions for any changes to the programme. The Housing Tenants Forum considered the draft Housing capital programme at its meeting on 4 February 2008 and details of their comments were submitted.

For both the GF and HRA any new schemes, which emerged during the lifespan of the programmes, would be funded through existing unallocated resources or through new resources, such as new capital receipts.

Resolved that Council be recommended that the General Fund and Housing Revenue Account capital programmes be agreed.

138. **Council Tax Setting 2008/09**

Submitted report which made recommendations to Council on the level of Council Tax for 2008/09.

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 2008/09 amounted to £29,190 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 £480,797. Taunton Deane's share of this amounts to £50,486 and this was reflected in the revenue estimates.

The Council's budget requirement was £14,014,469 including draft Parish Precepts and non-parished Special Expenses. This amount was then reduced by the amount notified in respect of the Borough's Revenue Support Grant (RSG) amounting to £1,022,665 and the Non Domestic Rates Distribution (NDR) from the pool, amounting to £7,346,300.

The net amount, having taken the collection fund position into account, of £5,695,990 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 January 2008.

The Council Tax for the borough (excluding Parish Precepts and Special Expenses for the non-parished area) was £131.89, an increase of £3.84 (3.0%) compared to the 2007/08 Council Tax. The total Council Tax, including the County Council, Police and Fire Authorities precepts was still subject to confirmation

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

(i) That it be noted that at its meeting on 14 January 2008 the Executive calculated the following amounts for the year 2008/09 in accordance with the regulations made under Section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended):-

(1) 40,153.07 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	78.82	Neroche	248.78
Ashbrittle	90.22	North Curry	724.80
Bathealton	81.22	Norton Fitzwarren	737.28
Bishops Hull	1,075.04	Nynehead	168.96
Bishops Lydeard/ Cothelstone	1,915.67	Oake	330.56
Bradford on Tone	277.60	Otterford	168.23
Burrowbridge	203.67	Pitminster	449.53
Cheddon Fitzpaine	636.76	Ruishton/ Thornfalcon	621.22
Chipstable	120.07	Sampford Arundel	128.69
Churchstanton	313.19	Staplegrove	719.37
Combe Florey	123.09	Stawley	123.05
Comeytrowe	2,088.46	Stoke St Gregory	381.60
Corfe	137.97	Stoke St Mary	212.07
Creech St Michael	940.01	Taunton	16,083.61
Durston	58.99	Trull	1,008.61
Fitzhead	124.85	Wellington	4,646.65
Halse	146.71	Wellington (Without)	297.29

Hatch Beauchamp	265.32	West Bagborough	159.39
Kingston St Mary	460.34	West Buckland	439.50
Langford Budville	220.32	West Hatch	140.64
Lydeard St Lawrence/Tolland	199.61	West Monkton	1,104.87
Milverton	596.15	Wiveliscombe	1,104.32

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 2008/09 in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:-
- (a) £72,268,826 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) £58,254,357 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) £14,014,469 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) £8,318,479 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 7 February 1994 (Community Charge Surplus).

(e) £141.86 $\frac{(c) - (d)}{1(i)} = \frac{14,014,469 - 8,318,479}{40,153.07}$

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) £400,199 being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act. (Parish Precepts and Special Expenses.)

(g) £131.89 $\frac{(e) - (f)}{1(i)} = \frac{141.86 - 400,199}{40,153.07}$

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	135.06	Neroche	145.56
Ashbrittle	148.52	North Curry	152.59
Bathealton	139.28	Norton Fitzwarren	155.48
Bishops Hull	150.49	Nynehead	151.42
Bishops Lydeard/ Cothelstone	147.03	Oake	143.99
Bradford on Tone	150.80	Otterford	131.89
Burrowbridge	154.06	Pitminster	147.13
Cheddon Fitzpaine	141.31	Ruishton/ Thornfalcon	150.00
Chipstable	145.22	Sampford Arundel	166.39
Churchstanton	155.84	Staplegrove	145.79
Combe Florey	144.89	Stawley	148.14

Comeytrowe	141.95	Stoke St Gregory	147.61
Corfe	139.86	Stoke St Mary	149.41
Creech St Michael	147.54	Taunton	133.70
Durstun	132.57	Trull	145.77
Fitzhead	153.28	Wellington	148.39
Halse	146.20	Wellington (Without)	147.53
Hatch Beauchamp	145.27	West Bagborough	138.16
Kingston St Mary	147.10	West Buckland	150.09
Langford Budville	155.13	West Hatch	147.04
Lydeard St Lawrence/Tolland	146.42	West Monkton	143.29
Milverton	146.99	Wiveliscombe	147.83

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 1(ii) 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:

138. (ii) (i) Shaded figures represent indicative data only

Valuation Band	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Ash Priors	90.04	105.05	120.06	135.06	165.07	195.09	225.10	270.12
Ashbrittle	99.02	115.51	132.02	148.52	181.53	214.53	247.54	297.04
Bathealton	92.86	108.33	123.81	139.28	170.23	201.18	232.14	278.56
Bishops Hull	100.33	117.05	133.77	150.49	183.93	217.38	250.82	300.98
Bishops Lydeard/Cothelstone	98.02	114.36	130.70	147.03	179.70	212.38	245.05	294.06
Bradford on Tone	100.54	117.29	134.05	150.80	184.31	217.82	251.34	301.60
Burrowbridge	102.71	119.82	136.95	154.06	188.30	222.53	256.77	308.12
Cheddon Fitzpaine	94.21	109.91	125.61	141.31	172.71	204.12	235.52	282.62
Chipstable	96.82	112.95	129.09	145.22	177.49	209.76	242.04	290.44
Churchstanton	103.90	121.21	138.53	155.84	190.47	225.10	259.74	311.68
Combe Florey	96.60	112.69	128.80	144.89	177.09	209.29	241.49	289.78
Comeytrove	94.64	110.40	126.18	141.95	173.50	205.04	236.59	283.90
Corfe	93.24	108.78	124.32	139.86	170.94	202.02	233.10	279.72
Creech St Michael	98.36	114.75	131.15	147.54	180.33	213.12	245.90	295.08
Durston	88.38	103.11	117.84	132.57	162.03	191.49	220.95	265.14
Fitzhead	102.19	119.22	136.25	153.28	187.34	221.41	255.47	306.56
Halse	97.47	113.71	129.96	146.20	178.69	211.18	243.67	292.40
Hatch Beauchamp	96.85	112.99	129.13	145.27	177.55	209.84	242.12	290.54
Kingston St Mary	98.07	114.41	130.76	147.10	179.79	212.48	245.17	294.20
Langford Budville	103.42	120.66	137.90	155.13	189.60	224.08	258.55	310.26
Lydeard St Lawrence/Tolland	97.62	113.88	130.16	146.42	178.96	211.50	244.04	292.84
Milverton	98.00	114.32	130.66	146.99	179.66	212.32	244.99	293.98
Neroche	97.04	113.21	129.39	145.56	177.91	210.26	242.60	291.12
North Curry	101.73	118.68	135.64	152.59	186.50	220.41	254.32	305.18
Norton Fitzwarren	103.66	120.93	138.21	155.48	190.03	224.58	259.14	310.96
Nynehead	100.95	117.77	134.60	151.42	190.07	218.72	252.37	302.84
Oake	96.00	111.99	128.00	143.99	175.99	207.99	239.99	287.98
Otterford	87.93	102.58	117.24	131.89	161.20	190.51	219.82	263.78
Pitminster	98.09	114.43	130.79	147.13	179.83	212.52	245.22	294.26
Ruishton/Thornfalcon	100.00	116.67	133.34	150.00	183.33	216.67	250.00	300.00
Sampford Arundel	110.93	129.41	147.91	166.39	203.37	240.34	277.32	332.78
Staplegrave	97.20	113.39	129.60	145.79	178.19	210.59	242.99	291.58
Stawley	98.76	115.22	131.68	148.14	181.06	213.98	246.90	296.28
Stoke St Gregory	98.41	114.81	131.21	147.61	180.41	213.22	246.02	295.22
Stoke St Mary	99.61	116.21	132.81	149.41	182.61	215.82	249.02	298.82
Taunton	89.14	103.99	118.85	133.70	163.41	193.12	222.84	267.40
Trull	97.18	113.38	129.58	145.77	178.16	210.56	242.95	291.54
Wellington	98.93	115.41	131.91	148.39	181.37	214.34	247.32	296.78
Wellington Without	98.36	114.74	131.14	147.53	180.32	213.10	245.89	295.06
West Bagborough	92.11	107.46	122.81	138.16	168.86	199.57	230.27	276.32
West Buckland	100.06	116.74	133.42	150.09	183.44	216.80	250.15	300.18
West Hatch	98.03	114.36	130.71	147.04	179.72	212.39	245.07	294.08
West Monkton	95.53	111.45	127.37	143.29	175.13	206.98	238.82	286.58
Wiveliscombe	98.56	114.98	131.41	147.83	180.68	213.53	246.39	295.66

Being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at (h) above by the number which, in proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which is that proportion applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands (Council Tax for Individual Parishes and the Borough)

That it be noted that for the year 2008/09 the Somerset County Council, the Avon and Somerset Police Authority and the Somerset and Devon Fire and Rescue Authority have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwelling shown below:

Somerset County Council	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
-------------------------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

Avon and Somerset Police Authority	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Devon and Somerset Fire and Rescue Authority	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

139. **Growth Point Funding**

Reported that in partnership with Somerset County Council, Taunton Deane Borough Council had applied to Government for Growth Point funding. This money was to be used for infrastructure that supported the growth of housing and the subsequent growth in the population. The agreed approvals for the spending programme would be ascertained from the Project Taunton Executive and the Project Taunton Advisory Board. However, as Taunton Deane Borough Council had an integral interest as a key land owner it was important that the Steering Group supported the planned projects.

Taunton Deane Borough Council/Somerset County Council had applied for £70m in their Growth Point funding bid. Notification had now been received that we would receive £2.740m capital and £2.87k revenue in 2008/09 and had been allocated an indicative allocation of £5.128m capital and £401.6k revenue for the following two years. However we had been told that CLG would hold a consultation exercise in the Spring to test out this new way of funding and following that we would be invited to reapply for the next two years' funding. The funding was not ring-fenced, but must be used to support growth. Our bid was accepted on the basis of the types of projects that were evidenced in it.

As we did not receive the total amount that we bid for, the projects that we plan to use this money on had to be prioritised. As this was partnership money the Project Taunton Executive and Advisory Board had agreed that they were the most appropriate bodies to give that partnership approval. However, as many of the projects also concerned Taunton Deane assets these projects must also be approved by Taunton Deane.

The South West Regional Development Agency were also promoting an additional fund – the Regional Infrastructure Fund – which offered forward funding of pieces of infrastructure that were required for development to take place, but which could be financed retrospectively by developer contributions. An initial bid had been submitted into this fund for the flood alleviation works at Longrun Farm and for the extension to the Park and Ride at Silk Mills. Details were submitted of the proposed priorities that had been agreed between the Somerset County Council and Taunton Deane Borough Council and Delivery Team.

Resolved that the schemes set out in the report be agreed as the ones that should be prioritised for delivery using the 08/09 Growth Point funding allocation. The Castle Green project should be subject to a plan for displaced car parking and the re-routing of buses from Castle Green.

(The meeting ended at 7.50p.m. .)