

Executive – 2 February 2010

Present: Councillor Henley (Chairman)
Councillors Coles, R. Lees, Paul, Prior-Sankey, Slattery,
A Wedderkopp and Mrs Wilson

Officers: Penny James (Chief Executive), Joy Wishlade (Strategic Director), Kevin Toller (Strategic Director), Tonya Meers (Legal and Democratic Services Manager), Maggie Hammond (Strategic Finance and Section 151 Officer), Ian Jamieson (Deputy Section 151 Officer), Paul Fitzgerald (Financial Services Manager), Paul Carter (Financial Services Manager), John Williams (Chief Housing Officer), Gill Stratford (Corporate Finance Assistant), Mark Leeman (Strategy Lead) and Richard Bryant (Democratic Services Manager).

Also present: Councillors Beaven, Bishop, Brooks, Mrs Court-Stenning, Farbahi, Hall, Horsley, Mrs Lewin-Harris, McMahon, Morrell, Mrs Stock-Williams, Stuart-Thorn, Swaine, Mrs Waymouth, Mrs Whitmarsh and Williams

(The meeting commenced at 6.15 pm.)

9. Apology

Councillors Mrs Smith.

10. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 January 2010, copies of which had been circulated, were taken as read and were signed.

11. Public Question Time

(a) Councillor McMahon referred to the proposal to either transfer to the Parish Council the responsibility for looking after the public toilets in Milverton or see their possible closure. As these facilities were well used, their closure would be a further erosion of local services. He understood that the public conveniences in Wiveliscombe had originally also been targeted but that they had now been spared the cuts. He asked on what basis this decision had been made? He also enquired whether it was fair to expect the Parish Council to take on the unexpected costs of cleaning the toilets having now set its precept?

One further observation from Councillor McMahon was in respect of the proposed closure of the toilets in Station Road, Taunton. These were the only conveniences now north of the town centre and their closure ought therefore to be reconsidered.

In response, the Chairman (Councillor Henley) commented that he understood that consultation with the Parish Councils over the transfer/closure

of toilets had taken place in sufficient time for decisions over the level of precepts to be made. He also stated that given the current financial situation, most of the other districts in Somerset had already passed the responsibility for cleaning toilets outside of the main urban areas to their Parish Councils.

As to Councillor McMahon's other points, the Chairman promised to send him a written response in due course.

(b) Councillor Morrell reported that he had been informed that up to the beginning of December 2009, the costs of the Somerset Square works had totalled approximately £798,000. Design costs alone had accounted for £100,000.

He asked whether it was felt this was value for money and, if not, whether the Executive was willing to investigate this level of expenditure.

The Chairman also promised Councillor Morrell a written response.

12. **Declarations of Interest**

Councillors Henley, Paul and Prior-Sankey declared personal interests as Members of Somerset County Council. Councillor Prior-Sankey also declared personal interests as she rented a garage from the Council and as a Member of the Supporting People Advisory Board. Councillor Coles declared a personal interest as a Director of Southwest One. Councillor Slattery declared personal interests both as a Member of the Somerset Waste Board and as an employee of Sedgemoor District Council.

13. **Draft Corporate Strategy 2010-2013**

Considered report previously circulated concerning the Draft Corporate Strategy for 2010-2013.

As well as providing direction for the Council, the Corporate Strategy contained the Council's Vision, Business Principles and Core Values and described the key outcomes that the Council intended to achieve in the community over the next three years.

Four new Corporate Aims (Priorities) were included in the Strategy to replace the Council's ETCHED (Economy, Transport, Crime, Healthy Living, Environment and Delivery) aims. These new aims were:-

- Tackling Deprivation and Sustainable Community Development;
- Regeneration (economic development and housing growth);
- Affordable Housing; and
- Climate Change.

These aims were all directly related to the growth agenda and, as a result, an amendment had been suggested to the Council's Vision to reflect the importance of the growth agenda and the possibilities that it will provide. The Vision was now intended to read:-

“Taunton Deane will be recognised nationally as a place that is developing in a sustainable way, securing a better life and future for its people, businesses and communities”.

Supporting the Corporate Aims were nine Corporate Objectives and a list of key activities. Noted that the number of Objectives had been reduced from 20 and that there had been a similar proportionate reduction in the number of key activities.

Performance would be monitored against the Corporate Strategy to understand how effective the Council was at delivering the aims and objectives. This would be done in the following ways:-

- Activity monitoring: Managers would be contacted on a quarterly basis for an update against each of the activities; and
- Performance Indicators had been selected that would provide statistical evidence to support an assessment of performance. The chosen National Indicators were within the Local Area Agreement. Data collection for most of the National Indicators was on a yearly basis. Locally defined Indicators would need more work in order to define data sources, baselines and targets.

In preparing the new Strategy, a 'Profile of Services' exercise has been undertaken to determine what Taunton Deane's future priorities should be.

Councillors had considered the community priorities, central Government requirements and what had already been committed to in partnership with the Local Area Agreement, Sustainable Community Strategy and other local agreements.

Councillors then used this context to consider in which of 75 different service areas the Council should increase, decrease or maintain investment.

The headline results for the increase/decrease areas were captured as follows:-

Service Area	Increase Investment	Decrease Investment
Climate Change	Yes	
Tackling Deprivation	Yes	
Growth and Economic regeneration	Yes	
Affordable Housing	Yes	
Tourist Information Centre		Yes
The Town Centre Company		Yes

Golf and Tennis	Yes
Pest Control	Yes
Conservation and Heritage	Yes
Licensing	Yes
Food Control	Yes
Scrutiny	Yes

This profile of services had been fed into the Core Council Review and had helped shape the Council's restructure. This would ensure that the Council was 'fit for purpose' and could effectively deliver against the new priorities from 2010 to 2013.

Reported that delivering the Corporate Aims would be achieved through the development of a 'Strategic Aims Delivery Plan'. This would be the equivalent of a service plan and would outline time-scales, key actions, risks, resource requirements, expected outcomes and key performance indicators.

It was acknowledged that to assist delivery, the Council needed to develop an enthusiastic and flexible workforce that could move between priorities. This would involve the "thematic working" which the Core Council Review had introduced.

The quality of service delivery would be considered and different ways of delivering the same service at less cost would be investigated. Services would be reviewed to identify opportunities for income generation and further streamlining.

A thorough review of assets would be undertaken and would be led by Southwest One aimed at exploring potential new revenue streams.

Public consultation on the Corporate Strategy would take place in Spring 2010. The Equalities Impact Assessment that had been undertaken would be used to inform this consultation. Primarily, the Council wanted to challenge whether the right key activities had been chosen and whether there were any alternative suggestions.

The Corporate Scrutiny Committee had considered the Corporate Strategy on three separate occasions since last October and had contributed widely to its new format.

Resolved that:-

- (1) the Draft Corporate Strategy 2010-2013 be approved; and
- (2) Full Council be recommended to adopt the Corporate Strategy.

14. **General Fund Revenue Estimates 2010/2011**

Considered report previously circulated regarding the Executive's final

2010/2011 budget proposals, prior to submission to Full Council on 16 February 2010 for approval.

Each year the Council set an annual budget which detailed the resources needed to meet operational requirements. The Council's approach followed key objectives of the Budget Strategy which were to:-

- Maintain an affordable and sustainable Council Tax position;
- Run an inclusive, open and transparent budget setting process;
- Ensure budgets were realistic, balanced, sustainable, and supported Corporate Priorities;
- Maintained a strong balance sheet position;
- Managed spending within budgets;
- Delivered year on year cash and non-cash efficiency savings in line with Government targets;
- Continued to improve on Financial Management, Use of Resources and Value for Money assessments;
- Maintained General Fund Reserves at a minimum of £1,250,000 (or £1,000,000 if being replenished via invest to save initiatives); and
- Maintained Housing Revenue Reserves at no less than £150 per dwelling.

The Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) was set out within the Financial Strategy Framework, which was a key link between the Corporate Strategy and financial planning and recognised the difficult issues and challenges facing this Council.

The annual budget was also prepared within the context of the MTFP and was essentially focussed on setting the budget for the first year of a 5-year rolling financial plan.

Budget setting this year had been considerably influenced by the overall economic climate and the major changes faced by Taunton Deane such as the Core Council Review. The investment in services and consideration of savings targets and delivery plans aimed to ensure that the Council was directing resources towards its highest priorities.

Reported that there were two main aims of this budget setting process – to ensure the increase in Council Tax was minimised and, at the same time, to try and maintain good front line service provision.

The MTFP had been updated over the summer to reflect the latest estimates

of demographic, legislative and other known changes considered to be unavoidable.

The initial Budget Strategy for 2010/2011 was presented to Corporate Scrutiny on 29 October 2009, which set out to identify options to close the General Fund Budget Gap which at that time stood at close to £1.4m.

The General Fund Revenue Account was the Council's main fund and showed the income and expenditure relating to the provision of services. Although the Council made charges for some of its services which reduced the net cost of providing them, the remaining expenditure was funded by the Government through the Revenue Support Grant and National Non-Domestic Rates and by the Council Tax payer.

In 2009/2010 the Council received a total of £8,536,000 from the Government via the Finance Settlement. The final figure for 2010/2011 was £8,721,220, an increase of 2.17%.

As 2010/2011 was the final year of the current three-year settlement, the Council did not have draft figures from the Government for future years. However, for the purposes of the MTFP a fall in funding during the next three year financial settlement period had been predicted.

Noted that the Government had indicated that they did not expect to see Council Tax increases above 3%.

Reported in detail on the unavoidable increases in costs together with a series of initiatives and savings proposed by the Executive for inclusion in the 2010/2011 budget. These could be summarised as follows:-

	£'000	£'000
Budget Requirement 2009/10 (excluding parishes)		14,216
General Inflationary increases	386	
Unavoidable increases		
Ongoing impact of 2009/10 pressures/savings	271	
Loss of car parking income (impact of P&R / Project Tauntor)	257	
Waste service contract inflation / reduced Recycling Credits	136	
Removal of DLO contribution to general fund (2009/10 only)	112	
Impact of VAT increase from 15% to 17.5%	73	
Loss of income from market site	21	
Repayment of capital borrowing (MRP)	10	
New initiatives / spending on services		
Waste service enhancements and withdrawal of bring banks	84	
Reinstatement of 'frozen' staff posts	133	
Removal of grant income for posts removed in the CCR	100	
Removal of vacancy factor	50	
Software licences for system enhancements (QAS/GIS)	26	
Castle Green maintenance	22	
Youth initiatives (includes £15k one-off)	30	
Statutory BV Place Survey	11	
Tree planting (one-off)	10	
Parish precepts	13	
Other	25	
Revenue Financing of Capital Programme	49	
Savings		
Core Council Review	(450)	
Income generation - fees and charges	(478)	
Savings Delivery Plans	(315)	
HB Administration Subsidy	(71)	
Reduction in Discretionary Rate Relief budget	(49)	
Concessionary travel demand	(40)	
Removal of Deprived Areas Fund	(36)	
Reduced maintenance following cremator enhancements	(44)	
Other Savings	(98)	
Net change in interest costs and investment income	58	
Increase in Net Operating Costs		<u>296</u>
Budget Requirement 2010/11		<u>14,512</u>
Net increase to be met by:		
Government grants and taxation base budget		14,216
Government grant increase	185	
Increase/decrease in Collection Fund surplus / (deficit)	(48)	
Impact of change in Tax Base	(2)	
Parish Precepts and Special expenses	30	
Council tax	<u>131</u>	
		<u>296</u>
		<u>14,512</u>

As part of the Budget Strategy for 2010/2011, savings targets had been issued to managers to identify options for savings within services. These Savings Delivery Plans (SDP's) had been widely reported and debated,

culminating in the latest proposals totalling £352,890 being submitted to the Corporate Scrutiny Committee for comment earlier this month.

Noted that three changes to the proposals presented to the Corporate Scrutiny Committee had been made which reduced the overall savings proposals to £315,140. These were:-

- (a) Grass cutting: The Executive had confirmed its intention not to support the proposals to seek to transfer grass-cutting services back to Somerset County Council. This potential £41,000 saving had therefore been removed from the SDPs;
- (b) Public conveniences: The costing for the savings related to potential transfer to parishes or closure of public conveniences had been finalised, with the saving increased by £13,250, to £20,100 in total; and
- (c) Parking: The option to introduce parking charges in Wiveliscombe had not been recommended by the Executive. Therefore the potential saving of £10,000 through additional income had been removed from the SDPs.

Reported that following much work to identify efficiencies and savings, the Budget Gap reported to the Corporate Scrutiny Board on 21 January 2010 for the draft proposals under consideration was a £23,000 surplus.

However, the budget proposals had been updated further as expenditure and income estimates and budget proposals had been finalised. The changes to the Budget Gap since the report was submitted to Scrutiny in January were shown in the table below. The overall impact of the proposed changes resulted in a nil budget gap.

	£000	£000
Budget Gap Reported to Scrutiny 21 January 2010		-23
Collection Fund Deficit – updated forecast	18	
Grass Cutting – savings option not recommended	41	
Public Conveniences – estimated savings updated	-13	
Concessionary Travel – updated forecast	-150	
DLO – Remove one-off item from Base Budget	112	
Tree Planting – one-off item from GF reserves	10	
Youth Projects – one-off item from GF reserves	15	
Youth Initiatives in unparished area of Taunton	15	
Car parking – Remove proposal to introduce parking fees in Wiveliscombe	10	
One-off transfer from GF Reserves	-20	
Increase Special Expenses for Youth Initiatives	-15	
Net impact of changes		23
Budget Gap		0

In order to balance the budget for 2010/2011, it was recommended that Council Tax was increased by 2.5%.

Noted that 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 £135.19, an increase of £3.30 on 2009/2010. This represented an increase of 6 pence per week. The Band D taxpayer would receive all the services provided by the Council in 2010/2011 at a cost of £2.59 per week.

The following table compared the 2010/2011 proposed budget with the 2009/2010 original budget, based on the information contained in the report:-

	Original Estimate 2009/10	Proposed Budget 2010/11
	£	£
Total Spending on Services	15,280,880	15,500,550
Capital Charges Credit	(1,930,000)	(1,930,000)
Interest payable on Loans	266,090	226,430
Minimum Revenue Provision	332,910	342,500
Interest Income	(167,000)	(69,000)
Contribution from G Fund Balances	0	(20,000)
AUTHORITY EXPENDITURE	13,782,880	14,050,480
Less: Revenue Support Grant	(1,600,772)	(1,105,826)
Less: Contribution from NNDR Pool	(6,935,368)	(7,615,394)
Surplus/Deficit on Collection Fund	81,600	130,210
Expenditure to be financed by District Council Tax	5,328,340	5,459,470
Divided by Council Tax Base	40,399.85	40,384.49
Council Tax @ Band D	£131.89	£135.19
Cost per week per Band D equivalent	£2.54	£2.59

Noted that the General Fund Reserve position showed the predicted balance of £1,418, 876.

This figure included a worst case scenario for the costs of Core Council Review (CCR) implementation in 2009/2010 and the forecast outturn deficit as at Quarter 2 budget monitoring. With regard to the CCR, the actual costs were unlikely to be known with certainty until March 2010, which would be

after the budget had been set. However current cost estimates were very close to the £592,000 worst case.

Whilst the forecast position was currently above the minimum amount in the budget strategy, maintaining a strong general reserves position was prudent in the current economic climate.

Although a review of Earmarked Reserves was to be undertaken shortly, at this point in time there was no reason to suggest these funds were not required for the purposes for which they were originally set aside.

As stated above, the Council prepared its annual budget within the context of the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP). This provided estimates of the budget requirement and budget gap into future years. The following table provided a summary of the current indicative MTFP and the General Reserves forecast:-

Indicative MTFP Summary

	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Expected Budget Requirement	14.513	15.109	16.763	17.268	17.820
<i>Financed By:</i>					
External Government Support	8.721	7.849	7.457	7.457	7.457
Council tax (increase assumed 2.5% each year)	5.922	6.058	6.198	6.342	6.489
Predicted Budget Gap	0	1.289	3.152	3.470	3.875

Note: Negative budget gap figure equals a surplus.

General Reserves Forecast

	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Estimated Balance B/F	-1.419	1.703	0.515	2.596	5.991
Planned Transfers to / from Reserves	-0.284	0.101	0.04	0	0
Predicted Budget Gap	0.000	1.289	3.152	3.470	3.875
Estimated Balance C/F	-1.703	-0.515	2.596	6.066	9.941

Note: Negative reserve figures equal amounts in hand.

The above table had been prepared on the assumption of a 2.5% increase in Council Tax each year within the MTFP period.

The MTFP also assumed that Government support would be hit hard in the next 3-year financial settlement, due to the overall state of the economy and pressures on Government spending and debt. The Council was therefore planning on the basis of a 10% reduction in 2011/2012 followed by a further 5% reduction in 2012/2013. A clearer idea of funding prospects was likely in the latter part of 2010.

Further reported that it was proposed to increase expenses chargeable to the non-parished area of Taunton in 2010/2011 to £47,050 - an increase of 50% on the Band D equivalent. This formed part of the total expenditure of the Council. The precept in 2009/2010 was £30,620. The proposed increase incorporated enhanced funding for youth initiatives in the Taunton Unparished Area.

Also reported that detailed budgets for 2010/2011 had been produced for the Deane DLO. Figures for Highways, Grounds Maintenance, Building Maintenance, Cleansing, the Nursery and Transport were reported but these were very much an estimate at this time due to the uncertainty as to their income sources.

The Executive was minded to support a number of further proposals, as follows:-

- **Brewhouse Theatre Grant / Carbon Neutral Projects:** An additional £50,000 one off budget in 2010/2011 for each of these topics (£100,000 in total). Although not included within the proposed Budget, further reports would be submitted after the 2009/2010 accounts, to confirm the need for funding and the availability of Council funds to support this cost.
- **Taunton East and Taunton North:** The Council was in the early stages of developing proposals, subject to the development of 3-year service level agreements (SLAs), to provide support to the Taunton East Development Trust and the North Taunton Partnership. The total funding sought was in the region of £130,000 over the three year period. As well as funding from the Housing Revenue Account and the existing Community Leadership budget, opportunities to obtain contributions for the balance from other partner organisations through the Local Strategic Partnership were being explored. The Executive was also minded to allocate a further £35,000 in total from existing Economic Development budgets to support specific and related projects.

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. 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/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 plans. In her response, Maggie Hammond had stated that she believed the Council's reserves to be adequate and the budget estimates used in preparing the 2010/2011 budget to be as robust as possible.

Resolved that Full Council be recommended to agree the budget for General Fund Services for 2010/2011 as outlined in the report and that:-

- (a) the transfer for any potential underspend in 2009/2010 back to General Fund Reserves be agreed;
- (b) the proposed 2010/2011 budget, being Authority expenditure of £14,050,480 and Special Expenses of £47,050 be agreed in accordance with the Local Government Act 1992;
- (c) the predicted General Fund Reserve balance at 31 March 2010 of £1,419,000 be noted;
- (d) the forecast budget position within the Medium Term Financial Plan be noted;
- (e) the Prudential Indicators for 2010/2011 as set out in the report be agreed.

15. Housing Revenue Account, Revenue Estimates and Rent Levels and Deane Helpline for the 2010/2011 Financial Year

Considered report previously circulated, which set out in detail the proposed Housing Revenue Account (HRA) for 2010/2011 which showed a working balance of £2,545,800.

Reported that last year the Council had originally set a rent increase of 6.2%. This was subsequently reduced to 2.95% following a last minute review by the Government of average national rent levels.

For 2010/2011 the Government, through the subsidy mechanism, had requested that average rents should increase by no more than 3.1%. It was therefore recommended that the average weekly rent increase would be £1.93 per week or 3.1%. The average weekly rent (excluding service charges) would increase from £62.10 to £64.03.

All housing fees and charges had already been considered and on average the majority of fees had been increased by 2.5%.

For 2010/2011 the expected Supported People income was estimated at £405,000. However, this had not been finalised as a result of continuing

negotiations with Somerset County Council.

The report gave details of the main expenditure changes relating to the HRA resource accounting. These included:-

- (a) Housing Subsidy;
- (b) Rents;
- (c) Increase in provision for bad debts;
- (d) Revenue Contribution to Capital;
- (e) Surplus/Deficit;
- (f) Working Balance

Further reported on the main expenditure changes relating to HRA Maintenance, Management and Supervisory Expenditure.

The Deane Helpline Trading Account was maintained separately from the HRA as a 'stand alone' enterprise. Details of the account were submitted.

Reported that the forecast surplus for 2009/2010 was £30,490 leaving a projected working balance of £43,154 at the end of the financial year. The forecast position for 2010/2011 was an estimated surplus of £48,640 leaving a working balance of £91,794 at the end of the financial year. These budgets also included a contribution to the General Fund of £30,000 as agreed in previous years.

The Corporate Scrutiny Committee had considered the 2010/2011 draft budget at its meeting on 21 January 2010. The Committee had noted the proposals and also requested that details of the Deane DLO budget were provided. This information had been included in the report concerning the General Fund Revenue Estimates (Minute No.14 above).

Resolved that Full Council be recommended to agree the Housing Revenue Account budget for 2010/2011.

16. **Capital Programme 2010/2011 Onwards**

Considered report previously circulated, together with an addendum report circulated at the meeting, which detailed the proposed General Fund (GF) and Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Capital Programmes for the period 2010/2011 to 2014/2015.

All Capital expenditure had to be financed from borrowing, capital receipts, capital grants and contributions or from revenue funds set aside for capital purposes.

The table below provided an overview of the gross estimated resources available for capital investment at the start of 2010/2011, plus an indicative forecast of additional resources made available during the year:-

	Estimated Balance 1 April £'000	Estimated Additional Resources £'000	Estimated Total Resources 2010/11 £'000
GF Capital Reserve (RCCO funding)	238	249	487
Usable Capital Receipts - General	65	0	65
Usable Capital Receipts - Housing	417	100	517
Grants and Contributions	0	742	742
Supported Borrowing - Housing	0	620	620
General Fund Capital Resources	720	1,711	2,431
HRA Capital Reserve (RCCO funding)	108	735	843
Major Repairs Allowance	0	3,785	3,785
Grants and Contribution	40	0	40
HRA Capital Resources	148	4,520	4,668
Overall Total Capital Resources	868	6,231	7,099

Where the overall amount of capital expenditure exceeded the available resources, the Council would be required to undertake prudential borrowing for the difference. The Executive had previously recommended approval to borrow £770,000 related to a proposed General Fund investment in the Crematorium. If the scheme was approved this, plus any further new loan debt required if capital approvals exceeded all other available resources, would only be taken after full consideration of the Council's Treasury Management Strategy and the indicators prescribed by the Prudential Code.

General Fund Capital Programme

The Council had approved a Capital Programme for 2009/2010 General Fund schemes totalling £1,954,930, in February 2009. Slippage from the previous year plus supplementary approvals during the current year had increased the estimated programme expenditure in 2009/2010 to £3,088,000.

The draft Capital Programme proposed for 2010/2011 totalled £2,852,000. At this stage, this assumed nil slippage from 2009/2010.

Reported that two schemes had been supported by the Executive at its meeting on 2 December 2009. These schemes which related to the Taunton Deane Crematorium Mercury Abatement Scheme (£1,000,000) and Play and

Youth Projects in Taunton (£93,000) had been included in the Capital Programme for 2010/2011.

Details of a number of one-off schemes which the Executive was not minded to approve were submitted.

Recurring Schemes

The Executive was minded to fund recurring capital schemes through a specific revenue contribution to capital (RCCO), continuing the policy of recent years, and from external grants where these were received.

The specific RCCO-funded schemes proposed for 2010/2011 totalled £165,000 as shown in the following table:-

	General Schemes	Approved Budget 2009/10 £000	Proposed Budget 2010/11 £000
1	Leisure Grants to Clubs	45	45
2	Play Equipment – grants to parishes	20	20
3	Replacement Play Equipment	10	10
4	New Play Equipment	10	10
5	Desktop Hardware Replacement	17	60
6	Replacement Car Parking Pay & Display Machines	5	5
7	Replacement Car parking Hand Held enforcement equipment	5	5
8	Taunton Canal Grant (sustainable transport scheme)	10	10
	Totals	122	165

In addition, recurring funding was proposed for General Fund (Non-HRA) Housing schemes which had previously been funded by a combination of specific Government grants, supported borrowing and use of capital receipts from the sale of housing stock.

Noted that at this stage the Council's grant allocations for 2010/2011 had not yet been confirmed. The proposals included within the programme, for the same amount of capital expenditure as in 2009/2010, were set out as provisional estimates on the assumption that resources available for financing would also continue at the same level as the current year.

	General Fund Housing Schemes	Approved Budget 2009/10 £000	Proposed Budget 2010/11 £000
1	Disabled Facility Grants	450	450
2	Private Sector Renewals Grants	335	335
3	Grants to Residential Social Landlords (RSLs)	809	809
	Totals	1,594	1,594

Future General Fund projects could be undertaken when resources became available. This could be through either borrowing, revenue contributions or through the sale of assets.

Details of the proposed Capital Programme for 2010/2011 to 2014/2015 were reported. Indicative allocations had been included in later years to provide Members with a longer term perspective on potential future capital investment and the implications on estimated available resources.

Housing Revenue Account Capital Programme

Reported that the levels of resources available to finance the proposed Housing Capital Programme for 2010/2011, totalled £4,668,000. This ensured that the HRA would not have to meet any unsupported borrowing costs (that is, debt repayment and interest costs).

The proposed HRA Capital Programme for 2010/2011 totalled £4,560,000. Submitted for the information of Members a breakdown of the proposed programme. This programme would leave resources available to carry forward, to support the future Housing Capital Programmes, of £108,000.

Further reported that 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 capital receipts. Bids for additional schemes to those set out above would be made through the Executive.

The Corporate Scrutiny Committee had considered the draft programme at its meeting on 21 January 2010 and made no formal suggestions for any changes to the programme.

As well as providing details of the proposed Capital Programme for 2010/2011, a revised Capital Programme budget for 2009/2010 had been recommended for approval.

The original budget for the year for the General Fund Capital Programme was £1,954,930. It was now proposed to increase this budget to £3,161,310 to take account of decisions made by the Executive before Christmas relating to the new Building Control IT System (Acolaid) and in respect of proposed investment in new play and youth facilities. The figure also included slippage

on various schemes from 2008/2009.

The following table provided a summary of the proposed changes:-

	£	£
Original Budget for 2009/2010		1,954,930
Slippage from 2008/2009 – Various schemes	546,480	
Play and Youth Facilities Projects	562,240	
New Building Control IT System (Acolaid)	72,900	
Total Changes		1,206,620
Proposed Revised Budget for 2010/2011		3,161,550

Noted that there was no impact on the availability of resources to the position included in the main Capital Programme 2010/2011 or the Revenue Budget Estimates.

Further reported that the HRA Capital Programme's original budget for 2009/2010 totalled £5,555,000. It was proposed to increase this budget to £6,724,000 due entirely to slippage on the various schemes from the previous financial year. This did not affect the overall cumulative expenditure – it was a timing difference between financial years.

Resolved that:-

- (1) Full Council be recommended to agree the General Fund and Housing Revenue Account Capital Programmes for 2010/2011;
- (2) The revised 2009/2010 General Fund Capital Programme budget of £3,161,550 be approved; and
- (3) The revised 2009/2010 Housing Revenue Account Capital Programme budget be also approved.

17. **Council Tax Setting 2010/2011**

Submitted report previously circulated, which made recommendations on the level of Council Tax for 2010/2011.

The Council was required to make an annual determination, which set its gross expenditure and gross income (including the Housing Revenue Account and balances brought forward), with the difference as its budget requirement. This determination was set out in the resolution.

Noted that at this stage, the precept figures for the Somerset County Council, the Avon and Somerset Police Authority and the Devon and Somerset Fire Authority were not available. It was likely this element of the total Council Tax determination would have to be advised to Members at the meeting of Full Council on 16 February 2010.

The estimated expenses chargeable to the non-parished area of Taunton in

2010/2011 amounted to £47,047 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 £1,248,350. Taunton Deane's share of this amounted to £130,210 and this was reflected in the revenue estimates.

The Council's budget requirement was £14,512,850 including draft Parish Precepts and non-parished Special Expenses. This amount was then reduced by the amount notified in respect of Taunton Deane's Revenue Support Grant (RSG) amounting to £1,105,826 and the Non Domestic Rates Distribution (NDR) from the pool, amounting to £7,615,394.

The net amount, having taken the collection fund position into account, of £5,921,840 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 on 13 January 2010.

The Council Tax for Taunton Deane (excluding Parish Precepts and Special Expenses for the non-parished area) was £135.19, an increase of £3.20 (2.5%) compared to the 2009/2010 Council Tax. The total Council Tax, including the County Council, Police and Fire Authorities precepts was still subject to confirmation.

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

That it be noted that at its meeting on 13 January 2010 the Executive calculated the following amounts for the year 2010/2011 in accordance with the regulations made under Section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended):-

- (1) 40,384.49 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	76.05	Neroche	255.85
Ashbrittle	97.07	North Curry	742.96
Bathealton	84.57	Norton Fitzwarren	826.06
Bishops Hull	1,072.38	Nynehead	156.55
Bishops Lydeard / Cothelstone	1,937.47	Oake	333.46

Bradford on Tone	283.61	Otterford	168.39
Burrowbridge	204.78	Pitminster	459.04
Cheddon Fitzpaine	648.71	Ruishton/ Thornfalcon	615.34
Chipstable	124.72	Sampford Arundel	131.90
Churchstanton	331.27	Staplegrove	714.77
Combe Florey	122.01	Stawley	131.00
Comeytrowe	2,086.27	Stoke St Gregory	387.38
Corfe	134.15	Stoke St Mary	206.72
Creech St Michael	950.07	Taunton	16,087.45
Durston	59.02	Trull	1,025.28
Fitzhead	121.87	Wellington	4,631.59
Halse	144.75	Wellington (Without)	304.46
Hatch Beauchamp	261.29	West Bagborough	163.62
Kingston St Mary	446.32	West Buckland	446.17
Langford Budville	238.40	West Hatch	143.28
Lydeard St Lawrence/ Tolland	200.64	West Monkton	1,115.05
Milverton	600.46	Wiveliscombe	1,112.28

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 related.

- (3) That the following amounts be calculated by the Council for the year 2010/2011 in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:-
- (a) £79,952,444 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimated for the items set out in Section 32(2)(a) of the Act.
(Gross Expenditure including amount required for working balance).
- (b) £65,439,594 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimated 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) £14,512,850 being the amount by which the aggregate at (a) above exceeded 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) £8,591,010 being the aggregate of the sums which the Council estimated would 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 estimated would 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 estimated would be transferred from its Collection Fund to its General Fund pursuant to the Collection Fund (Community Charge) directions under Section 98(4) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 made on 7 February 1994 (*Community Charge Surplus*).

(e) £146.64
$$\frac{(c) - (d)}{9.2.1(1)} = \frac{14,512,850 - 8,591,010}{40,384.49}$$

being the amount calculated at (c) above less the amount at (d) above, all divided by the amount at 9.2.1(a) 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) £462,370 being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act. (*Parish Precepts and Special Expenses*).

(g) £135.19
$$\frac{(e) - (f)}{(1) \text{ above}} = \frac{146.64 - 462,370}{40,384.49}$$

being the amount at (e) above less the result given by dividing the amount at (f) above by the amount at (1) 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 related.

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

(h)

Ash Priors	135.19	Neroche	149.07
Ashbrittle	147.55	North Curry	157.40
Bathealton	142.28	Norton Fitzwarren	164.15
Bishops Hull	153.84	Nynehead	157.55
Bishops Lydeard / Cothelstone	152.10	Oake	149.43
Bradford on Tone	154.58	Otterford	135.19
Burrowbridge	158.47	Pitminster	151.57
Cheddon Fitzpaine	144.44	Ruishton/ Thornfalcon	156.32
Chipstable	149.22	Sampford Arundel	168.85
Churchstanton	158.19	Staplegrove	149.18
Combe Florey	148.30	Stawley	153.51
Comeytrove	147.17	Stoke St Gregory	150.68
Corfe	146.37	Stoke St Mary	149.74
Creech St Michael	153.35	Taunton	138.11
Durston	135.19	Trull	148.85
Fitzhead	166.86	Wellington	151.72
Halse	147.28	Wellington (Without)	151.28
Hatch Beauchamp	152.41	West Bagborough	147.41
Kingston St Mary	148.63	West Buckland	153.12
Langford Budville	151.97	West Hatch	150.06

Lydeard St Lawrence / Tolland	151.14	West Monkton	161.90
Milverton	154.34	Wiveliscombe	153.17

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

(i) See overleaf

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)

18. Executive Forward Plan

Submitted for information the Forward Plan of the Executive over the next few months.

Resolved that the Forward Plan be noted.

(The meeting ended at 8.50 pm.)

(a)

2010/11 by Parish by Band at 2.5%

Shaded figures represent indicative data only

Valuation Band	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Ash Priors	90.13	105.15	120.17	135.19	165.23	195.27	225.32	270.38
Ashbrittle	98.37	114.76	131.16	147.55	180.34	213.13	245.92	295.11
Bathealton	94.86	110.67	126.48	142.28	173.90	205.52	237.14	284.57
Bishops Hull	102.56	119.65	136.75	153.84	188.03	222.21	256.40	307.68
Bishops Lydeard/Cothelstone	101.40	118.30	135.20	152.10	185.90	219.69	253.49	304.19
Bradford on Tone	103.06	120.23	137.41	154.58	188.93	223.29	257.64	309.17
Burrowbridge	105.65	123.26	140.87	158.47	193.69	228.91	264.12	316.95
Cheddon Fitzpaine	96.29	112.34	128.39	144.44	176.54	208.63	240.73	288.88
Chipstable	99.48	116.06	132.64	149.22	182.38	215.54	248.70	298.44
Churchstanton	105.46	123.04	140.62	158.19	193.35	228.50	263.65	316.39
Combe Florey	98.87	115.35	131.83	148.30	181.26	214.22	247.17	296.61
Comeytrowe	98.12	114.47	130.82	147.17	179.88	212.58	245.29	294.35
Corfe	97.58	113.84	130.11	146.37	178.90	211.43	243.95	292.74
Creech St Michael	102.23	119.27	136.31	153.35	187.42	221.50	255.58	306.69
Durston	90.13	105.15	120.17	135.19	165.23	195.27	225.32	270.38
Fitzhead	111.24	129.78	148.32	166.86	203.94	241.02	278.10	333.72
Halse	98.19	114.55	130.92	147.28	180.01	212.74	245.47	294.56
Hatch Beauchamp	101.61	118.54	135.48	152.41	186.28	220.15	254.02	304.82
Kingston St Mary	99.09	115.60	132.12	148.63	181.66	214.69	247.72	297.27
Langford Budville	101.31	118.20	135.08	151.97	185.74	219.51	253.28	303.94
Lydeard St Lawrence/Tolland	100.76	117.55	134.35	151.14	184.73	218.31	251.90	302.28
Milverton	102.89	120.04	137.19	154.34	188.64	222.94	257.24	308.68
Neroche	99.38	115.94	132.50	149.07	182.19	215.32	248.44	298.13
North Curry	104.93	122.42	139.91	157.40	192.38	227.35	262.33	314.80
Norton Fitzwarren	109.43	127.67	145.91	164.15	200.63	237.11	273.58	328.30
Nynehead	105.03	122.54	140.04	157.55	192.56	227.57	262.58	315.09
Oake	99.62	116.23	132.83	149.43	182.64	215.85	249.06	298.87
Otterford	90.13	105.15	120.17	135.19	165.23	195.27	225.32	270.38

