

Executive – 9 February 2010

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

Officers: Penny James (Chief Executive), Joy Wishlade (Strategic Director), Brendan Cleere (Strategic Director), Tonya Meers (Legal and Democratic Services Manager), Maggie Hammond (Strategic Finance and Section 151 Officer), Tim Burton (Growth and Development Manager), Brian Yates (Building Control Manager), Stephen Boland (Housing Estate Manager), Christine Thompson (Sheltered Housing Manager), Martin Griffin (Retained HR Manager) and Richard Bryant (Democratic Services Manager).

Also present: Councillors Beaven, Cavill, Mrs Court-Stenning, Gaines, Hall, Hayward, Ms Herbert, Horsley, Mrs Lewin-Harris, Morrell, Mrs Stock-Williams, Stuart-Thorn and Williams.

Ian McCulloch and Oliver Foster-Burnell from UNISON.
Chris Vaughn from Turner and Townsend, Consultants
Alan Cottrell, Independent Member of the Standards Committee

(The meeting commenced at 6.15 pm.)

19. Apology

Councillor A Weddekopp.

20. Declarations of Interest

Councillors Henley, Paul and Prior-Sankey declared personal interests as Members of Somerset County Council. 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.

21. Building Control Scheme of Charges for 2010/2011

Considered report previously circulated, concerning proposals to amend the Building Control charges.

The proposals were for a Scheme of Charges for 2010/2011 to meet the financial requirements of the Building (Local Authority Charges) Regulations 1998, and for further scheme amendments and adaptations to meet the objectives of the Communities and Local Government Implementation Plan "The Future of Building Control" published in September 2009.

The Building Control Service was provided jointly with Sedgemoor District Council and the same fees were applied by both authorities.

The Council was required to set a scheme of charges in connection with its functions under Building Regulations, such that the income from charges was equal to the anticipated costs of providing the service during the relevant period.

Examination and approval of plans of work and inspection of works in progress on site were how the Council met its statutory duty to enforce Building Regulations.

This work was carried out in competition with private sector Approved Inspectors. The Council, therefore, had to set charges for its service to enable recovery of the costs of service provision, whilst remaining competitive.

In the general recession affecting the economy, the construction sector had been hardest hit and would probably be the last to recover.

In January 2009, a scheme of charges and reduction in staffing had been proposed to manage a potential 15% drop in activity and income. However, the downturn was forecast to continue into and probably throughout 2010.

Savings in staff costs had continued to be made. In addition, further savings had been made through sharing a Building Control Surveyor with Sedgemoor District Council.

Proposals from the Communities and Local Government as to "The Future of Building Control" had moved to the 'Implementation Plan' stage. Further consultation was planned for 2010 in respect of these proposals. The establishment of a basis for the assessment of individual fees in conjunction with the Section 151 Officer and the South West Audit Partnership had also been proposed.

Fees for one or two dwellings remained unchanged from 2009/2010. With larger developments (in excess of ten dwellings) it was proposed that the Building Control Manager should have the option of a risk assessed service framework and tailored fee quotation in accordance with principles to be agreed.

This could result in the reduction of charges for repetitive work schemes or repeat house types by major house builders and improve the ability of Building Control to compete for this class of work.

Charges for minor works were unchanged from 2009/2010 and were reduced substantially for domestic garages.

Charges for medium and large extensions and loft conversions would increase by 4% on average, to reflect the greater cost of controlling such works, due to the increasing complexity of the Regulations and the greater reliance of small builders and self-builders on advice and guidance from the Building Control Service.

Fees for work in the lowest cost band (up to £5,000) were unchanged from 2009/2010, in order to improve value for money perceptions.

Middle range works (costing £25,000 to £50,000) would increase from between 2.8% and 6.8%. It was anticipated that income from this schedule would increase by 4% on average.

Works estimated to cost in excess of £100,000 whilst still encompassed by the Charging Scheme would, at the discretion of the Building Control Manager, be subject to the service framework and tailored fee quotation mentioned above. The ability of the Service to compete effectively for major development projects would be enhanced by this.

The fees had been set in conjunction with Sedgemoor District Council and it was hoped that both Local Authorities would operate the same fees with effect from 1 April 2010.

Resolved that:-

- (1) the Scheme of Charges as shown in the Appendix to these minutes be approved; and
- (2) the Building Control Manager, in conjunction with the Section 151 Officer and South West Audit Partnership be authorised to design and implement a framework for the risk-assessment and fee-setting of larger schemes of work.

22. Approval for Capital Spend – Digital Compliance : Deane Helpline

Considered report previously circulated regarding a proposal to allocate sufficient capital investment, using existing revenue resources, for the purchase and installation of new equipment in order to ensure that all Lifeline equipment operated by the Deane Helpline was digitally compliant.

The Council had been taking advice from the IT suppliers Tunstall and the Telecare Services Association for some time on this issue, so that managers had a good idea of the current position.

All sheltered housing schemes were upgraded from analogue to digital approximately 10 years ago, but it was estimated that approximately 173 properties (hard-wire schemes or dispersed alarms) within Taunton Deane required upgrading.

The approximate cost of £35,000 would include the installation of new helplines and the removal of obsolete equipment from hardwire schemes. The Deane Helpline would ensure that the service to customers would not be disrupted when telephone services were converted to digital.

Resolved that:-

- (1) a capital allocation of £35,000 to this project from existing revenue resources be approved; and
- (2) Full Council be recommended to approve this change to the capital programme.

23. Core Council Review : Taunton Tourist Information Centre

Considered report previously circulated, concerning proposals to reduce staffing

levels at the Taunton Tourist Information Centre (TIC) as well as looking again at possible relocation options.

The Core Council Review had included a saving of £50,000 through a review of the Taunton Tourist Information Service.

The TIC was based in accommodation within the Taunton Library in Paul Street and was leased from Somerset County Council. It provided a tourist information service, as well as selling maps, guides and local crafts. It also acted as a ticket agency and sold tickets for many local cultural events.

The net cost of the TIC service in the budget was £63,610, although the actual cost had been considerably higher over the last three years. The major costs were accommodation (£23,000) and staff (£103,000) comprising 3.7 full time equivalent (FTE) posts. The ticket agency was the major source of income.

The TIC had been identified as an area where investment should be reduced and accommodation and staff costs inevitably needed to be addressed if the £50,000 savings target was to be met. It was widely accepted that opportunities for further income generation were very limited.

Current TIC staffing comprised six staff amounting to 3.7FTE. Whilst the most important element of the service was provided for visitors to the area, the greatest income was generated from selling tickets to local residents.

It was therefore concluded that there would be an overall negative impact if the ticket agency function was to cease. However, any substantial reduction in opening hours, or relocation to a more peripheral site, would inevitably result in loss of income.

Whilst there needed to be significant savings from the staff budget if the savings target was to be met, adequate resource had to be retained to maintain reasonable opening times so as to avoid significant loss of income. It was considered that 2FTE was the absolute minimum to retain 5 or 6 day opening. This staff reduction would result in a saving of approximately £47,000.

Further reported that in terms of relocating the TIC, the following locations had been considered:-

Taunton Library – Remaining at the Library would avoid one-off relocation costs, although the space currently rented was larger than needed. Somerset County Council had indicated a willingness to reduce the rent from £23,000 to £12,000 per annum. However, with reduced staffing, issues would need to be resolved in respect of security with a single staffed office as the TIC was accessed separately from the Library;

The Market House – There was an area in the Market House which would be ideal in terms of footfall and prominence. However, as this was already leased, the Council would lose its current rental income meaning that in financial terms there would be no material benefit and sharing resources would not be possible.

An existing town centre retail business – This option had been discounted as not being commercially viable.

County Museum – There would be clear advantages from co-location with one of the town's major tourist attractions. Space would however be limited and the timescales for reopening the museum would prevent relocation until early 2011.

The Deane House Reception – This option would avoid paying any accommodation costs and would involve minimal set up costs. Although it would open up the future option of management of the service as part of the Southwest One contract, The Deane House was poorly located and opening at weekends could prove problematic.

The Brewhouse Theatre and Arts Centre – Sufficient space would be available within the theatre's existing Box Office which, subject to financial assistance being provided, was to be refurbished.

The two uses were complimentary and would enable a shared service to be provided, leading to enhanced footfall at the Box Office potentially improving the viability of the venue. The location was in the town centre and the developments associated with Project Taunton would raise the profile of the area. It was accepted that relocation of the TIC to the Brewhouse would inevitably reduce custom in the short term and the overall savings took account of some loss of income.

A number of letters of representation, including one from the Taunton Chamber of Trade, had been received details of which were reported. All took the view that the TIC should remain in its present location although the Chamber of Trade did say that relocation should be considered when the Firepool and town centre redevelopments had taken place.

Representations had also been received from the Taunton Deane Branch of UNISON. Its view was that relocation combined with a reduction in staff would render the service unviable. The UNISON representative, Ian McCulloch, reiterated the union's points at the meeting.

Further reported that the issue had been considered by the Community Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 26 January 2010 where the following recommendations to the Executive were made:-

- That the TIC should be retained in its current location;
- That a detailed review of possible locations for a TIC in Taunton should be undertaken; and
- That staffing levels should be reduced in line with the Core Council Review.

In order to achieve the target savings, it would be necessary to radically reorganise and reduce the Tourist Information service. The only real options for savings were in staffing and location costs.

The staffing reduction proposed was essential as relocation would currently not achieve accommodation savings higher than the amended rental now to be charged by the Somerset County Council for the TIC at the Library. However, it also had to

be recognised that the proposed staff reduction would have some impact in terms of the level of service to be provided.

Whilst remaining at the Library would avoid relocation costs and possible reduced income from a decrease in footfall, with the proposed staff reduction there continued to be obvious benefits from co-location with a similar function such as The Brewhouse Box Office or Museum Reception in the longer term.

Resolved that:-

- (1) the proposed staff reduction from 3.7FTE to 2FTE be approved; and
- (2) the Tourist Information Centre should remain at its current location in the short-term (at least until after the 2010 Summer season) whilst the preferred longer-term options of relocation to The Brewhouse Theatre or other suitable premises was explored further.

(Councillor Prior-Sankey declared a personal interest during the discussion of the above matter as her son was employed by Berrys Coaches whose tickets were sold from the TIC.)

24. Independent Review of Deane DLO

Considered report previously circulated, concerning the independent review of options for the future of services provided by Deane DLO.

Full Council had approved an alternative approach to completing the Core Council Review in April 2009. The alternative approach included the commissioning of independent external expertise to advise the Council on Theme 3 of the Core Council Review – to develop options for the future of services provided by Deane DLO.

Turner and Townsend PLC had been appointed to carry out the review after a rigorous procurement and selection process, culminating in an interview and presentation to a cross-party panel of elected Members, officers and a UNISON representative.

Turner and Townsend had worked to a brief, details of which were submitted. The review carried out by the company had been completed and its report, which was also submitted for the information of Members, set out the work that had been undertaken to establish the feasibility of six main options:-

- Outsourcing – Where the Council contracted with a private sector company to provide services on the Council's behalf. Under this option, staff would transfer to the private sector provider under their current terms and conditions;
- Joint Venture – Where the Council formed a new organisation with a private sector partner to deliver services. Under this option, staff would also transfer to the private sector provider under their current terms and conditions;

- Shared Service – Where the Council joined with other local authorities or public sector partners to deliver services;
- Lead Authority – Where the Council transferred activities to another Local Authority who delivered services on the Council's behalf. Alternatively, other Local Authorities could transfer services to the Council to provide services on their behalf;
- Internal Transformation – Where the Council invested in services to achieve large scale improvements and efficiency; and
- As Is – Where services continued as now and were subject to continuing financial pressure requiring annual incremental change.

Turner and Townsend had recommended that the Council followed a detailed procurement process with full outsourcing to a private sector supplier as the preferred way forward.

In recommending outsourcing as the preferred option, Turner and Townsend were proposing an implementation process which provided scope to implement potential alternatives of joint venture or internal transformation, if the business case for outsourcing did not meet the Council's requirements. This would be possible because much of the project work required to implement outsourcing could be re-used if necessary to support these potential alternatives.

Turner and Townsend had also made two further service specific recommendations which applied to all options:-

- A clearer separation should be created between the Housing Client and contractor functions. Both of these functions were currently based in Theme 3 at Priory Depot, overseen by the Housing Property Services Manager. The Community Services Manager would be looking into this recommendation further, exploring all options and bringing forward proposals to separate Housing Client functions from their current location; and
- The stores function should cease being operated from the Deane DLO site and a 'just in time' approach should be adopted for buying and supplying in the future. This issue would be looked into further during the Deane DLO transformation process, with a solution ready to begin operating at the inception of whichever model was selected by Members.

Turner and Townsend had carried out extensive consultation with a variety of different groups, including:

- Deane DLO Managers and staff;
- UNISON;
- Corporate Management Team;
- Taunton Deane Tenants' Forum;
- Elected Members;
- Other Local Authorities; and
- Potential private sector partners.

Formal consultation on Turner and Townsend's report had started on 13 January 2010 and ended on 5 February 2010. The Strategic Director, Brendan Cleere, reported that a resume of the responses received to this consultation had already been circulated to Members.

These had included representations from the Taunton Deane Branch of UNISON whose representative, Ian McCulloch, re-iterated the union's points at the meeting.

All options, except 'As Is', had one-off cost implications for implementation, with details provided in the consultant's report. In the case of the recommended outsourcing option, the one-off cost would be up to £200,000, with an implementation timescale of 12 months from a decision by Members. These one-off costs could be found from the General Fund, Housing Revenue Account and Deane DLO Reserve funds.

Turner and Townsend had advised that one-off costs for implementing alternative options of joint venture and internal transformation would be up to £300,000 and £600,000 respectively. Noted that the reserves position for both the General Fund and Deane DLO were such that the funding required to implement these options would put the reserves below their minimum level.

The potential annual savings arising from the recommended outsourcing were indicated at £278,000, achieved within 24–36 months of decision by Members to pursue the outsource option.

Reported that the above figures and timescales were indicative and were likely to change through a full procurement process and business case. Members would be kept informed and involved as appropriate in any procurement process to select a private sector supplier.

In the event of the Council selecting the recommended option, any savings required of Deane DLO services during the transition to a fully outsourced service would need to be made using the savings plan mechanism that Members were familiar with.

The Section 151 Officer had verified that the financial information and assumptions used up to this stage by Turner and Townsend PLC were sound and that any formal sign up to an outsource arrangement in future would need to be subject to Member approval of the business case emerging from a full procurement process.

Reported that the consultants' report had been discussed in detail by the Corporate Scrutiny Committee at a special meeting on 28 January 2010 and the views expressed at that meeting were submitted.

It had been made clear to the Scrutiny Committee that any decision by Full Council in February 2010 to pursue the recommended outsourcing option would be subject to a due diligence process, including detailed financial analysis of all Deane DLO functions, as well as Member approval of a full business case. The whole process leading up to a final decision by Members would take approximately twelve months.

Further reported that the approach proposed by Turner and Townsend gave scope for Members to select an alternative option if the business case for the recommended outsource option did not meet the Council's requirements.

Resolved that:-

- (i) The outcomes of the consultation process and the views and recommendations of the Corporate Scrutiny Committee be noted;
- (ii) Full Council be recommended to:-
 - (a) adopt the consultants' recommended approach, starting from the position that full outsourcing was the preferred way forward for Deane DLO services;
 - (b) approve the further development of internal transformation as a benchmark comparison option, to be presented to Members alongside results from (a) for further scrutiny and final decision;
 - (c) approve a sum of £225,000 (£113,000 from the Housing Revenue Account Reserve; £84,000 from the General Fund Reserve; and £28,000 from the Deane DLO Reserve) to pursue the approach outlined in (a) and (b) and to recognise the potential requirement for further implementation funds, the amount being dependent on the option ultimately agreed by Members;
- (iii) It be noted that implementation work would be overseen by the Change Programme Members Steering Group, with decisions to be taken at key stages of the project by the Executive and Full Council as appropriate; and
- (iv) further work to implement the consultants' recommendations in respect of Deane DLO stores and Housing Client functions be undertaken.

25. Somerset Waste Board Business Plan 2010-2015

Considered report previously circulated, concerning the Somerset Waste Partnership's (SWP) Draft Business Plan and Action Plan.

The SWP Constitution required the single client unit to prepare a Draft Business Plan with an accompanying Action Plan on an annual basis.

The Somerset Waste Board had approved a draft for consultation, to provide each partner authority with the opportunity to comment on the plan by the end of February 2010.

The Board could, by majority vote, amend the Business Plan in order to accommodate any unforeseen circumstances and to assist the Board to achieve its Aims and Objectives. Any partner Council could request such an amendment at any time.

The Draft Business Plan was submitted for the information of Members and this included:-

- A background to the SWP and a resume of recognition of its work in 2009;
- Principal objectives;
- Analysis of the operating environment;
- Governance Management;
- Principal Functions of the SWB;
- Equalities issues;
- Performance;
- Local Area Agreement;
- Financial Summary and Budget;
- Strategic Risk Register; and
- Key Action Plan.

The plan spanned a five year period but had a particular emphasis on key actions for the next 12 months.

Resolved that the Draft Business Plan be approved.

26. **Taunton Growth Board**

Considered report previously circulated, concerning the formation of a Taunton Growth Board.

The growth of Taunton over the next decade needed to be over-seen by a range of relevant agencies, organisations and the private sector. Without the strategic buy-in of partners, either the growth would not happen, or would occur in a way which would be detrimental to the eventual outcome. The support of regional agencies was also required and could be hugely beneficial.

The existing Project Taunton Advisory Board had had its terms of reference extended to include the growth of Taunton and the regeneration of the town centre. A Memorandum of Understanding existed between the three key parties for the delivery of Project Taunton – Somerset County Council, the South West Regional Development Agency and Taunton Deane Borough Council – but this had to be reviewed in March 2010.

It was felt that extending the remit of the Project Taunton Advisory Board would not provide the clarity and status required to deliver the economic and housing growth of Taunton.

In 2005, Taunton had been designated as a Growth Point which meant that the town would take a higher than average growth in housing, a position which the Council had accepted.

However, for a Growth Board to succeed, Taunton Deane, as the key local democratically accountable organisation, needed to give its full support.

It was therefore proposed that the existing Project Taunton Advisory Board should be dissolved with the inauguration of a Taunton Growth Board whose responsibility would encompass both the regeneration of the town centre and the wider economic and housing growth.

The suggested remit of the Taunton Growth Board was as follows:-

- To champion the regeneration of the town centre and the growth and economic development of Taunton;
- To oversee the growth and development of Taunton to ensure that key outcomes were delivered;
- To ensure strategic planning and delivery issues were addressed by relevant partners; and
- To identify and recommend funding priorities and oversee any jointly held partnership budget that the Growth Team might attract.

Details of the suggested Membership of the Growth Board were reported.

It was envisaged that the Taunton Growth Board would meet quarterly. Noted that the current delivery of the Advisory Board was supported by an Executive Group made up of senior officers from key agencies. It was proposed to retain and extend this Executive Group and its remit would be to:-

- Provide liaison between partner organisations;
- Ensure the co-ordination of resources;
- Identify priorities;
- Support the Growth Board;
- Raise the profile at Executive level within their own organisations;
- Take responsibility for managing delivery; and
- Agree expenditure of any partnership funding.

Details of the suggested membership of the Executive Group were also reported.

It was proposed that the Executive Group should meet monthly and that the independent Chairman of the Board should Chair these implementation meetings.

Under the current arrangements, a Co-ordination Group met monthly to update all relevant officers on progress and to ensure that activity was co-ordinated. It was suggested that this particular Group should be retained with its membership changed to that outlined in the report.

The Project Taunton Director would Chair the Co-ordination Group which would also meet on a monthly basis.

Reported that this matter had been discussed by the Corporate Scrutiny Committee on 21 January 2010. The Committee had formally recommended that a further private sector representative should be added to the Growth Board. However, discussion had also taken place as to whether two Members from each of the two main political Groups should be appointed to the Growth Board instead of the current proposal for just the Leader and Leader of the Opposition.

Resolved that:-

- (1) the proposals for the formation of a Taunton Growth Board be supported; and
- (2) the proposed membership of the Growth Board be increased by the addition of a further representative from the private sector and one further Councillor from each of the two main political Groups of the Council.

27. **Petitions – Response to Consultation**

Considered report previously circulated, concerning the requirements of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

The Act included requirements for every principal Local Authority to respond to petitions. These provisions had yet to be brought into force and the Government was now consulting on the implementation of these provisions. The main statutory requirements were as follows:-

- To have an on-line petition facility which allowed anyone to set up a petition on the Council's system, and allowed anyone to sign the petition on-line;
- To adopt a petition scheme which set out how the Council would acknowledge receipt of petitions and advise the petition organiser how the petition would be dealt with. The Act required that the petition scheme defined three categories of petition and set a minimum number of signatures for each type;
- To come within the scheme, the petition had to relate to a function of the Council or, for all Councils other than non-unitary District Councils, to "an improvement in the economic, social or environmental well-being of the Council's area to which any of the Council's partner authorities could contribute";
- The Authority could delegate to an appropriate officer the power to reject petitions which he/she considered to be vexatious, abusive or otherwise inappropriate; and
- The new petition scheme did not apply to petitions received under other statutory procedures, such as petitions for a Mayoral constitution and the Secretary of State proposed to make provision that petitions in response to some statutory consultations, such as Planning or Licensing applications, should also remain outside the new system.

For 'ordinary petitions', the Authority would be given wider flexibility to set the threshold number of signatures as high or low as it wished and to determine how such petitions would be dealt with.

'Petitions requiring debate' would have to be reported to Full Council and the Council could set a higher number of signatures as the threshold as opposed to ordinary petitions.

'Petitions to hold an officer to account' could name a senior officer and would trigger an open meeting of the appropriate Scrutiny Committee where the officer would be

questioned in relation to his actions on a particular matter. Again the Authority could set a different threshold for signatures.

Where the petition organiser was not satisfied by the actions taken by the Authority in response to a petition, they had to be given the right of appeal.

The draft guidance and Consultation Paper was reported and comments had to be submitted to the Department for Communities and Local Government by 24 February 2010.

The Consultation Paper incorporated a draft model petition scheme which authorities could adapt for their own use, and set out 12 questions on which the Government sought a response. The questions and a draft response to each of them was submitted for the information of Members.

The Act set out a general framework for Local Authorities to deal with petitions and a range of possible difficulties that might be encountered were highlighted.

Resolved that the proposed responses to the questions contained within the Government's Consultation Paper on Petitions be submitted to the Department for Communities and Local Government.

28. **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 8.26 pm.)

Appendix to the Minutes

(Note: The fees shown as “existing charges” are those approved by Executive for implementation from 1st April 2009. Fees currently being charged are slightly higher because of the change in the rate of VAT.)

Schedule 1 – New Dwellings			
No.	Existing Charge (Inc. VAT at 15%)	Proposed Charge (Inc. VAT at 17.5%)	Variation (Net fee before VAT)
1	£700	£700	(-2.13%)
2	£1050	£1100	2.5%
3	£1250	£1350	5.7%
4	£1450	£1550	4.62%
5	£1650	£1750	3.8%
6	£1850	£1950	3.16%
7	£2050	£2150	2.65%
8	£2250	£2300	0.05%
9	£2400	£2450	(-0.09%)
10	£2550	£2600	(-0.21%)
11 - 29	Add to the above £150 per unit	Add to the above £150 per unit	-
30 +	£5550 Plus £100 per unit above 30.	£5600 Plus £100 per unit above 30	-

Schedule 2 – Domestic Works			
Type of Work	Existing Charge (Inc. VAT at 15%)	Proposed Charge (Inc. VAT at 17.5%)	Variation (Exc. VAT)
Partial glazing	£75	£75	(-2.13%)
Total glazing	£150	£150	(-2.13%)
Electrical installation	£150	£150	(-2.13%)
Small garage or carport	£180	£180	(-2.13%)
Large garage or carport	£320	£300	(-8.24%)
Small extension	£340	£350	0.75%
Medium extension	£500	£540	5.7%
Loft conversion	£500	£540	5.7%
Large extension	£620	£660	4.19%

Schedule 3 – Other Works			
Estimated Cost £	Existing Charge £(VAT at 15%)	Proposed Charge £(VAT at 17.5%)	Variation (Exc.VAT)
Up to 2,000	150	150	(-2.13%)
2,001 – 5,000	225	225	(-2.13%)
5,001 – 10,000	280	300	4.86%
10,001 – 15,000	355	375	3.39%
15,001 – 20,000	430	450	2.42%
20,001 – 25,000	500	525	2.77%
25,001 – 30,000	550	600	6.77%
30,001 – 35,000	600	650	6.03%
35,001 – 40,000	650	700	5.40%
40,001 – 45,000	700	750	4.86%
45,001 – 50,000	750	800	4.40%
50,001 – 55,000	800	850	3.99%
55,001 – 60,000	850	900	3.63%
60,001 – 65,000	900	950	3.31%
65,001 – 70,000	950	1000	3.02%
70,001 – 75,000	1000	1050	2.77%
75,001 – 80,000	1050	1100	2.53%
80,001 – 85,000	1100	1150	2.32%
85,001 – 90,000	1150	1200	2.13%
90,001 – 95,000	1200	1250	1.95%
95,001 – 100,000	1250	1300	1.79%
100,001 – 1 Million	Rate of increase £50 per £10,000	Rate of increase £50 per £10,000	-
1 Million – 3 Million	Rate of increase £25 pr £10,000	Rate of increase £25 per £10,000	-
Over £3 Million	Rate of increase £12.50 per £10,000	Rate of increase £12.50 per £10,000	-