

## Taunton Deane Borough Council

At a meeting of Taunton Deane Borough Council held in the John Meikle Room, The Deane House, Belvedere Road, Taunton on 16 February 2010 at 6.30 pm.

**Present** The Mayor (Councillor Bowrah)  
The Deputy Mayor (Councillor Horsley)  
Councillors Mrs Allgrove, Beaven, Bishop, Brooks, Cavill, Coles, Mrs Copley, Ms Court, Mrs Court-Stenning, Critchard, Denington, D Durdan, Ms Durdan, Edwards, Farbahi, Mrs Floyd, Gaines, Govier, Guerrier, Hall, Henley, Ms Herbert, C Hill, Mrs Hill, House, Miss James, R Lees, Mrs Lees, Mrs Lewin-Harris, Meikle, Morrell, Mullins, Murphy, Paul, Prior-Sankey, Mrs Smith, P Smith, Mrs Stock-Williams, Stone, Stuart-Thorn, Swaine, Thorne, Watson, Mrs Waymouth, Ms Webber, A Wedderkopp, D Wedderkopp, Mrs Whitmarsh, Williams and Mrs Wilson

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

### 1. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting of Taunton Deane Borough Council held on 8 December 2009, copies having been sent to each Member, were signed by the Mayor.

### 2. **Apologies**

Councillors Hayward, McMahon and O'Brien.

### 3. **Communications**

Councillor R Lees reported the sad news that Adrian Yarde, a long-serving employee of the Council had unexpectedly died during a minor operation. He had worked for Deane DLO for over 46 years.

On behalf of the Council, the Mayor undertook to write a letter of condolence to Mr Yarde's family.

### 4. **Public Question Time**

All of the following questions were asked in connection with proposals in the Council's Core Strategy for development in the Killams Area of Taunton which would affect the Vivary Green Wedge:-

- (a) Bidy Garstang, Taunton Friends of the Earth - Is it acceptable for Taunton Deane to seek to construct arguments claiming that in the face of pressure from developers and the Regional Spatial Strategy the clean air the Vivary Green Wedge supplies is now somehow less important than it was?

- (b) Mike Threlfall, South Road and Area Residents Association - Is the Council 100% convinced that diligence and due care has been observed in these two documents (the Core Strategy and the Sustainability Report) and would they please consider revisiting them? Can we request a formal meeting with to discuss this further?
- (c) Gary Cox - Is Taunton Deane prepared to defend the Vivary Green Wedge from development with all the powers available to them, or are they simply going to abandon without a fight the commendable principles and precedents that they themselves have established and enforced over many decades?
- (d) Bob Kirby (Wilton and Sherford Community Association) - How is it sustainable to build in the Green Wedge when there are 6,500 empty properties in Taunton?
- (e) Sharon Cox - In view of the errors in the Sustainability Report and in order to prevent the possibility of costly legal challenges, will Taunton Deane go through the whole sustainability process again and, this time, make sure that they do it correctly?
- (f) Fran Hicks - Is the provision of new housing being approached as creatively as it might?

In response, Councillor Coles requested those who had asked questions to submit them in writing to enable him to respond in full.

Councillor Coles stated that the current Core Strategy exercise was the first part of an extensive consultation process. He made reference to the views of a previous Government Inspector who had expressed the view that an urban extension had to be planned as a community. The Core Strategy had attempted to achieve this. A mixed use development at Killams would comprise 600 dwellings, not the 750 stated by the Residents' Association. A 20m wide belt of landscaping would separate the development from the Green Wedge.

He added that further public consultation was planned in the future. As far as the Core Strategy document was concerned, Councillor Coles was confident that due diligence had been exercised in its preparation.

## 5. **Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Brooks declared personal interests as a Member of Somerset County Council and as a Council tenant. Councillor Coles declared a personal interest as a Director of Southwest One. Councillors Govier, Paul, Mrs Waymouth and D Wedderkopp declared personal interests as Members of Somerset County Council. Councillor Henley declared personal interests both as a Member of the Somerset County Council and as an employee of Job Centre Plus. Councillors Mullins and Slattery declared personal interests as Members of the Somerset Waste Board. Councillor Slattery also declared a personal interest as an employee of Sedgemoor District Council. Councillor Miss James declared a personal interest as an employee of Viridor. Councillor Prior-Sankey declared personal interests as a Member of Somerset County Council, the Supporting People Advisory Group and as someone who

rented a Council-owned garage. Councillors Mrs Court-Stenning, Mrs Hill, Mrs Smith and Stone declared personal interests as employees of Somerset County Council. Councillor Mrs Hill also declared a personal interest as a Council tenant. Councillor Mrs Wilson declared a personal interest as an employee of Job Centre Plus. Councillor Bishop declared a personal interest as a Member of Oake Village Hall and Recreation Committee. Councillor Cavill declared a prejudicial interest as he was the owner of land at Monkton Heathfield which could be affected by the Core Strategy. Councillor Gaines declared a personal interest as an employee of the Link Centre at Halcon, Taunton.

6. **Borough Council By-Election – 28 January 2010**

The Democratic Services Manager, on behalf of the Returning Officer, reported that Councillor Ben Swaine of Glenthorne Road, Taunton had been elected as a Councillor for the Lyngford Ward.

7. **Windfall Value Added Tax (VAT) Receipt**

Considered report previously circulated, concerning a one off windfall VAT receipt of £649,119.

HM Revenue and Customs had altered the regulations relating to claims for overpaid VAT. Following a House of Lords judgement it had been possible for claims to be made back as far as 1974 up to the date that the three year cap was brought in. The cut off for these claims was 31 March 2009

The Council had engaged Pricewaterhouse Coopers to conduct a review of VAT activity on a “no win no fee” basis, removing any risk of paying Pricewaterhouse Coopers unless benefits were identified.

The Council had now been able to reclaim overpaid VAT and associated interest in several areas including excess parking charges, cemetery supplies and leisure admissions amounting to £783,833.

The charge made by Pricewaterhouse Coopers for this work was £134,714 resulting in a net receipt of £649,119.

This receipt was a one off receipt and therefore should not be used to fund ongoing budget issues.

**Resolved** that:-

- (a) a supplementary estimate for income of £606,718 be approved;
- (b) a supplementary estimate for expenditure of £606,718 to fund the one-off cost of implementing Phases Two and Four of the Core Council Review (being £13,718 more than originally reported to the Executive due to an unforeseen change in the profile of staff redundancies) be approved; and

(c) the transfer of the balance of £42,401 to General Fund Reserves at the year end be also approved.

**8. Written Question to Member of the Executive**

Councillor Morrell asked the following questions:-

“Apart from Longrun Farm, in the eight years since it was established what has Project Taunton tangibly achieved with respect to actual physical regeneration on the ground?

How much has Project Taunton cost to date and what is the breakdown of this expenditure?

What benchmarks have been set to ensure that the Project Taunton Delivery Team is delivering value for taxpayers’ money?

As leader of the Council, do you feel that the £798,000 spent to date on Somerset Square represents good value for tax payers’ money?

Considering the Somerset Square project overran its initial £300,000 budget by some £500,000, will you ensure a comprehensive forensic external audit is undertaken as to why this sum was not identified at the start and what this expenditure relates to?

As leader of the Council, do you feel that the £3,800,000 proposed to be spent on removing the car park at Castle Green represents good value for tax payers’ money?

Where will the annual £100,000 shortfall in revenue and £20,000 maintenance cost come from once the car park at Castle Green is no longer available? Please can you identify the new revenue generating schemes which will address this net £120,000 per annum loss.”

Councillor Henley replied as follows:-

“What I don’t think Councillor Morrell understands is that regeneration has a long / medium term delivery time – a huge amount of work needs to occur before you see the diggers start. We need to be planning for the longer term or nothing will ever happen.

(1) It is 4.5 years (not 8) since the delivery team were in place. These are the projects:-

- Flooding – negotiate away from the 6 dams suggested by the Environment Agency (which would have cost £35,000,000) and obtain the Regional Development Agency (RDA) finance to (a) buy the land and (b) do the works;

- Procurement of development partner for Firepool. Purchase of third party properties needed for the development – all with funding negotiated from the RDA (£3,000,000). Demolition work, refurbishment of auction centre for marketing suite and lettable area (4000 sq ft unit). Planning application for public realm and landscaping on Priory Bridge Road Car Park;
  - Firepool Lock – 110 affordable homes will be built here due to Growth Point (GP) funding of the road – GP funding bid for and won by Project Taunton Team;
  - Cricket Club – enabled to purchase Taunton Deane land – worked together on Pegasus development and landscaping of Somerset Square area;
  - Planning consent for Castle Green;
  - Exclusivity agreement with owners of retail centre – working up this scheme will be 3 – 4 years;
  - Tangier – in current discussion with Musgrove and Somerset College about provision of student and newly qualified doctor and nurses accommodation; and
  - Worked with Somerset County Council (SCC) on evidence base for Third Way and Northern Inner Distributor Road. Both awaiting Department for Transport funding.
- (2) It has cost Taunton Deane the original input of £660,000 (from Planning Delivery Grant not the base budget) in 2004/2005 along with similar funding from SCC and RDA. Since then Taunton Deane has put in £300,000 from the sale of land to the Cricket Club towards Somerset Square, but nothing else from its own budget. The Delivery Team and its activity has been funded either from RDA funding or from Growth Points. A total of £5,800,000 from RDA and £6,000,000 from Growth Points means £11,800,000 capital funding plus £600,000 revenue.
- (3) Not sure what you mean by this – however, the Project Taunton Plan is something that was the subject to huge amount of public consultation at its formation – the Vision for Taunton Commission. The team is tasked with delivery against this plan. In terms of local taxpayers this has been excellent value for money as the bulk of funding has not had to be found locally but has come either from regional pots (RDA) or Central Government (Growth Points). Both the RDA and Government (Department of Communities and Local Government) are content with the progress that has been made as shown by their continuing willingness to fund Project Taunton delivery.
- (4) Yes, if we want to see high quality public space in Taunton then we have to pay the price. The costs at Somerset Square were significantly increased due to the foundations that needed to be put in to allow the Brewhouse Theatre to continue to receive its lorry deliveries to the back stage door. Do not forget that £250,000 of this was from the developer.
- (5) No – there is no need to. The original estimate was £300,000 plus the £250,000 developer contribution (total £550,000) prior to any work being

done on the design or the materials that would be required. Once this was done – all costs approved by a Quantity Surveyor – a further report was made to the Executive in February 2009 requesting further funding from Growth points to be able to complete the project to a high quality specification. This was approved. In fact the project came in under the final budget.

- (6) What is better than giving the town a fantastic heart to it – a public space that local people and visitors can enjoy and be proud of and will provide a fantastic setting for the re-opened and re-furbished Museum of Somerset?
- (7) These issues are picked up in the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) and in the budget setting process. The revenue is picked up in this year's budget and we will pick the maintenance up in next year's budget. All of our savings plans contribute to any shortfall in the MTFP, not a particular saving against a particular gap”.

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

### (a) **Gambling Act 2005 – Revised Statement of Principles**

The Gambling Act 2005 placed a duty on all Licensing Authorities to produce a Statement of Principles (also known as the Gambling Policy).

Each Licensing Authority was required to review this policy document at least every three years and take into account the views of those representing the holders of existing licences and certificates, local residents, businesses and the Police.

Taunton Deane's 2007 Statement of Principles had recently been updated in accordance with the Statutory Guidance and widespread consultations had been undertaken.

On the motion of Councillor Slattery, it was

**Resolved** that the revised Statement of Principles be approved.

### (b) **Fees and Charges 2010/2011**

Consideration had been given to the proposed fees and charges for 2010/2011 for the following services:-

- Cemeteries and Crematorium;
- Waste Services;
- Housing; and
- Licensing.

Details of the proposed increases were submitted. No increase was proposed to the Land Charges fees.

The results of previous public consultation events “Your Council, Your Views” had clearly indicated that the public preferred to see increases in fees and charges, rather than in Council Tax, as a way for the Council to raise income. Therefore, where possible, fees had been increased to take these views into account.

On the motion of Councillor Slattery, it was

**Resolved** that the fees and charges for 2010/2011 in respect of Cemeteries and Crematorium, Waste Services, Housing and Licensing, as submitted, be agreed.

### (c) **Corporate Strategy 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) had been 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 has been made to the Council’s Vision to reflect the importance of the growth agenda and the possibilities that it would provide. The Vision now read:-

“Taunton Deane would be recognised nationally as a place that was 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 number of key activities.

Themes and Service Areas would need to work closely together to deliver the Corporate Aims. It was intended to closely monitor performance against the

Strategy in order to understand how effective the Council was in delivering the aims and objectives.

On the motion of Councillor Mrs Wilson, it was

**Resolved** that the Corporate Strategy 2010-2013 be adopted.

**(d) Minimum Revenue Provision**

Before the start of each financial year, the Council was required to determine the basis on which it made provision from revenue for the repayment of borrowing undertaken for the purpose of financing capital expenditure.

This annual provision, known as Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP), was designed to ensure that authorities made prudent provision to cover the ongoing costs of their borrowing.

In 2008, the Government became less prescriptive offering Councils a number of options for calculating MRP. For the financial year 2009/2010, the Council determined to calculate MRP as follows:-

- for supported borrowing, 4% on outstanding debt; and
- for unsupported borrowing, the debt associated with asset divided by the estimated useful life of the asset.

On the motion of Councillor Henley, it was

**Resolved** that the basis of calculating the Minimum Revenue Provision in 2009/2010 be retained for 2010/2011.

**(e) Core Council Review – Independent Review of Deane DLO**

In April 2009 the Council approved an alternative approach to completing the Core Council Review which included the commissioning of independent external expertise for Theme 3 of the Core Council Review – to develop options for the future of services provided by Deane DLO.

Turner and Townsend PLC were appointed to carry out the review after a rigorous procurement and selection process. The company's report set out the work that has 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;
- Joint Venture – Where the Council formed a new organisation with a private sector partner to deliver services;



- 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 should follow a detailed procurement process with full outsourcing to a private sector supplier as the preferred way forward.

In recommending outsourcing, Turner and Townsend were proposing an implementation process which provided scope to implement the potential alternatives of joint venture or internal transformation, if the business case for outsourcing did not meet the Council's requirements.

All options, except 'As Is', had one-off cost implications for implementation. For the outsourcing option, the one-off cost would be up to £200,000, with an implementation timescale of approximately 12 months.

The one-off costs for implementing alternative options of joint venture and internal transformation would be up to £300,000 and £600,000 respectively.

The potential annual savings arising from the recommended outsourcing was estimated at £278,000, which would be achieved within a time span of 24–36 months.

On the motion of Councillor Henley, it was

**Resolved** that:-

- (a) the consultants' recommended approach, starting from the position that full outsourcing was the preferred way forward for Deane DLO services be approved;
- (b) the further development of internal transformation as a benchmark comparison option, to be presented to Members alongside the results from (a) for further scrutiny and final decision, be approved; and
- (c) 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) above and to recognise the potential requirement for further

implementation funds, the amount being dependent on the option ultimately agreed by Members, be also approved.

**(f) General Fund Revenue Estimates 2010/2011**

The Executive had previously considered its 2010/2011 budget proposals. It contained details on:-

- (i) the General Fund Revenue Budget proposals for 2010/2011, including the proposed Council Tax increase and the Prudential Indicators;
- (ii) draft figures on the predicted financial position of the Council for the following four years.

The Corporate Scrutiny Committee had also considered the draft budget proposals at its meeting on 21 January 2010.

The Council Tax calculation and formal tax setting resolution was to be considered separately. However, the proposed budget for Taunton Deane would result in a Band D Council Tax of £135.19, an increase of £3.30 (2.5%) on 2009/2010.

It was a requirement for the Council to prepare not only budgets for the following financial year but to also provide indicative figures into future years. The Medium Term Financial Plan provided an indication of the expected budget gap going forward into 2011/2012 and a summary of this position was submitted.

These figures had been prepared on the assumption of a 2.5% increase in Council Tax each year, including 2011/2012. However, the Medium Term Financial Plan 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.

The estimated expenses chargeable to the non-parished area of Taunton in 2010/2011 amounted to £47,047, an increase of 50% on the Band D equivalent, and this formed part of the total net expenditure of the Council. The precept in 2009/2010 was £30,620.

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

The Council's Section 151 Officer had a duty to comment, as part of the budget setting process on the robustness of the budget and the adequacy of reserves. In her response, 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.

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

- (i) **Car park income** – reduced losses as proposed extension to Silk Mills Park and Ride was not proceeding . This would save the Council £28,000;
- (ii) **Castle Green Maintenance** – impact deferred to 2011/2012. A further saving of £22,000;
- (iii) **Reduce funding for the Local Strategic Partnership.** This would save £15,000 in the forthcoming financial year;
- (iv) **Funding for the Link Partnership and North Taunton Partnership** towards Service Level Agreements (in addition to contributions from existing budget). The budget would be £10,000;
- (v) **Rural deprivation** funding of £5,000;
- (vi) **Public conveniences:** Recommendation not to close the toilets at Rockwell Green, Bishops Lydeard, Milverton Recreation Ground and Milverton Creedwell Orchard and not to seek a contribution from the West Somerset Railway for the public conveniences there. The cost would be £21,000;
- (vii) **Carbon Neutral projects.** The budget for this would be £19,000; and
- (viii) **Wiveliscombe Community Partnership** - Top up of Service Level Agreement. The funding for this would be £10,000.

The amendment was put and was carried.

Moved by Councillor Williams, seconded by Councillor Bishop that the budget proposals be amended by the alternative budget prepared by the Conservative Group. The amendments took the form of:-

- (i) **Reinstate Savings Plan – Closure/transfer of public conveniences**  
It was proposed to reinstate this £20,100 saving in the 2010/2011 budget.
- (ii) **Reinstate Savings Plan – Voluntary Services Grant**  
The budget sought to reduce the current grants on offer to voluntary services by £9,250. It was proposed to reinstate this saving.
- (iii) **Reinstate Savings Plan – Stop Food after Annual Council**  
It was proposed to reinstate this £1,000 saving.
- (iv) **Reinstate Savings Plan – Climate Change Initiatives**  
Climate Change was a Corporate Priority. It was proposed to reinstate this £1,250 saving.
- (v) **Amend Savings Plan - Move Planning Committee to 6pm and stop providing food**  
The original savings plan was a saving £2,000. It was proposed to add £1,000 back to the budget for 2010/2011 to allow some refreshments to be provided.

- (vi) **Amend Savings Plan – Reduce Hanging Basket provision by 25%**  
It was proposed to add £6,000 to the budget to reinstate hanging baskets in High Street and Shuttern, Taunton.
- (vii) **Reduction in Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) Funding**  
It was proposed to reduce the Council's funding to the LSP by £15,000.
- (viii) **New Initiative – Somerset Building Trust**  
It was proposed to add £1,200 to the budget as a tangible gesture of support for the good work the Trust did.
- (ix) **New Initiative – Climate Change Initiatives**  
It was felt that the new Corporate Aim should be fully supported by adding £11,200 to the 2010/2011 budget.
- (x) **New Initiative –Town Centre Seating**  
To enable some further seating to be provided in Taunton Town Centre it was proposed to add £7,500 to the budget.
- (xi) **New Initiative – Surface Remedial Works to Council Car Parks**  
To repair surface damage to public car parks caused by the recent severe weather, it was proposed that £2,500 was added to the budget.
- (xii) **HRA Contribution to Youth Initiatives**  
It was proposed to add £15,000 from the Housing Revenue Account to the 2010/2011 budget for Youth Initiatives.

The Mayor adjourned the meeting to allow Councillors the opportunity to consider the above alternative proposals from the Conservative Group.

On the resumption of the meeting, the amendment was put and was lost.

The substantive Motion which is detailed below, was put and was carried:-

**Resolved that:-**

- (1) the budget for General Fund services for 2010/2011 as shown in the original report to Full Council and as amended above, be approved;
- (2) the transfer of any potential underspend in 2009/2010 back to General Fund reserves be approved;
- (3) the proposed 2010/2011 budget set out in the original report to Full Council and as amended above, being Authority expenditure of £14,050,480 and Special Expenses of £47,050 in accordance with the Local Government Act 1992 be approved;
- (4) The predicted General Fund Reserve balance at 31 March 2010 of £1,419,000 be noted;
- (5) The forecast budget position within the Medium Term Financial Plan be Noted; and
- (6) The Prudential Indicators for 2010/2011 as set out in the report be agreed.

**(g) Capital Programme 2010/2011 Onwards and revisions to the 2009/2010 Programme**

Consideration had been given to the proposed General Fund (GF) and Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Capital Programmes for the period 2010/2011 to 2014/2015.

For the General Fund the existing unallocated resources available were £65,000. It was however likely that some future capital receipts would arise from the sale of the existing Nursery site in Mount Street, Taunton.

For all Housing schemes, both GF and HRA, the estimated resources available for 2010/2011 amounted to £6,547,000. The proposed capital programme for 2010/2011 amounted to £6,154,000. The unallocated resources of £393,000 were proposed to be carried forward to support the Housing Capital Programme in future years.

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.

A revised Capital Programme budget for 2009/2010 had also been considered by the Executive.

The original budget for the year for the General Fund Capital Programme had originally been set at £1,954,930. It was now proposed to increase this budget to £3,161,310 to take account of recent decisions made 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 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.

On the motion of Councillor Henley it was

**Resolved** that:-

- (1) the General Fund and Housing Revenue Account Capital Programmes for 2010/2011 be agreed;
- (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.

**(h) Council Tax Setting 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.

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 had also been received of the parish precepts levied and the appropriate Council Tax at Band D.

The Council's budget requirement was £14,519,470 including 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 national pool, amounting to £7,615,394.

The net amount, having taking the collection fund position into account, of £5,928,660 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 2010.

The Council Tax for the Borough (excluding Parish Precepts and Special Expenses for the non-parished area) was £135.19, an increase of £3.30 (2.5%) compared to the 2009/2010 Council Tax. The total Council Tax, including the Somerset County Council, Police and Fire Authorities precepts was still subject to confirmation.

On the motion of Councillor Henley it was

**Resolved** that subject to final determination to take account of the Council Tax for Somerset County Council, the Police and Fire Authorities, which was to be advised:-

(1) 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):-

- (i) 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.

(ii)

Ash Priors	76.05	Neroche	255.85
Ashbrittle	97.07	North Curry	742.96

Bathealton	84.57	Norton Fitzwarren	777.50
Bishops Hull	1,072.38	Nynehead	156.55
Bishops Lydeard / Cothelstone	1,943.65	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
Comeytrove	2,086.27	Stoke St Gregory	387.38
Corfe	134.15	Stoke St Mary	206.72
Creech St Michael	950.07	Taunton	16,112.21
Durston	59.02	Trull	1,025.27
Fitzhead	121.87	Wellington	4,649.24
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.

- (iii) 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) £79,981,814                      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) £65,462,344 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) £14,519,470 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) £146.80 
$$\frac{(c) - (d)}{(1) \text{ above}} = \frac{14,519,470 - 8,591,010}{40,384.49}$$
 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) £468,990 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

$$\frac{(e) - (f)}{(1) \text{ above}} = 146.80 - \frac{468,990}{40,384.49}$$

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	145.49	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	153.19

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).

(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	96.99	113.16	129.32	145.49	177.82	210.15	242.48	290.98
Bathealton	94.86	110.66	126.47	142.28	173.90	205.51	237.14	284.56
Bishops Hull	102.56	119.66	136.75	153.84	188.02	222.21	256.40	307.68
Bishops Lydeard/Cothelstone	101.40	118.30	135.20	152.10	185.90	219.70	253.50	304.20
Bradford on Tone	103.06	120.23	137.41	154.58	188.93	223.28	257.64	309.16
Burrowbridge	105.65	123.26	140.86	158.47	193.68	228.90	264.12	316.94
Cheddon Fitzpaine	96.30	112.34	128.39	144.44	176.54	208.63	240.74	288.88
Chipstable	99.48	116.06	132.64	149.22	182.38	215.54	248.70	298.44
Churchstanton	105.46	123.04	140.61	158.19	193.34	228.49	263.65	316.38
Combe Florey	98.87	115.35	131.82	148.30	181.25	214.21	247.17	296.60
Comeytrove	98.12	114.47	130.82	147.17	179.87	212.57	245.29	294.34
Corfe	97.58	113.85	130.11	146.37	178.89	211.42	243.95	292.74
Creech St Michael	102.24	119.27	136.31	153.35	187.43	221.50	255.59	306.70

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	212.73	245.47	294.56
Hatch Beauchamp	101.61	118.54	135.48	152.41	186.28	220.14	254.02	304.82
Kingston St Mary	99.09	115.60	132.12	148.63	181.66	214.68	247.72	297.26
Langford Budville	101.32	118.20	135.09	151.97	185.74	219.51	253.29	303.94
Lydeard St Lawrence/Tolland	100.76	117.56	134.35	151.14	184.72	218.31	251.90	302.28
Milverton	102.90	120.04	137.19	154.34	188.64	222.93	257.24	308.68
Neroche	99.38	115.95	132.51	149.07	182.19	215.32	248.45	298.14
North Curry	104.94	122.42	139.91	157.40	192.38	227.35	262.34	314.80
Norton Fitzwarren	109.44	127.67	145.91	164.15	200.63	237.10	273.59	328.30
Nynehead	105.04	122.54	140.05	157.55	192.56	227.57	262.59	315.10
Oake	99.62	116.23	132.83	149.43	182.63	215.84	249.05	298.86
Otterford	90.13	105.15	120.17	135.19	165.23	195.27	225.32	270.38
Pitminster	101.05	117.89	134.73	151.57	185.25	218.93	252.62	303.14
Ruishton/Thornfalcon	104.22	121.58	138.95	156.32	191.06	225.79	260.54	312.64

Sampford Arundel	112.57	131.33	150.09	168.85	206.37	243.89	281.42	337.70
Staplegrove	99.46	116.03	132.61	149.18	182.33	215.48	248.64	298.36
Stawley	102.34	119.40	136.45	153.51	187.62	221.73	255.85	307.02
Stoke St Gregory	100.46	117.20	133.94	150.68	184.16	217.64	251.14	301.36
Stoke St Mary	99.83	116.47	133.10	149.74	191.06	216.29	249.57	299.48
Taunton	92.08	107.42	122.77	138.11	206.37	199.49	230.19	276.22
Trull	99.24	115.77	132.31	148.85	181.93	215.00	248.09	297.70
Wellington	102.13	119.15	136.17	153.19	187.23	221.27	255.32	306.38
Wellington Without	100.86	117.66	134.47	151.28	184.90	218.51	252.14	302.56
West Bagborough	98.28	114.65	131.03	147.41	180.17	212.92	245.69	294.82
West Buckland	102.08	119.10	136.11	153.12	187.14	221.17	255.20	306.24
West Hatch	100.04	116.72	133.39	150.06	183.40	216.75	250.10	300.12
West Monkton	107.94	125.92	143.91	161.90	197.88	233.85	269.84	323.80
Wiveliscombe	102.12	119.13	136.15	153.17	187.21	221.24	255.29	306.34

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)

**(b)**

That it be noted that for the year 2010/11 the Somerset County Council, the Avon and Somerset Police Authority and the Somerset and Devon Fire & Rescue Authority have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Sect

Somerset County Council	684.87	799.01	913.16	1,027.30	1,255.59	1,483.88	1,712.17	2,054.60
Avon & Somerset Police Authority	112.02	130.69	149.36	168.03	205.37	242.71	280.05	336.06
Devon & Somerset Fire & Rescue Authority	47.85	55.82	63.80	71.77	87.72	103.67	119.62	143.54

Valuation Band	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Ash Priors	934.86	1,090.67	1,246.48	1,402.29	1,713.91	2,025.53	2,337.15	2,804.58
Ashbrittle	941.73	1,098.68	1,255.64	1,412.59	1,726.50	2,040.41	2,354.32	2,825.18
Bathealton	939.59	1,096.18	1,252.78	1,409.38	1,722.58	2,035.77	2,348.97	2,818.76
Bishops Hull	947.29	1,105.18	1,263.06	1,420.94	1,736.70	2,052.47	2,368.23	2,841.88
Bishops Lydeard/Cothelstone	946.13	1,103.82	1,261.51	1,419.20	1,734.57	2,049.96	2,365.33	2,838.40
Bradford on Tone	947.79	1,105.75	1,263.72	1,421.68	1,737.61	2,053.54	2,369.47	2,843.36
Burrowbridge	950.38	1,108.78	1,267.17	1,425.57	1,742.36	2,059.16	2,375.96	2,851.14
Cheddon Fitzpaine	941.03	1,097.86	1,254.70	1,411.54	1,725.21	2,038.89	2,352.57	2,823.08
Chipstable	944.21	1,101.58	1,258.95	1,416.32	1,731.06	2,045.80	2,360.54	2,832.64

Churchstanton	950.20	1,108.56	1,266.92	1,425.29	1,742.02	2,058.75	2,375.49	2,850.58
Combe Florey	943.60	1,100.87	1,258.13	1,415.40	1,729.93	2,044.47	2,359.01	2,830.80
Comeytrove	942.85	1,099.99	1,257.13	1,414.27	1,728.55	2,042.83	2,357.12	2,828.54
Corfe	942.31	1,099.37	1,256.42	1,413.47	1,727.57	2,041.68	2,355.79	2,826.94
Creech St Michael	946.97	1,104.79	1,262.62	1,420.45	1,736.11	2,051.76	2,367.42	2,840.90
Durston	934.86	1,090.67	1,246.48	1,402.29	1,713.91	2,025.53	2,337.15	2,804.58
Fitzhead	955.97	1,115.30	1,274.63	1,433.96	1,752.62	2,071.28	2,389.94	2,867.92
Halse	942.92	1,100.07	1,257.23	1,414.38	1,728.69	2,042.99	2,357.30	2,828.76
Hatch Beauchamp	946.34	1,104.06	1,261.79	1,419.51	1,734.96	2,050.40	2,365.85	2,839.02
Kingston St Mary	943.82	1,101.13	1,258.43	1,415.73	1,730.34	2,044.94	2,359.56	2,831.46
Langford Budville	946.05	1,103.72	1,261.40	1,419.07	1,734.42	2,049.77	2,365.12	2,838.14
Lydeard St Lawrence/Tolland	945.49	1,103.08	1,260.66	1,418.24	1,733.40	2,048.57	2,363.73	2,836.48
Milverton	947.63	1,105.57	1,263.50	1,421.44	1,737.32	2,053.19	2,369.07	2,842.88
Neroche	944.11	1,101.47	1,258.82	1,416.17	1,730.87	2,045.57	2,360.28	2,832.34
North Curry	949.67	1,107.94	1,266.22	1,424.50	1,741.05	2,057.61	2,374.17	2,849.00
Norton Fitzwarren	954.17	1,113.20	1,272.22	1,431.25	1,749.31	2,067.36	2,385.42	2,862.50

Nynehead	949.77	1,108.06	1,266.36	1,424.65	1,741.23	2,057.82	2,374.42	2,849.30
Oake	944.36	1,101.75	1,259.14	1,416.53	1,731.31	2,046.10	2,360.88	2,833.06
Otterford	934.86	1,090.67	1,246.48	1,402.29	1,713.91	2,025.53	2,337.15	2,804.58
Pitminster	945.78	1,103.41	1,261.04	1,418.67	1,733.93	2,049.19	2,364.45	2,837.34
Ruishton/Thornfalcon	948.95	1,107.10	1,265.26	1,423.42	1,739.74	2,056.05	2,372.37	2,846.84
Sampford Arundel	957.30	1,116.85	1,276.40	1,435.95	1,755.05	2,074.15	2,393.25	2,871.90
Staplegrove	944.19	1,101.55	1,258.92	1,416.28	1,731.01	2,045.74	2,360.47	2,832.56
Stawley	947.07	1,104.92	1,262.77	1,420.61	1,736.30	2,051.99	2,367.68	2,841.22
Stoke St Gregory	945.19	1,102.72	1,260.25	1,417.78	1,732.84	2,047.90	2,362.97	2,835.56
Stoke St Mary	944.56	1,101.99	1,259.41	1,416.84	1,739.74	2,046.55	2,361.40	2,833.68
Taunton	936.81	1,092.94	1,249.08	1,405.21	1,755.05	2,029.75	2,342.02	2,810.42
Trull	943.97	1,101.29	1,258.62	1,415.95	1,730.61	2,045.25	2,359.92	5,531.90
Wellington	946.86	1,104.67	1,262.48	1,420.29	1,735.91	2,051.53	2,367.15	2,840.58
Wellington Without	945.59	1,103.18	1,260.79	1,418.38	1,733.58	2,048.77	2,363.97	2,836.76
West Bagborough	943.01	1,100.18	1,257.34	1,414.51	1,728.85	2,043.18	2,357.52	2,829.02
West Buckland	946.81	1,104.62	1,262.42	1,420.22	1,735.82	2,051.43	2,367.03	2,840.44



West Hatch	944.77	1,102.24	1,259.70	1,417.16	1,732.08	2,047.00	2,361.93	2,834.32
West Monkton	952.67	1,111.44	1,270.22	1,429.00	1,746.56	2,064.10	2,381.67	2,858.00
Wiveliscombe	946.85	1,104.66	1,262.46	1,420.27	1,735.89	2,051.50	2,367.12	2,840.54

**(h) Housing Revenue Account, Revenue Estimates and Rent Levels and Deane Helpline for the 2010/2011 Financial Year**

Consideration had been given to the proposed Housing Revenue Account (HRA) for the 2010/2011 Financial Year which showed a working balance of £2,545,800. It also included details of the proposed new rent charges for the year and provided information on the Deane Helpline Trading Account.

The Corporate Scrutiny Committee had considered the 2010/2011 draft budget at its meeting on 21 January 2010 where no formal recommendations to change the HRA budget were made. The Tenants Forum has also considered the report.

On the motion of Councillor Prior-Sankey, it was

**Resolved** that the Housing Revenue Account budget for 2010/2011 be agreed.

**(i) Digital Compliance : Deane Helpline**

Consideration had been given to a proposal to allocate sufficient capital investment for the supply of new equipment to ensure that all Lifeline equipment operated by the Deane Helpline was digitally compliant.

It was estimated that approximately 173 individual properties (hard-wire schemes or dispersed alarms) within Taunton Deane required upgrading.

The Executive had agreed that a capital allocation of £35,000 to this project from existing revenue resources should be approved.

On the motion of Councillor Prior-Sankey, it was

**Resolved** that this change to the capital programme be agreed.

**10. Reports of the Leader of the Council and Executive Councillors**

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

**(i) Leader of the Council (Councillor Henley)**

Councillor Henley's report covered the following topics:-

- Core Council Review;
- The Budget;
- Project Taunton
- Lyngford By-Election;

- Britain in Bloom;
- Deane DLO;
- Meetings.

(ii) **Community Leadership (Councillor A Wedderkopp)**

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

- Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership;
- The Paintball Project;
- CCTV Cameras;
- A Neighbourhood Pathfinder Bid;
- Wellington Restorative Justice Panel 2008 - 2010;
- Taunton Restorative Justice Panel;
- Local Strategic Partnership – Infrastructure Planning, Deprivation and Climate Change.

(iii) **Communications (Councillor Paul)**

Councillor Paul's report covered the following topics:-

- The Deane Dispatch;
- Local Government Communications Seminar;
- Somerset Public Service Communications Group;
- Press Releases.

(iv) **Planning Policy and Transportation (Councillor Coles)**

Councillor Coles submitted his report, which drew attention to the following:-

- Pedestrianisation of Taunton Town Centre;
- Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Site Allocations;
- Southwest One;
- Houses in Multiple Occupation to be brought under Planning control;
- Planning Application Fees Frozen;
- Planning Team Changes.

(v) **Economic Development and the Arts (Councillor Mrs Smith)**

The report from Councillor Mrs Smith covered:-

- Core Council Review – Team Changes;
- Economic Development Strategy;
- Rural Retail Support;
- Local Action for Rural Communities;

- Arts;
- Tourism;
- Project Taunton.

(vi) **Sports, Parks and Leisure (Councillor R Lees)**

The report from Councillor R Lees dealt with activities taking place in the following areas:-

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

(vii) **Environmental Services (Councillor Slattery)**

The Report from Councillor Slattery drew attention to developments in the following areas:-

- Environmental Protection Team;
- Food and Health and Safety Team;
- Waste Management.

(viii) **Housing Services (Councillor Prior-Sankey)**

Councillor Prior-Sankey submitted her report which drew attention to the following:-

- Farewell to Chief Housing Officer – John Williams FCIH;
- Appointment of new Housing Services Lead;
- Tenant Services Management Board;
- Home Improvement Agency Contract;
- Housing Subsidy Reform : “The Offer”;
- Shrinking Homes;
- Developments at Parmin Close, Ruskin Close and Victoria Gate, Taunton;
- Emerging Corporate Priority – Affordable Housing.

(ix) **Resources (Councillor Mrs Wilson)**

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

- Southwest One Customer Contact Highlights;
- Update on progress with Investors in People Action Plan;
- Performance and Client Team Update;
- Revenues and Benefits Service Unit.

(Councillors Morrell, Mullins, Govier and Swaine left the meeting at 9.22 pm, 9.31 pm, 9.32 pm and 9.40 pm respectively.)

(The meeting ended at 9.42 pm.)