

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 22 February 2011 at 6.30 pm.

Present The Mayor (Councillor Horsley)
 The Deputy Mayor (Councillor Brooks)
 Councillors Mrs Adkins, Mrs Allgrove, Beaven, Bishop, Bowrah, Cavill, Coles, Mrs Copley, Critchard, Denington, D Durdan, Ms Durdan, Edwards, Farbahi, Mrs Floyd, Gaines, Govier, Guerrier, Hall, Hayward, Henley, Mrs Herbert, C Hill, Mrs Hill, House, Miss James, R Lees, Mrs Lees, Mrs Lewin-Harris, McMahon, Meikle, Morrell, Mullins, Murphy, Paul, Prior-Sankey, Mrs Smith, P Smith, Mrs Stock-Williams, 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. Reflection

The meeting was opened with a reflection offered by Mrs Sheila Harvey, a member of the Society of Friends.

2. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of Taunton Deane Borough Council held on 2 February 2011, copies having been sent to each Member, were signed by the Mayor.

3. Apologies

Councillors Mrs Messenger, O'Brien and Slattery.

4. Communications

The Mayor reminded Councillors of two forthcoming events:-

- 19 March 2011 – The Mayor's Charity Concert, featuring the Taunton Deane and Truro Male Voice Choirs; and
- 26 March 2011 – A Charity Gala Concert and Dinner at Taunton School, Staplegrove Road, Taunton.

5. Declarations of Interest

Councillors Govier, Mrs Waymouth and D Wedderkopp declared personal interests as Members of Somerset County Council. Councillor Prior-Sankey declared personal interests both as a Member of Somerset County Council and as the tenant of a Council-owned garage. Councillor Brooks declared

personal interests both as a Member of Somerset County Council and as a tenant of a Council-owned property. Councillor Henley declared personal interests both as a Member of the Somerset County Council and as an employee of Job Centre Plus. Councillor McMahon declared personal interests both as a Member of the Somerset County Council and as a Director of Southwest One. Councillor Miss James declared a personal interest as an employee of Viridor. Councillors Mrs Adkins and Mrs Hill declared personal interests as employees of Somerset County Council. Councillor Mrs Smith declared personal interests both as an employee of Somerset County Council and because her son-in-law was a Police Community Support Officer (PCSO). Councillor P Smith also declared a personal interest because his son-in-law was a PCSO. Councillors Hayward and Mrs Whitmarsh declared personal interests as the Council's representatives on the Somerset Waste Board. Councillor Mrs Wilson declared a personal interest as an employee of Job Centre Plus. Councillor Watson declared a personal interest as the alternate Director of Southwest One. Councillor R Lees declared a prejudicial interest as someone who was in receipt of taxi tokens. He stated that he would leave the room if there was any discussion on this matter. Councillor Mullins declared a personal interest as EDF Energy at Hinkley Point was his employer. Councillor Murphy declared personal and prejudicial interests as his company dealt with Southwest One and Council contracts. He left the room on three occasions whilst matters relating to Disabled Facilities Grants were discussed.

6. **Public Question Time**

- (a) Mr Chris Mann addressed the Council as its Members were, in his view, part of a service management structure that was cutting services to its most vulnerable citizens whilst keeping seven Chief Executives and seven senior management teams in a small rural county.

The Council appeared to have allowed management and debt to expand to consume all available funds. Why was this? What caused the outlook or calibre of Councillors to change? Did the availability of expenses attract a different type? Why were Councillors now so liberal with taxpayer's money? There was such a stark contrast with the private sector where mergers and flattening of structures were the norm. Why was the Council not directing this?

You did not re-engineer services to unitary management in 2007 and I think that Taunton Deane was left with what is now an extravagant management structure.

Most unanswered questions are on the complex and risky Southwest One which I think is completely unnecessary additional management and was wisely rejected by your four sister councils. However, it blocks any further moves towards unitary management.

It is inadequate to say that Southwest One is costing no more than Taunton Deane's 2007 costs. It displays a complete lack of understanding of how business has changed. During the remaining 80

months of the contract, Mr Mann believed IBM would be paid about £100m in profits and the Council would also still have to pay for the additional very expensive Client Services Team.

With zero democratic enterprise on management costs, was it accepted that normal business reform could not be voted upon for another 80 months and that the Leader and Executive method had been compromised by the 3000 page contract with IBM?

Councillors were still regulators of a monopoly service and collectively had the authority. You must surely prove that the Leader and Executive method can work by holding your Executive to account on so many still unanswered questions:-

- Why had local residents not seen the much trumpeted Southwest One review by the County Audit Chairman?
- If residents could not see this report on the spending of your share of £400m of public money, would Taunton Deane's Scrutiny Committee produce a public review of the costs and benefits that included the costs of your expensive Client Services Team?
- How could residents be assured that procurement was not more expensive through Southwest One? and
- How could residents be assured that proposed service cuts would not be claimed as 'gainshare' payments to IBM as identified in the Audit Commission's report on Southwest One?

In response, Councillor Williams made the following points:-

- (i) Taunton Deane was actively seeking to work in partnership with other Authorities to drive down costs and improve service delivery. Southwest One, the Southwest Audit Partnership, Tone Leisure and the Somerset Waste Partnership were prime examples of this. Additionally, Taunton Deane was in the process of undertaking a restructure through its Core Council Review. This had involved a significant 'flattening' of the management structure and a number of posts being made redundant. The net effect of this restructure had been to deliver significant savings and to make the Council's structure fit for purpose for the current economic climate.
- (ii) The other districts all signed-up to the original framework agreement for Southwest One and consequently did, initially at least, express an interest. Southwest One did not block the move to a Unitary Council or the districts voluntarily choosing to work together. Ultimately the move to a Unitary Council is the decision of Central Government and would override the Southwest One contract.
- (iii) Our payment to Southwest One is significantly less than the cost of running the services in 2007. This is because we receive the benefit of the cumulative 2.5% year-on-year reduction in the unitary charge. Yes, the environment in which services were provided and

consequently the requirements on the services changes. However, the contract reflects this and provides mechanisms for us to performance manage these changes.

- (iv) Taunton Deane would certainly not pay IBM £100m in profits, as that was way more than our contract was worth. We would actually pay less as the contract progressed as we received the year-on-year 2.5% cumulative reduction in the unitary charge. Over the lifetime of the contract this would realise savings for Taunton Deane of approximately £5.7m. The cost and staffing of our Client Team is small in comparison to the extent and cost of the Southwest One contract which it manages.
- (v) The 'Southwest One Performance Management and Benefits Realisation Report' published in 2010, was produced by the Audit Commission for Somerset County Council and its findings and recommendations were consequently County Council orientated.
- (vi) It was difficult to see how the Southwest One contract compromised the Leader and Executive method of political governance.
- (vii) The question relating to the Southwest One Review by the County Audit Chairman needed to be directed at the County Council.
- (viii) It would be a matter for Taunton Deane's Scrutiny Committee if it was felt the cost of the Client Team warranted review.
- (ix) All Procurement activity was undertaken in accordance with EU procurement legislation to ensure competitiveness and fairness. The Southwest One Procurement Team worked closely with Council officers in order to ensure that not only was the best price received but that solutions met our needs. The gainshare mechanism that was built into the contract provided an additional incentive for Southwest One to maximise savings.
- (x) The contract with Southwest One provided specific provisions to govern the circumstances in which gainshare payments became payable to Southwest One. None of the budget savings outlined in the Council's proposed budget would be subject to gainshare payments.

Councillor Williams confirmed that a full written response would also be sent to Mr Mann.

- (b) Mr Paul Partington referred to a consultation on the proposed diversion of a public footpath at Oake Manor Golf Club, Oake.

There were notices on the course which warned that golf balls left both the driving range and the golf course at Oake Manor.

Mr Partington stated that on other golf courses he was familiar with, netting had often been erected to prevent golf balls leaving the course and reaching either nearby roads or public footpaths. He could not therefore understand why, in relation to the latest proposal to divert a footpath, the Golf Club was not going to take preventative measures such as the provision of netting.

He therefore asked:-

- (i) What risk assessments had been carried out by Taunton Deane Borough Council to be satisfied that any proposed diversions to a public right of way were safe for the public? If there were risk assessments, were those risk assessments carried out by a trained person?
- (ii) Was Taunton Deane prepared to promote a footpath diversion onto a route where no precautions were going to be taken to prevent passers-by being hit by golf balls driven into areas out of sight of those driving the golf balls and from where walkers could not see the golfers?

Councillor Edwards promised Mr Partington that his questions would be addressed and that a written response would be sent to him in due course.

- (c) Mr Peter Wren made reference to a meeting held on 26 May 2010 between the Leader of the Council and the Managing Director of Persimmon Homes. The outcome of this meeting was that Persimmons agreed to complete all the highway works at Bishops Hull before commencing development on site, provided that the S106 Agreement was signed by all parties that day and the planning permission issued.

Following the approval of the reserved matters on 30 November 2010, construction work on the development site commenced on 14 December 2010 and was currently continuing. However, as work on the highways near the Bishops Hull Crossroads did not actually commence until 4 January 2011, progress on the development site was in total contravention of both the Section 106 Agreement and the planning permission.

Whilst it was appreciated that Breach of Condition Notices had now been served on the developer, any penalties ultimately imposed by the Court would be like "petty cash" to a national house builder like Persimmons.

What decisive action would now be taken by Full Council against Persimmon Homes for blatantly and knowingly ignoring the agreement reached last May, together with the total disregard of some 21 planning conditions that had been carefully thought out and approved by the Local Planning Authority? Further, what will the Council do to rectify this corporate failing?

In reply, Councillor Edwards stated that the Breach of Condition action that had been taken demonstrated the Council's resolve to ensure the development was constructed in accordance with what had previously been agreed. He also confirmed that a full written response would shortly be sent to Mr Wren.

- (d) Mrs Carol Wren asked who was responsible for checking that the correct signage was put in place by the developer on Monday, 14 February 2011 before work started on the very busy A38/Bishops Hull Crossroads?

Although all was corrected on the following day, there was a lengthy period during the 14 February where traffic from the A38 was turning into Bishops Hull Road against vehicles travelling south onto the A38.

This threat to public safety was witnessed by one of Taunton Deane's Strategic Directors, Kevin Toller. If correct safety procedures had been undertaken by Highways, the dangerous situations which did occur would have been avoided. It was not good enough to be told "but all was OK on the 15 February"!

Where was the Local Planning Authority's and Highways' duty of care?

Councillor Edwards stated that this issue was clearly a matter for Somerset County Highways and he would arrange a written response to the points Mrs Wren had raised.

- (e) Mr Andrew Gottlieb referred to the question he had asked at the previous meeting of Full Council on 14 December 2010, concerning the gifting of Crematorium land at the Bishops Hull Crossroads for the betterment of the developer. He had not yet seen a full response to this question either from Councillor Williams or Kevin Toller and wondered when a reply would be forthcoming?

Councillor Williams thought a reply had already been sent but would liaise with Kevin Toller over this matter.

- (f) Mrs Gottlieb referred to the new development to the west of Bishops Hull Road. She asked why the Planning Committee had agreed to a house being constructed so close to the road?

In her view, the Committee should have undertaken a site visit before the decision to grant planning permission was made.

Councillor Edwards responded that ultimately it was for the Planning Committee to take the decision to grant or refuse planning permission. Its decisions could not be reviewed by Full Council. He confirmed that a written response would be sent to Mrs Gottlieb.

- (g) Mrs Robertshaw made reference to the recent decision by the

Planning Committee to grant permission for a Solar Field, comprising photovoltaic panels, on land at Sandhill Park, near Bishops Lydeard.

She wondered how permission could have been granted based on incorrect data and vague reports and felt that the decision had been rushed through with no proper consideration.

Her specific concerns were:-

- Who would be responsible for the removal of the photovoltaic panels when the planning permission expired?
- How could local residents be assured that the landowner would bring the field back into agricultural use once the photovoltaic panels had been removed? and
- Why was it necessary for the Solar Field to be surrounded by a security fence, particularly in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?

In response, the Mayor confirmed that decisions taken by the Planning Committee were not subject to review by Full Council. Judicial Review of the decision was a possibility but it would be for those who were against the development to take this further.

Councillor Edwards confirmed that he had made a note of Mrs Robertshaw's specific questions and would send her a written response in due course.

7. Recommendations to Council from the Executive

(a) Proposals to increase Summons and Liability Costs for Council Tax and Business Rate Defaulters

The Executive had previously considered a proposal to increase the current level of reasonable costs levied for issuing Summonses and Liability Orders in connection with the non-payment of Council Tax and Business Rates. The Council was permitted to add such costs to outstanding debts if recovery was assisted through the Magistrates' Court.

The last time an increase in these costs occurred was in April 2006 when the current costs of £40 for a Summons and £5 for a Liability Order were set.

A recent exercise had shown that the actual cost of issuing Summonses and Liability Orders was now in excess of £73 and it was therefore accepted that the charges should be increased.

On the motion of Councillor Hall it was

Resolved that:-

- (1) The costs for Summonses and Liability Orders for non-payment of Council

Tax and Business Rates be increased to £63.50 (from £40) and £10 (from £5) respectively with effect from 1 April 2011; and

- (2) These costs be reviewed annually along with the other Fees and Charges.

(b) General Fund Earmarked Reserves

Following the completion of a further thorough review of the reserve accounts, reserves totalling £126,743.85 relating to Planning compensation, the Smokefree Scheme and three Waste budgets had been identified as no longer being required.

When this matter was considered recently by the Executive, it was proposed that only a proportion of the surplus reserves should be returned to the General Fund Reserve, with the sum of £60,000 being used as a Revenue Contribution towards Capital Outlay (RCCO) to fund the replacement of thirteen Pay and Display machines in the Council's Car Parks.

It was necessary to bring the machine replacement forward from the 2011/2012 financial year, as the Government had announced that new coinage, which could not be used in connection with the older machines, was to be released from April 2011 – although in recent days it appeared likely that the new coinage was not now going to be put into circulation until later in the year.

On the motion of Councillor Williams it was

Resolved that:-

- (a) £66,743.85 of surplus earmarked reserves be transferred to the General Fund Reserve in the 2010/2011 financial year; and
- (b) The funding of a Revenue Contribution towards Capital Outlay of £60,000 in 2010/2011, to pay for thirteen new Pay and Display machines, be agreed.

(c) General Fund Revenue Estimates 2011/2012

The Executive had previously considered its final 2011/2012 budget proposals which had been prepared in the face of unprecedented financial challenges and uncertainty. It contained details on:-

- (i) the General Fund Revenue Budget proposals for 2011/2012, including the proposed Council Tax increase and the Prudential Indicators; and
- (ii) draft figures on the predicted financial position of the Council for the following four years.

The Corporate Scrutiny Committee had also considered the draft budget proposals at its meeting on 27 January 2010.

The Council Tax calculation and formal tax setting resolution was to be considered separately. The proposed budget for Taunton Deane contained a proposed Council Tax Freeze for 2011/2012 which would mean that the Band D Council Tax would remain at £135.19.

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 (MTFP) provided an indication of the expected budget gap going forward into 2012/2013 and beyond and a summary of this position was reflected in the following table:-

	2011/12 £m	2012/13 £m	2013/14 £m	2014/15 £m	2015/16 £m
Net Expenditure	11.578	12.237	14.092	14.876	15.609
<i>Financed By:</i>					
External Government Support	5.981	5.310	4.783	4.310	4.416
Council Tax Freeze Grant	0.136	0.136	0.136	0.136	0
Council Tax	5.461	5.598	5.738	5.881	6.028
Predicted Budget Gap	0	1.193	3.435	4.549	5.165

These figures included the following assumptions relating to funding:-

- Government Grant would be reduced by the following rates: 2011/2012 by 13.2%; 2012/2013 by 11.2%; 2013/2014 by 10%; and 2014/2015 by 10%. A 2.5% increase had been assumed for 2015/2016;
- The Council Tax Freeze Grant relating to 2011/2012 would be receivable for four years; and
- Council Tax would increase by 2.5% each year from 2012/2013.

The Proposed Budget for 2011/2012 would maintain reserves well above the acceptable minimum reserves position of £1,250,000 or £1,000,000 if funds were allocated to 'invest to save' initiatives, but the MTFP indicated that the Council would face significant financial pressures in the medium term as shown in the following table:-

General Reserves Forecast

	2011/12 £m	2012/13 £m	2013/14 £m	2014/15 £m	2015/16 £m
Estimated Balance B/F	2.163	2.261	1.061	-2.421	-7.017
Transfers – Previous Years commitments	0.301	0.040	0	0	0
RCCO in 2011/12	-0.049	0	0	0	0

Deane Helpline 2011/12	-0.154				
Predicted Budget Gap	0	-1.193	-3.435	-4.549	-5.165
Estimated Balance C/F	2.261	1.108	-2.327	-6.876	-12.041

The estimated expenses chargeable to the non-parished area of Taunton in 2010/2011 amounted to £46,820, which represented a 0% increase in the special expenses per Band D equivalent of £2.92 per property per year in the Unparished Area.

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 and 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, Shirlene Adam had stated that she believed the Council's reserves to be adequate and the budget estimates used in preparing the 2011/2012 budget to be as robust as possible.

Moved by Councillor Henley, seconded by Councillor A Wedderkopp that the budget be amended by restoring the proposed cut of £29,500 to Police Community Support Officer funding. The cost to be met from reserves.

The amendment was put and was lost.

On the motion of Councillor Williams it was

Resolved that:-

- (a) The budget for General Fund services for 2011/2012 as outlined in the report to Full Council be agreed;
- (b) The transfer for any potential underspend in 2010/2011 back to General Fund Reserves be approved;
- (c) The proposed 2011/2012 budget, being Authority expenditure of £11,370,060 and Special Expenses of £46,820 be agreed in accordance with the Local Government Act 1992;
- (d) The projected General Fund Reserve balance of £2,260,000 in 2011/2012 be noted;
- (e) The forecast budget position within the Medium Term Financial Plan be noted; and

- (f) The Prudential Indicators for 2011/2012, as set out in the appendix to these minutes, be agreed.

(d) Capital Programme Budget Estimates 2011/2012

Consideration had been given to the proposed General Fund (GF) and Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Capital Programmes for the period 2011/2012 to 2015/2016.

Full Council had approved a Capital Programme for 2010/2011 General Fund schemes totalling £2,852,000 in February 2010. Slippage from the previous year and supplementary budget approvals during the year had increased the Capital Programme to £6,689,000.

An additional supplementary estimate of £60,000 was required in the current year to fund the cost of replacing thirteen payment machines in the car parks to enable new coinage to be accepted. This scheme had been brought forward as the coinage was due to be introduced from April 2011 – although in recent days it appeared likely that the new coinage was not now going to be put into circulation until later in the year.

The loss of a significant amount of Government funding for General Fund Housing Capital had been confirmed. £462,000 of Housing Capital Grant had been cut in full and £620,000 of Supported Borrowing had also been cut.

As a result, the predicted funding gap of £123,000 had increased to £1,205,000. This had made it necessary to review and revise the proposed Capital Programme for 2011/2012.

The proposed General Fund Capital Programme for 2011/2012 now totalled £1,421,000. This assumed nil slippage from 2010/2011, although it was thought that the majority of costs of the Crematorium Mercury Abatement project would slip into 2011/2012.

The Council had approved a Capital Programme for 2010/2011 HRA Schemes totalling £4,560,000 in February 2010. Slippage from the previous year had increased the estimated programme expenditure in 2010/2011 to £6,058,000.

The proposed HRA Capital Programme for 2011/2012 totalled £4,299,000 and assumed nil slippage.

The Corporate Scrutiny Committee had considered the draft programme and the Housing Tenants Forum had also considered the draft Housing Capital Programme.

On the motion of Councillor Williams it was

Resolved that:-

- (1) Both the General Fund Capital Programme and Housing Revenue Account Capital Programme for 2011/2012 be agreed; and
- (2) The supplementary estimate required in 2010/2011 for the replacement of the car park payment machines be also approved.

(e) Council Tax Setting 2011/2012

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 2011/2012 amounted to £46,820 and this formed part of the total net expenditure of the Council. Details of the Parish Precepts levied and the appropriate Council Tax at Band D had also been received.

The Council's budget requirement was £11,872,520 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 £1,412,330 and the Non Domestic Rates Distribution (NDR) from the national pool, amounting to £4,569,120.

The net amount, having taken the collection fund position into account, of £5,962,870 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 2011.

The Council Tax for the Borough (excluding Parish Precepts and Special Expenses for the non-parished area) was £135.19, which was unchanged from the 2010/2011 Council Tax. The total Council Tax, including the Somerset County Council, Police and Fire Authorities' precepts was £1402.29.

On the motion of Councillor Williams it was

Resolved that:-

- (1) It be noted that at its meeting on 19 January 2011 the Executive calculated the following amounts for the year 2011/2012 in accordance with the regulations made under Section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended):-

- (i) 40,390.64 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	78.84	Neroche	251.93
Ashbrittle	97.37	North Curry	748.27

Bathealton	88.08	Norton Fitzwarren	820.30
Bishops Hull	1,075.48	Nynehead	157.34
Bishops Lydeard / Cothelstone	1,116.85	Oake	333.62
Bradford on Tone	290.50	Otterford	170.04
Burrowbridge	205.44	Pitminster	458.91
Cheddon Fitzpaine	639.63	Ruishton/Thornfalcon	614.50
Chipstable	128.01	Sampford Arundel	132.51
Churchstanton	335.61	Staplegrove	713.43
Combe Florey	121.40	Stawley	130.08
Comeytrowe	2,092.08	Stoke St Gregory	389.61
Corfe	132.48	Stoke St Mary	204.23
Cotford St Luke	800.55	Taunton	16,033.53
Creech St Michael	946.10	Trull	1,029.79
Durston	59.57	Wellington	4,683.53
Fitzhead	123.27	Wellington (Without)	302.74
Halse	141.39	West Bagborough	168.06
Hatch Beauchamp	260.51	West Buckland	444.62
Kingston St Mary	452.76	West Hatch	141.96
Langford Budville	236.73	West Monkton	1,116.84
Lydeard St Lawrence/ Tolland	204.07	Wiveliscombe	1,119.67
Milverton	598.41		

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) £77,375,400 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(2)(a) of the Act.
(Gross Expenditure including amount required for working balance).

(b) £65,502,880 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(3)(a) to (c) of the Act.
(Gross Income including reserves to be used to meet Gross Expenditure).

(c) £11,872,520 being the amount by which the aggregate at (a) above exceeds the aggregate at (b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 32(4) of the Act, as its budget requirement for the year.

(d) £5,909,650 being the aggregate of the sums which the Council estimates 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 estimates 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 estimates 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) £147.63
$$\frac{(c) - (d)}{(i) \text{ above}} = \frac{11,872,520 - 5,909,650}{40,390.64}$$

being the amount calculated at (c) above less the amount at (d) above, all divided by the amount at (i) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 33(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year. (*Average Council Tax at Band D for Borough including Parish Precepts and Special Expenses*).

(f) £502,465 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
$$\frac{(e) - (f)}{(i) \text{ above}} = 147.63 - \frac{502,465}{40,390.64}$$

being the amount at (e) above less the result given by dividing the amount at (f) above by the amount at (i) 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

dwelling in those parts of its area to which no special items relate. (*Council Tax at Band D for Borough Excluding Parish Precepts and Special Expenses*).

(h)

Ash Priors	135.19	Neroche	151.07
Ashbrittle	153.68	North Curry	157.24
Bathealton	140.87	Norton Fitzwarren	165.83
Bishops Hull	155.65	Nynehead	160.61
Bishops Lydeard / Cothelstone	157.74	Oake	149.43
Bradford on Tone	154.12	Otterford	135.19
Burrowbridge	154.66	Pitminster	155.41
Cheddon Fitzpaine	146.13	Ruishton/Thornfalcon	154.72
Chipstable	149.64	Sampford Arundel	169.90
Churchstanton	156.79	Staplegrove	149.21
Combe Florey	151.66	Stawley	153.64
Comeytrowe	147.14	Stoke St Gregory	151.87
Corfe	154.06	Stoke St Mary	149.92
Cotford St Luke	153.93	Taunton	138.11
Creech St Michael	159.64	Trull	148.79
Durston	145.26	Wellington	154.99
Fitzhead	159.49	Wellington (Without)	151.87
Halse	147.57	West Bagborough	147.09
Hatch Beauchamp	152.46	West Buckland	153.18
Kingston St Mary	148.44	West Hatch	151.60
Langford Budville	152.09	West Monkton	163.48
Lydeard St Lawrence / Tolland	152.34	Wiveliscombe	153.95
Milverton	154.41		

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 (iii) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act, as the basic amounts of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate. (*Council Taxes at Band D for Borough, Parish and Special Expenses*).

(i) See overleaf

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)

2011/12 by Parish by Band

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	96.97	113.14	129.30	145.46	177.78	210.11	242.43	290.92
Bathealton	93.91	109.56	125.21	140.87	172.17	203.47	234.78	281.73
Bishops Hull	103.76	121.06	138.35	155.65	190.23	224.82	259.41	311.29
Bishops Lydeard/Cothelstone	105.16	122.69	140.21	157.74	192.79	227.85	262.90	315.48
Bradford on Tone	102.75	119.87	137.00	154.12	188.37	222.62	256.87	308.25
Burrowbridge	103.11	120.29	137.48	154.66	189.03	223.40	257.77	309.32
Cheddon Fitzpaine	97.42	113.66	129.90	146.13	178.61	211.08	243.56	292.27
Chipstable	99.76	116.39	133.02	149.64	182.90	216.15	249.40	299.28
Churchstanton	104.53	121.95	139.37	156.79	191.64	226.48	261.32	313.58
Combe Florey	101.11	117.96	134.81	151.66	185.37	219.07	252.77	303.33
Comeytrowe	98.09	114.44	130.79	147.14	179.84	212.54	245.23	294.28
Corfe	102.71	119.83	136.94	154.06	188.30	222.53	256.77	308.12
Cotford St Luke	102.62	119.72	136.82	153.93	188.13	222.34	256.55	307.85
Creech St Michael	106.43	124.17	141.90	159.64	195.12	230.60	266.07	319.29
Durston	96.84	112.98	129.12	145.26	177.54	209.82	242.10	290.52

Fitzhead	106.32	124.04	141.77	159.49	194.93	230.37	265.81	318.97
Halse	98.38	114.77	131.17	147.57	180.36	213.15	245.95	295.13
Hatch Beauchamp	101.64	118.58	135.52	152.46	186.34	220.23	254.11	304.93
Kingston St Mary	98.96	115.45	131.95	148.44	181.43	214.42	247.40	296.88
Langford Budville	101.39	118.29	135.19	152.09	185.88	219.68	253.48	304.17
Lydeard St Lawrence/Tolland	101.56	118.49	135.41	152.34	186.19	220.05	253.90	304.68
Milverton	102.94	120.09	137.25	154.41	188.72	223.03	257.35	308.82
Neroche	100.71	117.50	134.28	151.07	184.64	218.21	251.78	302.13
North Curry	104.83	122.30	139.77	157.24	192.18	227.13	262.07	314.48
Norton Fitzwarren	110.55	128.98	147.40	165.83	202.68	239.53	276.38	331.65
Nynehead	107.08	124.92	142.77	160.61	196.30	232.00	267.69	321.23
Oake	99.62	116.22	132.82	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	103.61	120.87	138.14	155.41	189.95	224.48	259.02	310.82
Ruishton/Thornfalcon	103.15	120.34	137.53	154.72	189.10	223.48	257.86	309.44
Sampford Arundel	113.27	132.15	151.03	169.90	207.66	245.42	283.17	339.81
Staplegrove	99.47	116.05	132.63	149.21	182.36	215.52	248.68	298.41
Stawley	102.43	119.50	136.57	153.64	187.78	221.92	256.07	307.28

Stoke St Gregory	101.25	118.12	135.00	151.87	185.62	219.37	253.12	303.75
Stoke St Mary	99.95	116.60	133.26	149.92	183.23	216.55	249.86	299.84
Taunton	92.07	107.42	122.76	138.11	168.80	199.49	230.18	276.22
Trull	99.19	115.72	132.25	148.79	181.85	214.91	247.98	297.57
Wellington	103.33	120.55	137.77	154.99	189.43	223.87	258.32	309.98
Wellington Without	101.25	118.12	135.00	151.87	185.62	219.37	253.12	303.74
West Bagborough	98.06	114.40	130.75	147.09	179.78	212.46	245.15	294.18
West Buckland	102.12	119.14	136.16	153.18	187.22	221.26	255.30	306.37
West Hatch	101.07	117.91	134.76	151.60	185.29	218.98	252.67	303.21
West Monkton	108.99	127.15	145.32	163.48	199.81	236.14	272.47	326.97
Wiveliscombe	102.63	119.74	136.84	153.95	188.16	222.37	256.58	307.89

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 2011/2012 the Somerset County Council, the Avon and Somerset Police Authority and the Somerset and Devon Fire and Rescue Authority have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each of the categories of dwelling shown below.

Since this table was presented to the Executive the Fire and Police Authorities have both confirmed that their band D precept is as previously advised and the same as last year (2010/2011). As spreadsheet calculations for each tax band can differ from the billing system by one or two pence, the final precept demand by parish and band have been verified by the Revenue and Benefits system. The figures shown are those that will appear on the Council Tax demands.

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	934.87	1,090.67	1,246.49	1,402.29	1,713.91	2,025.53	2,337.16	2,804.58
Ashbrittle	941.72	1,098.66	1,255.62	1,412.56	1,726.46	2,040.36	2,354.28	2,825.12
Bathealton	938.66	1,095.09	1,251.54	1,407.97	1,720.85	2,033.73	2,346.63	2,815.94
Bishops Hull	948.51	1,106.58	1,264.68	1,422.75	1,738.92	2,055.08	2,371.26	2,845.50
Bishops Lydeard/Cothelstone	949.90	1,108.21	1,266.53	1,424.84	1,741.47	2,058.10	2,374.74	2,849.68
Bradford on Tone	947.49	1,105.39	1,263.32	1,421.22	1,737.05	2,052.87	2,368.71	2,842.44
Burrowbridge	947.85	1,105.81	1,263.80	1,421.76	1,737.71	2,053.65	2,369.61	2,843.52
Cheddon Fitzpaine	942.16	1,099.18	1,256.21	1,413.23	1,727.28	2,041.33	2,355.39	2,826.46
Chipstable	944.50	1,101.91	1,259.33	1,416.74	1,731.57	2,046.40	2,361.24	2,833.48
Churchstanton	949.27	1,107.47	1,265.69	1,423.89	1,740.31	2,056.73	2,373.16	2,847.78
Combe Florey	945.85	1,103.48	1,261.13	1,418.76	1,734.04	2,049.32	2,364.61	2,837.52
Comeytrowe	942.84	1,099.96	1,257.11	1,414.24	1,728.52	2,042.79	2,357.08	2,828.48
Corfe	947.45	1,105.35	1,263.26	1,421.16	1,736.97	2,052.79	2,368.61	2,842.32
Cotford St Luke	947.36	1,105.25	1,263.15	1,421.03	1,736.81	2,052.60	2,368.39	2,842.06
Creech St Michael	951.17	1,109.69	1,268.22	1,426.74	1,743.79	2,060.85	2,377.91	2,853.48
Durston	941.58	1,098.50	1,255.44	1,412.36	1,726.22	2,040.08	2,353.94	2,824.72
Fitzhead	951.07	1,109.57	1,268.09	1,426.59	1,743.61	2,060.63	2,377.66	2,853.18

Halse	943.12	1,100.30	1,257.49	1,414.67	1,729.04	2,043.41	2,357.79	2,829.34
Hatch Beauchamp	946.38	1,104.10	1,261.84	1,419.56	1,735.02	2,050.48	2,365.94	2,839.12
Kingston St Mary	943.70	1,100.98	1,258.27	1,415.54	1,730.10	2,044.67	2,359.24	2,831.08
Langford Budville	946.14	1,103.81	1,261.51	1,419.19	1,734.57	2,049.94	2,365.33	2,838.38
Lydeard St Lawrence/Tolland	946.30	1,104.01	1,261.73	1,419.44	1,734.87	2,050.30	2,365.74	2,838.88
Milverton	947.68	1,105.62	1,263.57	1,421.51	1,737.40	2,053.29	2,369.19	2,843.02
Neroche	945.46	1,103.02	1,260.61	1,418.17	1,733.32	2,048.47	2,363.63	2,836.34
North Curry	949.57	1,107.82	1,266.09	1,424.34	1,740.86	2,057.38	2,373.91	2,848.68
Norton Fitzwarren	955.30	1,114.50	1,273.73	1,432.93	1,751.36	2,069.79	2,388.23	2,865.86
Nynehead	951.82	1,110.44	1,269.09	1,427.71	1,744.98	2,062.25	2,379.53	2,855.42
Oake	944.36	1,101.75	1,259.15	1,416.53	1,731.31	2,046.10	2,360.89	2,833.06
Otterford	934.87	1,090.67	1,246.49	1,402.29	1,713.91	2,025.53	2,337.16	2,804.58
Pitminster	948.35	1,106.40	1,264.46	1,422.51	1,738.62	2,054.74	2,370.86	2,845.02
Ruishton/Thornfalcon	947.89	1,105.86	1,263.85	1,421.82	1,737.78	2,053.74	2,369.71	2,843.64
Sampford Arundel	958.01	1,117.67	1,277.34	1,437.00	1,756.33	2,075.67	2,395.01	2,874.00
Staplegrove	944.22	1,101.57	1,258.95	1,416.31	1,731.05	2,045.78	2,360.53	2,832.62
Stawley	947.17	1,105.02	1,262.89	1,420.74	1,736.46	2,052.18	2,367.91	2,841.48
Stoke St Gregory	945.99	1,103.64	1,261.32	1,418.97	1,734.30	2,049.62	2,364.96	2,837.94
Stoke St Mary	944.69	1,102.13	1,259.58	1,417.02	1,731.91	2,046.81	2,361.71	2,834.04
Taunton	936.82	1,092.94	1,249.09	1,405.21	1,717.48	2,029.75	2,342.03	2,810.42
Trull	943.94	1,101.25	1,258.58	1,415.89	1,730.53	2,045.17	2,359.83	2,831.78
Wellington	948.07	1,106.07	1,264.09	1,422.09	1,738.11	2,054.13	2,370.16	2,844.18
Wellington Without	945.99	1,103.64	1,261.32	1,418.97	1,734.30	2,049.62	2,364.96	2,837.94
West Bagborough	942.80	1,099.93	1,257.07	1,414.19	1,728.45	2,042.72	2,356.99	2,828.38
West Buckland	946.86	1,104.66	1,262.48	1,420.28	1,735.90	2,051.52	2,367.14	2,840.56
West Hatch	945.81	1,103.43	1,261.08	1,418.70	1,733.97	2,049.23	2,364.51	2,837.40
West Monkton	953.73	1,112.67	1,271.64	1,430.58	1,748.49	2,066.39	2,384.31	2,861.16
Wiveliscombe	947.38	1,105.26	1,263.17	1,421.05	1,736.84	2,052.63	2,368.43	2,842.10

(f) Halcon North Regeneration Project

Over the past twelve months, Councillors had become involved in proposals to regenerate the Halcon North area of Taunton which featured in the top 10 per cent of the most deprived wards in the country.

The Council's aspiration was to redevelop the area to make Halcon a place that residents were proud of, but it was understood that a multi-agency approach was going to be required to achieve this.

It had become clear that strong governance and project management arrangements needed to be put in place, as well as the development of a full business case in order to explore all potential delivery options and risks.

The two key strands currently being finalised were the Business Plan and the procurement process. With regard to the latter, work had begun towards tendering for consultants to work with the Council on the overall project. The engagement of consultants did however require funding to be allocated.

On the motion of Councillor Mrs Adkins it was

Resolved that a sum of up to £50,000 from the Housing Revenue Account be allocated to meet the cost of consultancy fees required to progress the Halcon North Regeneration Project.

(g) Housing Revenue Account Estimates 2011/2012

Consideration had been given to the proposed Housing Revenue Account (HRA) estimates for the 2011/2012 Financial Year which showed a working balance of £1,467,520. It also included details of the proposed increase in Average Weekly Rent for the year where a 6.87% (£4.41) increase had been recommended.

The Dwelling Rents formed the major element of income for the HRA. Each ½% rent increase was equivalent to approximately £100,000. If the average rent was set lower than the current proposal, the loss of income would have to be met by reducing expenditure.

The budget for non-dwelling rents and charges for services and facilities was based on a 4.6% increase.

The Negative Subsidy for 2011/2012 was based on the Final

Determination figures and represented payments to Central Government under the subsidy system. For Medium Term Financial Plan purposes, it had been assumed that the HRA would move to a 'self financing' model from 2012/2013 and therefore no subsidy would be payable. It had also been assumed that the Council would take on a debt of £86,000,000 from the Government as the estimated cost of the move to self-financing.

Based on the budget contained within the report, the expected deficit for 2011/2012 was forecast to be in the region of £175,000. This was after making a revenue contribution to capital of £361,000.

Both the Corporate Scrutiny Committee and the Tenants Forum had considered the 2011/2012 draft budget.

On the motion of Councillor Mrs Adkins it was

Resolved that:-

- (1) The Average Weekly Rent increase of 6.87% be approved; and
- (2) The Housing Revenue Account budget for 2011/2012 be agreed.

8. **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 Williams)**

Councillor Williams's report covered the following topics:-

- Notable Events;
- Core Strategy;
- Hinkley Point;
- Superfast Broadband;
- Regeneration of Taunton;
- The Council Budget 2011/2012.

(ii) **Sports, Parks and Leisure (Councillor Mrs Herbert)**

The report from Councillor Mrs Herbert dealt with activities taking place in the following areas:-

- Parks;

- Community Leisure and Play;
- Tone (Taunton Deane) Limited Activities;
- Environmental Issues.

(iii) **Housing Services (Councillor Mrs Adkins)**

Councillor Mrs Adkins submitted her report which drew attention to the following:-

- Housing Property Services Review;
- Affordable Housing;
- Regeneration of Halcon, Taunton;
- Estates Team and Anti-social Behaviour;
- Somerset West Private Sector Housing Partnership;
- Consultation : A fairer future for social housing;
- Self-Financing
- A Housing, Health Care and Support Strategy for older people in Somerset;
- Tenants' Forum.

(iv) **Corporate Resources (Councillor Hall)**

The report from Councillor Hall provided information on the following areas within his portfolio:-

- Revenues and Benefits;
- Southwest One;
- Legal and Democratic Services;
- Performance and Client Team.

(v) **Planning and Transportation (Councillor Edwards)**

The report from Councillor Edwards provided information on the following areas within his portfolio:-

- Core Strategy;
- Maidenbrook, Taunton Appeal;
- Consultation on the overhaul of Planning Application Fees;
- Review of the Planning process;
- Firepool, Taunton.

(vi) **Community Leadership and Communications (Councillor Mrs Lewin-Harris)**

Councillor Mrs Lewin-Harris presented the Community Leadership

and Communications report which focused on the following areas within that portfolio:-

- Taunton Deane Partnership;
- Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership;
- Health White Paper;
- Communications;
- Community Hub at St Augustine's, Taunton.

(vii) **Economic Development, Asset Management, Arts and Tourism (Councillor Cavill)**

The report from Councillor Cavill covered:-

- Keeping Members informed;
- Stimulating Business Growth and Investment;
- Ensuring a Skilled and Entrepreneurial Workforce;
- Creating an Attractive Business Environment.

(viii) **Environmental Services (Councillor Hayward)**

The report from Councillor Hayward drew attention to developments in the following areas:-

- Environmental Health Teams;
- Street Cleansing;
- Crematorium;
- Climate Change / Carbon Management;
- Waste Management.

(Councillors Murphy, McMahon, Cavill, Govier, Coles, Bowrah, Critchard, Mrs Copley, Mrs Hill and D Wedderkopp left the meeting at 8.16 pm, 8.20 pm, 8.24 pm, 8.25 pm, 8.35 pm, 8.55 pm, 8.57 pm, 8.58 pm, 9.05 pm and 9.28 pm respectively. Councillors D Durdan and Miss Durdan both left the meeting at 9.04 pm. Councillors Gaines, Mrs Whitmarsh and Mrs Waymouth all left the meeting at 9.09 pm.)

(The meeting ended at 9.35 pm.)

Appendix

PRUDENTIAL INDICATORS

PRUDENTIAL INDICATOR	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
	outturn	estimate	estimate	estimate	estimate
Capital Expenditure					
General Fund	£4,562	£6,689	£1,421	£1,910	£1,875
HRA	£5,142	£6,231	£4,300	£4,399	£4,020
TOTAL	£9,704	£12,920	£5,721	£6,309	£5,895
Ratio of financing costs to net revenue stream					
General Fund	0.14%	1.08%	1.32%	1.70%	1.75%
HRA	1.89%	1.81%	2.28%	2.17%	2.07%
Net borrowing projection					
brought forward 1 April	£9,900	£7,786	£11,710	£11,710	£12,753
Carried forward 31 March	£7,786	£11,710	£11,710	£12,753	£14,103
in year borrowing requirement	-£2,114	£3,924	£0	£1,043	£1,350
Capital Financing Requirement as at 31 March					
General Fund	£8,586	£12,260	£12,015	£12,796	£13,864
HRA	£14,451	£14,451	£14,451	£14,451	£14,451
TOTAL	£23,037	£26,711	£26,466	£27,247	£28,315
Incremental impact of capital investment decisions	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p
Increase in council tax (band D)	1.54	2.90	-0.84	0.00	0.16
Authorised limit for external debt -					
TOTAL	£40m	£40m	£40m	£40m	£40m
Operational boundary for external debt -					
TOTAL	£30m	£30m	£30m	£30m	£30m
Upper limit for fixed interest rate exposure					
Net interest re fixed rate borrowing/ investments	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Upper limit for variable rate exposure					
Net interest re variable rate borrowing/ investments	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%
Maturity Structure of Fixed Rate Borrowing (Upper and lower limits)					
under 12 months	0% to 50%	0% to 50%	0% to 50%	0% to 50%	0% to 50%
12 months and within 24 months	0% to 50%	0% to 50%	0% to 50%	0% to 50%	0% to 50%
24 months and within 5 years	0% to 50%	0% to 50%	0% to 50%	0% to 50%	0% to 50%
5 years and within 10 years	0% to 50%	0% to 50%	0% to 50%	0% to 50%	0% to 50%
10 years and above	20% to 100%	20% to 100%	20% to 100%	20% to 100%	20% to 100%
Upper limit for total principal sums invested for over 364 days (per maturity date)					
	£2m or 20%	£2m or 20%	£2m or 20%	£2m or 20%	£2m or 20%

