

BOROUGH OF TELFORD & WREKIN

Minutes of a meeting of the Borough of Telford & Wrekin held on Thursday, 22 November, 2012 at 6.30 p.m. at the Civic Offices, Telford.

PRESENT:

Councillors K.R. Guy (Mayor), S. Bentley, F.M. Bould, S.P. Burrell, E.J. Carter, E.A. Clare, D.G. Davies, S. Davies, N.A. Dugmore, A.J. Eade, A.R.H. England, N.A.M. England, R.C. Evans, I.T.W. Fletcher, V.A. Fletcher, G.M. Green, T.J. Hope, M.B. Hosken, M.G. Ion, A.S. Jhawar, R.T. Kiernan, A. Lawrence, J. Loveridge, A.A. Mackenzie, C.N. Mason, A.D. McClements, W.A.M. McClements, J.C. Minor, C.P.R. Mollett, L.A. Murray, R.A. Overton, F.R. Picken, G.C.W. Reynolds, S.A.W. Reynolds, H. Rhodes, K.S. Sahota (Leader), R.G. Scammell, J.M. Seymour, R.J. Sloan, C.F. Smith, M.J. Smith, A.J. Stanton B.J. Thompson, W.L. Tomlinson, C.R. Turley, P.R. Watling and D.R.W. White.

42. MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of Council Meeting held on 13 September 2012, be confirmed and signed by the Mayor.

43. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors R.K. Austin, K.T. Blundell, B.H. Duce, C.B.A. Elliott, E.J. Greenaway, A.A. Meredith and K.L. Tomlinson,

44. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Bentley, Evans, Green, Hope, Hosken, Lawrence, Loveridge, Overton, S. Reynolds, Sahota and M. Smith all declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in agenda item 10, the Council Tax Support Scheme.

45. COUNCILLOR KEITH AUSTIN – REQUEST FOR 6 MONTH LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The Mayor moved that a leave of absence be agreed for Councillor R.K. Austin who was recovering from serious illness. The motion was seconded and Members voted unanimously in favour of the recommendation.

RESOLVED – that in accordance with section 85 (1) of the Local Government Act 1972, Councillor R.K. Austin be granted leave of absence from his Council duties for a period of six months effective from 22 November 2012.

46. LEADER'S REPORT & ANNOUNCEMENTS

- a) Presentation of Certificate of Merit to Olympian Kelly Edwards and Paralympian Mickey Bushell

Councillor K.S. Sahota, Leader of the council, paid tribute to the Borough's Olympians and paralympians who had performed magnificently at the summer Olympic Games.

In particular, he paid tribute to Kelly Edwards who had represented team GB at Judo. Kelly and her family were in attendance and were warmly welcomed by councillors. The Leader also paid special tribute to the achievements of Telford's Paralympic gold medallist, Mickey Bushell who, due to illness, was not able to attend to receive his certificate.

b) Recognition of Borough carers – Shropshire Care awards

Councillor E.A. Clare, Cabinet Member: Adult & Social Care asked members to recognise the achievements of the Borough's carers who had been successful at the recent Shropshire Care awards. Many of the successful carers were in attendance and received a warm tribute from councillors.

c) Leader's Report

The Leader asked members to note that this would be the last council meeting taking place at Civic offices as the building would be vacated by mid December. This was part of the council's rationalisation of buildings, reducing office space by one third and saving £1.5m. A copy of the minutes of the first Full council meeting at the venue was tabled for members' interest. The meeting took place on 14 July 1976 and two of the councillors present at that meeting were at the current meeting. They were Councillors M.J. Smith and M.B. Hosken.

The Leader drew members' attention to White Ribbon day on Sunday 25th November which recognises the global campaign to ensure men take more responsibility for reducing the level of violence against women.

The Leader also drew members' attention to an item later on the agenda, the Council Tax Support scheme.

Amongst a number of items the Leader also asked members to note:

- Southwater development which was due to complete November 2013
- Ice rink reopened following £4m investment
- All council spending over £100 now published as part of the council's commitment to openness and transparency
- Snow wardens had been recruited

47. MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

(a) Mayoral Engagements

The Mayor drew members' attention to the forthcoming Lantern Parade on 21 December and the signing of the Military Covenant which would take place on 14 December. He drew particular attention to his attendance at the return to its Donnington base of 174 Provost Company, 3rd Regiment Royal Military Police. The company of 115 men who had been serving in Afghanistan were the only full time frontline service unit still based in the Borough.

48. CABINET DECISIONS MADE SINCE THE LAST MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

Members received the report on the Cabinet decisions made since the last meeting of the Council on 13 September, 2012.

49. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CABINET

18 October 2012 Cabinet

i) **Financial Monitoring 2012/13**

Councillor W.A.M. McClements, Cabinet Member: Resources & Service Delivery, presented the report of the Head of Finance, Audit & Information Governance which sought approval for slippage, virements and new allocations which were identified at Appendix 3 of the report.

RESOLVED - That the slippages, virements and new allocations identified at Appendix 3 of the report be approved.

Prior to discussion of the next agenda item the following councillors left the room.

Councillors Bentley, Evans, Green, Hope, Hosken, Lawrence, Loveridge, Overton, S. Reynolds, Sahota and M. Smith

50. COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME

Councillor W.A.M. McClements, Cabinet Member: Resources & Service Delivery, presented the report of the Assistant Director: Customers & People which outlined options and recommendations for a Council Tax support scheme from April 2013.

The government had announced, as part of the 2010 spending review, that it would localise support for Council Tax from 2013/14, with an expectation that expenditure would be reduced by 10%. Every authority was required to introduce a scheme by 31 January 2013. A formal consultation had taken place with residents and stakeholders between 28 August and 26 October. Councillor McClements noted that government estimations assumed a reduction in claimants, whereas under current economic conditions claimants were increasing. Estimates did not allow for inflation and the scheme would be costly to administer. The effects of inflation, increasing numbers of claimants and the likely impact on collection levels meant an estimated funding shortfall of £3.1m in 2013/14. The proposed scheme would meet the funding gap through a combination of changes to exemptions which were detailed in the report, and by applying a percentage global reduction in support given to less vulnerable claimants. This would mean an estimated 21% reduction in council tax support for working age non-vulnerable claimants. £65k was proposed to be earmarked for the award of discretionary discounts in cases of extreme financial hardship.

DCLG had announced funding for one year to support authorities; the council could apply for £336k of this transitional grant. Although this would reduce the funding gap to £2.8m the limitations and criteria imposed for the design of the support scheme would result in a funding shortfall of £680k in 2012/13 which would have to be met through savings elsewhere across the council. Also, as funding was for one year only, the budget shortfall would increase to just over £1m in future years. It was therefore recommended not to apply for transitional grant funding. Reports were attached from the joint Co-operative & Communities and Budget & Finance Scrutiny committees recommending approval of the Council Tax support scheme and recommending that additional transitional funding not applied for.

RESOLVED:-

- a) That the Council Tax Support scheme policy for 2013/14 be approved.
- b) That the decision not to apply for the additional transitional funding for 2013/14 be approved.
- c) That the principles of the Council Tax Support Exceptional Hardship Policy be approved.
- d) That the reports from the joint Co-Operative and Communities and Budget & Finance Scrutiny Committees (see Appendix A and B) recommending approval of the proposed Council Tax Support Scheme and the recommendation above not to apply for the additional transitional funding be considered and noted by council.
- e) That council note that the approval of this policy is dependent upon the approval of the recommendations regarding the empty property exemptions and charges that will be contained in the Setting of the Council Tax Base report presented to Cabinet January 2013
- f) That council delegate authority to the Benefit Service Delivery Manager to undertake all functions, except approval of policy, relating to Council Tax Support under the Local Government Finance Acts 1992 and 2012 and Regulations made there under and as amended.

Prior to discussion of the next agenda item the following councillors returned to the room.

Councillors Bentley, Evans, Green, Hope, Hosken, Lawrence, Loveridge, Overton, S. Reynolds, Sahota and M. Smith

51. FURTHER ELECTORAL REVIEW – FURTHER SUBMISSION ON COUNCIL SIZE

Councillor R.J. Sloan, Chairman of Boundary Review Committee, presented the report of the Assistant Director: Law, Democracy & Public Protection which sought approval for the Boundary Review Committee to meet to determine an appropriate

further submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) for a council size of 54 councillors.

Full council in September approved that a submission be made to LGBCE for a preferred Council size of 54 councillors by the Boundary Review Committee. The main opposition group made a separate submission in support of a council size of 44 and based on a return to the 'Committee system'. LGBCE considered both submissions and decided to consult on both numbers from the end of October. Consultation on council size would close on 3 December.

RESOLVED: -

- a) **That the Boundary Review Committee meet to determine, if appropriate, whether a further submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) for a Council size of 54 councillors**
- b) **That the Assistant Director Law, Democracy & Public Protection in consultation with the Chairman of Boundary Review Committee be delegated with ensuring that any further submission is made to LGBCE by 3 December.**

52. BUDGET CONSULTATION TIMEFRAME

Councillor W.A.M. McClements, Cabinet Member: Resources & Service Delivery, presented the report of the Assistant Director: Finance, Audit & Information Governance which noted that there was currently considerable uncertainty over the date that the Government would announce the provisional local government finance settlement. The settlement could not be announced before the Chancellor's autumn statement which was scheduled for 5th December but had to be announced on or before 31st December. The Council's constitution required the Cabinet to publish its budget and policy proposals before the end of December. If the provisional settlement were to be announced very late in December, which was quite possible, it would mean that proposals could not be issued by this deadline. The report asked members to note that if the provisional settlement was received later in December; proposals would need to be published outside the constitutional timeframe.

RESOLVED – that members noted the current uncertainty over the date that the Government would announce the local government finance settlement and agree that proposals could, if necessary, be published outside the constitutional timeframe.

53. ANNUAL SCRUTINY REPORT 2011/12

Councillor D.R.W. White, Chairman of Scrutiny Management Board presented the Annual Scrutiny report for 2011/12. He told the meeting that it had been a year of change for scrutiny. The effectiveness of the scrutiny structure had been assessed. Health and Adult Social Care had been brought together as one committee, putting scrutiny in a good position to work with the Health & Well-Being Board. The

Housing, Economy & Infrastructure committee had taken on dedicated scrutiny of key service areas from Scrutiny Management Board. Links had been strengthened with Town & Parish councils with the recruitment of 6 Town and Parish councillors to scrutiny committees. Two call-ins had been considered by Scrutiny Management Board, neither had been upheld but the process had demonstrated rigorous challenge from scrutiny and feedback from had been positive. The current year's work programme was focussed on fewer issues, allowing resources to be targeted more effectively.

Key achievements had been:

- Continued oversight and challenge provided by Joint Health Overview committee to hospital reconfiguration plans
- Budget & Finance committee worked hard on scrutiny of budget proposals.
- Co-operative & Communities committee had made recommendations to Cabinet on changes to leisure concessions policy, single point of contact for businesses to council services and management of Community centres.

RESOLVED – That the 2011/12 Annual Scrutiny report be noted.

54. ANNUAL AUDIT COMMITTEE REPORT 2011/12

Councillor R.J. Sloan, Chairman of Audit Committee presented the report of the Assistant Director: Law, Democracy & Public Protection which provided an annual report of the operations of Audit Committee for 2011/12.

RESOLVED – That the Audit Committee Annual Report 2011/12 be noted.

55. MINUTES OF BOARDS AND COMMITTEES

Council noted the resolved minutes of Boards and Committees:

Audit Committee	25 September
Boundary Review Committee	23 August
Licensing Committee	5 September
Plans Board	22 August, 12 September, 3 October & 24 October
Standards Committee	19 September
Budget & Finance Scrutiny Committee	31 July
Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee	18 September
Co-operative & Communities Scrutiny Committee	8 August
Scrutiny Management Board	4 July

56. QUESTIONS

The following Questions were asked in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 10:

- a) Councillor G.C.W. Reynolds asked the following question of Councillor P.R. Watling, Cabinet Member: Children, Young People & Families

Can the Lead Member for Children, Young People & Families please update the Council on the changes to the Early Intervention Grant?

Councillor Watling replied that early indications suggested that national government's Early Intervention Grant which funds a number of vital preventative services across the Council would be cut by over £2.234m (27%) in 2013/14. This was in addition to a cut of £2.665m [25%] in 11/12.

In response, Councillor Reynolds asked what effect the grant change would have on the most vulnerable people of the Borough,

Councillor Watling replied that

This grant funded a number of services including children and family centres, youth work, positive activities for young people, short breaks for children with disability, connexions for youth, support for children in care and other preventative service for some of our most vulnerable children and young people.

Faced with further national government cuts in grant allocation the Council was currently identifying proposals for making savings to offset this particular loss of grant. Every effort would be made to minimise the impact of this cut on front line services, this was becoming increasingly difficult given the substantial savings already made in response to previous cuts.

- b) Councillor Steven Bentley asked the following question of the Leader of the council, Councillor Kuldip Sahota.

Will the leader agree with me that this nation owes our armed services personnel a debt of gratitude which can never be repaid, and whenever possible this borough, and the nation as one should join together to protect or honour any individual who has selflessly performed their duty, when called upon in the name of freedom and democracy."

Councillor Sahota replied that he agreed with those sentiments completely and that he supported the armed forces.

In response councillor Bentley asked what would be being done to raise awareness of the 100 year anniversary of the beginning of the 1st World War.

Councillor Sahota referred Councillor Bentley to the signing of the Military covenant which was due to take place in December.

57. NOTICES OF MOTION

(a) Councillor W.A.M. McClements, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11, moved the following Motion:

Telford & Wrekin Borough Council notes the comments made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer about offering all Councils the option of taking a 1% grant to freeze Council tax for 2013/14.

The Council is also aware that the Government is likely to announce further funding cuts in its December statement to Parliament.

The Council agrees to consider contingency budget plans but wait to finalise its proposals when the details of the Local Government Finance Settlement are available. The Council agrees to fully consult the residents of the Borough about options and its proposals before putting the final budget plans to Full Council in March 2013.

The motion was seconded by Councillor R.J. Sloan

RESOLVED – that the motion be approved

Councillor S. Bentley moved, in accordance with Council procedure rule 11, the following motion:

This Council will pursue an approach, and do all in its power, to ensure that the Crudgington Creamery site is utilised as a centre for rural employment within the Borough should the creamery be ultimately closed.

The motion was seconded by Councillor A.J. Eade

The motion was moved and seconded and was then referred, without further discussion, to Cabinet under section 11.6 of the Council procedure rules.

RESOLVED – that the motion be referred to Cabinet

The meeting ended at 8.38 pm

Mayor:

Date:

B

MAYORAL ENGAGEMENTS 12th November 2012 – 14th January 2013

November	12th	DM	Licensing and Installation of Rev Alan Walden The Parish of Madeley
	13th	M	England Under 19's and Finland New Bucks Head- Wellington
	15th	M	NHS South Staff & Shropshire Staff Awards Ceremony County Showground, Weston Road, Stafford ST18 0BD
	16th	M	Photo opportunity for White Ribbon day Ice rink, Telford
		DM	Hadley Male Orpheus Choir - Charity Singathon for Children in Need Castle Farm Community Centre, Hadley
		DM	Remembrance Concert Ford Hall, Lilleshall
	20th	M	West Midlands Ambulance Service Excellence in the Community Awards Telford International Centre
	21st	M	Citizenship Ceremony Ceremony Room, Register Office, Wellington Civic & Leisure Centre
		M	Olympic Memorabilia Auction promotion Oakengates Theatre
	22nd	DM	Time Capsule 'planting' for International Year of Co-operatives Sutherland Business School, Gibbons Road, Trench
	23rd	M	Impact Alcohol and Addiction services- Opening of new premises The People Centre, High street, Madeley, Telford TF7 5AS
		M	Malinslee Christmas Light Switch Malinslee local centre

B

- 29th** **DM** Senior Citizens Forum Carol Concert
St Michael's Church, Madeley
- 30th** **DM** Oakengates Christmas Light Switch On
Oakengates Town Council Offices, Limes
Walk, Oakengates
- M** WW2 Aircraftsmen Memorial Plaque
Unveiling
Bulls Head, Dawley Bank
- M** Dawley Christmas Lights Switch On
Dawley Christian Centre
- M** Civic Carol Service
Oakengates Theatre @ The Place
- December**
- 1st** **M** Lantern making workshop
Wellington Library
- M** Wrockwardine Wood & Trench Senior
Citizens Christmas Party
The Sutherland School, Gibbons Road,
Trench Telford TF2 7JR
- DM** Great Dawley Over 60's Christmas Party
Park Inn, Telford
- 2nd** **M** Great Dawley Over 60's Christmas Party
Park Inn, Telford
- 3rd** **M** Cadet Awards Ceremony
TA Centre, Donnington
- 4th** **M** Christmas Celebration Party for Causeway
Madeley Baptist Church
- 6th** **DM** RBL Poppy Dance
Hadley Service Club
- 7th** **M** Cycle to Lapland appeal launch
Tesco, Madeley
- DM** Midlands Air Ambulance Charity shop
opening
16-18 New Street, Wellington

B

- DM** Pantomime Opening Night
Oakengates Theatre
- M** Brookside Bigger Bang
Brookside Community centre
- 8th** **M** College and Arleston Supplementary School
Pilot induction
TCAT
- M** Telford Hornets Christmas Lunch
Telford Hornets ground, Hinkshay Road,
Dawley
- 9th** **M** Santa Fun Run in aid of guide dogs and
RNIB
QE ii Arena Telford Town Park
- 10th** **DM** T&WC Retirement Association
Swan Hotel Wellington
- 11th** **DM** Official opening of Krispy Kreme
Telford Shopping Centre
- DM** Civic Panto Night- Jack and the Beanstalk
Grand Theatre Wolverhampton
- 12th** **M** Madeley Academy visit
Madeley Academy, Castlefields Way,
Madeley
- M** Shropshire Fire & Rescue Annual Festival of
Carols
All Saints' Church, Wellington
- 14th** **M** Age Concern Xmas Party
Church Farm Guest House Wrockwardine
- M** Armed Forces Community Covenant event
Abraham Darby Academy
- DM** Telford & Wrekin Arthritis Support Group
Annual Dinner
Grays Hotel, Telford Town Centre
- 15th** **M** Oakengates Swimming Club Presentation
Evening

B

Great Hall, Harper Adams Uni College,
Edmond TF10 8NB

DM Bridgnorth Mayor's Charity Christmas
Concert
Castle Hall, West Castle Street, Bridgnorth

16th **DM** Family Christmas Carol Service
Madeley Baptist Church

19th **DM** Citizenship Ceremony
Ceremony Room, Register Office,
Wellington Civic & Leisure Centre

M Community Carol Concert
The Village Green- Dawley Bank

20th **DM** FutureFocus launch event
FutureFocus shop, Madeley
12-14 Court street

M Christmas Fair opening
Sutherland Business & Enterprise College,
Gibbons Road, Trench

DM Adams' Grammar School Family Carol
Service
St Nicholas Church, Newport

21st **M** Royal Mail Sorting Office visits with David
Wright MP
Tweedale & Oakengates

DM Davina's Dream official opening
Asda, Donnington

M Lantern parade
Telford Town Park

M Hope House Christmas Concert
Engine Shop, at Enginuity

22nd **M** Civic Christmas Concert
All Saints Church, Wellington

January

5th **DM** Induction Service for Rev'd James Whately
Trinity Church, Newport

11th **M** Holocaust Memorial Day briefing

B

Park Lane Centre, Woodside

- 12th** **M** Annual General Meeting of Shropshire Royal
British Legion
Dawley RBL Club, Dawley

- 16th** **DM** Telford and Wrekin Citizenship Ceremonies
2013
Register Office Wellington Civic & Leisure
Centre

- 19th** **M** Telford and Wrekin Open Art Exhibition 2013
Gallery Bar at The Place



TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL

COUNCIL – 24 JANUARY 2013

REPORT OF CABINET – FOR INFORMATION ONLY

MATTERS DETERMINED BY THE CABINET

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report sets out those matters determined by the Cabinet at its meetings on 8th November 2012 and 6th December 2012 and 10th January 2013.

2.0 CABINET BUSINESS

Matters that have been determined by Cabinet are listed below:

2.1 8th November 2012

- 2.1.1 Approval of a New Funding Formula for Telford & Wrekin Mainstream Schools
- 2.1.2 Telford and Wrekin Crisis Help Network
- 2.1.3 West Mercia Energy
- 2.1.4 White Ribbon Town Award
- 2.1.5 Investigation of Illegal Money Lenders (Loan Sharks)
- 2.1.6 Building Schools for the Future – Approval of Final Business Case for Ercall Wood Technology College and approval to Acquire a Site in Priorslee for a New Secondary School
- 2.1.7 Telford Town Centre – Car Parking for Employees

2.2 6th December 2012

- 2.2.1 Driving Delivery of the Council's Priorities – Half Year Position
- 2.2.2 School Organisation- Behaviour Review/Jigsaw School
- 2.2.3 Relocation of the Inclusive Education Services and Disposal of the Social Education Centre
- 2.2.4 Development of a Pooled Budget (Section 75 Agreement) for Carers Services
- 2.2.5 Telford Ice Rink – New Ways of Working
- 2.2.6 Marches Local Transport Body
- 2.2.7 Telford & Wrekin Armed Forces Community Covenant
- 2.2.8 Newport Planning – Update

2.3 10th January 2013

2.3.1 Financial Monitoring 2012/13

2.3.2 Service and Financial Planning 2013/14 – 2015/16

2.3.3 Representation on Outside Bodies

3.0 DELEGATION OF POWERS GRANTED BY THE CABINET

REPORT HEADING	DELEGATION GRANTED TO	DETAIL OF DELEGATION GRANTED
West Mercia Energy	Assistant Director: Law Democracy & Public Protection	To agree and execute a new Joint Agreement under the terms of the Local Authority (Goods and Services Act 1970) with the other three owning authorities and to establish a Joint Committee of the executives of the four authorities to manage the activities of West Mercia Energy.
Investigation of Illegal Money Lenders (Loan Sharks)	Assistant Director: Law Democracy & Public Protection	To undertake the necessary legal procedures to bring the resolution into effect.
Building Schools for the Future – Approval of Final Business Case for Ercall Wood Technology College and Approval to Acquire a Site in Priorslee for a New Secondary School	Assistant Director: Development, Business & Housing Assistant Director: Development Business & Housing	In consultation with the Cabinet Member: Children, Young People & Families, to award the Single School Design and Build contract and the Future Schools Agreement to Shepherd Construction Ltd and to enter into all related contract documents. In consultation with the Cabinet Member: Children, Young People & Families to agree the land acquisition and transfer arrangements and to enter into all related contract documents provided that the cost is

C

REPORT HEADING	DELEGATION GRANTED TO	DETAIL OF DELEGATION GRANTED
	Assistant Director: Law, Democracy & Public Protection	<p>considered by the Assistant Director of Finance, Audit & Information Governance to be affordable within the existing overall BSF funding envelope.</p> <p>To agree and execute all necessary documentation, including the affixing of the common seal of the Council to contractual documentation as is appropriate under article 14.06 of the Constitution.</p>
Telford Town Centre – Car Parking for Employees	<p>Assistant Director: Law, Democracy & Public Protection</p> <p>Assistant Director: Customer & People Services</p>	<p>To agree and execute all necessary documentation to give effect to the resolutions.</p> <p>To agree in consultation with the Cabinet Member: Resources & Service Delivery the annual charge and payment structure for allocation of car parking passes to employees working at Darby House, Addenbrooke house and the new Southwater One building.</p>
Relocation of the Inclusive Education Service and Disposal of the Social Education Centre	Assistant Director: Development, Business & Housing	In conjunction with the Assistant Director: Law, Democracy & Public Protection to agree terms and conditions in order to complete the sale of the property and to enter into any contracts and transfer of documents that may be required to achieve the sale of the property and the relocation of the service.
Telford Ice Rink	Managing Director	To endorse the review of working practices and resource alignment and to progress and implement them.

C

REPORT HEADING	DELEGATION GRANTED TO	DETAIL OF DELEGATION GRANTED
<p>Marches Local Transport Body</p>	<p>Assistant Director: Neighbourhood & Leisure Services</p> <p>Assistant Director: Law, Democracy & Public Protection</p>	<p>In consultation with the Cabinet Members for Transport & Community Protection and Housing, Regeneration & Economic Development to agree documentation and terms of reference for the LTB.</p> <p>To agree and execute all necessary documentation and to give effect to the recommendations.</p>
<p>LEGAL COMMENT FINANCIAL COMMENT LINKS WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES RISKS AND OPPORTUNITIES ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT EQUALITY & DIVERSITY WARD IMPLICATIONS</p>	<p>As described in each report considered by Cabinet. Copies of all reports have been previously circulated to all Members of the Council</p>	



TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL

COUNCIL – 24 JANUARY 2013

REPORT OF CABINET – FOR INFORMATION ONLY

MATTERS DETERMINED BY THE CABINET

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report sets out those matters determined by the Cabinet at its meetings on 8th November 2012, 6th December 2012, 20th December 2012 and 10th January 2013.

2.0 CABINET BUSINESS

Matters that have been determined by Cabinet are listed below:

2.1 8th November 2012

- 2.1.1 Approval of a New Funding Formula for Telford & Wrekin Mainstream Schools
- 2.1.2 Telford and Wrekin Crisis Help Network
- 2.1.3 West Mercia Energy
- 2.1.4 White Ribbon Town Award
- 2.1.5 Investigation of Illegal Money Lenders (Loan Sharks)
- 2.1.6 Building Schools for the Future – Approval of Final Business Case for Ercall Wood Technology College and approval to Acquire a Site in Priorslee for a New Secondary School
- 2.1.7 Telford Town Centre – Car Parking for Employees

2.2 6th December 2012

- 2.2.1 Driving Delivery of the Council's Priorities – Half Year Position
- 2.2.2 School Organisation- Behaviour Review/Jigsaw School
- 2.2.3 Relocation of the Inclusive Education Services and Disposal of the Social Education Centre
- 2.2.4 Development of a Pooled Budget (Section 75 Agreement) for Carers Services
- 2.2.5 Telford Ice Rink – New Ways of Working
- 2.2.6 Marches Local Transport Body
- 2.2.7 Telford & Wrekin Armed Forces Community Covenant
- 2.2.8 Newport Planning – Update

2.3 20th December 2012

- 2.3.1 Adoption of Statement of Community Involvement
- 2.3.2 Ironbridge Gorge Museum Trust (IGMT) – Partnership Update
- 2.3.3 Representation on Outside Bodies

2.4 10th January 2013

- 2.4.1 Financial Monitoring 2012/13
- 2.4.2 Service and Financial Planning 2013/14 – 2015/16
- 2.4.3 Representation on Outside Bodies

3.0 **DELEGATION OF POWERS GRANTED BY THE CABINET**

REPORT HEADING	DELEGATION GRANTED TO	DETAIL OF DELEGATION GRANTED
West Mercia Energy	Assistant Director: Law Democracy & Public Protection	To agree and execute a new Joint Agreement under the terms of the Local Authority (Goods and Services Act 1970) with the other three owning authorities and to establish a Joint Committee of the executives of the four authorities to manage the activities of West Mercia Energy.
Investigation of Illegal Money Lenders (Loan Sharks)	Assistant Director: Law Democracy & Public Protection	To undertake the necessary legal procedures to bring the resolution into effect.
Building Schools for the Future – Approval of Final Business Case for Ercall Wood Technology College and Approval to Acquire a Site in Priorslee for a New Secondary School	Assistant Director: Development, Business & Housing Assistant Director: Development Business &	In consultation with the Cabinet Member: Children, Young People & Families, to award the Single School Design and Build contract and the Future Schools Agreement to Shepherd Construction Ltd and to enter into all related contract documents. In consultation with the Cabinet Member: Children, Young

C

REPORT HEADING	DELEGATION GRANTED TO	DETAIL OF DELEGATION GRANTED
Telford Ice Rink	Managing Director	To endorse the review of working practices and resource alignment and to progress and implement them.
Marches Local Transport Body	Assistant Director: Neighbourhood & Leisure Services Assistant Director: Law, Democracy & Public Protection	In consultation with the Cabinet Members for Transport & Community Protection and Housing, Regeneration & Economic Development to agree documentation and terms of reference for the LTB. To agree and execute all necessary documentation and to give effect to the recommendations.
Ironbridge Gorge Musuem Trust (IGMT) – Partnership Update	Assistant Director: Law Democracy & Public Protection	To execute all appropriate contract documentation .
LEGAL COMMENT FINANCIAL COMMENT LINKS WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES RISKS AND OPPORTUNITIES ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT EQUALITY & DIVERSITY WARD IMPLICATIONS	As described in each report considered by Cabinet. Copies of all reports have been previously circulated to all Members of the Council	

TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL**COUNCIL – 24 JANUARY 2013****2012/13 FINANCIAL MONITORING REPORT****REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR: FINANCE, AUDIT & INFORMATION GOVERNANCE (CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER)****PART A) – SUMMARY REPORT****1.0 SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES**

1.1 The Financial Monitoring report to Cabinet in January showed overall revenue spending projected to be within approved budgets and provided an update on progress on capital programme spending. The report also highlighted some new capital allocations, slippage and virements which require formal approval by Full Council.

1.2 SUMMARY

The detailed approvals required by Council are:

New Allocations					
Scheme	2012/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	
	£	£	£	£	
Improve Local People's Prospects Through Education & Skills					
Short breaks for Disabled Children	296,972				Grant funding
Millbrook Primary - library and external works	3,000				External funding
Charlton School	25,000				School contribution
Ensure Neighbourhoods are Safe and Clean					
Ironbridge Gorge - reduced grant and re-phasing	26,000	334,000	- 682,000	-2,075,000	
Improve the Health & Wellbeing of our Communities					
AFC 5 A Side Football	79,640				Capital Receipts
Total New Allocations	430,612	334,000	- 682,000	-2,075,000	

Virements		
Scheme Vired To	£	Scheme Vired From
Improve the Health & Wellbeing of our Communities		Managing the Organisation
Newport Fitness Suite	41,200	General works and survey

Slippage		
Scheme	£	Comment
Protecting and Creating Jogs as a Business Support, Business Winning Council		
Town Centre - Accomodation Strategy	- 1,400,000	Re-phasing of spend to 13/14
Improve the Health & Wellbeing of our Communities		
Parks for People - Phase 2	- 223,000	Programme slippage to 13/14 - prudential
Parks for People - Phase 2	- 446,000	Programme slippage to 13/14 - grant
Protect and Support our Vulnerable Children & Adults		
Social Care ICT review	- 250,000	Programme slippage to 13/14 - prudential
Regenerate Neighbourhoods in Need		
Unallocated Housing	- 318,104	Programme slippage to 13/14
Brookside	- 600,000	Programme slippage to 13/14
Ensure Neighbourhoods are Safe and Clean		
Highways & Bridges Capital Maintenance-WEAD	- 232,000	Re-phasing of carriageway schemes to 13/14
Highways/Footpaths-WEAF	- 293,970	Re-phasing of carriageway schemes to 13/14
Integrated Transport-WEAC	- 333,721	Re-phasing of town centre interchange to 13/14
Ironbridge Gorge	- 200,000	Re-profiling of prudential borrowing from 12/13 to 15/16
Ironbridge Gorge	- 300,000	Re-profiling of prudential borrowing from 13/14 to 15/16
Ironbridge Gorge	- 500,000	Re-profiling of prudential borrowing from 14/15 to 15/16
Highways and Bridges	- 25,000	Re-phasing to 13/14
Improve Local People's Prospects Through Education & Skills		
Meadows Primary	- 400,000	Re-phasing of school scheme to 13/14
Muxton Primary - 3 Classbase extension	- 435,000	Re-phasing of school scheme to 13/14
Newdale Primary - classbase extension	- 412,759	Re-phasing of school scheme to 13/14
Newdale Primary - classbase extension	- 137,241	Re-phasing of school scheme to 13/14
Meadows Primary - Electrical Installation	- 53,500	Re-phasing of school scheme to 13/14
Teagues Bridge Primary - 3 classbase extension	- 181,104	Re-phasing of school scheme to 13/14
Managing the Organisation		
ICT - Flex System Upgrade	100,000	Acelerated spend to 12/13 from 13/14
Capital Receipts site preparation	- 500,000	Re-phased to 13/14

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 Members are asked to approve the changes to the capital programme shown in section 1 above.

3.0 SUMMARY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

COMMUNITY IMPACT	Do these proposals contribute to specific Priority Plan objective(s)?	
	Yes	Delivery of all priority objectives depend on the effective use of available resources.
	Will the proposals impact on specific groups of people?	
	No	
TARGET COMPLETION/DELIVERY DATE	The capital programme will be immediately updated to reflect the new approvals.	

FINANCIAL/VALUE FOR MONEY IMPACT	Yes	Financial impacts arising from this report will be reflected in future financial monitoring reports and built in to the final service and financial planning strategy for 2012/13 and beyond
LEGAL ISSUES	No	None directly arising from this report. The S151 Officer has a statutory duty to monitor income and expenditure and take action if overspends /shortfalls emerge.
OTHER IMPACTS, RISKS & OPPORTUNITIES	No	
IMPACT ON SPECIFIC WARDS	No	Borough Wide

4.0 PREVIOUS MINUTES

- 01/03/12 – Full Council, Service & Financial Planning Strategy
- 26/07/12 – Cabinet, 2012/13 Financial Monitoring
- 18/10/12 – Cabinet, 2012/13 Financial Monitoring
- 10/01/13 – Cabinet, 2012/13 Financial Monitoring

PART B) – ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

There is no additional information.

5.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS

2012/13 Budget Strategy / Financial Ledger reports

Report Prepared by: Ken Clarke, Assistant Director: Finance, Audit & I.G. (C.F.O.) – 01952 383100; Pauline Harris, Finance Manager – 01952 383701

TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL										
Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	25991	18449	10355	7652	4416	2013	991	49	69916
Class A to W exemptions	0	530	279	254	109	39	26	13	4	1254
Diplomats' dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	25461	18170	10101	7543	4377	1987	978	45	68662
Disabled reductions	0	97	133	77	100	61	23	14	7	512
Effectively chargeable	97	133	77	100	61	23	14	7	0	512
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	97	25497	18114	10124	7504	4339	1978	971	38	68662
Single adult household 25% discount	25	11628	6087	2642	1338	620	216	102	6	22664
Resident disregarded 25% discount	2	181	151	95	50	26	13	8	0	526
2nd Home discount	0	4	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	7
2 Adults disregarded	1	7	9	8	9	3	1	3	0	41
Zero Discount	0	3	3	3	10	6	4	15	3	47
Total dwellings 50% discount	1	14	12	11	20	11	5	18	3	95
10%-50% discount PCLAA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	297	160	114	61	28	12	9	1	682
Entitled to no discounts	69	13377	11704	7262	6035	3654	1732	834	28	44695
CTS Discounts	0.0	7932.3	3031.7	914.5	362.1	146.3	42.8	14.7	0.0	12444.4
Total equivalent dwellings	89.8	14,605.5	13,516.8	8,519.8	6,784.9	4,025.7	1,875.5	919.8	35.0	62,817.0
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	49.9	9,737.0	10,513.1	7,573.2	6,784.9	4,920.3	2,709.1	1,533.0	70.0	43,890.5
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										204.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 22 Total + Line 23)										44094.5
AT 98.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE										
COUNCIL TAX BASE										43216.7
										98% OF CELL K23 + CELL K24

Chetwynd

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	17	45	21	16	43	44	36	4	226
Class A to W exemptions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	16	45	21	16	43	44	36	4	225
Disabled reductions	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	5
Effectively chargeable	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	5
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	0	17	44	22	16	42	45	36	3	225
Single adult household 25% discount	0	13	10	5	1	12	4	5	1	51
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
2nd Home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Adults disregarded	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zero Discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
10%-50% discount PCLAA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Entitled to no discounts	0	4	34	17	15	29	40	30	2	171
CTS Discounts	0.0	5.5	7.4	2.1	0.8	2.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	18.8
Total equivalent dwellings	0.0	8.3	34.1	18.7	15.0	36.8	42.5	34.8	2.8	211.5
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.0	5.5	26.5	16.6	15.0	45.0	61.4	58.0	5.6	233.6
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										233.6

AT 98.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE

COUNCIL TAX BASE

228.9

98% OF CELL K23 + CELL K24

Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	13	40	25	25	22	25	21	1	172
Class A to W exemptions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	12	40	25	25	22	25	21	1	171
Disabled reductions	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	4
Effectively chargeable	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	4
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	0	12	40	26	26	21	24	21	1	171
Single adult household 25% discount	0	3	8	5	6	4	2	1	0	29
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
2nd Home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Adults disregarded	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zero Discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
10%-50% discount PCLAA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	4
Entitled to no discounts	0	9	29	20	20	17	21	19	1	136
CTS Discounts	0.0	1.6	3.2	0.4	2.5	0.0	1.0	0.7	0.0	9.4
Total equivalent dwellings	0.0	9.7	34.6	24.4	22.0	20.0	22.5	19.6	1.0	163.0
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.0	6.5	26.9	21.7	22.0	24.4	32.5	32.7	2.0	168.7
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										168.7

AT: 98.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE
COUNCIL TAX BASE
165.3

98% OF CELL K23 + CELL K24

Church Aston

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	26	212	83	58	109	30	30	2	550
Class A to W exemptions	0	0	6	3	0	3	1	1	0	14
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	26	206	80	58	106	29	29	2	536
Disabled reductions	0	0	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	5
Effectively chargeable	0	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	5
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	0	27	207	79	57	107	28	29	2	536
Single adult household 25% discount	0	14	62	15	9	17	3	2	1	123
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
2nd Home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Adults disregarded	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Zero Discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
10%-50% discount PCLAA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	2	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	8
Entitled to no discounts	0	10	140	63	45	90	25	27	1	401
CTS Discounts	0.0	7.8	14.0	4.8	0.8	1.5	1.3	0.0	0.0	30.2
Total equivalent dwellings	0.0	15.5	176.5	70.5	54.0	101.3	26.0	28.5	1.8	504.0
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.0	10.3	137.3	62.7	54.0	123.8	37.6	47.5	3.6	476.8
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										476.8

AT: 98.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE
COUNCIL TAX BASE
467.3

98% OF CELL K23 + CELL K24

Dawley Hamlets

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	590	1130	569	293	163	77	29	2	2853
Class A to W exemptions	0	7	12	3	1	2	0	0	0	25
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	583	1118	566	292	161	77	29	2	2828
Disabled reductions	0	0	4	3	3	0	1	2	2	15
Effectively chargeable	0	4	3	3	0	1	2	2	0	15
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	0	587	1117	566	289	162	78	29	0	2828
Single adult household 25% discount	0	294	395	123	44	21	7	3	0	887
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	3	5	2	1	1	0	1	0	13
2nd Home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Adults disregarded	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
Zero Discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	4
10%-50% discount PCLAA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	13	14	7	3	2	0	0	0	39
Entitled to no discounts	0	277	703	434	240	138	71	22	0	1885
CTS Discounts	0.0	95.6	141.1	44.0	16.6	5.6	0.8	0.6	0.0	304.3
Total equivalent dwellings	0.0	417.2	875.9	490.8	260.7	150.9	75.5	25.9	0.0	2,601.0
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.0	278.1	681.3	436.3	260.7	184.4	109.1	43.2	0.0	1,993.1
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										1993.1

AT: 98:00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE

COUNCIL TAX BASE 1953.2

98% OF CELL K23 + CELL K24

Edgmond

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	21	121	141	103	94	69	37	3	589
Class A to W exemptions	0	5	19	7	5	5	3	0	1	45
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	16	102	134	98	89	66	37	2	544
Disabled reductions	0	0	1	1	2	2	3	0	0	9
Effectively chargeable	0	1	1	2	2	3	0	0	0	9
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	0	17	102	135	98	90	63	37	2	544
Single adult household 25% discount	0	12	34	34	17	21	5	2	0	125
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	0	0	2	2	2	1	0	0	7
2nd Home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Adults disregarded	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zero Discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLAA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	5
Entitled to no discounts	0	5	67	97	78	67	57	34	2	407
CTS Discounts	0.0	4.0	11.6	11.8	1.6	2.8	0.7	0.0	0.0	32.5
Total equivalent dwellings	0.0	10.0	81.9	114.2	91.7	81.5	60.8	36.5	2.0	511.0
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.0	6.7	63.7	101.5	91.7	99.6	87.8	60.8	4.0	515.8
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										515.8

AT 98.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE
COUNCIL TAX BASE
505.5

98% OF CELL K23 + CELL K24

Ercall Magna

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	96	187	168	122	61	37	43	4	718
Class A to W exemptions	0	2	0	5	1	1	0	0	0	9
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	94	187	163	121	60	37	43	4	709
Disabled reductions	0	1	5	1	2	3	0	1	1	14
Effectively chargeable	1	5	1	2	3	0	1	1	0	14
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	1	98	183	164	122	57	38	43	3	709
Single adult household 25% discount	0	52	60	39	30	6	9	5	0	201
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	5
2nd Home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Adults disregarded	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zero Discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
10%-50% discount PCLAA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	1	3	4	1	0	1	0	0	10
Entitled to no discounts	1	43	119	119	91	51	28	37	2	491
CTS Discounts	0.0	31.7	51.8	19.3	6.3	1.6	1.8	0.8	0.0	113.3
Total equivalent dwellings	1.0	52.8	116.0	134.5	108.2	53.9	34.0	40.5	2.5	656.5
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.6	35.2	90.2	119.6	108.2	65.9	49.1	67.5	5.0	541.3
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										541.3

AT 98.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE

COUNCIL TAX BASE **530.5**

98% OF CELL K23 + CELL K24

Eyton

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	0	4	11	1	5	6	5	1	33
Class A to W exemptions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	0	4	11	1	5	6	5	1	33
Disabled reductions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Effectively chargeable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	0	0	4	11	1	5	6	5	1	33
Single adult household 25% discount	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	5
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2nd Home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Adults disregarded	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zero Discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLAA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Entitled to no discounts	0	0	3	9	1	3	5	5	1	27
CTS Discounts	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Total equivalent dwellings	0.0	0.0	3.8	10.0	1.0	4.5	5.8	5.0	1.0	31.8
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.0	0.0	3.0	8.9	1.0	5.5	8.4	8.3	2.0	37.1
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										37.1

AT: 98.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE
COUNCIL TAX BASE
36.4

98% OF CELL K23 + CELL K24

Hadley & Leegomery

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	2201	1485	759	739	328	167	75	0	5754
Class A to W exemptions	0	93	9	6	3	0	2	1	0	114
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	2108	1476	753	736	328	165	74	0	5640
Disabled reductions	0	11	14	3	6	4	0	1	0	39
Effectively chargeable	11	14	3	6	4	0	1	0	0	39
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	11	2111	1465	756	734	324	166	73	0	5640
Single adult household 25% discount	4	927	475	201	108	43	14	9	0	1781
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	13	17	5	5	4	2	1	0	47
2nd Home discount	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
2 Adults disregarded	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zero Discount	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	4
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	6
10%-50% discount PCLAA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	22	8	6	2	1	0	0	0	39
Entitled to no discounts	7	1147	965	544	617	274	150	63	0	3767
CTS Discounts	0.0	624.8	309.0	78.9	36.7	14.8	4.9	1.0	0.0	1070.1
Total equivalent dwellings	10.0	1,250.2	1,033.0	625.6	668.0	296.5	157.1	69.5	0.0	5,180.0
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9
Band D equivalents	5.5	833.4	803.4	556.0	668.0	362.3	226.7	115.6	0.0	3,570.9
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										3570.9

..... AT: 98.00%: ESTIMATED: COLLECTION: RATE:
COUNCIL TAX BASE

3499.5 98% OF CELL K23 + CELL K24

Hollinswood & Randlay

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	1518	468	176	157	55	1	0	0	2375
Class A to W exemptions	0	20	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	1498	464	176	157	55	1	0	0	2351
Disabled reductions	0	12	3	1	0	3	0	0	0	19
Effectively chargeable	12	3	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	19
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	12	1489	462	175	160	52	1	0	0	2351
Single adult household 25% discount	3	574	119	30	27	10	1	0	0	764
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
2nd Home discount	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
2 Adults disregarded	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Zero Discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
10%-50% discount PCLAA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Entitled to no discounts	9	888	341	144	133	42	0	0	0	1557
CTS Discounts	0.0	369.2	79.6	8.4	6.7	4.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	468.5
Total equivalent dwellings	11.3	971.8	352.2	158.6	146.6	45.5	0.2	0.0	0.0	2,154.5
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	6.3	647.9	273.9	141.0	146.6	55.6	0.3	0.0	0.0	1,271.6
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										1271.6

AT 98.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE
COUNCIL TAX BASE
1246.2

98% OF CELL K23 + CELL K24

Ketley

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	522	673	280	159	49	14	5	0	1702
Class A to W exemptions	0	7	3	3	0	1	0	0	0	14
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	515	670	277	159	48	14	5	0	1688
Disabled reductions	0	2	1	1	4	1	1	0	0	10
Effectively chargeable	2	1	1	4	1	1	0	0	0	10
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	2	514	670	280	156	48	13	5	0	1688
Single adult household 25% discount	0	250	190	66	27	7	1	0	0	541
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	3	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	18
2nd Home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Adults disregarded	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zero Discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLAA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	14	3	2	2	1	0	0	0	22
Entitled to no discounts	2	247	468	206	127	40	12	5	0	1107
CTS Discounts	0.0	166.5	107.0	28.8	12.0	5.8	1.0	0.0	0.0	321.1
Total equivalent dwellings	2.0	284.3	513.3	233.2	137.3	40.5	11.8	5.0	0.0	1,548.3
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	1.1	189.5	399.2	207.3	137.3	49.5	17.0	8.3	0.0	1,009.2
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										1009.2

AT: 98.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE
COUNCIL TAX BASE
989.0

98% OF CELL K23 + CELL K24

Kynnersley

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	4	21	9	19	12	7	7	0	79
Class A to W exemptions	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	4	20	9	17	12	7	7	0	76
Disabled reductions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
Effectively chargeable	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	1	3	20	9	17	12	8	6	0	76
Single adult household 25% discount	0	1	6	2	2	3	0	0	0	14
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2nd Home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Adults disregarded	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zero Discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLAA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Entitled to no discounts	1	2	13	7	15	9	8	6	0	61
CTS Discounts	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.8
Total equivalent dwellings	1.0	2.8	13.5	7.7	16.5	11.3	8.0	6.0	0.0	72.5
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.6	1.9	10.5	6.8	16.5	13.7	11.6	10.0	0.0	71.6
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										71.6

AT 98.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE

COUNCIL TAX BASE

70.2

98% OF CELL K23 + CELL K24

Lawley & Overdale

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	691	661	504	588	246	71	9	1	2771
Class A to W exemptions	0	13	5	0	1	2	1	1	0	23
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	678	656	504	587	244	70	8	1	2748
Disabled reductions	0	3	1	4	9	1	0	0	0	18
Effectively chargeable	3	1	4	9	1	0	0	0	0	18
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	3	676	659	509	579	243	70	8	1	2748
Single adult household 25% discount	1	306	240	126	85	25	3	1	1	788
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	3	5	9	5	1	1	0	0	24
2nd Home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Adults disregarded	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zero Discount	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
10%-50% discount PCLAA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	6	4	2	1	2	1	0	0	16
Entitled to no discounts	2	361	410	372	488	214	65	7	0	1919
CTS Discounts	0.0	217.6	92.7	42.4	27.0	11.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	393.8
Total equivalent dwellings	2.8	381.2	505.1	432.9	529.5	225.0	65.9	7.8	0.8	2,544.5
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	1.6	254.1	392.9	384.8	529.5	275.0	95.2	13.0	1.6	1,947.7
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										1947.7

AT: 98.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE
COUNCIL TAX BASE
1908.7

98% OF CELL K23 + CELL K24

Lilleshall, Donnington and Muxton

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	2470	1414	920	729	409	140	72	1	6155
Class A to W exemptions	0	45	60	9	23	6	8	4	1	156
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	2425	1354	911	706	403	132	68	0	5999
Disabled reductions	0	11	9	2	5	4	2	0	0	33
Effectively chargeable	11	9	2	5	4	2	0	0	0	33
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	11	2423	1347	914	705	401	130	68	0	5999
Single adult household 25% discount	2	1008	502	232	112	38	17	6	0	1917
Resident disregarded 25% discount	2	10	10	8	7	3	2	0	0	42
2nd Home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Adults disregarded	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	4
Zero Discount	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	5
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	1	0	0	7	0	0	1	0	9
10%-50% discount PCLAA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	35	13	9	5	1	1	0	0	64
Entitled to no discounts	7	1369	822	665	574	359	110	61	0	3967
CTS Discounts	0.0	649.9	201.3	74.7	30.2	9.6	3.1	1.1	0.0	969.9
Total equivalent dwellings	10.0	1,518.1	1,017.7	779.3	641.5	381.2	122.2	64.9	0.0	5,504.8
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	07-Sep	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	5.5	1,012.0	791.4	692.5	641.5	465.8	176.3	108.0	0.0	3,893.0
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										91.7
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 22 Total + Line 23)										3984.7

AT: 98.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE
COUNCIL TAX BASE
3906.9

98% OF CELL K23 + CELL K24

Little Wenlock

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	7	43	35	30	44	36	29	1	225
Class A to W exemptions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	7	43	34	30	43	36	29	1	223
Disabled reductions	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	4
Effectively chargeable	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	4
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	0	8	43	33	30	45	34	29	1	223
Single adult household 25% discount	0	4	10	7	7	3	6	5	0	42
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
2nd Home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Adults disregarded	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zero Discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLAA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3
Entitled to no discounts	0	3	33	26	23	40	28	23	1	177
CTS Discounts	0.0	0.0	5.6	4.2	0.8	1.4	0.7	0.8	0.0	13.5
Total equivalent dwellings	0.0	7.0	34.9	27.1	27.5	42.6	31.8	27.0	1.0	212.3
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.0	4.7	27.1	24.1	27.5	52.1	45.9	45.0	2.0	228.4
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										228.4

AT 98.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE
COUNCIL TAX BASE
223.8

98% OF CELL K23 + CELL K24

Madeley

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	5234	1103	520	452	162	46	36	1	7554
Class A to W exemptions	0	74	7	3	4	1	0	0	0	89
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	5160	1096	517	448	161	46	36	1	7465
Disabled reductions	0	17	11	6	7	1	1	0	0	43
Effectively chargeable	17	11	6	7	1	1	0	0	0	43
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	17	5154	1091	518	442	161	45	36	1	7465
Single adult household 25% discount	3	2284	341	122	69	27	3	3	0	2852
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	42	11	7	1	2	1	0	0	64
2nd Home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Adults disregarded	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Zero Discount	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	6
Total dwellings 50% discount	1	2	1	0	1	1	0	2	1	9
10%-50% discount PCLAA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	52	11	7	5	1	0	0	1	77
Entitled to no discounts	13	2774	727	382	366	130	41	31	-1	4463
CTS Discounts	0.0	1750.4	214.7	59.3	17.2	3.4	1.0	0.8	0.0	2046.8
Total equivalent dwellings	15.8	2,821.1	787.8	426.5	406.7	149.9	43.0	33.5	0.5	6,731.5
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	8.7	1,880.6	612.6	378.9	406.7	183.0	61.9	55.6	1.0	3,589.0
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										3589.0

AT 98.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE
COUNCIL TAX BASE
3517.2

98% OF CELL K23 + CELL K24

Newport

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	779	1406	1376	801	382	119	31	3	4897
Class A to W exemptions	0	44	71	47	32	4	1	0	0	199
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	735	1335	1329	769	378	118	31	3	4698
Disabled reductions	0	1	11	6	14	3	0	1	2	38
Effectively chargeable	1	11	6	14	3	0	1	2	0	38
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	1	745	1330	1337	758	375	119	32	1	4698
Single adult household 25% discount	0	477	499	440	138	43	7	7	0	1611
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	5	15	13	5	1	0	0	0	39
2nd Home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Adults disregarded	0	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	5
Zero Discount	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	6
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	1	1	1	2	0	1	4	1	11
10%-50% discount PCLAA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	5	22	18	2	1	0	1	0	49
Entitled to no discounts	1	257	793	865	611	330	111	20	0	2988
CTS Discounts	0.0	214.8	216.7	118.9	27.2	7.2	2.1	1.0	0.0	587.9
Total equivalent dwellings	1.0	409.2	984.3	1,104.4	694.0	356.8	114.7	27.3	0.5	4,280.0
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.6	272.8	765.6	981.7	694.0	436.1	165.7	45.5	1.0	3,363.0
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										3363.0

AT 98.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE

COUNCIL TAX BASE **3295.7** 98% OF CELL K23 + CELL K24

Oakengates

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	1325	1565	544	221	67	6	7	0	3735
Class A to W exemptions	0	35	10	7	0	1	0	0	0	53
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	1290	1555	537	221	66	6	7	0	3682
Disabled reductions	0	5	12	4	4	1	0	0	0	26
Effectively chargeable	5	12	4	4	1	0	0	0	0	26
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	5	1297	1547	537	218	65	6	7	0	3682
Single adult household 25% discount	2	609	488	128	54	8	0	0	0	1289
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	5	15	4	0	0	0	0	0	24
2nd Home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Adults disregarded	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	4
Zero Discount	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	1	1	1	0	2	0	1	0	6
10%-50% discount PCLAA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	9	14	4	3	1	0	0	0	31
Entitled to no discounts	3	673	1029	400	161	54	6	6	0	2332
CTS Discounts	0.0	449.0	230.1	50.9	14.6	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	747.0
Total equivalent dwellings	4.5	694.0	1,190.7	452.6	189.9	59.6	6.0	6.5	0.0	3,350.8
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	2.5	462.7	926.1	402.3	189.9	72.8	8.7	10.8	0.0	2,075.8
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										2075.8

AT: 98.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE
COUNCIL TAX BASE
2034.3

98% OF CELL K23 + CELL K24

Preston

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	1	20	11	13	20	16	11	0	92
Class A to W exemptions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	1	20	11	13	20	16	11	0	92
Disabled reductions	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	3
Effectively chargeable	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	0	2	20	10	13	20	17	10	0	92
Single adult household 25% discount	0	1	6	5	3	3	0	1	0	19
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
2nd Home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Adults disregarded	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zero Discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLAA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Entitled to no discounts	0	1	14	4	10	17	17	9	0	72
CTS Discounts	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0
Total equivalent dwellings	0.0	1.8	16.5	8.5	12.3	19.3	17.0	9.8	0.0	87.0
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.0	1.2	12.8	7.6	12.3	23.6	24.6	16.3	0.0	98.4
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										98.4

AT 98.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE

COUNCIL TAX BASE **96.4** 98% OF CELL K23 + CELL K24

Rodington

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	37	55	63	63	64	48	29	0	359
Class A to W exemptions	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	5
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	34	55	63	63	64	46	29	0	354
Disabled reductions	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3
Effectively chargeable	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	0	34	55	64	63	64	45	29	0	354
Single adult household 25% discount	0	13	20	13	12	10	9	2	0	79
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
2nd Home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Adults disregarded	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zero Discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLAA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	4
Entitled to no discounts	0	21	35	50	49	52	36	27	0	270
CTS Discounts	0.0	6.7	8.5	8.0	5.5	2.6	0.2	0.0	0.0	31.5
Total equivalent dwellings	0.0	24.1	41.5	52.8	54.5	58.7	42.6	28.5	0.0	334.0
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.0	16.1	32.3	46.9	54.5	71.7	61.4	47.5	0.0	330.4
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										330.4

AT 98.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE

COUNCIL TAX BASE **323.8** **98% OF CELL K23 + CELL K24**

Stirchley & Brookside

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	2600	759	348	270	115	25	6	0	4123
Class A to W exemptions	0	45	4	0	3	1	0	0	0	53
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	2555	755	348	267	114	25	6	0	4070
Disabled reductions	0	13	5	8	4	3	0	0	0	33
Effectively chargeable	13	5	8	4	3	0	0	0	0	33
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	13	2547	758	344	266	111	25	6	0	4070
Single adult household 25% discount	2	1012	215	63	41	14	2	1	0	1350
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	23	5	3	2	2	0	0	0	35
2nd Home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Adults disregarded	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Zero Discount	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	3
10%-50% discount PCLAA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	27	4	3	1	1	0	0	0	36
Entitled to no discounts	11	1485	534	273	222	94	23	4	0	2646
CTS Discounts	0.0	792.9	153.4	31.9	13.3	6.5	0.3	0.0	0.0	998.3
Total equivalent dwellings	12.5	1,495.4	549.6	294.6	242.0	100.5	24.2	5.3	0.0	3,722.3
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	6.9	996.9	427.5	261.9	242.0	122.8	35.0	8.8	0.0	2,101.8
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										2101.8

AT: 98.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE

COUNCIL TAX BASE **2059.8**

98% OF CELL K23 + CELL K24

Tibberton & Cherrington

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	7	79	25	27	47	41	43	2	271
Class A to W exemptions	0	0	3	2	1	0	1	0	0	7
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	7	76	23	26	47	40	43	2	264
Disabled reductions	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	3
Effectively chargeable	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	0	8	75	24	26	46	40	43	2	264
Single adult household 25% discount	0	2	18	7	6	5	6	6	0	50
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
2nd Home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Adults disregarded	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zero Discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLAA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Entitled to no discounts	0	6	56	15	20	41	34	37	2	211
CTS Discounts	0.0	0.5	19.2	1.6	1.3	1.3	0.8	0.0	0.0	24.7
Total equivalent dwellings	0.0	7.0	51.1	20.4	23.2	43.5	37.7	41.5	2.0	251.0
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.0	4.7	39.7	18.1	23.2	53.2	54.5	69.2	4.0	266.6
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										266.6

AT 98.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE

COUNCIL TAX BASE

261.3

98% OF CELL K23 + CELL K24

Waters Upton

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	20	42	73	62	79	67	31	6	380
Class A to W exemptions	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	19	42	72	61	79	67	31	6	377
Disabled reductions	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	3
Effectively chargeable	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	3
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	0	20	41	73	60	80	66	31	6	377
Single adult household 25% discount	0	9	13	17	11	12	7	3	2	74
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	3
2nd Home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Adults disregarded	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zero Discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLAA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	0	10
Entitled to no discounts	0	9	27	55	47	66	56	26	4	290
CTS Discounts	0.0	3.2	6.1	14.8	2.8	3.5	0.0	0.7	0.0	31.1
Total equivalent dwellings	0.0	14.6	31.7	54.0	54.2	73.5	64.0	29.3	5.4	357.8
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.0	9.7	24.7	48.0	54.2	89.8	92.4	48.8	10.8	378.4
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										378.4

AT 98.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE

COUNCIL TAX BASE

370.8

98% OF CELL K23 + CELL K24

Wrockwardine

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	63	235	447	222	248	157	118	9	1499
Class A to W exemptions	0	2	1	3	5	1	2	0	1	15
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	61	234	444	217	247	155	118	8	1484
Disabled reductions	0	0	0	3	4	5	2	0	0	14
Effectively chargeable	0	0	3	4	5	2	0	0	0	14
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	0	61	237	445	218	244	153	118	8	1484
Single adult household 25% discount	0	34	101	112	46	42	21	15	1	372
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	0	2	6	2	0	0	0	0	10
2nd Home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Adults disregarded	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Zero Discount	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
10%-50% discount PCLAA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	1	3	7	5	0	0	1	0	17
Entitled to no discounts	0	26	130	320	164	202	132	102	7	1083
CTS Discounts	0.0	6.4	39.9	27.5	10.3	10.6	4.2	3.8	0.0	102.7
Total equivalent dwellings	0.0	46.1	170.9	388.0	195.2	222.9	143.6	110.5	7.7	1,387.5
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.0	30.7	132.9	344.9	195.2	272.4	207.4	184.2	15.4	1,383.1
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										3.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 22 Total + Line 23)										1386.1

AT: 98.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE
COUNCIL TAX BASE
1358.4

98% OF CELL K23 + CELL K24

Wrockwardine Wood & Trench

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	859	936	422	77	28	5	1	0	2328
Class A to W exemptions	0	10	5	125	1	0	0	0	0	141
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	849	931	297	76	28	5	1	0	2187
Disabled reductions	0	4	10	4	3	0	0	0	0	21
Effectively chargeable	4	10	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	21
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	4	855	925	296	73	28	5	1	0	2187
Single adult household 25% discount	1	375	238	89	17	5	0	0	0	725
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	9	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	17
2nd Home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Adults disregarded	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zero Discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLAA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	13	5	2	0	2	0	0	0	22
Entitled to no discounts	3	458	676	204	55	21	5	1	0	1423
CTS Discounts	0.0	240.9	116.3	27.3	5.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	390.5
Total equivalent dwellings	3.8	518.1	747.7	246.2	63.5	25.8	5.0	1.0	0.0	2,001.5
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	2.1	345.4	581.5	218.8	63.5	31.5	7.2	1.7	0.0	1,251.7
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										109.3
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 22 Total + Line 23)										1361.0

TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL

COUNCIL MEETING – 24 JANUARY 2013

SETTING OF THE COUNCIL TAX BASE FOR 2013/14

**REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR: FINANCE, AUDIT & INFORMATION
GOVERNANCE (CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER)**

PART A – SUMMARY REPORT

1. SUMMARY OF MAIN PROPOSALS

To determine the Council Tax Base for General and Special Fund purposes for the financial year 2013/14.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

That the calculation of the tax base for 2013/14 as at paragraph 6.6 and Appendix 1 be approved.

In accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 2012 (SI 2012:2914), the amount calculated for Telford and Wrekin Council Tax base for 2013/14 for its Special Fund Area shall be as per the appropriate parish amounts detailed in Appendix 1 for the parishes listed in paragraph 6.7.

3. SUMMARY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

COMMUNITY IMPACT Do these proposals contribute to specific priority plan objectives?

Yes/No All priorities. Setting the council tax base is a legal requirement and is needed to calculate council tax levels for 2013/14 and therefore directly supports the delivery of all Council priorities.

Will the proposals impact on specific groups of people?

Yes/No Council tax payers

**TARGET
COMPLETION /
DELIVERY DATE**

The setting of the Council Tax Base is the first stage in the process of setting the Council Tax for 2013/14. Final recommendations on council tax levels will be presented to Full Council on 7th March 2013.

**FINANCIAL/VALUE
FOR MONEY IMPACT**

Yes/No Used in determining the Council Tax to be charged in 2013/14.

LEGAL ISSUES

Yes/No The legal requirements relating to the setting of the Council tax base are set out in the main body of this report. The Council has a statutory obligation to set the Council Tax Base by 31 January 2013 to

enable the level of Council Tax to be then set within the statutory timescales (paragraph 4.1 of this report).

As part of this calculation the Council must also estimate the aggregate sums of the amounts which are likely to be paid during the relevant financial year as described in this report. The Council will note the introduction of the Council Tax Support Scheme and the changes to exemptions and discounts which form part of the calculation (paragraphs 4.1, 4.3 and 6.2 of this report).

In summary the Council has the power and the duty to set the Council Tax Base in the way described in this report.

OTHER IMPACTS, RISKS AND OPPORTUNITIES

Yes/No

The opportunities and risks associated with the report have been identified and assessed. Arrangements will be put in place to manage the risks and maximise the opportunities that have been identified..

IMPACT ON SPECIFIC WARDS

Yes/No

PART B – ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Council Tax Base

4.1 The Government announced as part of the Spending Review in 2010, that it would remove the national council tax benefit scheme with effect from 1st April 2013 and localise support for Council Tax from the same date. At the same time, the Government reduced the funding that they have previously made available by 10% as part of the Government's national deficit reduction programme of spending cuts. The Council has therefore had to design and consult on a local Council Tax Support Scheme (CTSS) which was approved by full council on 22 November 2012. This new scheme operates acts as a "discount" (in a similar way to a single person discount) and therefore reduces the tax base. The council receives a grant that partly compensates us for this reduction in tax base as it enables the Council to levy a lower precept.

As part of the changes considered by full Council on 22 November, the council is also amending exemptions as follows:-

- Reduce the Class A exemption to a 0% discount for the whole period
- Reduce the Class C exemption to a 0% discount for the whole period
- Introduce a "premium to charge 150% on dwellings left empty and unoccupied for more than 2 years
- Reduce the second homes discount from 10% to 0%

4.2 In order to determine the appropriate Council Tax levels for the area, it is necessary for the Council to determine the tax base for its area or part of its area. The budget requirements of the various precepting authorities are divided by this figure to arrive at the Band D equivalent level of Council Tax.

4.3 The tax base for 2013/14 must be set by full Council between 1 December 2012 and 31 January 2013 as prescribed by section 8 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 2012 (SI 2012:2914). The figures used for tax base allow for the continuation of the resolutions in respect of reducing the discounts for empty properties and second homes agreed previously.

5 PREVIOUS MINUTES

- 5.1 Council meeting 19 January 2012
Council meeting 22 November 2012

6. COUNCIL TAX BASE INFORMATION

6.1 As members will be aware, the Council Tax is a banded capital value based property tax.

6.2 The main features of the tax are:-

- Each domestic property is allocated to one of 8 bands depending on its capital value which has been set by the Valuation Office Agency.
- Section 5 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 sets out the range of property values within each band. Associated Regulations determine the relationship between the tax rates for each band.
- A 25% discount from the full charge is available for single adult households. Certain categories of resident are disregarded in deciding the number of adult residents. These include students, student nurses, youth training trainees, the severely mentally impaired etc. Qualifying criteria must be met before discounts or disregards are allowed.
- A reduction equivalent to one council tax band is available where a resident of a dwelling is disabled and certain facilities are required for meeting the needs of that disabled person. For Band A properties the reduction is equivalent to 1/9th of the Band D Charge so the charge for such a Band A dwelling is 5/9ths rather than the usual 6/9ths for a Band A property.
- CTSS is applied to the council tax base as a discount that varies depending on personal circumstances and this reduces the Council Tax Base.
- The grant system is intended to take account of differences in the needs and taxable capacity of each area.

6.3 The Council Tax Bands range from A to H and the details are as follows:-

Band	House Value (as at April 1991 prices)	Band D Proportion	Telford & Wrekin Properties Spread	% Increase/ Decrease for 13/14
	£	%	%	%
A	Under 40,000	66.7	37.17	-0.30
B	40,001 – 52,000	77.8	26.39	+0.13
C	52,001 – 68,000	88.9	14.81	+0.16
D	68,001 – 88,000	100.0	10.94	0.00
E	88,001 – 120,000	122.2	6.32	+0.02
F	120,001 – 160,000	144.4	2.88	0.00
G	160,001 – 320,000	166.7	1.42	-0.01
H	Over 320,000	200.0	0.07	0.00

6.4 Property Base

There are 69,916 properties in the valuation list for the Telford & Wrekin area. This compares with a figure of 69,322 in the list at the same time last year. There has been an increase of 594

properties, which equates to an increase of 0.86%. Overall there has been a decrease in the proportion of Band A and G properties and an increase in Band B, C and E properties, with the largest increase in Band C.

6.5 Council Tax Base

To arrive at the Council Tax Base, it is necessary to undertake the following calculation in respect of each tax band:

Total number of chargeable dwellings
(Less) Dwellings subject to discounts
=
Total equivalent number of properties
x
Ratio to Band D
=
Relevant Amount (Band D Equivalent)

The relevant amounts for each tax band are then aggregated to arrive at the total for the area.

Finally, an estimated Collection Rate needs to be applied to the resultant figure. This has to be common to the whole area and has to provide for amendments to the Council Tax Banding List, appeals against banding, additional discounts and losses on collection. Due to the changes as a result of CTSS it is suggested that a figure of 98% be used. Clearly every effort is taken to vigorously pursue all council tax due to the authority.

6.6 General Fund Tax Base

This is the estimated council tax base for the whole of the area and will be used by Telford & Wrekin to calculate its General Fund Council Tax levy and also by The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for West Mercia and the Shropshire and Wrekin Fire & Rescue Authority to calculate the levy in respect of their precepts.

The tax base for this purpose for 2013/14 is 44,094.5 (including 204.0 for contributions in lieu). Using an estimated collection rate of 98% (adjusted for 100% collection of contributions in lieu), the tax base becomes **43,216.7**. The detailed build up to this figure by parish is shown in Appendix 1.

6.7 Special Fund Tax Base

This is the estimated council tax base for the Special Fund area, i.e. those areas where Telford & Wrekin Council provides services which, in other areas, are provided by Town & Parish Councils. These areas are;

- Dawley Hamlets,
- Great Dawley,
- Hollinswood & Randlay,
- Lawley & Overdale,
- Madeley,
- Oakengates,
- St Georges & Priorslee,
- Stirchley & Brookside,
- The Gorge,
- Wellington and
- Wrockwardine & Trench.

The Council Tax Base for each can be found in Appendix 1.

For 2013/14 it will be necessary to have two levels of special fund tax. The first tax will be levied on all the parishes in the Special Fund area. The second tax will be levied on those parishes that have opted not to take over responsibility for street lighting in their area.

The Special Fund Council Tax will be set taking into account the services provided by each individual parish and taking account of the tax base for each parish.

7. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Local Government Act 2003

CLG Calculation of Council Tax Base Return (CTB1) October 2012

The Council Tax (Prescribed Classes of Dwellings)(England) Regulations 2003

Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 2012 (SI 2012:2914)

Local Government Finance Act 2012,

Report prepared by

Bernie Morris, Finance Team Leader (01952) 383702

Ken Clarke, Assistant Director: Finance, Audit & Information Governance (01952) 383100.

BOUNDARY REVIEW COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Boundary Review Committee held on Thursday, 26th September, 2012 at 6.00 p.m. in the Civic Offices, Telford, Shropshire

PRESENT: Councillors K.T. Blundell, S. Davies, A.J. Eade, and R.A. Overton.

BRC-9 CHAIRMAN

Councillor R.A. Overton was elected Chairman for the meeting in the absence of the Committee's appointed Chairman.

BRC-10 MINUTES

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 23rd August 2012 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman

BRC-11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

N.J. Dugmore, A.D. McClements and R.J. Sloan

BRC-12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

BRC-13 BOROUGH ELECTORAL REVIEW – SUBMISSION ON COUNCIL SIZE

Members received the report of the Assistant Director: Law, Democracy & Public Protection which contained proposals for a preferred council size of 54 councillors. Full Council had debated the matter of council size on 13 September and had tasked the Boundary Review Committee with approval of the Council's submission document to LGBCE. In addition, council had required that the Assistant Director: Law, Democracy & Public Protection ensure that the submission document was with LGBCE by the end of September.

The council's proposed submission was for the retention of 54 councillors based upon Commission's statutory criteria and the requirements and aspirations of a Co-operative council and the community served by the council. Particular points raised within the submission supporting a council size of 54 were:

- Co-operative council working placed greater requirements for councillors to engage with the community
- Electors deserved an effective and convenient level of representation, the current ratio of councillors to electors was manageable
- Current arrangements worked effectively, delivering significant council savings and securing improvement in a number of key priority areas

- Scrutiny structure was robust and high quality, the council benefitted from the service and this could be compromised by reductions in the number of councillors
- A councillor survey had identified increasing workload increases for a majority of those responding
- Workloads would increase as more responsibilities were passed down from central government
- The Borough had a young and the population was growing quickly, councillor numbers needed to be able to offer good representation in the light of population growth
- The Borough contained significant areas of deprivation, councillors representing those wards would tend to have significant workloads, continued spending reductions and recessionary pressures would increase the support required in those communities.

The submission also identified significant future trends that would require an effective number of councillors in order to deal with:

- Transfer of Public Health services from NHS
- Impact of the Welfare Reform agenda
- Demands of Localism agenda
- Providing services and support to communities in very difficult financial circumstances
- Engagement/support of local business
- Corporate Parenting requirements
- Adult Social Care pressures
- Public spending cuts and reductions in available staff support placing more demands on time/resources of councillors

Members debated the submission briefly. It was agreed that, in the opening section of the submission a minor amendment be made to reflect the fact that nearly 25% of the Borough's wards contained neighbourhood areas ranked amongst the 10% most deprived in the country.

Councillor S. Davies, referring to an alternative submission from the main opposition group was concerned that any proposals to return to a Committee structure would have significant effects on already scarce staff resources. Councillor A.J. Eade, leader of the main opposition group, confirmed that those issues would be addressed in his group's submission, together with a number of other significant issues.

RESOLVED – That the council's formal submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) for a Council size of 54 councillors be approved and that the Assistant Director: Law, Democracy &

Public Protection make arrangements for documents to be submitted to LGBCE by the end of September.

The meeting ended at 6.04 p.m.

Chairman:

Date:

BOUNDARY REVIEW COMMITTEE**Minutes of a meeting of the Boundary Review Committee held on Thursday, 26th November, 2012 at 6.00 p.m. in the Civic Offices, Telford, Shropshire**

PRESENT: Councillors S. Davies, N.J. Dugmore, A.J. Eade, A.D. McClements and R.A. Overton and R.J. Sloan.

BRC-14 MINUTES

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 26th September 2012 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman

BRC-15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

K.T. Blundell

BRC-16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

BRC-17 BOROUGH ELECTORAL REVIEW – SUBMISSION ON COUNCIL SIZE – FURTHER SUBMISSION

Consultation was currently taking place on council size – the appropriate number of councillors that were required to transact the business of the council effectively.

Full council in September had agreed that a submission be made to LGBCE for a preferred Council size of 54 councillors by the Boundary Review Committee. The main opposition group had made a separate submission in support of a council size of 44. LGBCE had considered both submissions and decided to consult on both numbers from the end of October. If appropriate, further submissions could now be made supporting proposals for council size. LGBCE had shown particular interest in further information on the following questions:

How the role and functions of councillors in the Borough supported a council size of 54

How the status of a Co-operative council affected the workload of councillors.

Full council had tasked Boundary Review Committee with agreeing any further submission in support of a council size of 54. The Assistant Director: Law, Democracy & Public Protection, in consultation with the Chairman of Boundary Review Committee had been delegated with ensuring that any response was made to LGBCE by 3 December before publishing a provisional decision on council size in January 2013. A public consultation on ward boundaries was then expected to run from 29 January 2013 to 8 April 2013.

Following a brief debate it was agreed that a further response would be prepared and approved by the Chairman and circulated to members of the Committee before submission to LGBCE on 3 December.

LGBCE

RESOLVED – That a further submission be prepared and submitted to LGBCE in support of a Council size of 54 councillors and that the Assistant Director: Law, Democracy & Public Protection make arrangements for the submission to be submitted to LGBCE by the deadline of 3 December.

The meeting ended at 6.26 p.m.

Chairman:

Date:

LICENSING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Licensing Committee held on Tuesday 20th November 2012 at 6.00 pm in the Reception Suite, Civic Offices, Telford

PRESENT

Councillors: C Mason (Chair), R Picken, A Mackenzie, L Murray, R Scammell, J Seymour and J Thompson.

Officers in attendance: Ian Mercer – Public Protection Service Delivery Manager, Suzanne Fisher – Public Protection Team Leader, Tina Street – Solicitor and Wendy Buckley - Democratic Services Support Officer.

LC- 15 MINUTES

In relation to minute LC – 14, some Members considered that the minute did not fully reflect the debate and divergent views that were expressed at the meeting. It was therefore:

RESOLVED – that minute LC - 14 of the meeting of the Licensing Committee held on the 2nd October 2012 be amended to include a sentence stating that:

“Members debated the matter and arguments were put for and against which resulted in a 5 to 4 majority decision in favour of the motion”. The amended minutes be brought back for approval at the next meeting.

LC– 16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors B Duce and T Hope.

LC- 17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

LC- 18 GAMBLING ACT 2005 – REPORT ON THE STATUTORY REVIEW OF THE COUNCIL’S STATEMENT OF LICENSING PRINCIPLES

The Public Protection Team Leader presented a summary of the report of the Service Delivery Manager - Public Protection advising Members that following a consultation, a revised Statement of Principles along with supporting appendices had been prepared to be presented to Council on 22nd November and effective from 31st January 2013. The Statement of Licensing Policy for the Gambling Act 2005 has to be reviewed every three years as a statutory requirement and the policy was last reviewed in 2009.

The Solicitor for the Council advised Members that Telford has a ‘no casino policy’. This can only be changed with agreement from Central Government for the location of casinos countrywide.

Only minor amendments were made to the previous Statement of Principles following revised guidance from the Gambling Commission. Some changes to the wording of the introduction of the Statement of Principles were suggested by a Member and agreed by Members.

Members also stated that in view of the large consultation exercise where only 5 responses had been received, this was very disappointing and the instructions to the Parish Councils should be reworded in the hope that more responses to consultations would be forthcoming.

RESOLVED - that the Statement of Licensing Principles for the Gambling Act 2005 for the Borough of Telford & Wrekin be recommended to Full Council for approval with an effective date of 31st January 2013.

LC – 19 GAMBLING ACT 2005 – REPORT ON THE DELEGATION OF STATUTORY FUNCTION TO OFFICERS

The Service Delivery Manager Public Protection advised Members that the purpose of the report was to delegate functions of the Licensing Committee under the Gambling Act 2005 to the Service Delivery Manager in respect of the revocation of premises licences due to non-payment of annual fees. It was hoped that the process would be streamlined in that the Service Delivery Manager could then delegate to the Principal Licensing Officer, in writing, to revoke a premises licence on non-payment of fees.

RESOLVED - that Members delegate the functions set out in the report to the Service Delivery Manager Public Protection.

Meeting closed at 6.25 pm.

Chairman:

Date:

PLANS BOARD

Minutes of a meeting of the Plans Board held on Wednesday, 14 November 2012 at 6.00pm in the Reception Suite, Civic Offices, Telford, Shropshire

PRESENT: Councillors J C Minor (Chairman), N A Dugmore, I T W Fletcher, J Loveridge, C P R Mollett (as substitute for R T Kiernan), S A W Reynolds, R J Sloan (as substitute for G C W Reynolds), M J Smith and C R Turley

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors A J Eade and A A Meredith (for planning application TWC/2011/0827)

PB-052 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Plans Board held on 24 October 2012 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman subject to changing the date for the site visit in respect of planning application TWC/2011/0292 to Thursday, 29 November 2012.

PB-053 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors R T Kiernan and G C W Reynolds

PB-054 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor N A Dugmore declared a non-pecuniary interest in planning application TWC/2012/059.

PB-055 DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS

Members were advised that with regard to planning application TWC/2011/0959 Isombridge Farm, Isombridge, Shropshire TF6 6NF, the Applicant's Agent had asked that consideration of the application be deferred to the meeting of the Plans Board on 12 December 2012.

RESOLVED – that determination of planning application TWC/2011/0959 be deferred until the meeting of the Plans Board on 12 December 2012.

PB-056 SITE VISITS

Members were reminded that a site visit had previously been agreed to take place at 3.00pm on Thursday, 29 November 2012 in respect of planning application TWC/2011/0292 – Land adjacent to Woodhouse Farm, Granville Road, Donnington Wood, Telford, Shropshire.

PB-057 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

Members had received a schedule of planning applications to be determined by the Board and fully considered each report and the supplementary information tabled at the meeting regarding planning application reference TWC/2012/0594 and TWC/2012/0706.

(a) TWC/2011/0827 - Land to the North of Audley Avenue, Newport, Shropshire

This was an outline application for the erection of up to 215 houses, highway works, public open space provision, allotments and associated infrastructure development following demolition of buildings. All matters other than means of access were reserved for consideration at a later stage via a separate application. Full details of the application were set out in the report. Members were reminded that this application was one of four applications submitted to the Council seeking consent for residential development in and around Newport. A site visit for this application had been undertaken earlier in the day.

Speaking on behalf of Newport Town Council, Councillor R Pitt opposed the application on the grounds that the proposals were premature in the absence of an adopted Local Plan. He raised issues of vehicular, emergency and pedestrian access, safety and parking. He noted the suggestion that ownership of the allotments be transferred to the Town Council and requested that a covenant be placed upon the playing fields to ensure they were protected against development.

Councillor A A Meredith, Borough Councillor for Newport South Ward, spoke in opposition to the application on the grounds of traffic safety and increased traffic generation, flooding of the cemetery and removal of opportunities to increase the cemetery's life span, the prematurity of the application with regard to the Local Plan and building upon Greenfield land.

Councillor A J Eade, Borough Councillor for Church Aston and Lilleshall Ward, spoke in opposition to the application regarding housing supply and need, building on Greenfield land when Brownfield sites remained available and the impact upon infrastructure particularly caused by the water table, increased traffic generation and school places at Burton Borough School. He urged Members to vote democratically and was assured by the Chair that the Plans Board was not predetermined.

Mr M Atherton, representing the Newport Regeneration Partnership, spoke against the application with regard to whether the affordable housing levels set out in the report were achievable in the current period of austerity, housing need and the level of house building beyond the current plan period (which had been reduced by the Inspector). In making this latter point he also questioned the prematurity of the application in the absence of a Local Plan.

The Applicant's Agent, Mr P Hill of RPS Planning and Development, spoke in support of the application raising issues regarding the delivery of affordable housing at this site, public consultation and the delivery of public open space, the phased nature of the development, maintenance of the bus gate, submission of a flood risk strategy, endorsement of noise assessments and the lack of objection from utilities in terms of infrastructure.

The Planning Officer referred Members of the Board to the detailed report before them, which explained that the proposals were compliant with national and local policies and emphasised that a lack of affordable housing was a main driver for Core Strategy policies CS1 and CS6(Newport). He further noted that development of the Council's new Local Plan (Shaping Places) was in its infancy and there were, therefore, no grounds to consider this application in relation to prematurity with an emerging Plan. He

drew Member's attention to the data set out in the report regarding delivery of housing and affordable housing in Newport to date and the housing trajectory beyond the end of the Core Strategy period. He noted that planning permission for residential development had recently been granted at Wellington Road (TWC/2011/0821) and Maynard's Croft (TWC/2012/0211) but indicated that those proposals alone would not meet identified needs. In addition, he drew attention to the sections of the report which addressed the impact on the highway network, drainage and flooding, physical and social community infrastructure, allotments, and noise issues. He clarified that delegated authority was sought as the Secretary of State had requested sight of the Board's decision and report.

Councillor I T W Fletcher questioned the policy implications for housing at the site in light of the Land Allocations Development Document not having been progressed beyond the Preferred Options stage. Councillor Fletcher noted that the site did not benefit from access to public transport but enhancements to public transport and associated infrastructure would be made as a result of development proposals being promoted on adjoining land which it was, therefore, suggested would bring benefits for this proposal. However, he understood that the adjoining proposals were the subject of an Appeal and public transport was, therefore, not secured. At that afternoon's site visit Councillor Fletcher had further noted that there had been high levels of HGV traffic and he was concerned that this could be increased. Councillor R J Sloan shared this concern and also expressed concern regarding the emergency access. In addition, Councillor Fletcher questioned why the recommendations in the report appeared to show a break with the housing policy for Newport as set out in the adopted Core Strategy which stated that Newport's local housing requirements would be met by approximately 60 new dwellings per annum. The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist was invited to respond to these points. He explained that the Land Allocations Development Document had not been adopted and was, therefore, not a policy consideration. He stressed that it was important to consider the proposals holistically and referred Members to the report before them which thoroughly addressed pertinent issues. In particular, the report comprehensively addressed transport issues and advised that there were no objections to the proposals from Highways Officers, subject to conditions as detailed. He stated that achieving the housing requirements set out in the report was consistent with current national and local policy and further noted concerns that the application was being rushed through the system. He pointed out that the Government had urged Councils to support sustainable development and that the emerging status of the Local Plan (Shaping Places) was not, therefore, a reason for refusal in this case. The Planning Officer reconfirmed that the Highways Officer had confirmed that access was acceptable. He also indicated that a covenant being placed upon the playing fields to ensure they were protected against development for a set period could be considered.

Councillor N A Dugmore questioned the calculations in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment which suggested that 124 affordable dwellings were required each year over a twenty year period to meet the needs of Newport residents. In light of recent applications from developers to reduce S106 affordable housing contributions as a result of the economic climate, he did not believe that this was feasible. While Councillor Dugmore welcomed the proposed transfer of ownership of both the playing pitches and Shuker Field, he was disappointed that this was not accompanied by a financial contribution towards ongoing maintenance. Councillor Dugmore expressed further concerns regarding HGV traffic levels, drainage issues particularly affecting the cemetery, and the future impact upon the sewerage treatment plant. Overall he considered that the proposals for access were poorly designed and sought clarification that if Members were minded to grant permission at this stage, access would be non-

negotiable. In response, the Planning Officer confirmed that access formed part of this outline application and was not a reserved matter. The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist advised that Highways were satisfied with the access proposals as set out in the application so there had been no reason to refuse this element of the proposals. Similarly, Education, Leisure and Parks and Open Spaces Officers had been fully consulted and their responses were detailed in the report.

Taking a holistic view, Councillor C R Turley considered that the proposals represented sustainable development and were, therefore, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) compliant. He noted that this was supported by the Planning Inspector's endorsement and enhancement of the Council's approach regarding the quantum of housing to be delivered in Newport over the Core Strategy period. The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist commented in this regard that the Inspector had also recognised that as Newport was not as well-provided with Brownfield opportunities as other areas in Telford that a higher proportion of Greenfield development may be unavoidable if the proposed dwelling numbers were to be achieved in Newport.

Councillor S A W Reynolds also noted paragraph 187 of the NPPF regarding sustainable development together with the current Government's intention to relax Planning laws. She commented that it was her understanding that there were no Brownfield sites in Newport which would accommodate a development of this size.

At the end of the debate, the recommendations set out in the report were proposed and seconded. In accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 12 and at the request of Councillors J C Minor and R J Sloan, a recorded vote was taken, the voting being as follows:

For: 6
Councillors J Loveridge, J C Minor, S A W Reynolds, R J Sloan, M J Smith and C R Turley

Against: 3
Councillors N A Dugmore, I T W Fletcher and C P R Mollett

Abstentions: 0

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2011/0827 the Development Management Manager be authorised to grant planning permission subject to:-

- (a) Confirmation from the Secretary of State that he does not wish to call in the application for determination;
- (b) The applicants/Council as landowner entering into a Section 106 agreement/Memorandum (signed by the Assistant Director: Development Business and Housing) with the Local Planning Authority (terms to be agreed by the Development Management Manager) relating to:
 - (i) Affordable housing, to include:

Provisions ensuring that 35% of the dwellings to be built shall be affordable housing either in number or value (to allow for the inclusion of more expensive specialised affordable housing where required);

Of the above 80% to be Rented Social Housing dwellings and the remaining 20% in Shared Ownership unless otherwise agreed with the Council;

Provisions ensuring that the affordable housing is provided throughout the development and not left to the latter stages and also that the houses are delivered in small clusters;

Inclusion of details to ensure lettings are prioritised to Newport area based residents;

Receipts from the disposal of any Shared Ownership dwellings to be recycled and used for the provision of further affordable housing.

(ii) Highways works, to include:

Off site highway infrastructure improvements - up to a maximum of £314,072;

Public transport service enhancements – up to a maximum of £120,000;

Public transport infrastructure (bus shelters) – up to a maximum of £10,000.

Timescale and triggers for the payment of the contributions to be agreed.

Details of reviews will need to be agreed to take into account whether other permissions have been or are likely to be granted or implemented in Newport and if not to reassess whether the maximum figures stated can still be justified for this development.

Travel Plan monitoring - £5,000.

(iii) Education infrastructure funds up to maximum of £529,878 provided the average number of bedrooms per dwelling across the development is under 3.35.

Timescale and triggers for the payment of the contributions to be agreed.

Details of reviews will need to be agreed to take into account whether other permissions have been or are likely to be granted or implemented in Newport and if not to reassess

whether the maximum figures stated can still be justified for this development.

- (iv) **The provision of Open Spaces, to include (if that option is exercised by the applicant) a transfer of the open space and recreation areas to the Council at a suitable time and with payment of a commuted sum for maintenance to be agreed. Or alternatively, provide for a residents management company to maintain those areas.**
 - (v) **Index linked financial contribution of £162,000 for the provision of a Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play on land adjoining the application site as indicated on submitted drawings.**
 - (vi) **Provision of new allotment land of 0.22 hectares to be provided as an extension to the existing allotment site north of the application site and offered for transfer into the ownership of Newport Town Council.**
 - (vii) **The transfer of 1.6 hectares of privately owned land to Telford and Wrekin Council to be used for continued sports pitch provision as part of the enhanced Shukers Field playing fields area.**
 - (viii) **The transfer to Telford and Wrekin Council of land owned by the applicant that is developed as a new sports pitch adjacent to the Burton Borough School as indicated in the Playing Pitch Assessment Report; and**
 - (ix) **Provision of a Planning and Financial Monitoring contribution of £9,000.**
- (c) **the conditions set out in the report with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to the Development Management Manager.**
- (b) TWC/2012/0594 - Lord Silkin School, Stirchley, Telford, Shropshire, TF3 1FA

This was a Council application which sought outline planning permission for the demolition of the existing school buildings and sought the creation of a new integrated school comprising a 600 place Secondary, 420 place Primary, 32 place Nursery and 100 place post 16-18 Vocational Training Centre (VTC) and associated car parking and works as part of the Council's BSF programme. With reference to the tabled update report, Members were advised that layout had been removed from the application and this would now be considered together with access as part of a reserved matters application. The application was, therefore, seeking outline planning permission to establish the principle of development with scale the only matter for approval. Members' attention was also drawn to the recommended condition regarding school travel plans which had been changed for plans to be updated within six months of occupation.

Members welcomed the proposals. However, some concerns were expressed regarding adequate car parking provision and ensuring facilities for drop off and pick up. Members requested that consideration be given to incorporating these features at reserved matters stage.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0594 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the update report.

(c) TWC/2012/0706 - 38 Haybridge Road, Hadley, Telford, Shropshire, TF1 6LT

This was a retrospective application for change of use from A1(Retail), previously a conservatory/Upvc window business to a small private second hand car show room and car sales business (Sui Generis) with an office area, customer parking and external display area for 3 vehicles at 38a Haybridge Road, Hadley.

Hadley & Leegomery Parish Council had requested that the application be determined by the Plans Board.

Members expressed some concerns regarding the impact that the change of use may have upon traffic safety at this busy location. However, Members noted that if approval was granted, this could be for a period of two years in order to assess any adverse impact on highway safety and monitor parking on the footway.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0706 planning permission be granted for a period of two years in order to assess any adverse impact on highway safety and monitor parking on the footway and subject to the conditions as set out in the report

(d) TWC/2012/0777 - Darby House, Lawn Central, Telford, Shropshire, TF3 4JA

This was a Council application which sought consent for the alteration of the existing entrance to Darby House.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0777 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

The meeting ended at 7.48pm

Chairman:

Date:

PLANS BOARD

Minutes of a meeting of the Plans Board held on Thursday, 29 November 2012 at 6.00pm in the Reception Suite, Civic Offices, Telford, Shropshire

PRESENT: Councillors J C Minor (Chairman), N A Dugmore, I T W Fletcher, R T Kiernan, J Loveridge, G C W Reynolds, S A W Reynolds, M J Smith, C R Turley

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor A J Eade (for planning applications TWC/2011/0916 and TWC/2012/0679)

PB-058 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Plans Board held on Wednesday, 14 November 2012 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

PB-059 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None

PB-060 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr I T W Fletcher declared an interest in planning application TWC/2012/0828 because he was a member of the Parish Council which had actively supported the application and indicated that he would withdraw from the meeting during determination thereof.

Cllr J Loveridge declared an interest in planning application TWC/2012/0794 because of her involvement in Parish Council discussions and indicated that she would withdraw from the meeting during determination thereof.

Cllr J C Minor declared an interest in planning application TWC/2012/0828 because he was a member of the Parish Council which had actively supported the application and indicated that he would withdraw from the meeting during determination thereof.

Cllr C R Turley commented on his position regarding planning applications TWC/2012/0679, TWC/2012/0778 and TWC/2012/0794 but stated that, in the circumstances, he would not be withdrawing from the meeting for these items.

PB-061 DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS

None.

PB-062 SITE VISITS

RESOLVED - that a site visit takes place in respect of planning application TWC/2011/0292 - land adjacent to Woodhouse Farm, Granville Road, Donnington Wood, Telford, Shropshire departing Civic Offices (Telford) at 2.00pm on Wednesday, 12 December 2012; and to be immediately followed by a site visit in respect of planning application TWC/2012/0679 - Land at Hoo Farm Animal Kingdom, Preston Upon The Weald Moors, Telford, Shropshire, TF6 6DJ

PB-063 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

Members had received a schedule of planning applications to be determined by the Board and fully considered each report and the supplementary information tabled at the meeting regarding planning applications TWC/2011/0916, TWC/2012/0679 and TWC/2012/0778.

(a) TWC/2011/0916 - Land To The West Of Station Road, Newport, Shropshire

This application for full planning permission for the erection of a new superstore, highway works, associated infrastructure and landscaping was considered at Plans Board on 25 April 2012 and was subsequently called in by the Secretary of State. The purpose of the report presented to the Plans Board was to update Members on the current position and to establish the Local Planning Authority's position at the forthcoming Public Inquiry. In addition, an update report was tabled at the meeting which summarised objection letters received with responses by the Applicant and the Council's retail consultants. The letters were attached to the update report and Members were given some time to read these in detail.

The Planning Officer reminded Members that this application was one of two proposals that were presented to the Plans Board at about the same time for retail foodstores, the other being at Audley Avenue (TWC/2011/0632). That application was the subject of an appeal against non-determination, with the Council adopting a position that it wished to refuse planning permission. The appeal was allowed by the Planning Inspector earlier in 2012 and the Council, along with the applicant for the Station Road development, lodged a legal challenge to that decision with the High Court (at the time of the meeting a hearing date had not been set). The Secretary of State had subsequently called in the Station Road application and, in doing so also determined that an Environmental Statement was necessary. Members were updated on events that had arisen since the Audley Avenue appeal inquiry, which were fully detailed in the report and particularly related to employment issues, retail planning issues, Section 106 contributions, highways issues, open space issues, village green and agricultural land classification.

Councillor P Evans representing Church Aston Parish Council (adjoining the site) spoke in opposition to the application. He considered that the report raised issues which had not been subject to consultation, that the arguments put forward in appealing the Audley Avenue decision were equally applicable to the Station Road site, that the Environmental Statement suggested further survey work was necessary, that with regard to open space the proposed development was in breach of policy OL6 and he questioned the arguments relating to the commercial attractiveness of the proposals. He was critical of the Council's expenditure in defending its decisions despite the vast local opposition to the proposals.

Cllr A J Eade, Borough Ward Member for Church Aston & Lilleshall, also spoke against the application in terms of loss of employment land being introduced as an issue at this stage and the reintroduction of S106 contributions. He was generally critical of the Authority's stance and urged Members to fully consider the issues.

Ms A Conacur of Indigo Planning, agents for Audley Business Parks spoke to oppose the application, the defence of which she considered conflicted with previous advice brought before the Plans Board in April 2012. She stated that interest in the Audley Avenue site had been received from three of the four major foodstores and her clients

were now in the final stages of negotiations and had cleared the site. She was in no doubt that the Audley Avenue site would come forward and as a result there would be significant adverse impacts upon the town centre if the Station Road proposals also came to fruition.

Mr Paul Hill, the Applicant's Agent spoke in support of the application which he believed was compliant with national and local policy. He drew attention to the current limitations in retail provision in Newport and claimed that the Audley Avenue site was not sufficiently large enough to accommodate a foodstore capable of clawing back leakage of retail expenditure at other retail centres and would, instead, directly compete with the existing Waitrose store. He supported Station Road as the preferable site and stated that highways issues, noise impacts, landscape and flood risk issues had all been considered as part of the application process. He also referred to the appropriation of the site, enhancement of the footpath, provision of public transport links and job creation.

The Planning Officer reminded members that the purpose of the report was not to reconsider the planning application and the related technical information but was to decide how best to present the local planning authority's case to the Planning Inspector and therefore he addressed comments made with regard to the pertinent issues raised in the report. He acknowledged that retail impact was a key issue as set out in the report and which was closely linked to the detailed employment issues as it was considered that if the Station Road site achieved planning permission, a major retailer would not be found for the Audley Avenue site which would, therefore, revert to business class use, supporting the objectives of policy CS6. He advised that the Section 106 contributions were being sought in accordance with the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations. He drew attention to the detailed reasons for Planning Officers' view that the Planning Inspector at the Audley Avenue Inquiry was wrong to regard Station Road as open space within the meaning of Policies OL6 or CS11 and was further incorrect in her application of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) definition of open space to the site. The Planning Officer noted that a hearing to consider an application to designate the site as Village Green was held in October but drew Members' attention to the Notice served under the Appropriation of Land Act which would enable the development to proceed irrespective of the outcome of the Village Green application. The Planning Officer also highlighted the issues regarding agricultural land classification as set out in the report together with the lack of objection by Natural England to the loss of this land for agricultural purposes.

Councillor N A Dugmore noted that the report referenced an Environmental Statement but believed that the Plans Board Members had not had sight of it. Similarly, he considered it would be of use to the Board to view the Consultant's report referred to on page 4 of the report. With regard to employment issues, he noted comments regarding the ratio of jobs in Newport to its labourforce but he formed the view that it was usual for people to commute some distance to work and, therefore, the demand for local employment land was less significant now than it may have been some years ago. He questioned the introduction of employment issues at this stage. With regard to retail planning issues, he noted the contents of Indigo Planning Limited's letter dated 27 November 2012 and suggestions that the presence of two large foodstores would seriously affect the health of Newport town centre; he further rejected the contention that new facilities would not divert trade from the Co-Op store. He considered the suggestion in the report that the Audley Avenue site would not come forward and, with reference to the comments made by Ms Conacur, he felt that she had demonstrated that some

progress was already being made towards occupation at the site. Councillor Dugmore made further comments regarding public transport, town centre enhancement, public art and enhancement of green space and requested clarification of the impact of the appropriation of the land upon the Village Green application.

Councillor G C W Reynolds noted that the NPPF supported economic growth and job creation and supported Local Planning Authorities to look for solutions rather than problems. She further considered that local residents without access to private transport required local employment which could be maximised by the development of a retail foodstore at Station Road and the subsequent expected reversion to business class use at Audley Avenue. She considered that the impact upon the High Street would not be significant.

Concern was expressed by Councillor S A W Reynolds with regard to the ratio of jobs in Newport to its labourforce and she considered that it was, therefore, imperative to increase employment opportunities in Newport. She felt that the report convincingly explained that the Station Road site could deliver upon this measure as it was highly improbable that both retail sites would come forward. She considered the proposals were compliant with the Core Strategy and NPPF and concluded that Station Road was a more preferable location for the development of a retail foodstore.

Councillor I T W Fletcher considered the report had not swayed his original opinion that this proposal could not be supported and, furthermore, he could not find incontrovertible proof that the Audley Avenue site would not come forward. He considered that the proposals would have a serious impact upon the viability of the town centre and the use of Greenfield land and public space was a breach of policy.

Similarly, Councillor R T Kiernan considered that in his opinion, the report did not represent any material change from that presented in April 2012 and he maintained the view that he could not support the proposals.

In response to questions raised, the Planning Officer advised Members that the Environmental Statement had been lodged with the Planning Inspector but that the Council had agreed to host a copy on the Council's website and in Civic Offices to assist public access. He acknowledged that the impact upon the town centre remained a concern for Members but he reminded Members of advice received that if the Station Road site was granted planning permission, the Audley Avenue site would not occur. With reference to sequential testing he confirmed that there was no other site capable of accommodating an application of this size. With regard to Section 106 obligations, he believed that there were disadvantaged people living in Newport who would benefit from the proposed public transport. He contended that the Audley Avenue inquiry Planning Inspector should not have considered the pony paddock to be public open space and reminded Members of the proposals to relocate the footpath.

Also responding to questions raised during the debate, the Legal Advisor confirmed the legal position as it was understood to be which was, as stated in the report, that irrespective of the outcome of the Village Green application, the appropriation of the land would enable the development to proceed. He also noted Member comments that an aspect of the Growth and Infrastructure Bill was to change village green laws in relation to land identified for development but advised that although the Bill was before Parliament it was not yet law and its terms were not finalised so could not be given weight in the consideration of this application.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist further advised that the Council was the registering authority for Town and Village Green applications and it was, therefore, dealing with the application appropriately. The appropriation of the land, which took precedence over the Village Green application, had been fully discussed at Cabinet on 26 July 2012. With regard to employment land use, this was an issue raised by the Council's barrister at the Audley Avenue Inquiry and the report detailed the further investigations on this issue which had taken place. He confirmed that the Local Planning Authority did not agree with the Planning Inspector 's view regarding Section 106 requirements and this would form an element of the challenge being made, in addition to the Local Planning Authority's view that Station Road was the preferred site for development. He reiterated the Planning Officer's advice with regard to cumulative retail impact and the view that only one foodstore would eventually manifest. He believed that Officers' advice had been consistent and reminded Members that the purpose of the report was not to reconsider whether planning permission should be granted but to determine, from the elements updated in the report, whether the Local Planning Authority should reconfirm its position for the call-in.

At the end of the debate, at the request of Councillors I T W Fletcher and N A Dugmore and in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 12, a recorded vote on the motion to approve the recommendations contained in the report was taken, the voting being as follows:

For: 6

Councillors J C Minor, J Loveridge, G C W Reynolds, S A W Reynolds, M J Smith and C R Turley

Against: 3

Councillors N A Dugmore, I T W Fletcher and R T Kiernan

Abstentions: 0

RESOLVED – that subject to the Council as landowner providing an appropriate memorandum to be submitted to the call inquiry which agrees that the land will be bound by the obligations in the event of the sale of the land in respect of the provision of a sum of monies comprising a contribution of up to £907,508 for the provision of major highway schemes, £1.2 million towards public transport; £10,000 towards public transport infrastructure; £5,000 for monitoring of the store travel plan £50,000 for the commissioning of public art on or off site as may be subsequently agreed, an appropriate commuted sum for open space maintenance if required to be adopted and £150,000 to create a fund to enhance the Town Centre Shop Fronts and their signage , £100,000 for a Retail Business Development Fund , £15,000 for monitoring of financial and planning covenants, to maintain a position of requesting the Secretary of State to grant planning permission at Station Road and to present evidence to support that grant at the forthcoming Inquiry.

(b) TWC/2012/0679 Land at, Hoo Farm Animal Kingdom, Preston Upon The Weald Moors, Telford, Shropshire, TF6 6DJ

This was a full planning application for change of use of land and the erection of a temporary prefabricated building to accommodate a pre-school children's nursery which was relocating from current premises in Wrockwardine. A small car park and outdoor

playing area was also proposed. An update report was tabled which detailed the supportive comments received from the Council's Early Intervention team with regard to the proposed scheme.

Cllr A J Eade, Borough Ward Member for Church Aston & Lilleshall spoke in support of the proposal, extolling the virtues of the high quality nursery provision and the exciting learning environment which could be provided at the proposed location which was also designated as a Forest School. He asked Members to consider a five year temporary permission to secure viability for the proposals.

Mr P Fenwick, the applicant's agent, and Ms P Hustwick, owner of the relocating nursery, also spoke to support the application. Mr Fenwick stated that the nursery, which accommodated over 50 pre-school children, was four months away from the end of its current lease of property in Wrockwardine and that the Council's Estates and Investment Unit had been unable to locate suitable alternative premises. The proposed location was Brownfield land, close to a local major employment centre. He did not believe that there was a policy precedent for this application and asked Members to take a balanced view. Ms Hustwick advised that the nursery was moving from its current location as the building needed upgrading which the owner was unable to provide, hence the termination of the lease. She advised that a temporary two year permission would not be financially viable and would not provide sufficient continuity for children attending the nursery.

Whilst the Planning Officer acknowledged the high quality service provided by the nursery, it remained her advice that the proposed site was unsustainable given its rural location and that permission in excess of two years would be contrary to Policies E6 and LR1 of the Wrekin Local Plan and CS10 of the Core Strategy.

Members noted the Planning Officer's comments and recognised the difficulties faced by the nursery, particularly with regard to sustainability. In considering the proposed location Members considered that there was potential for a deleterious impact upon local residents due to increasing volumes of traffic along the access road which was referred to as a "dirt track". It was, therefore, resolved by a majority vote that Members would benefit from a site visit.

RESOLVED – that determination of planning application TWC/2012/0679 be deferred to allow the Board Members to make a Site Visit.

(c) TWC/2012/0778 Land Off, Beaconsfield/Burford, Brookside, Telford, Shropshire

This application sought outline planning permission with all matters reserved except access for the regeneration of Brookside local centre. The works involved the demolition of 37 residential dwellings, existing retail units and covered walkway and youth centre building and the construction of up to 14 residential bungalows, three replacement retail units for uses classes A1 and A5 with up to 2 residential units above, the extension and refurbishment of the existing community centre building (use class D2) to include a replacement housing trust office (use class B1), formation of a new public square, community gardens and new children's play facilities, together with all associated engineering works, car parking and landscaping. An update report was tabled which included additional consultation responses.

Members welcomed the application and applauded the co-operative approach which had been taken in formulating the Masterplan. Some concern was expressed regarding parking and Members were advised that this would significantly contribute to the vibrancy of the local centre. With regarding to phasing, some disruption would be inevitable but work was anticipated to progress quickly.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0778 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the update report.

(d) TWC/2012/0794 The Rose & Crown PH, Stirchley, Telford, Shropshire, TF3 1DY

In accordance with her declaration of interest Councillor J Loveridge left the room during determination of this application.

This was a full planning application seeking the change of use of part of an existing car park into a hand car wash facility. A previous application was heard at Plans Board on 16 May 2012 for the same proposed scheme. Members awarded delegated authority to the Head of Planning to grant but the application was later withdrawn.

Mr R Breeze and Mr A Watkin spoke as local residents opposed to the application. Mr Breeze stated that his objections were unchanged from those expressed on 16 May 2012; he particularly raised issues regarding parking and increased traffic on Northwood Terrace and the suitability of the site for the proposed use. Mr Watkin echoed these comments and also expressed concern regarding the potential for noise nuisance and the environmental impact of the potential drainage of contaminated water into the storm drain.

Mr Keable, representing the Applicant, spoke in support of the application referring to the works which had been undertaken regarding drainage, addressing the potential for noise nuisance and explained attempts to address inappropriate parking.

Councillor I T W Fletcher proposed, seconded by Councillor N A Dugmore, that a site visit take place but, on being put to the vote, four Members voted to undertake a site visit and four voted against. This being the case, the Chairman exercised his casting vote and the site visit was not agreed.

Members expressed some concern regarding the operation of a car wash at this location, particularly with regard to drainage, but were also mindful of the previous decision reached. However, there being no proposer that the application be given temporary approval for two years, it was proposed and seconded that temporary approval be given for one year.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0794 temporary planning permission be granted for one year subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(e) TWC/2012/0828 Public Open Space, Freeston Avenue, St Georges, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 9EQ

In accordance with his declaration of interest Councillor I T W Fletcher left the room during determination of this application.

In accordance with his previous declaration of interest Councillor J C Minor left the meeting prior to the discussion and determination of this item. Councillor S A W Reynolds took the Chair for this item.

This proposal for the refurbishment of a children's ball court was unanimously welcomed by Members.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0828 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(f) TWC/2012/0850 Telford Town Park Visitor Centre, Telford Town Park, Hinkshay Road, Dawley, Telford, Shropshire, TF3 4EP

This was a proposal for the installation of a children's water play area in the vicinity of the new visitor centre in Telford Town Park and associated plant room.

Members wholeheartedly welcomed the application which represented a high quality play environment for children. Some queries were raised about drying facilities but comment was also expressed that such facilities were not particularly successful at other water play sites.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0850 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

The meeting ended at 8.44pm

Chairman:

Date:

PLANS BOARD

Minutes of a meeting of the Plans Board held on Wednesday, 12 December 2012 at 6.00pm in the Reception Suite, Civic Offices, Telford, Shropshire

PRESENT: Councillors J C Minor (Chairman), N A Dugmore, I T W Fletcher, R T Kiernan, J Loveridge, G C W Reynolds, S A W Reynolds, M J Smith, C R Turley

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors A J Eade (for planning application TWC/2012/0679) and A Lawrence (for planning application TWC/2012/0292).

PB-064 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Plans Board held on Thursday, 29 November 2012 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

PB-065 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None.

PB-066 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr N A Dugmore declared an interest in planning application TWC/2011/0292 as he was Chair of the Granville Management Committee and he indicated that he would withdraw from the meeting during determination thereof.

Cllr J Loveridge commented on her position regarding planning application TWC/2012/0866 but stated that, in the circumstances she would not be withdrawing from the meeting for that item.

Cllr C R Turley commented on his position regarding planning applications TWC/2012/0261, TWC/2012/0679 and TWC/2012/0866 but stated that, in the circumstances he would not be withdrawing from the meeting for these items. Cllr C R Turley also declared an interest in planning application TWC/2011/0292 as he was a member of the Granville Management Committee and Chair of the Council's Housing, Economy & Infrastructure Scrutiny Committee and he indicated that he would withdraw from the meeting during determination thereof.

PB-067 DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS

None.

PB-068 SITE VISITS

None.

PB-069 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

Members had received a schedule of planning applications to be determined by the Board and fully considered each report and the supplementary information tabled at

the meeting regarding planning applications TWC/2011/0292, TWC/2012/0679, TWC/2012/0401, TWC/2012/0628 and TWC/2012/0899.

- (a) TWC/2011/0292 - Land adjacent to Woodhouse Farm, Granville Road, Donnington Wood, Telford, Shropshire

In accordance with their declarations of interest Councillors N A Dugmore and C R Turley left the room during determination of this application.

This was a proposal by Veolia Environmental Services (UK) PLC to construct a fully enclosed In-Vessel Composting (IVC) facility, with access road improvements, at Woodhouse Farm, Redhill, near Telford. The proposals were comprehensively detailed in the Officer's report. Members had undertaken a site visit earlier in the day.

Cllr A Lawrence, Borough Ward Member for Muxton spoke on behalf of local residents, businesses and the Parish Council to oppose the proposals. He stated that the proposals were out of character in the locality and did not align with plans for the retention and expansion of the Country Park for recreational uses in the long term. He also raised issues regarding the suitability of the location, loss of visual amenity, increased traffic generation from heavy goods vehicle movement and the associated burden upon infrastructure, impact upon the nearby Golf Centre, impact upon the watercourse, noise and dust resulting from use and road traffic safety.

Mr J Cook, on behalf of the Applicant, addressed the Board in support of the proposals. He commented upon the location of the existing landfill site and the time it would take to restore and incorporate it into the Local Nature Reserve at the end of its operational life, current industrial use in the area and traffic generation expectations. He also commented upon the benefits of the proposals including the diversion of waste from landfill, required improvements to the proposed access route and the Applicant's commitment to S106 contributions for enhancement works to Granville Country Park in order to compensate for the impact on the character of the Local Nature Reserve. He noted the wide consultation which had taken place and expressed the opinion that objections received could be mitigated or overcome through condition.

The Planning Officer acknowledged there was a need for this proposed development but considered that the current proposed site was an inappropriate location for an In-Vessel facility. She particularly commented upon the existing and evolving character of the area, the negative impact of proposed access improvements upon the Country Park and the proposed size of the facility. The Planning Officer professed the opinion that the proposals represented an unacceptable urban use in a rural area and stated that the required need for the facility could be more appropriately accommodated on a number of industrial sites in either Shropshire or Telford & Wrekin.

Members expressed disappointment at the proposed location for this facility and, referring to the site visit, commented upon the impacts of the proposals including loss of invaluable visual amenity, destruction of recreational amenity, unacceptable increased traffic generation from heavy goods vehicles and negative impact upon

users of the nearby equestrian centre. Overall, whilst Members recognised the need for such a facility, it was considered that the proposed location was inappropriate for industrial use and could not be reconciled with the associated environmental impacts. It was, therefore, unanimously:-

RESOLVED – that planning application TWC/2011/0292 be refused for the following reasons:-

- (a) The location and use of the proposed development site is unacceptable. The traffic generated by the development which would gain access to the site via the Granville Road access route ('the Western Approaches') would have an unacceptable affect on the character of the area which is predominantly rural and tranquil, its recreational use and enjoyment, on local amenities, and the recreational, leisure, sport, and heritage value of the area including the Granville Country Park, 'The Shropshire' Golf Course, and Local Nature Reserve. . The proposals are therefore considered to be in conflict with the NPPF, RSS11 policy QE6 and RSS112 policy W7; Joint Structure Plan saved polices P65, P67 and P68; Core Strategy policies CS2, CS7, CS9, CS11, CS12, and CS14; and Wrekin Local Plan saved policies UD2, UD3, UD4, E6, OL2, OL3, OL4, OL6, OL11 and OL12.
- (b) The proposed access route ('The Western Approaches') to and from the proposed waste management facility would be a permanent encroachment into the designated Green Network which is not consistent with the stated policy aims and objectives of land within the Green Network. By reason of the proposed route's location, improvement works and permanency the proposals would erode the quality and character of this part of the town's immediate environs, would conflict with the aims of retaining an appropriate supply of open land and would have a negative and harmful impact upon the character, appearance and amenity of the Green Network, the local area and Granville Country Park, the proposed extension to the Local Nature Reserve,, especially following the completion of the reclamation proposals following the cessation of the adjacent Granville Landfill site.. As such, the proposal would be contrary to RSS11, Policy W7; Joint Structure Plan Saved Policies P31 and P67; Wrekin Local Plan Saved Policies OL3 and OL4 and LDF Core Strategy Policy CS11.
- (c) There are more suitable and available alternative locations for future waste management facilities within industrial areas in the Borough of Telford & Wrekin . The proposals are therefore in conflict with: PPS10; RSS11 Policy WD3, and RSS P2R Policies W5 and W7; WLP Saved Policies UD2, UD3, UD4, E6, OL2, OL3, OL4, OL6, OL11 and OL12; Cores Strategy Policies CS2, CS7, CS9, CS11 and CS15.
- (d) The scale and mass of the proposed industrial building will adversely impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and impact on long scale viewpoints and will create a significant and incongruous feature in an elevated position; which fails to be

compatible with the rural setting. The proposal development will therefore have a detrimental impact on the rural landscape and is contrary to planning policies UD2 and UD4 of the Wrekin Local Plan, policy CS15 of the Core Strategy and guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework.

- (b) TWC/2012/0261 - Land off Wrekin Course, Wellington Road, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire

This application seeking planning permission to construct a 40 space car parking area and hardstanding to site a mobile catering van, with provision of a footpath link leading to the track up to The Wrekin had been considered at Plans Board on 20 June and 11 July 2012. At Plans Board on 11 July 2012 Members resolved to recommend approval subject to conditions and the Applicant entering into a S106 Agreement. As part of the associated highways contributions, the Development Management Manager was authorised to negotiate with the applicant and highways officers regarding an alternative to yellow lines for the parking restrictions on the existing highway. Unfortunately, alternative measures such as a boulders or bollards had proved cost-prohibitive, particularly as the contributions originally recommended were sufficient. The Section 106 Agreement was, therefore, left in abeyance until contributions were agreed.

The Applicant's Agent, Mr A Francis-Jones spoke to support the application. He explained the volunteer-led nature of the project which would be free to use and, in the circumstances, expressed his disappointment at the prohibitive request for Section 106 contributions.

The Planning Officer confirmed that following recent discussions, it was acknowledged that the suggested highways improvements would form part of a larger review in any event and, taking into account the volunteer-led, grant-funded nature of the proposals, suggested that Members may wish to consider whether Section 106 contributions were a requirement in this instance.

Members were keen to support this community-led project which would significantly enhance public enjoyment of The Wrekin as a major tourist attraction. Members noted the comments of the Planning Officer regarding the suggested highways improvements and concluded that, in the circumstances, payment of section 106 contributions was inappropriate in this case. There being no proposer that planning permission be granted subject to section 106 contributions, it was proposed and seconded that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0261 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

- (c) TWC/2012/0401 - Land to the side of 64 Mafeking Road, Hadley, Telford, Shropshire, TF1 5LB

This was an outline application which included access and scale (with other matters for later consideration in any subsequent reserved matters applications), for

residential development on land to the side of number 64 Mafeking Road. Indicative plans showed the erection of a pair of semi-detached dwellings. Hadley and Leegomery Parish Council had requested that the application be determined by the Plans Board but had subsequently withdrawn their objection as set out in the update report tabled at the meeting. The update report also detailed Highways comments.

Following withdrawal of the Parish Council's objections, Members considered that the application could be supported.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0401 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(d) TWC/2012/0628 - Ercall Wood Technology College, Golf Links Lane, Wellington, TF1 2DT

This was a full application for the demolition of existing buildings and the erection of a new 900 place secondary school with associated car parking, landscaping and sports facilities on land at and adjacent to the Ercall Wood Technology College, Wellington. Members were asked to give particular consideration to changes made in this application from those granted in a recent outline consent, in particular with regard to the provision of sports pitches; consideration of the detailed design of the building and surrounding layout; effect of lighting of the relocated tennis courts / multi use games area and ecology. An update report was tabled which detailed additional consultation responses and the signing of a Memorandum by the Director of Children and Family Services committing to the preparation of a detailed strategic vision for sporting provision, including school playing fields, to be delivered at school sites through the remainder of the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) Programme. The vision would demonstrate that the delivery of new provision would exceed any losses and that the proposals were, therefore, in accordance with Sport England's requirements as outlined in their revised response to the application.

Members welcomed this application. In response to concerns raised by Councillors N A Dugmore and I T W F Fletcher, the Planning Officer demonstrated on maps where facilities for drop off and pick up were located and advised that the access road would be widened at point of entry. The Planning Officer also advised that floodlight design details had been submitted and that Environmental Health had seen these and had not raised any objection. The design details of the floodlighting as submitted would constitute approved drawings under condition number 27.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0628 the Development Management Manager be authorised to grant planning permission subject to:

(a) the Development Management Manager accepting, on behalf of the Council as Local Planning Authority, the commitment from the Council as Local Education Authority (LEA) in the letter from the latter dated 11th December 2012 and to take any required steps to ensure that the LEA commitment is sufficient to secure the withdrawal of Sport England's objection; and

- (b) **the Council as landowner agreeing to provide a Memorandum signed by the Assistant Director: Development Business and Housing agreeing that the Council will provide Traffic Regulation Order works, upon commencement of the development; and**
- (c) **the conditions set out in the update report (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be further delegated to the Development Management Manager).**
- (e) TWC/2012/0679 - Land at Hoo Farm Animal Kingdom, Preston Upon The Weald Moors, Telford, Shropshire, TF6 6DJ

This was a full planning application for change of use of land and the erection of a temporary prefabricated building to accommodate a pre-school children's nursery which was relocating from current premises in Wrockwardine. A small car park and outdoor playing area was also proposed. This application had been deferred at the meeting of the Board on 29 November 2012 to enable Members to undertake a site visit. An update report was tabled at the meeting which advised Members that the Council's Assets & Property Department had indicated that there may well be available Council owned property which could be suitable for the Nursery to occupy.

Cllr A J Eade, Borough Ward Member for Church Aston & Lilleshall spoke in support of the application. He pointed to the requirement for high quality nursery provision in the area, the excellent reputation of the nursery which was supported by the Early Intervention Team, the exciting learning environment provided at the proposed location, retention of employment opportunities and questioned sustainability issues. He reminded Members that the nursery would soon need to vacate its current premises and, in order for the proposals to be viable, a five year temporary or personal permission was sought.

Mr P Fenwick, the applicant's agent, and Ms P Hustwick, owner of the relocating nursery, also spoke to support the application. Mr Fenwick noted the contents of the tabled update report which he considered was ambiguous regarding the availability of suitable premises and impressed upon Members the immediate availability of the Hoo Farm site. He did not believe that there was a policy precedent for this application and asked Members to consider the proposals as an exceptional case. The proposed location was Brownfield land, close to a local major employment centre and he did not consider that the proposals would generate an increase in car journeys as the current premises, in Wrockwardine, was similarly not on a bus route. Ms Hustwick advised that the nursery was moving from its current location as the building needed upgrading which the owner was unable to provide. She noted demand for high quality nursery provision in the locality and community support for the proposals. She advised that a temporary two year permission would not be financially viable as it would not provide sufficient continuity for children attending the nursery.

The Planning Officer acknowledged the high quality service provided by the nursery and the comments of the Early Intervention Team but reiterated her opinion that this did not outweigh planning considerations concerning location and sustainability. She

assured Members that the Council was eager to retain the nursery provision and that some further work on finding a more sustainable location could take place.

All Members were keen to support the retention of the high quality nursery provision offered by ABC Nurseries but there were divided opinions regarding the sustainability of the location and suitability of the access road. In response to questioning, the Assistant Director: Planning Specialist indicated that he had been assured that a more suitable location in an urban area could be found either from within the Council's own stock or privately. Councillor I T W Fletcher considered that the proposals were sustainable as there was sufficient demand for nursery provision and considered that some flexibility should be exercised to accommodate the longer temporary permission requested by the Applicant which would not only ensure financial viability but would provide continuity for children attending the nursery. These comments were echoed by Councillors N A Dugmore and R T Kiernan. Councillor G C W Reynolds recognised the need for nursery provision but when this was balanced against planning considerations, she felt that the proposed location was inappropriate and a permanent location should be found. Similarly, Councillor S A W Reynolds appreciated the valuable services that the nursery provided but she did not believe that the proposed location could be supported until firm evidence of a lack of alternative sites could be provided. A proposal to defer the application to allow further urgent investigation into the availability of suitable premises was made and seconded. Following a vote, it was by a majority:-

RESOLVED – that planning application TWC/2012/0679 be deferred to allow the Council's Assets & Property Unit to urgently investigate and identify a suitable alternative premises at which to locate the nursery.

(f) TWC/2012/0849 - Telford Town Park Visitor Centre, Telford Town Park, Hinkshay Road, Dawley, Telford, Shropshire, TF3 4EP

This was a Council proposal for the installation of an aerial rope course and associated point of sale. The proposed facility was a new commercial and educational provision within the park which would offer a variety of both low and high aerial rope features to cater for all age and ability ranges. The proposals also included the erection of a new fence and gates. Members welcomed the excellent facilities proposed by this application.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0849 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(g) TWC/2012/0866 - Land off Burford, Brookside, Telford, Shropshire

This Council application, which formed the first phase of a wider master plan for Brookside (considered at Plans Board on 29 November 2012) was for the construction of three new retail units comprising up to 621sqm floor space (Use Classes A1 and A5) with two residential flats above (Use Class C3) and associated service yard incorporating private car parking. The new units were to be an A1 retail convenience store including post office counter, hairdressers and A5 hot food takeaway and were to be replacement facilities for those existing within the local

centre. The proposals also included the creation of a car park for staff parking for the retail units and residents along with servicing area and landscaping. Members were fully supportive of this application.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0866 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(h) TWC/2012/0899 - Land Opposite 12 Church Hill, Ironbridge, Telford, Shropshire

This was a Council application for the erection of an engineered piled retaining wall to replace failed wall section. An update report was tabled which detailed further consultation responses received. Members noted that the wall acted as a retaining feature to the public highway of Church Road and it was vital to the safety of Church Hill that the wall was replaced and remediated in accordance with the Council's statutory duty.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0899 the Development Management Manager be authorised to grant planning permission following the expiration of the consultation period on 13th December, 2012 subject to the conditions set out in the update report.

PB-070 URGENCY RESOLUTION - SECTION 100B(4), LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

The Chairman of the meeting made the following statement:

“I am of the opinion that the following items of business should be dealt with as a matter of urgency at this meeting to avoid any unnecessary delay.”

PB-071 PLANNING APPLICATION TWC/2011/0959 - ISOMBRIDGE FARM, ISOMBRIDGE, SHROPSHIRE TF6 6NF

This application, seeking planning permission to convert two agricultural buildings located at either end of a small field on the edge of Isombridge Farm to a live/work unit, had previously been considered by Plans Board on 11 April 2012 and 1 August 2012. At Plans Board on 1 August, Members resolved to recommend approval subject to the Applicant entering into S106 Agreement and conditions outlined in the update report. The Applicant had not yet signed the S106 Agreement as the Agent had raised concerns regarding the wording of Conditions 8 and 9 of the draft decision notice. These conditions related to the removal of permitted development rights and measures to ensure that the live/work unit remained as a single unit with no opportunity to create a separate residential dwelling in the open countryside. Following discussions with the Applicant's agent, a revised Section 106 Agreement was suggested. Members welcomed the application and were satisfied with the revised conditions.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2011/0959 planning permission be granted subject to the applicants entering into a

revised Section 106 Agreement which ensures that the live unit and the work unit are not let or sold separately to each other and further subject to the revised conditions as set out in the report.

PB-072 PLANNING APPLICATION TWC/2012/0882 - SUTTON HILL ROUNDABOUT, SUTTON HILL, TELFORD, SHROPSHIRE, TF7 4JP

This was a proposal to display four non-illuminated advertisement signs on the Sutton Hill traffic island. Members considered that the signage was acceptable in this location.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0882 advertisement consent be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

The meeting ended at 7.34 pm

Chairman:
Date:

STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Standards Committee held on Thursday, 13 December, 2012 at 6.00 p.m. at Civic Offices, Telford

PRESENT: Councillors R.C. Evans (Chair), T.J. Hope, A.D. McClements and R.J. Sloan

ST-14 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Standards Committee held on 19 September 2012 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

ST-15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors S. Davies, M.B. Hosken and A.J. Stanton

ST-16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

ST-17 UPDATE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW STANDARDS REGIME

The Legal Services Manager and Deputy Monitoring Officer presented a report which provided the Committee with an update on the implementation of the new standards regime.

Except for two Parish Councils where details were still awaited, all authorities had now confirmed that they had adopted a Code of Conduct. Unfortunately, there were still a number of Declaration of Interest Forms outstanding from Parish Councillors. Officers continued to chase these, and had clearly explained to the Clerks of Town and Parish Councils the implications of failure to provide this information. The Parish and Town Councils with outstanding Declarations of Interests forms were listed in the report. The information from all the forms received had now been uploaded to the Council's website. There had been no complaints against Councillors received since the last meeting of the Committee in December.

Members considered what further action could be taken to encourage compliance with the new regime, and enquired whether there was resistance from some Parish Councils. The Legal Services Manager advised that, apart from a couple of Parishes, some, though not all, forms had been received from those Councils listed in the report. There did not appear to be any open hostility from Parishes to the new regime, and the Monitoring Officer had been attempting to strike a balance between monitoring and enforcement. While endorsing a low-key approach, Members felt that it was unfair to those who had completed a Declaration of Interests form if others were not doing so, and

therefore a further reminder should be sent to Town and Parish Council Clerks about outstanding forms.

The Chair referred to the Committee's work programme, and whether anything needed to be added. It was felt that there was still some confusion among Members about the implications of the new standards framework on issues such as pre-determination, and that some more training and guidance could be provided (including examples from case studies). The Legal Services Manager stated that a Members Information Seminar could be arranged for 2013, and that dispensations was another topic that could be covered. In terms of the number of meetings for the 2013/14 municipal year, Members were of the view that only three programmed meetings were required for delivering the work programme. It was noted that the Committee's terms of reference stated that quarterly reports would be received from the Monitoring Officer, but that these didn't necessarily need to be in the form of a formal Committee report.

RESOLVED –

- (a) that progress towards adoption of a code of conduct by the Borough and Town & Parish Councils, and the completion of their interests forms by Members, be noted, and that the Monitoring Officer be authorised to send a reminder to the Clerks of those Parish and Town Councils with forms still outstanding;**
- (b) that the update on complaints received since the adoption of the new code of conduct be noted;**
- (c) that an Information Seminar, for Borough and Town & Parish Members, be arranged for the first quarter of 2013 to provide further clarification and guidance on the new standards regime;**
- (d) that for the 2013/14 municipal year, meetings of the Committee be programmed for July 2013, November 2013 and March 2014.**

The meeting ended at 6.25 pm

Chairman:

Date:

BUDGET AND FINANCE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Budget and Finance Scrutiny Committee held on Tuesday, 16th October 2012 at 6.30pm in the Scrutiny Meeting Room, Civic Offices, Telford

PRESENT: Councillors S. Reynolds (Chair), R. Evans, A. Lawrence, C. Mollett, G. Reynolds, R. Sloan, A. Stanton and Co-optees F. Robinson and R. Williams.

Also attending: Cllr. W. McClements, Cabinet Member Resources & Service Delivery; P. Harris, Finance Manager, Corporate Finance & Customer Services; R. Jones, Community Engagement Equalities and Action Manager; S. Jones, Scrutiny Officer.

BFSC-6 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Budget and Finance Scrutiny Committee held on 31st July 2012 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

BFSC-7 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

K. Clarke, Assistant Director Finance, Audit & Information Governance; Andy Challenor, Community Engagement and Equalities Manager.

BFSC-8 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr. Sloan declared a non-prejudicial interest in matters pertaining to the Department of Work & Pensions.

BFSC-9 SERVICE & FINANCIAL PLANNING UPDATE – CABINET REPORT OF 20TH SEPTEMBER

The Chairman welcomed Cllr. Fiona Robinson from Newport Town Council to the Committee. Cllr. Robinson had been appointed by the Scrutiny Management Board as a Town & Parish Council Co-optee. Cllr. Robinson was invited to introduce herself, and the Chairman said she felt Cllr. Robinson's experience would be very useful to the work of the Committee.

Cllr. Reynolds then invited Cllr. McClements and officers present to provide a briefing on the Service & Financial Planning Update report which had been presented to Cabinet on 20th September. The Finance Manager summarised the key points.

The report provided an update on changes to funding mechanisms which would affect the Council from April 2013, and additional savings proposals which had been published early on for 2013/14. The following points were made:

- The number of changes being made to local government finance meant that there was a high degree of uncertainty about funding from April 2013 and made forecasting extremely difficult. In 2012/13 the Formula Grant accounted for 53% of the Council's net revenue spending and any changes to the funding mechanism could have a great impact on the Council's overall financial position.
- From April 2013 the existing Formula Grant system of funding for local authorities would be replaced by the Business Rate Retention Scheme. The proposed scheme was made up of a number of complex and inter-related components which were described in the report. A system of top-ups and tariffs would be applied depending on whether the authority's base rates baseline is above or below the baseline funding level to establish a fair starting point and this would be fixed until 2020 with only an RPI increase. Authorities would retain 50% of business rate growth up to a threshold deemed to be "disproportionate" beyond which no additional growth would be retained locally. There was a safety net for authorities experiencing unforeseen falls in business rates, but the threshold for top-ups would be set within the range of 7.5%-10% below an authority's baseline funding level meaning the authority would have to fund the shortfall. It was felt the scheme had watered down the original intentions to incentivise authorities to support business growth by capping the retained growth income, and had transferred significant risk from government to authorities where there is a fall in business rates. Consultation on the scheme had closed on 20th September and feedback was being reviewed. The outcome would be announced in the Autumn Statement due on 5th December with Councils receiving confirmation of settlements between 6th and 31st December.
- The government had announced the abolition of the Council Tax Benefit Scheme and the introduction of localised Council Tax Support schemes. Authorities would be allocated a grant which would be 10% less than currently paid out in benefits. Pension age claimants would be protected but authorities had discretion to design their own schemes for working age claimants to manage the funding shortfall. Cllr. McClements also informed members that the government had just announced £100 million additional funding for transitional grants which Councils could apply for to support schemes during the first year but which limited the maximum cut to benefits for working age claimants who have never paid Council Tax to 8.5% and to other set criteria. Consultation on the Telford & Wrekin proposed Council Tax Support scheme closed on 26th October and the Scrutiny Officer reminded members that a scrutiny meeting had been scheduled for 23rd October for members of the Budget & Finance and Co-operative & Communities Scrutiny Committees to take part in the consultation.
- The government had consulted on changes to schools funding and details had been released in June. The dedicated Schools Grant had been retained, but there would be less flexibility in how funding would be allocated with a move from local formula (currently with around 42 factors) to a formula set within national parameters with about a dozen criteria. Schools were being consulted on the new formula subject to final agreement by the Education Funding Agency (EFA). From April 2013, funding would flow directly to schools based on pupil numbers.

This was likely to have an impact on the financial stability of smaller secondary schools or schools with falling rolls and it was anticipated that action may be needed to address the issue for schools where there may be interim falls in pupil numbers. The proposals also affected Special Education in requiring a more standardised funding system removing funding linked to lower value statements and a lesser role for Councils in commissioning high needs places with more involvement of the EFA. A report would go to Cabinet on 8th November outlining the funding methodology which would be sent to the EFA.

- The Public Health functions of the PCT would transfer to the Council from April 2013. Under current proposals the Council would receive a grant of around £7.3m for functions on which the PCT currently spends £10.4m. The Council's approach would be to spend within the ring-fenced grant and it was felt that this was manageable particularly if transitional arrangements were put in place. There were continuing pressures relating to the transfer of costs from the PCT to the Council from the withdrawal of Continuing Healthcare (CHC) funding. One-off payments had been made to the Council to offset additional costs but this was not a long-term solution. Cllr. McClements emphasised the huge drop in the level of CHC funding in Telford & Wrekin over the last 4 years. Expenditure in Shropshire had been double that in Telford & Wrekin up to 6 months ago, but the level had now been scaled back to the same as Telford & Wrekin and it was felt that the funding had been moved elsewhere. There was a risk that the current application of the funding mechanism would become embedded and would disadvantage Telford & Wrekin over future years. There was a DoH toolkit for the application of CHC funding and the Audit Commission had identified significant differences in what PCTs spend. The Scrutiny Officer reminded members that the Health & Adult Care Scrutiny Committee was looking at the issue of CHC and the result of this work would be reported back to the Budget & Finance Scrutiny Committee.
- Additional savings proposals identified for 2013/14 were shown in Appendix 1 of the report. As mentioned previously there was a great deal of uncertainty about the finances and planning totals for next year. The economy had not recovered as quickly as hoped and there was an assumption that local authorities would continue to bear the burden of rebalancing the finances and work continued to find savings.
- The Community Engagement Equalities and Action Manager gave an update on the equality impact assessments, consultation and communication relating to the additional savings proposals which was described in the main body of the report and in a separate briefing note. There had been widespread consultation on the three year budget proposals in 2011/12 so this did not need to be repeated. The approach this year had three elements:
 - Equality Impact Assessments and / or targeted service user engagement proportionate to individual proposals. Each proposal was evaluated to decide what was required so that resources could be focused on proposals which would have a more significant impact.
 - A broad communications strategy focussing on key messages about the Council's budget position and approach to managing the budget

- Contingency for further consultation in January should the Council's settlement in December be worse than anticipated and more new savings are needed. £7.5m of savings had been identified in the report which went to Cabinet in September to meet savings target for 2013/14, but if, for example, the settlement in December was £6m less than expected there would need to be consultation on the £6m new savings.
- The Chancellor had announced £270m of funding for Councils to freeze Council Tax and a requirement for a referendum for Councils planning an increase above 2% in 2013/14. Further detail was awaited in the autumn statement.
- In previous years Cabinet had agreed the budget proposals before Christmas but this year it was quite likely they would not be agreed for consultation until January dependent upon the date that the settlement is received.

Members asked questions and discussed a number of issues raised in the briefing.

- Cllr. Stanton wanted to know how the "disproportionate benefit" had been defined as a cap for the retention of business rate growth. The Finance Manager explained that the level is set so that Councils cannot benefit by more than 1% p.a. above the baseline funding level. The additional money would be retained in the system and used to fund the safety net for authorities experiencing in-year fluctuations in business rates. If the borough lost a key business the Council's yield would drop but the safety net would not be triggered until rates fell to 7.5%-10% below the baseline funding level and the Council would need to fund the gap which could be as much as £5-6 million.
- Cllr. Lawrence asked if the Council had done a breakdown of businesses in the borough to analyse the risks/opportunities around business rates. Cllr. McClements agreed this was a good idea and if a list did not already exist it would be put together. Cllr. Lawrence also wanted to know what the Council is doing to target large businesses to discuss how their needs can be supported to ensure they remain in the borough. Cllr. McClements said there had been government lobbying to support the retention of the MOD in Donnington and to promote the message out that it was cheaper to build and expand in Telford.
- Members wanted to know with the system of tariffs and top-ups to equalise the start position between authorities, whether Telford & Wrekin would be in a tariff (i.e. collect more than assessed as needing) or top-up (i.e. collect less than assessed as needing) position. Cllr. McClements thought that the Council would be in a top-up position and as this would be set to 2020 it was necessary to drive business growth to generate income. The components of the scheme are very complex and the final position would not be known until December but it was unlikely that the Council would be better off.
- Cllr. Lawrence said that growth would be very important going forward and Cllr. McClements also pointed out that the funding for the New Homes Bonus scheme

was set aside from the balance of funding from business rates before the balance is re-distributed to local authorities as revenue support grant. This meant that authorities needed to build above the national average rate to benefit from the funding scheme. If the Council builds below the national average there would be a net loss.

- Cllr. Sloan said that Telford & Wrekin had done well from public sector employment but there would be an inevitable scaling back and authorities who were more reliant on the public sector jobs with less private sector growth potential would be disadvantaged. He was disappointed that the original incentives to encourage growth had been dampened under the proposed scheme. Cllr. Lawrence said if the public sector is shrinking, the emphasis should be on growing the private sector. Cllr. McClements said that in Telford & Wrekin manufacturing accounted for 18.6% of the economy compared to 10.1% nationally but there was still a lot of social deprivation and wages in the borough were below national averages. The public sector in Telford & Wrekin accounted for 26% of the economy which was below the national average.
- Cllr. Sloan said he had supported the concept of driving out savings through procurement but was concerned about the pace and whether the projected £2.1m savings were on target. Cllr. McClements said there had been a lot of procurement activity and some issues of double-counting had been ironed out. It was difficult to show savings through procurement when services changed and were re-tendered and there was an element of judgement involved but attempts were made to categorise the reason for the saving in the budget proposals.
- There was a further question about whether the Council has the right skills in-house to deliver the savings and Cllr. McClements said that two extra posts had been created as an Invest to Save investment to bring extra resource and key skills to procurement.
- The Chairman asked about the Equality Impact Assessments and service user engagement on the additional savings proposals and whether it was sufficient to avoid as far as possible the risk of challenge and Judicial Review. The Community Engagement Equalities and Action Manager said that challenges were usually made when the impact of changes on groups with protected characteristics had not been adequately assessed and the Council's approach was to carry out targeted engagement on specific proposals with service users and affected groups – sometimes a small cut can have a significant impact on a small number of people.

The Cabinet member and officers left the meeting at the end of the discussion.

Relating to the table "Savings Proposals by Type" in Appendix 1 members felt it was confusing for people not used to reading financial spreadsheets to have "income" shown as a saving and this should be explained in future reports.

BFSC-10 WORK PROGRAMME

Members of the Budget & Finance Scrutiny Committee had been invited to other meetings where items of interest were being discussed to avoid duplication of work and the Chairman invited feedback from members who had attended these meetings.

- Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee, 18th September
The Scrutiny Officer reported that the discussion on value for money of children in care placements had been deferred until 5th November and members were invited to attend.

- Audit Committee, 25th September
The Chairman, Cllr. Evans and Mr. Roy Williams had attended for the item on Capital Receipts. The item had been held in closed session as it involved the likely disclosure of exempt financial information. Mr. Williams said that the information had been provided in a clear and open fashion, but felt that the Budget & Finance Committee should continue to monitor this as it was a high risk issue for the Council.

- Co-operative & Communities Scrutiny Committee, 11th October
The Chairman, Cllr. Mollett and Mr. Roy Williams had attended a presentation on the proposed Council Tax Support scheme. Mr. Williams said the presentation had been very good and that it was difficult to see any room for manoeuvre with the proposals because reducing the cuts for one group of people would mean another group paying more. Cllr. Sloan was concerned about the cost of administration and bureaucracy of each authority having its own scheme and about the potential impact on collection rates which must be closely monitored. The Chairman was concerned about the enforcement of the empty property tax. The Chairman said it had been agreed that a joint meeting of the Co-operative & Communities and Budget & Finance Scrutiny Committees would be held on 23rd October to agree a response to the proposed scheme.

The date of the next meeting on 18th December was noted. It was agreed that if the 2013/14 full budget proposals had not been approved by Cabinet by this date which was unlikely, the Committee would look at the additional savings proposals already published and a report on the changes to schools funding.

The meeting ended at 7.30pm.

Chairman:.....

Date:.....

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee held on Monday, 5th November 2012 at 6.00 pm in the Scrutiny Meeting Room, Civic Offices, Telford

PRESENT: Councillors M. Ion (Chair), S. Burrell, G. Green, J. Greenaway, J. Loveridge, A. Mackenzie, M. Smith, C. Turley and Co-optees R. Aveley, S. Harris, E. Ofori, S. Rayner, M. Ward.

Attending: L. Johnston, Director Children & Family Services; K. Perry, Assistant Director Children's Safeguarding; J. Collins, Assistant Director Education & Skills; V. McKay, Group Manager Commissioning, Procurement & Brokerage (CYP); S. Jones, Scrutiny Officer.

CYPSC-7 MINUTES

The Chairman once again thanked Sue Harris, Head Teacher of Shortwood Primary School for hosting the previous meeting, and thanked Karen Perry, Viv McKay and Maria White for providing reports and information for members at the meeting.

Reviewing the minutes of 18th September, Cllr. Greenaway asked for a breakdown of residential providers in the regional contract framework by tier.

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee held on 18th September 2012 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

CYPSC-8 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Co-optees A. Atkinson and S. Ali; Cabinet Member Cllr. Paul Watling. Cllrs. Burrell and Greenaway were only able to attend part of the meeting due to a conflicting group meeting.

CYPSC-9 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

CYPSC-10 CHILDREN IN CARE PLACEMENTS

The Chairman reminded members that the role of the Committee was to scrutinise the outcomes and impact of policies and procedures and not the operational systems which were up to officers to determine. He also reminded members of the Committee's agreed objectives for the review of the Children in Care Placement Strategy which were about the **safety** of children and young people in care, the **value for money** of placements and the Council's responsibility, if any, for children placed in the borough by other authorities. The focus of this item was to scrutinise costs - how money is allocated and whether spending offers best value for money. The Assistant Director Children's Safeguarding was invited to summarise the key points of the Children in Care Monthly Performance Dashboard circulated as Appendix B, and the

following points were highlighted:

- The key message was the high cost of residential placements which accounted for half of the placement budget for 43 placements.
- The number of children in care had risen to 303 at the end of September, and 306 at the end of October.
- The report showed cessations from April-September 2012, but it was too early to make comparisons with the previous year's data as the position can change quickly.
- Placement types showed that over the previous year the number of children placed for adoption had fluctuated between 12 and 19; kinship care had risen then fallen; agency foster care was similar to the same point as last year but internal foster care placements had increased which was good because the cost was lower and internal foster carers were more likely to be local; there was an overall increase in the number of residential care placements and a decrease in the number of children placed with parents.
- Unit costs had decreased due to the placement mix and commissioning strategy which had reduced the average weekly unit cost of residential placements.
- Total projected placement costs had dipped in July but then risen; residential and external fostering remained significantly over budget; internal foster care and relative care remained over budget but by a relatively small margin.
- Narrative in the report described a range of activity to reduce costs:
 - Family Connect was showing early indications of impact by diverting less complex cases away from the safeguarding service, freeing up resource to focus support on children needing interventions so they are less likely to need a care plan;
 - Commissioning and procurement would be reported in more detail later in the meeting;
 - A new model for Child Protection conferences had been developed to focus more on the child's experience particularly in cases of neglect;
 - There was to be even greater emphasis on getting children safely out of care through the work of the Permanence Panel (e.g. back home, adoption, family carer);
 - The allowance for internal foster carers had been increased to improve competitiveness, the response to enquiries had been improved to speed up the approval process and recruitment activity was bringing in promising enquiries, particularly from the weekly stall in the town centre.

There was a lengthy discussion about the costs of care placements, during which the Group Commissioning Manager tabled a report describing how efficiencies were being driven out through the commissioning strategy. The Council was part of the West Midlands Commissioning Partnership which had set up collaborative framework contracts for agency foster care (from April 2011) and residential care (from May 2012). Staffordshire and Worcestershire authorities had led the work with support from the West Midlands Regional Improvement & Efficiency Partnership. It was difficult to calculate exact savings as children move in and out of placements and through age fee bands and changing arrangements, but the full year effect of the foster care framework contract had been analysed and assessed as being over £100,000 based on the transfer of existing placements to the new framework and the estimated cost of

new placements that would have been made under the old arrangements. A breakdown of the analysis was shown in Appendix 1 of the report. The residential contract set up in May was relatively new but had already resulted in price reductions. Sixteen placements had moved to the new contract arrangements resulting in an immediate saving of £3,979 per week, equating to £175,000 p.a. assuming the children remained in the same placement. It was expected that further discounts would be applied where a number of children were placed with one provider.

During the discussion, members explored a number of issues:

- Members questioned the differential between the average unit cost of internal (£272p.w.) and agency (£806p.w.) foster carers - almost three times as much. The Assistant Director explained that the differential was not as great as it appeared from the figures presented because the internal foster care cost did not take account of staff costs. As well as Fees and allowances paid to the foster carers (the allowances vary according to the age and needs of the child)
- The true cost would include:
 - The cost of the fostering social workers (i.e. social workers supporting the carer). This would include costs of recruitment, training, salaries, support, overheads etc.
- The cost of external foster care includes the total agency costs. This would include:
 - The fees and allowances paid by the agency to the foster carer
 - The fostering social workers (to support the carers) employed by the agency (not the Council)
 - The agency overheads and fees.
- It was difficult to calculate the true cost of internal foster care, but work had started on doing this and would be factored into the costs presented on the Dashboard in future. True cost was likely to be considerably less than £600p.w. meaning the differential between internal and external foster care was more realistically well over £200pw. Mr. Reynolds asked whether the unit cost for Relative/Friend Carers included on-costs, and the Assistant Director said that it did not and this needed to be factored in, although costs were generally lower because the cohort tended to be from younger age groups.
- Members wanted to know when the external foster care framework contract would be re-tendered and whether the cost of procurement had been factored into the unit costs. The framework contract had been set up in April 2011 for three years. The cost of procurement was minimal because Staffordshire Council had led the exercise so procurement and transaction costs had not been factored in.
- Members asked about the reasons for needing residential care and the balance between foster and residential care. The Assistant Director said that the number placed with agency foster carers had remained static over the last year, while the number placed with internal foster carers had increased. In the last three months, all placements had been with internal foster carers and there was a need to keep recruiting. However there were some children whose needs are just too complex for a foster carer and needed residential care. Sometimes a child could be placed in foster care but their behaviour deteriorates and efforts were made to put support around the foster carer to prevent the breakdown of the placement. The Assistant Director agreed with the Chairman that there would always be a need for

residential care for some children but efforts were being made to reduce the numbers.

- There was a lengthy discussion about the costs of residential care which at £3000pw for 43 children accounted for almost half the budget. Members wanted to know why the cost was so high and whether it would be cheaper for the Council to have its own home in the borough. Members were told:
 - Care homes are tightly regulated by Ofsted and must comply with the regulatory framework and minimum ratios of staff. Once void rates are factored in, the costs are high, but efforts were being made to reduce costs.
 - Detailed costings had been done for a Council owned care home. Costs involved property, a registered manager, regulation 33 inspections, registration of the home, staff 24/7, other one-to-one support, transport, education etc. The estimated cost was £2,700 per week per child which was not significantly lower than the current residential care costs. Voids also need to be factored in. A small home may not be able to accommodate the mix of young people needing residential care, for example a vulnerable young woman could not be placed with a young man exhibiting inappropriate sexual behaviour and risk has to be factored in.
 - The Chairman asked for assurances that the children in external residential care could not be provided for better within the borough and the Assistant Director assured him that this was the case. The Assistant Director meets managers every few weeks to review residential placements to make sure the children are safe and making progress. When children are ready they are moved into foster care, but those with very complex needs can remain in residential care for a long time because their care needs to be stabilised. The reviews also check that health contributions are claimed where appropriate.
 - A member pressed the point that the West Midlands authorities should use their collective bargaining power harder and felt that there must be more that could be done. Officers said that this was what the procurement exercise had been about and that the 13 authorities involved had used their buying power to negotiate better prices. There were 144 residential providers on the 2 year framework contract – this would be monitored and evaluated to identify where costs could be driven down further. Work with providers would continue through Provider Forum meetings. A meeting had also been arranged with a not-for-profit provider to find out more about their business model.
 - The cheapest provider on the framework in the borough cost £2,095 per week but the cheapest was not always the best. Providers had been evaluated on a 60% price 40% quality basis, and the tier one providers were always searched first for vacancies. A member questioned whether the quality of provision had been compromised for lower prices but was told that in fact the procurement exercise had enhanced the quality assurance checks.
 - The Chairman was given firm assurance that the costs of external care had come down due to the framework contracts.

- There was a discussion about the budget overspend. Members wanted to know why the gap between forecast and budget was so significant (£10m allocated in April was overspent by £1.5m) and why there is a consistent year-on-year overspend which cannot be accounted for by the variations in numbers. Members were informed:
 - Although the number of children in care had been relatively stable over the last 12 months it had increased by around 50 in the last 5 years. The lowest number in 2010/11 was 264. Decisions made today could have a long-term impact on the budget – for example a child placed in residential care may continue there until age 16-18. The costs are modelled through so if the budget is overspent at year end one year it is likely to be overspent going forward.
 - The budget position shows the need to reduce the number of residential placements – replacing 10 residential placements to other types of placement would save around £1m per year. A lot of new ideas were being looked at to help for example the use of Jigsaw, recruiting super foster-carers as Council staff, putting in place a Support Panel to look at non-emergency, edge of care cases to put wrap around support in place to prevent children needing to be taken into care. Asked what work is done with parents when their children are in care, the Assistant Director explained that preventative support is provided to parents before children are taken into care, and a lot of work is done with parents with children in care to try and get children safely home. Different approaches were being tried in cases of domestic abuse or neglect though an interim support initiative.
 - Asked whether she felt the budget was realistic, the Assistant Director replied that it was not realistic in terms of being achieved by the end of the year and the overspend would carry over to 2013/14 but she was working closely with the Assistant Director Family & Cohesion Services on a cost improvement plan to improving value for money and reduce costs - for example to prevent repeated care.
- The Chairman asked how Telford & Wrekin compared to other authorities and whether overspend was a national issue. The Director of Children & Family Services said that the Association of Directors of Children's Services had just produced its third report on Safeguarding Pressures which showed a mixed picture – 60% of authorities had rising costs and 40% were reducing, but the reasons for this needed to be unpicked. Some authorities had invested heavily in early intervention which was the route Telford & Wrekin had gone down but more work was needed to understand the correlations and reasons. This was something that could come back to scrutiny. The Assistant Director said that some authorities had found innovative solutions – for example Reading had done a lot of work on stopping baby after bay being repeatedly removed into care from the same parents – and these ideas were being looked at. Only one authority in the West Midlands had reduced the number of children coming into care but they had been rated by Ofsted as inadequate. Cllr. Mackenzie was concerned about the potential consequences of not taking a child into care – the Assistant Director said that historically there had been a tendency to keep children on protection plans for too

long and there was a need to draw a balance so that the right children were brought into care.

CYPSC-11 OFSTED ACTION PLAN

The Chairman reminded members that a further meeting would be held in December to review the Children's Services Improvement Plan in detail and this item was to receive an interim update on progress to date.

The Director of Children & Family Services (DCFS) said that the Senior Leadership Team, led by the Assistant Director for Children's Safeguarding, had been developing an integrated Children's Services Improvement Plan in response to the Ofsted report and recommendations. The Assistant Director (AD) explained that the plan was work in progress. Not all the Ofsted recommendations were for the Council and a workshop was being held on 15th November to integrate health actions. The AD briefed members on the report circulated as Appendix C which showed progress against recommendations for immediate (i.e. by 10/08/21) and 3 month (i.e. by 10/11/12) action. The briefing focussed on the steps taken in safeguarding to rectify issues requiring immediate action as these were of most urgent concern. The issues related to the safeguarding duty desk taking too long to gather information and process or record decisions. Decisions about referrals or care orders should be made within 24 hours which was not always happening and this practice was considered by Ofsted to be unsafe.

An additional report was tabled to show the impact of the immediate steps taken on the number and percentage of completed contacts, referrals and Section 47 visits within the 24 hour guideline monitored on a weekly basis between 27/08/12 and 08/10/12.

The report showed:

- Contacts completed within 24 hours (i.e. calls from families or professionals to Family Connect) had shown steady progress from 91.26% to 100%.
- Referrals completed within 24 hours (i.e. where the social worker had decided more support is needed than just advice) had improved from 60.41% to 82%. The remaining 18% had been completed within 2-5 days. There was sometimes a good reason for not sending in a social worker within 24 hours unless the child is in immediate danger, for example if the health visitor was not contactable that day and it was better to wait to get information from someone who knew the child which might mean a visit by a SW was not necessary and the AD was confident that these cases were justifiable.
- Strategy meetings and Section 47 visits (a single agency or joint visit with the police where there is a child protection enquiry – if necessary a child protection conference is held within 15 days of the last strategy meeting) completed within 24 hours had improved from 50% to 100% for the three weeks from 23/09/12 to 08/10/12.

The data showed a much better and a more timely response to children which had been recommended by Ofsted, and the weekly monitoring meant the data could be interrogated to analyse the reasons for any dips in performance. There had been a

dip across the board w/c 03.09.23 which was the first week of the school term and there had been sickness in the team and the detailed analysis enabled contingencies to be planned for similar circumstances.

There was one recommendation (Ensure that all looked after children have a qualified social worker and that the minimum statutory visiting requirements are complied with) which would not be met by the three month target. This could have been rectified by bringing in agency social workers, but the non-qualified case workers had been working with the children for a long time and it was felt that it was not in the children's interest to suddenly disrupt their relationship with their caseworker and a longer term solution was being found that was better for the children.

The Chairman commented that progress was very encouraging. There were then a number of questions.

- Cllr. Greenaway had left the meeting at 6.30 but a question was tabled on her behalf about the position on providing partner agencies with a clear definition of the roles and responsibilities of the community social work team where the original hope had been to produce a draft report by the end of October. The relevant manager had considered this but it was necessary to look at the role of the social workers across the whole system so early intervention and edge of care could be brought together.
- The Chairman questioned the issue of statutory visits for out of borough children – members had received assurances at the last meeting that these happened. The AD assured members that the visits were happening. The data did not always show 100% of statutory visits completed but this was thought to be an issue with a time lag in the recording system rather than the duty was not being met. A piece of work was being done to separate the children in Telford & Wrekin from those outside the borough to ensure the service is not diminished. The DCFS said that the AD had focussed on the quality of visits and that they were not just about timing.
- Members wanted to know why there were children without a qualified social worker and whether it was because it was difficult to recruit qualified social workers. This was a historic issue – in the past there had been not been a requirement for all caseworkers to be qualified social workers but this now needed to change. A lot of work had been done to recruit qualified social workers or to train and qualify internal staff. The number of social work vacancies had reduced significantly – there were 10 currently 10 vacancies from a cohort of over 70. The future looked positive with high quality trainees coming through the national “Step up to Social Work” fast-track graduate programme who would be graduating in August. There were also some very good candidates with rich backgrounds and depth of experience coming through the “Return to Social Work” campaign. Professional fees for practising social workers had gone up to £192 for 2 years but this was not a barrier to entry because the Council funded the fee.
- Mrs. Ward asked for more information about the contingency for sickness cover for the Safeguarding Advisors Team. The plan is for social workers from other parts of the service move into the team temporarily. Previous delays were not just an

issue about the availability of social workers but the process of authorisation by managers.

The Chairman thanked officers for attending the meeting and providing reports and information to the Committee and officers left the meeting. The Chairman reminded members that the sub-group would meet on 9th November to consider the information provided to date as part of the review of Children in Care Placements to identify further work that needed to be done and to start to formulate a report and recommendations which would be considered by the Committee next year.

CYPSC-12 EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

The Assistant Director Education & Skills presented reports on the 2012 Key Stage 2 (KS2) and Key Stage 4 (KS4) results for the borough and for children in care. The information was from the first statistical release and the data would not be validated until December. These showed:

- KS2 results showed an upward trend from 2011 with notable improvements in English and Maths. The assessment of writing skills had changed making the results not directly comparable with previous years. There had been improvements at Level 4+ (pupils expected to attain the benchmark results) and Level 5 (higher attaining pupils) in English, Maths and English & Maths combined and against national averages. Details of the increases were provided in the report.
- There were no schools below floor standard at KS2 in 2012 which was a marked improvement on last year when 4 had fallen below. Intervention packages had been put into those schools and they had shown significant improvement.
- There was an improving trajectory at KS4 with 60.7% in Telford & Wrekin achieving 5 or more A*-C grade GCSEs including English and Maths compared to an average of 58.4% in the all England state funded sector. The report showed Telford & Wrekin performing well overall against statistical neighbours, West Midlands and all England averages.
- The floor standard at KS4 had risen in consecutive years from 30% to 35% to 40%. In 2012 there was only one school which had fallen below floor standard due to GCSE English results being 7% lower than expected (38% against an expected 45%).
- There were 9 looked after children in the 2012 KS2 cohort. The results were lower than the Telford & Wrekin averages (L4+ English 66.7%, L4+ Maths 63.6%). Results can fluctuate significantly because of the small numbers in each cohort. Nationally children in care perform lower than national averages, but the key concern is to close the gap.
- The 2012 KS4 results for children in care in Telford & Wrekin were shown in the report. 35.7% had achieved the national benchmark (5 or more A*-C GCSEs

including English and Maths) which was considered very good although was largely attributed to the particular cohort many of whom had not experienced disruptions in their education or placement breakdown and had remained engaged with education. However, the results were still below the Telford & Wrekin average and again highlighted the need to close the gap. The 2012 national averages for children in care would not be published until December but would be reported to the Committee.

- Ofsted had changed the rating framework. The old categories were Outstanding, Good or Satisfactory with sub-categories Notice to Improve or Special Measures. The Satisfactory rating had been replaced by Requires Improvement, also with the sub-categories. The standards required to achieve each grade had also been lifted. Since 1st September, 5 primary schools had been inspected by Ofsted under the new framework. Three had been rated Good, two had been rated as Requires Improvement. At secondary level, Lord Silkin had achieved Good or above in all categories which was cause for celebration.

The Chairman commented that there was much to celebrate in the results and hoped the encouraging picture would continue into future years. Members asked a number of questions and were given the following information:

- In terms of reasons for the improving picture, schools seemed to be feeling the pressure and responding to national strategies. The Learning Partnership enabled Head Teachers to share good practice, learn and apply lessons from each other there seemed to be a real collective desire to see school improvement right across the borough.
- There was no geographical concentration of schools below floor standard at KS2 in 2011. 2 were in the south, one was central and one in Wellington.
- Asked whether support for looked after children is equal across all schools, it was hoped there was no disparity as all schools had a designated teachers and governor for looked after children supported by regional network meetings. However Ofsted had found that the quality of Personal Education Plans (PEPs) which are a statutory requirement for children in care were too variable. More recent plans tended to be tighter and better quality but some needed to be sharpened up.
- Regarding the English GCSE results, one school had been affected by the change to the assessment standard and had dropped 4% on expected results but a number of the pupils were doing re-sits and it was hoped the results would lift the average up to over 50%.
- Members wanted to know why 6 of the children in care had not achieved any GCSEs at all. The AD agreed that this was not good, but compared to the national performance for children in care this number would be expected to be higher. There can be several reasons for pupils getting no qualifications – for example young people unable to attend school because they are in the criminal justice system or pregnant, children in special schools or if a young person has moved

schools and not been entered for exams. This is monitored and care placement plans have an education plan running alongside to minimise disruption to education. In terms of follow-up support, these children remain under the transition team so they have the support of a key worker to help them look at college courses or employment routes. They also keep their PEP which is tailored through. If a young person leaves care at 16 and chooses to move away they do not continue to receive support.

The Chairman requested a breakdown of KS4 results for children in care in Telford & Wrekin schools and outside the borough, and a breakdown of average performance by gender.

CYPSC-13 WORK PROGRAMME

The next meeting would be on 11th December to review the Children's Service Improvement Plan in detail.

The meeting ended at 8.05 pm.

Chairman:.....

Date:.....

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee held on Tuesday, 11th December 2012 at 6.00 pm in Meeting Room 3, Darby House, Telford

PRESENT: Councillors M. Ion (Chair), G. Green, J. Greenaway, J. Loveridge, C. Turley and Co-optees S. Ali and S. Rayner.

Attending: A. Mason, Chair Telford & Wrekin Safeguarding Children Board; Cllr. P. Watling, Cabinet Member Children, Young People and Families; K. Perry, Assistant Director Children's Safeguarding; S. Jones, Scrutiny Officer.

CYPSC-14 MINUTES

On reviewing the minutes, Mr. S. Ali pointed out a typing error on p. 5 in the final paragraph that "bay" should read "baby". Cllr. Greenaway asked for clarification on the dip in the number of Strategy meetings / Section 47 visits completed within 24 hours at the beginning of September and the Assistant Director explained this was due to sickness which could not be foreseen. Trends in busy periods such as the first and last week of school terms could be anticipated and planned for and although the numbers could fluctuate, performance had improved considerably since the Ofsted inspection.

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee held on 5th November be confirmed and signed by the Chairman subject to correction of the typing error on page 5.

CYPSC-15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr. A. Mackenzie and Co-optees A. Atkinson, R. Aveley, E. Ofori and M. Ward.

CYPSC-16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

CYPSC-17 OFSTED IMPROVEMENT PLAN

The Chairman welcomed Andrew Mason to the meeting. Mr. Mason had been invited as Chair of the Telford & Wrekin Safeguarding Children Board (TWSCB) as some of the recommendations on the Ofsted report related to the Board. There was a need to align the governance and reporting structures for Children & Young People (CYP) services as there was the potential for duplication between the TWSCB, Scrutiny and other Council-led Boards and there would be further discussion about this. Mr. Mason was invited to talk through the presentation circulated as Appendix B2 to

provide the Committee with a better understanding of the role, function, structure and priorities of the TWSCB. Mr. Mason then highlighted the key points from the presentation:

- The presentation opened with a poster to publicise the Board and its work, and to remind people of the deaths of the young children which had driven changes in legislation around safeguarding.
- The definition of safeguarding (giving children and young people the best possible chance in life, protection from harm or ill-treatment, ensuring health or development is not damaged, growing up safely, cared for) adopted by the TWSCB is based on the Working Together to Safeguard Children strategy with a focus on prevention.
- The Children's Act 2004 required children's services authorities to establish a Safeguarding Children Board and to promote co-operation between partners.
- The Board's scope covers responsive work (to protect children from harm), targeted pro-active work or any activity affecting children such as bullying.
- The functions of the Board include developing policies and procedures, service planning, monitoring and evaluation. A key function is to carry out Serious Case Reviews and a sub-group of the Board co-ordinates the response to unexpected child deaths.
- Board membership is designated by government and includes representatives from the authority, health, police, probation, Youth Offending Service, education etc. and community members.
- Members are responsible for representing their organisation on the Board and representing the Board back into their own organisation, for scrutinising the functions of the Board and ensuring continuous improvement.
- The sub-structure includes an Executive Group which meets every 6 weeks to keep business going, two sets of sub-groups themed around priorities and functions with a number of cross-cutting work streams and professional practices embedded throughout.
- The presentation set out the range of key activities under each priority. The pro-active and preventative work, such as the anti-bullying chatterboxes, had been recognised nationally as best practice.

Mr. Mason highlighted the Board's key role in co-ordinating work across partners and providing challenge to ensure a shared understanding. There was some cross-over with the Scrutiny Committee and the Children & Families Board in terms of scrutiny and governance, but the TWSCB had the ability to look across the whole patch and to join up partners. Mr. Mason had been appointed at the start of December but had already visited Family Connect and had been very impressed with application of technology and sharing of information.

Following the presentation members asked a number of questions and Mr. Mason and the Assistant Director provided the following additional information:

- The Board meets quarterly. Around 30 people attend meetings, but this included Board members and non-member supporting officers. Members were all named

decision-makers within the organisation they represent. Substitutions were not allowed to encourage continuity and discourage delegation to non-decision makers. Attendance and commitment was generally good, and Ofsted had commended the effectiveness of the Board. There were challenges, for example the fragmentation of health services and the establishment of the Health & Wellbeing Board meant there was no one organisation or board that speaks for health services, and all member organisations were going through a time of change which made continuity of representation more difficult. The good news was that the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) which would be responsible for commissioning the designated doctor and nurse safeguarding roles which the government had agreed would continue.

- The Board scrutinises a wide range of activity as a “critical friend“, and there would need to be a discussion with the Cabinet Member and Scrutiny Chairman to agree how this would align with scrutiny to avoid duplication.
- There is currently no statutory responsibility for agencies to contribute financially to the Board but guidance was forthcoming. Historically, agencies had been willing to contribute funding as well as in-kind contributions, but budget pressures within each organisation made financial planning more difficult. Funding was needed for training, the business planning and development and QA functions etc., and a Serious Case Review cost around £10-20k so there always needs to be a level of contingency.
- The Munro report would continue to have implications. The on-going reconfiguration of services had taken Munro into account and changes to the inspection regime were expected in the summer. There had been delays to guidance on Working Together guidance which it was hoped would be released by the end of the year. The Board’s work on child abuse and Children Abused Through Exploitation (CATE) were well recognised - and it needed to continue to be responsive and operate within budget.
- Both professional practice themes came from a serious case review. “Invisible Men” was about taking account of the role men play in children’s lives, both positive and negative. “Cultural Competence” reflects the need for the children’s workforce to be aware of and take into account diverse needs of children and their families in assessment and care planning; Telford’s population, especially amongst children and young people, is becoming increasingly diverse
- As Chair of the Board, Mr. Mason was accountable to the Director of Children & Family Services but was responsible for working with all members. The Chair had been appointed by a panel of board partners. The initial appointment was for one year with a view to moving to a three yearly term. Mr. Mason worked as a Management Consultant and business owner, was previously a governor and vice-chair of Madeley Court school, a board member of Telford Business Partnership and had been a non-Executive member of the Telford & Wrekin PCT Board for 7 years, the last 3 as Chair, and he continued as a non-Executive member of the PCT Cluster Board until the end of March 2013 when the PCTs

would be abolished. He had had a lot of involvement with safeguarding at the PCT. The post had been advertised externally nationally.

When there were no further questions, the Chair thanked Mr. Mason for the introduction and extended a standing invitation to future scrutiny meetings to keep the dialogue going.

The Chair reminded members that the Ofsted Improvement Plan had been developed in response to the recommendations made by Ofsted following the inspection of safeguarding and looked after children services in the summer. The Committee had received an informal briefing on the outcome in August when a commitment had been made that the Plan would come to a future meeting for detailed scrutiny. Recommendations requiring immediate and three month action had been made by Ofsted which had now elapsed, and the Cabinet Member and Assistant Director had been invited to present progress on actions to address the recommendations.

The AD was invited to talk through the Plan circulated as Appendix B1. Progress had been made on all three month actions but there were some that had not been completed for appropriate reasons. The recommendation to define the roles and responsibilities of the community social work team was still in progress as this needed to be done in the context of, and not in isolation from, the on-going service reconfiguration. The requirement for all children to have a qualified social worker was being addressed in a way that was in the best interest of the children so that existing strong relationships with non-qualified staff were not disrupted. It was felt that these approaches were appropriate and that were Ofsted to re-visit they would agree.

The recommendations had been grouped under 8 priority themes and there was a presentation and discussion about the highlights:

- **Priority 1** related to immediate actions relating to response times to concerns which had already been addressed.
- **Priority 2** related to the reconfiguration of safeguarding services to support the child's journey. A key action was to minimise changes of social worker for the child. The service was being redesigned to move away from a process-driven structure (meaning children changed social worker through different stages) to one which balanced the need of the child for continuity and strong relationships without losing the support of specialist social workers. This is a complex piece of work which had started with a social work conference in November and there had been positive buy-in. In the meantime, there had been a very successful recruitment campaign with all but 5 Senior Social Worker posts being filled. One new senior social worker had been filled in the Family Placement team which was important for supporting the rest of the team in preventing disruptions and recruiting more internal foster carers. The council is good at retention of newly qualified staff and there had been 2 or 3 promotions into Senior Social Worker positions. Appointments would be made from the Step Up to Social Work Programme which had produced some excellent candidates. Although agency staff could be very able, there were issues with turnover, so the recruitment of permanent staff would significantly help to minimise changes of social worker. There were currently 70.6

social workers in total, of which there had been 12.7 agency workers in October, now down to 10.9 and projected to be 9 by the end of December. The target was to reduce to 6 agency workers by March 2013, 2 by September 2013 and 0 by March 2014. The Chairman said that he found this progress very encouraging.

- **Priority 3** related to the quality of **social work practice**. A new format for child protection conferences was being piloted. Child protection plans were down from 220 to 155. Fewer children were coming off plans at 3 months which was an indicator of how partnership working was improving so that only the right children were being put on plans in the first place. There are fewer children who had been on a plan for longer than 2 years - after this length of time children generally need to be off a plan or in care. The quality of assessments had improved and Family & Cohesion services were putting packages around the child to reduce the need for protection plans or care. With regard to recommendation 19, a temporary post had been agreed to increase IRO capacity but it was not envisaged this would be needed longer term as the numbers in care reduce.
- **Priority 4** related to **mental health and emotional wellbeing**. Much of this work was tied into the review of Children and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS). Members asked about the timeliness and performance indicators for CAMHS interventions. The Cabinet Member explained that the target for referral to treatment was set by government at 18 weeks which was not a helpful indicator and there was a need to think about a better local indicator. Issues had been raised with the Children and Families Board about long waiting times for assessments and this was being looked at. CAMHS had now been incorporated into the Family Connect triage service from early in the new year which was a huge step forward and further work would continue. The AD said that it was also important for professionals to distinguish between mental illness and mental wellbeing so that referrals are appropriate and work was being done on this.
- **Priority 5** related to the **involvement of children and young people in service redesign**. The Care Council had worked with IROs to redesign assessment and review meeting forms to make them child-friendly. Work was also needed on the engagement of parents and an audit was being carried out to identify when parents had been involved in reviews and the reasons for non-involvement. The reviews were for the child and there is sometimes a good reason why parents do not attend review meetings is at the wishes of the child.
- **Priority 6** related to **sharing knowledge, skills and capacity**. Doctors in hospitals had received training to help them understand and tackle safeguarding issues robustly. A key piece of work was the input of social workers into the new workforce development strategy to develop career pathways and the concept of a Telford Social Worker. This was a big piece of work which would make a significant difference to the skills, capacity and recruitment of social workers and their managers.
- **Priority 7** related to **health** and the NHS had lead responsibility for these actions. Christine Morris, Senior Nurse safeguarding lead on the CCG, was leading on

health related actions in the Plan. Performance was good on the frequency of health assessments, although assessment on coming into care could be improved.

- **Priority 8** related to the **transition to independent living**. A Transition Group had been set up. The Council was working with care leavers to shape services. There had been a workshop with a presentation from care leavers about their experience of leaving care and of the support services, including care leavers who were young parents, to help shape options.

At the end of the presentation and questioning, the Chairman thanked the Cabinet Member and AD for the helpful presentation and commented that he felt there was much to celebrate in the progress reported.

CYPSC-18 REPORTS CIRCULATED FOR INFORMATION

Members considered three reports which had been circulated for monitoring.

The Dashboard of children in care performance had been circulated as Appendix C. The AD highlighted changes since the last meeting:

- The number of children in care had risen to 315 due to children from 3 large families (6/4/4) being taken into care, which showed the impact a small number of families could have on numbers and costs. They had all been placed with internal carers, except one family which was with an external carer to keep siblings together. The Cost Improvement Plan had been developed around a care number of around 300 and this was being refined. The Cabinet Member was confident that this would make a difference in terms of cost and stability of placements.
- The number of internal and agency foster carers had increased, and the upward trend was greater for internal carers.
- Following the discussion at the last scrutiny meeting, the Dashboard had been updated to reflect the actual cost of internal and relative carers from October. The average unit cost for internal care was £417 per week, as opposed to around £600 which was the average national costing discussed at the last meeting. The calculation of the cost base now included the cost of support carers, but it was not possible to adjust the calculation retrospectively. The Chairman was concerned that the presentation of costs on the Dashboard should make this clear because it looked as though there had been a sudden increase in costs. The average unit cost of relative carers was lower at £368 because generally the children in relative care were younger and the allowances were lower.
- The cost pie-chart again illustrated the need to reduce the number of residential placements. A regional framework contract for supported lodgings was almost complete.

- There were two performance areas flagged red, but these were not considered to be matters of concern. The number of adoptions varies over the year and the AD was confident that this would be improved over the whole year. The AD felt that the indicator for the number of new foster care households approved in the year was not a useful indicator because it was based around approvals and deregistration and not whether carers were providing placements. There were 19 assessments in progress which it was hoped would go to panel by the end of the year.

Cllr. Green raised the issue of how information about costs is presented to Members and the public so that they understand what is behind them, for example the reasons why children are coming into care and the fact that taking a large family into care can have a significant impact on costs. The Chairman replied that the scrutiny committee was looking at long-term strategies to reduce costs but that there could be no compromise of safety. Cllr. Watling suggested this could be taken up by the Corporate Parenting Group.

A breakdown of 2012 KS4 results for children in care by gender and schools in and out of the borough, and Telford & Wrekin children in care results compared to borough and national averages had been circulated as Appendix D and E.

The Chairman drew Members' attention to the bar charts showing the achievement and trend gaps of children in care in Telford & Wrekin compared to all children in the borough and national averages for children in care at KS2 L4 plus and KS4 and that generally this showed an encouraging picture. The 2012 KS4 data showed 34.5% of children in care achieving 5+ GCSEs including English and Maths, compared to 60.7% for all children in the borough. Comparing this to the trend national averages for children in care in previous years, this showed an encouraging picture. However, it was noted that the numbers in the cohorts were small which could impact significantly on the percentages achieved and the Committee might want to unpick the data in more detail at a future meetings.

CYPSC-19 CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE

The Chairman updated members on the work of the sub-group since the last meeting. The sub-group had met to take stock of work so far and had agreed further work which had been built into the work programme. Documents were tabled to show the actions agreed and how they were being taken forward.

It was noted that the next meeting would be at 6.00pm on Tuesday, 8th January. Confirmation on the venue was awaited and Members would be advised in due course.

The meeting ended at 7.55 pm.

Chairman:.....

Date:.....

CO-OPERATIVE & COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Co-operative & Communities Scrutiny Committee held on Thursday, 11th October 2012 at 6.00pm in the Reception Suite, Civic Offices, Telford

PRESENT: Councillors A. McClements (Chair), N. England, J. Greenaway, C. Mollett, G. Reynolds, S. Reynolds. Co-optees J. Ellis, R. Williams.

Also attending: Cllr. B. McClements, Cabinet Member Resources & Service Delivery; Cllr. L. Clare, Cabinet Member Adult & Social Care; Cllr. P. Watling, Cabinet Member Children & Young People; L. Higgins, Benefit Service Delivery Manager; S. Lane, Revenues Service Delivery Manager; S. Jones, Scrutiny Officer.

CCSC-6 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Co-operative & Communities Scrutiny Committee held on 8th August 2012 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

CCSC-7 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllrs. R. Evans, A. Jhawar, J. Loveridge, A. Stanton, K. Tomlinson. A. Astley, Assistant Director Customer & People Services.

CCSC-8 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

CCSC-9 Council Tax Support Scheme

The Chairman welcomed John Ellis who had been appointed to the Committee as a Town & Parish Council co-optee, and invited those present to introduce themselves. The intention for the meeting was for members to consider the proposed options for the Council Tax Support scheme and to ask questions. A further meeting would be held to formulate a response as part of the consultation.

Lee Higgins gave a presentation which provided a national overview and local background to the Council Tax Support (CTS) scheme; the assumptions, principles and proposals of the Telford & Wrekin scheme; detailed financial modelling of the impact of the proposed options on affected groups and other options which had been considered; the consultation process and timetable for approval.

The key points were:

- The government had decided to move away from the national Council Tax Benefit (CTB) scheme from April 2013 to a localised Council Tax Support (CTS) scheme. Authorities had discretion as to how they wanted to award financial assistance but DCLG prescribed the default scheme.
- Pension age claimants must be protected, but authorities had discretion to define other vulnerable groups for protection. The scheme must not disincentivise work.
- Authorities would be given a ring-fenced grant for CTS which would be 10% less than current CTB expenditure and with an assumed 2% reduction in caseload per year based on signs of recovery in the economy. There would be a funding shortfall in Telford & Wrekin of **£3.1million**.
- A Member/Officer group had developed the options for the CTS scheme. The timescales and IT system had limited the complexity of the scheme for the first year, but refinements could be made for year 2.
- The changes coincided with DWP changes to Housing Benefit which will also impact on working age customers, especially those with children.
- In Telford & Wrekin there had been a 19% increase in the CTB caseload since 2008 (75 more new claims in September than August). 18,465 (26%) households received CBT. The financial model therefore assumed a growth in caseload of 2% per year.
- The model assumed increases in Council Tax of 2.5% in 2012/13 and 2013/14. The model had been developed before the announcement about the cap on Council Tax increases without a referendum.
- The financial impact of the potential funding shortfall would be shared between the Council and Police & Fire Services, but Parishes were protected. There was an estimated total shortfall of £3.1million for the Council and £0.7million for the Police and Fire Services.
- The options for the Council were to subsidise the £3.1million funding gap by cutting services or by reducing Council Tax support. If the caseload increased without an increase in the grant, the deficit will grow year on year.
- 42% of the CTB caseload were of pension age and would be protected under the national default scheme. The burden of the cuts would therefore fall on working age claimants.
- The value of CTB paid to working age claimants was £8.4m in 2012/13 (projected to increase to £9.0m in 2013/14). The available grant for CTS was estimated at £5.8m for 2013/14, representing a 35% reduction in the amount available to

support working age customers. 8,100 of the 10,700 working age claimants were on JSA or below the minimum income guarantee figure and pay no Council Tax at all; 2,500 are on low pay and pay some Council Tax.

- Key principles of the Telford & Wrekin CTS were: the cut in funding should not mean cuts to other Council services; to protect vulnerable claimants; the cuts should be shared fairly across working age claimants; to protect vulnerable claimants; the needs of those with children or caring responsibilities should be recognised (but the cuts would still apply); the scheme should not discourage employment.
- The key features of the proposed scheme were:
 - To define the severely disabled as a protected vulnerable group
 - To cut the amount of CTS paid to non-vulnerable working age claimants by 21%
 - Remove exemptions and discounts on empty properties and second homes
 - Introduce an empty homes premium of 150% for properties vacant over 2 years - this would incentivise landlords to bring properties back to use
 - Reduce the savings and capital limit for claims from £16,000 to £6,000 - those with savings are comparatively less financially vulnerable
 - Limit backdated claims to a maximum of one month (from 6)
 - Introduce a minimum £2.50 award level i.e. people entitled to less than £2.50 support would receive nothing
 - Remove the second adult rebate for working age customers - the 25% discount can be claimed regardless of the income of the tax payer
 - Introduce a discretionary fund of £65k for cases of extreme financial hardship.
- Examples of other authorities' schemes were given.
- The consultation closes on 26th October. Once the feedback has been considered the final proposals will go to Full Council in November assuming the legislation has received Royal Assent.

Members were also taken through detailed financial modelling to consider the impact and implications of the proposed scheme, and alternative models. This showed:

- The removal of the empty property/second home exemptions and discounts was very controversial with landlords who had argued for a minimum one week exemption, but this was the element that would have the greatest impact on the scheme. Removing the discounts and exemptions would generate an estimated £1.2m towards offsetting the £3.1m funding gap. Adding in the removal of the second adult rebate, the reduction of the savings cap to £6,000, reducing maximum backdate to one month and introducing a minimum weekly award would increase this to £1.4m. The effect of these changes would be to keep the reduction in benefits for working age non-vulnerable claimants to 21% as opposed to 38% if the changes were not introduced. Any exemption granted on empty properties would mean a corresponding increase in benefit cuts for working age

non-vulnerable claimants: 1 week exemption = 23.4% cut, 2 weeks = 24.8%, 1 month = 27.5%. These options could be considered as part of the consultation.

- For households with children, the proposed scheme retained the elements currently built into the CTB scheme that advantage households with children i.e. Child Benefit and Maintenance, additional income exempt from CTB (additional £17.40 for families, additional £64.99 for each child), up to £300 for claimants or partners paying childcare costs - all of these would be disregarded as income under the CTS scheme. However, families or claimants with children would not be defined as vulnerable and the cuts would apply under the proposed CTS scheme. An example was given to show the impact of the proposals on a working age couple, both working but on a low income, and the impact on the same couple with the addition of a child. For the childless couple, CTB at £1.83pw would be removed under CTS minimum award, and for the couple with a child (taking into account £116.10 additional income from Working Tax Credit, Child Tax Credit and Child Benefit), the existing CTB entitlement of £2.57 would reduce by 21% to £2.03pw.
- Treating households with children as vulnerable would mean the whole of the funding gap would have to be shared between the 4,490 non-vulnerable working age claimants. Protecting all households with children would cut their benefit by 51%. Protecting households with children by age group would mean cutting benefit for working age non-vulnerable claimants by a corresponding amount: child under 5 = 29% cut, child under 4 = 27.4%, child under 3 = 25.7%, child under 2 = 23.9%, child under 1 = 22.2%.
- There were grave concerns about the impact of the cuts on unemployed young people. Claimants on JSA receive £56.25 per week, so cuts in benefit would have a very significant impact. Under the proposed scheme, working age non-vulnerable claimants in a Band A property (6,700 live in Band A, 2177 in Band B, 569 in Band C) would be affected as follows:
 - a) Existing CTB = £0
 - b) 21% CTS reduction = £20.44pm over 10 months
 - c) If empty properties exempt for one month = £22.34pm over 10 months
 - d) If all families with children protected = £48.70pm over 10 months
 - e) If both c) and d) above = £63.40pm over 10 months, or 26% of entire incomeCoupled with this, the changes to housing benefits and other welfare reforms were likely to have a big impact on young people under 25.

At the end of the presentation the Chairman invited Cabinet Members to make comments. Cllr. McClements felt that CTS should have been rolled into the Universal Credit to make it easier for people to manage their budget. He expressed concern about the expense of collection, the risk of bad debt, and confusion for people migrating across authorities with different schemes. He emphasised the fact that the scheme had needed to be developed quickly and that it had been kept simple to administer to avoid the costs of assessments. Other authorities had protected families with children, but this was at the cost of other working age claimants. Further

revisions may be required over coming years if the caseload continues to increase. The property exemptions had been removed to incentivise landlords to keep or bring properties into use, and to protect unemployed people and those on low or minimum wage. Cllr. Clare expressed concerns about the potential impact of the housing benefit changes and the introduction of the Universal Credit and the lack of one-bed roomed properties and risk of homelessness. Cllr. Watling regretted the fact that the cuts had to be made, but there was no choice. Front line services needed to be protected. He was also concerned about the cost of collection and risk of bad debt. He felt the cuts to the welfare system could be a false economy because the consequences would put pressure on other services.

Members then asked questions and commented on various points:

- *How has the grant been calculated and when will it be reviewed?*
The Department for Communities & Local Government (DCLG) had calculated the grant as 10% below current CBT expenditure plus an assumed 2% reduction in caseload based on the belief that there were signs of an improvement in the economy. There was no indication as to whether or when the grant would be reviewed, but it was felt that if the government has assumed a 2% reduction in case load then this could be applied year on year to the grant. The Department of Work & Pensions (DWP) had based its assumptions on figures from the Office of National Statistics – the Local Government Association had asked the government to provide the figures so they could be scrutinised but to officers' knowledge this hadn't happened. Locally, there were no signs of improvements in the economy and the CTS scheme had assumed a 2% increase in caseload based on current trends.
- The presentation showed that 26% of households currently receive some CBT, of which 42% are pensioners who are protected from the changes. Members requested a breakdown of the remaining claimant caseload which would be provided after the meeting.
- *How has the shortfall from failure to collect been projected, has adequate provision been made, and how is this shared across the Council, Police & Fire Services and Parishes?*
The collection rate for 2011/12 was just above 97% which was similar to the national average. £600k had been built into the model as provision for default, but there was a high level of uncertainty about this. Only around 20% of working age benefit claimants affected already paid some element of Council Tax and the majority would be making a contribution for the first time making it very difficult to predict the level of default with any degree of accuracy. The model allowed for a 70% collection rate (or 30% default) for claimants who have never paid Council Tax before. It would be possible for the Council to pursue debtors through the courts and take payments directly from their benefit, but this was not desirable because of the cost of administration and court fees.
Currently, under the CTB scheme, the Police and Fire Services are protected from the impact of defaults on Council Tax and the Council carries the whole risk.

Under the CTS scheme, the risk / impact of non-collection will be shared between the Council and the Police and Fire Services, but the Parishes will be protected and this had been factored into the projected impact of reduced collection.

- *The government has prescribed the protection of claimants of pension age. How will caseloads be affected by increases in the pension age and the growing ageing population?*

The pension age is set nationally and the local CTS scheme will recognise this. As the pension age increases claimants will be recognised as working age for longer and this will off-set the growth in the ageing population so it is anticipated there will be a negative impact.

- Members raised various concerns about the potential consequences of the cuts to Council Tax benefit, taken in conjunction with other welfare benefit reforms, and the risks of increased rent arrears, debt and homelessness which may put pressure on other Council services which cost more than the scheme saves.
- *What national and local consultation has there been?*
DCLG consulted on the proposals and amount of grant and have published a statement of intent which sets out what they would like to see in the final regulations. The regulations have yet to receive Royal Assent, but it was felt unlikely there would be changes. The regulations set out the national defaults for CTS. As it stands, the 25% single person's discount will remain - in Telford & Wrekin a reduction to 20% would fund the deficit in full. The Council had responded as part of the national consultation, and the Leader continued to lobby and had recently written to DCLG to make points back to government.

DCLG specified a minimum 9 week consultation on local options and because of the tight timetable for implementation had suggested this should start before the regulations were launched. In Telford & Wrekin there had been a 12 week consultation involving all households and not just those in receipt of Council Tax benefit to canvass a wider view from landlords, people with second properties etc. "Your Voice" had been sent to all houses in the borough, there had been three headlines in the Shropshire Star, 2 in the Telford Journal, Bill McClements had been on Radio Shropshire, there had been six consultation forums including a public open evening and sessions with Town & Parish Councils, landlords and disability groups etc. There had been around 240 responses and this was the most tweeted topic on the Council's Twitter page. All feedback is captured, including Tweets. Once the final scheme is agreed, all claimants would be written to in January to tell them how much Council Tax they will pay from April.

- *Did you look at other Council's schemes?*
Other authorities' schemes had been looked at, and the Benefits Service Delivery Manager had attended a session at DCLG attended by about 65 other authorities all of which were applying funding cuts. Of neighbouring authorities, Wolverhampton, Dudley, Walsall & Solihull were funding their schemes in full for the first year. Birmingham was reducing CTS to fund the gap, primarily by

removing the empty property discounts and making everyone pay the first 24% of their Council Tax so CTS will only be calculated on the remaining 76%. It was felt this was a harsher scheme than proposed for Telford & Wrekin as discounts would apply to the whole amount. Cannock Chase were making changes similar to the Telford & Wrekin options, except they were proposing to protect families with children under 5, but to offset this, all other families' Child Benefit and Maintenance would be included in the assessment of income.. Shropshire, Sandwell and Coventry were still considering options and had not made any decisions. Some Councils were capping based on property banding, but in Telford & Wrekin the majority of CT claimants fall within Band A or B and there were not enough in the top bands to warrant introducing the complexities of this kind of scheme. A breakdown of caseload by property banding would be provided after the meeting.

- Members had concerns about child poverty and about how the proposals support families with children when this is a priority for the Council.
- *How is "severely disabled" defined?*
The intention is to adopt the DWP definition and this had been published as part of the consultation. Members requested clarification on which rate of Attendance Allowance would apply as a qualifying benefit. Essentially, the definition covers people who are unable to work because of a disability. It would not cover people who are disabled but assessed as able to work who cannot find work. Moving away from set criteria would introduce the need for an assessment which would be very expensive. There is a problem because the Income Support system does not record which claimants are "severely disabled" and they will have to be identified by April. The definition may change with the introduction of Universal Credit but that is not until 2014.
- *Will the removal of the empty property exemption apply to young people who have saved to buy a property which is not habitable (e.g. no bathroom/kitchen) which they intend to do up to live in?*
This is a hard choice because we need investment in housing, but on balance it was felt fairer for people who could afford to save and buy to pay Council Tax than to exempt empty properties and put an extra burden on people with little money. This proposal will have a high impact on landlords. There was a consultation session for landlords and they raised big concerns about the proposal and have asked for a period of exemption to cover vacant periods between tenancies to be considered.
- *Do you think the removal of the exemption on empty properties in need of repair will deter landlords from taking on properties in need to repair which will have an impact on the housing market?*
Possibly, but removing the exemption may encourage landlords with properties needing repair to get on with the work.
- Members were concerned that developers would delay legal completion of properties to avoid Council Tax when the property may only need door knobs.

- *How many empty properties are there and how will they be identified?*
Empty properties are easy to identify now because the owner/landlord claims the exemption. In future, there will be an issue with identifying the properties and enforcing the payments. No provision has been made for this within the projections because it is unknown.
- *Will properties under probate be liable for Council Tax?*
The property would be subject to an exemption until probate is granted.
- *How is the £6,000 savings and capital limit calculated?*
It will include property other than the main residence, savings, stock, bonds, shares etc. It will not include assets such as cars or personal possessions.
- *How will the recent announcement about the 2% cap on Council Tax without a referendum affect the proposals?*
The proposals assumed a 2.5% increase in Council Tax for 2013/14. If the increase is lower this will have less impact and less risk which would be good news.
- *Why is Council Tax paid over 10 months, and can the payments be spread over 12 months to make them more affordable?*
The national statutory instalment scheme is that Council tax is paid over 10 instalments and this will remain, although people can request payments spread over 12 months. This happens now.
- *Could landlords structure tenancies so they expire during February/March when Council Tax is not paid to avoid paying the tax if there is a void between tenancies?*
No. Council Tax is paid in 10 instalments but covers the whole 12 months - February and March are not "free" months. Tenants are liable for Council Tax for the period of occupancy - their liability generally ceases on the day they move out and the landlord then becomes liable, unless they still have a current tenancy agreement. If a tenant moves out in January, they receive a rebate on pro rata overpayments and the landlord will assume liability.

At the end of the discussion it was agreed that the Committee would meet again on 23rd October to consider the information and agree a response for submission as part of the consultation and to Cabinet.

CCSC-10 2012/14 WORK PROGRAMME

Members noted the date of next meeting on 23rd October, and the meetings of the Co-operative Commission and Employee Commission on 12th and 19th October which members had been invited to attend.

The meeting ended at 7.50 p.m.

Chairman:.....

Date:.....

CO-OPERATIVE & COMMUNITIES AND BUDGET & FINANCE SCRUTINY COMMITTEES

Minutes of a meeting of the joint Co-operative & Communities and Budget & Finance Scrutiny Committees held on Tuesday, 23rd October 2012 at 6.00pm in the Reception Suite, Civic Offices, Telford

PRESENT: Councillors A. McClements (Chair), N. England, R. Evans, A. Jhawar, C. Mollett, G. Reynolds, S. Reynolds, R. Sloan, . Co-optees J. Ellis, R. Williams.

Also attending: A. Astley, Assistant Director Customer & People Services; L. Higgins, Benefit Service Delivery Manager; S. Jones, Scrutiny Officer.

CCSC-11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

CCSC-12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr. Sloan declared a non-pecuniary interest in matters relating to DWP.

CCSC-13 COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME

Cllr. McClements reminded members that this was a joint meeting of the Budget & Finance and Co-operative & Communities Scrutiny Committees. This followed the meeting on 11th October and the purpose was to agree a joint response from the Committees to submit as part of the consultation on the proposed Council Tax Support (CTS) scheme.

Since 11th October the government had announced additional funding for transitional grants which local authorities could apply for to support the CTS scheme during the first year. The Assistant Director and Benefits Manager gave a briefing on the Transitional Grant Scheme making the following points:

- £100m had been made available nationally for authorities to apply for transitional grants after 31st January 2013 to support CTS schemes in 2013/14.
- The grant would be subject to a number of restrictions. The following limitations would apply to the proposed Telford & Wrekin CTS scheme:
 - the benefit entitlement for working age customers currently paying no Council Tax could be reduced by no more than 8.5% (the current proposal was 21%)
 - the maximum increase in earnings taper for working age customers not receiving full benefit would be 25% (currently 20%)
 - to ensure the calculation of CTS is based on 100% of Council Tax liability
 - limit dramatic increases in non-dependent deductions.
- Assuming the other elements of the proposed scheme remained unchanged, the

restrictions would have the following anticipated impacts:

- Applying for the grant would leave an overall estimated funding gap of £679k in 2013/14. The transitional grant would be worth £336k but restrictions on the scheme would mean collecting over £1m less. The deficit could not be passed on to benefit claimants and would need to be met internally.
- Increasing the taper to 25% would generate £189k additional income but could act as a disincentive to work contrary to the principles of the CTS scheme
- The Council would need another consultation on the revised scheme – even if this was launched immediately it would allow very limited time to make the necessary changes to the systems by April 2013.
- The Local Government Association (LGA) had claimed that the grant would be equivalent to 80% of the deficit from the reduction in the grant for Council Tax Support schemes, but this had assumed a reduction in case load and no increase in Council Tax.

Following the briefing there was a discussion during which members made a number of comments and asked a number of questions.

- Members were sceptical about the assertion that the Transitional Grant was equivalent to 80% of the funding deficit for authorities with a demographic like Telford & Wrekin.
- Members wanted further details about the impact of a further consultation and were told that the latest Councils could approve the CTS scheme was 31st January so a new consultation would need to be launched immediately to have the scheme approved by then. However, there was a huge amount of work to do on the systems and staff training once the scheme was approved and delaying approval until 31st January would make this very difficult. Even approving the scheme in November made the timescale for making the changes challenging.
- The legal position on consultation is that Councils can consult on a range of options but must then consult on the final proposed scheme. Because there would not be time to carry out a two phased consultation, if the Council decided to apply for the Transitional Grant there would only be one consultation on the final scheme which would have to assume the grant would be awarded at the level announced i.e. £336k for Telford & Wrekin although applications could not be made until after 31st January.
- The £100m funding allocation was thought to be for authorities in England (as opposed to nationally) and this would be confirmed after the meeting. The allocations for individual authorities had been based on a funding formula and the figure of £336k for Telford & Wrekin was the amount that would be awarded should the Council apply and there was certainty about the amount.
- The consultation on the proposed CTS scheme was still open. Feedback was being gathered and there seemed to be general support and agreement on the fairness of the scheme.

- Members examined and queried the figures presented and considered the financial implications of applying for the grant. Officers clarified that:
 - the grant would be £336k
 - an 8.5% cut in benefit for the 8,753 working age claimants paying no Council Tax would raise £542k but overall collection would be around £1.2m less than if the cut was 21% as proposed
 - the transitional grant would mean increasing the existing earnings taper level from 20% to 25%. This would mean an additional £189k would be collected, but would create a disincentive to work contrary to the principles of the CTS
 - overall, taking the grant and applying the restrictions would leave a deficit of £679k
 - the deficit could not be passed onto benefit claimants and would have to be found internally.

Members commented that in all likelihood this would mean making cuts to services which would undermine principle 1 of the CTS scheme. Also, the premise of the proposed scheme was to incentivise work and members were concerned that the Transitional Grant scheme may compromise this.

- Members wanted to know why the funding had been announced, and why it had been announced so late in the day when Council's had already consulted on, or were in still consulting on, CTS schemes. Officers could not comment on this, but it was noted there had been some opposition in the media to the welfare reforms and this could have put pressure on the government.
- It was too early to say whether other Councils would apply for the grant but information would emerge over the following couple of weeks.
- Members wanted to know if the Council took the grant whether the 8.5% cap on benefit cuts for working age claimants paying no Council Tax could be increased to 21% (as proposed in the current scheme) for the following year. Officers said that at the moment the Transitional Grant was only available for the first year so the restrictions would only apply for 2013/14 and thereafter authorities could reduce benefit further. The government's intention was to help authorities to monitor the impact of more limited changes and to gauge reaction during the transition year to help inform further changes to the scheme. However, new guidance was being issued by DCLG regularly and this could change in future.
- Under the CTS, the impact and risks of the funding reduction is shared between the Council and Police & Fire Services. The Town & Parish Councils are protected and this is a decision which was made nationally by DCLG.
- Members were very concerned about the cost implications of making the changes to IT systems and administering the CTS. Cllr. Sloan suggested this could be an issue for scrutiny to look into with scrutiny committees in other authorities. The AD welcomed the suggestion – the constraints of the IT system and staff training requirements had limited the options for the first year and the approach had been

to keep the scheme simple with the emphasis on getting the assumptions right. The scheme would be monitored during the first year of implementation to identify revisions to improve it for the following year and scrutiny's input would be welcome. From an IT point of view, different authorities operated on different platforms, although there were some who used the same system as Telford & Wrekin so there could be some opportunities to look at cost savings from joint working with those authorities.

- Members asked whether the Council had lobbied government on the CTS funding and the AD replied that there had been strong lobbying.

The AD and Benefits Manager left the meeting at the end of the questioning. Members then considered the information provided at the meeting on 11th October and at this meeting to agree their comments on the proposed CTS scheme.

Members first discussed the information on the Transitional Grant making the following comments:

- Cllr. Jhawar was concerned that £679k was a big funding gap and was likely to have an impact on other services, but also concern about the impact of the benefit cuts on claimants.
- The Chair was concerned that the CTS scheme was intended to incentivise work but the Transitional Grant did not support this.
- Cllr. S. Reynolds was concern about how the public would perceive the decision if the Council decided not to apply for the Transitional Grant, and the Council would be seen to be turning down money which could help people on benefits.
- Cllr. G. Reynolds felt that felt that the Transitional Grant was only a temporary solution and although the decision to cut benefits was horrible, the Council would only be storing up problems for the following year.
- Mr. Ellis felt that the Council should welcome opportunities to limit the impact of cuts on the public, but that to receive £336k to forgo £679k did not make financial sense, would jeopardise public services and would only defer difficult decisions for a year.
- Cllr. Sloan agreed with these remarks. He could see that the Transitional Grant scheme could help ease the transition for people who have never paid Council Tax before and that in the longer term this could improve collection rates and reduce the cost of collection, but in terms of the broader finances of the Council the grant did not make sense. He further commented that he felt Council Tax benefit should have been incorporated into the Universal Credit.
- Cllr. S. Reynolds thought that even if the grant meant there were improved collection rates over the longer term, the rate of improvement was unlikely to be

significant enough to offset the loss of £679k and applying for the grant did not add up for Telford & Wrekin, and that it was storing up problems for the following year.

- Mr. Williams was worried that the deficit would be made up by cuts to council services and that service cuts could impinge on vulnerable people.
- Mr. Ellis asked for clarification on whether any funding surplus created by authorities not applying for the grant would be redistributed to the applying authorities or whether it would go back to the Treasury. The Chairman replied that it was unlikely the surplus would be redistributed because grants are usually allocated on a formula basis, but clarification would be sought after the meeting.
- Cllr. England said he would not be in favour of the Council taking the grant.

Members then considered the information provided at the meeting on 11th October, additional information provided by e-mail in response to questions and further information heard at this meeting about the proposed CTS scheme. The following points were made during the discussion:

- Cllr. Sloan felt the scheme was as good as it could be for the first year, but that once it was up and running there needed to be an assessment of the unintended consequences to make improvements for 2014. He suggested that the Budget & Finance Scrutiny Committee and the Co-operative & Communities Scrutiny Committee should join up to scrutinise this over the year post-implementation. The Committees could look at the CTS scheme, the impact of changes to housing benefit and changes to the Social Fund, perhaps by looking at the impacts on the groups of people. There was agreement from members on this suggestion. Mr. Ellis further suggested that the Committees could work with scrutiny committees in other authorities to join up on wider issues related to Universal Credit and collection methods.
- Mr. Williams regretted the fact that cuts to benefit needed to be made but felt the proposed scheme was the least worst option and that if any aspect of the scheme was changed it would have an impact on other groups.
- The Chairman felt that on balance the scheme was the fairest possible.
- Cllr. S. Reynolds felt the scheme was the best possible that could be designed within the tight time and IT constraints and agreed that the scheme should be reviewed post-implementation.
- Cllr. Sloan felt an argument could be made for changing the single persons' discount which was set nationally.
- Members felt that there had been adequate consultation on the proposals and as efforts had been made to reach all people in the borough and not just those on benefit, but there were concerns that the consultation (Your Voice) may not have

reached people affected by the changes because some people put Your Voice in the bin without reading it. Members felt that an awareness campaign should continue, and that low or no cost ways of reaching target groups should be looked and Cllr. Reynolds suggested printing messages on housing benefit slips. Cllr, Sloan agreed this was important – nationally DWP had a campaign to telephone people affected by the benefit cap up to a year in advance.

- Cllr. G. Reynolds wanted to see consideration given to how empty properties would be identified and how the tax would be enforced, and whether tax liability would start from when the property is identified as being empty or be backdated.
- Members praised the hard work of the benefits team in preparing and presenting complex information for scrutiny, especially the Benefits Service Delivery Manager Lee Higgins.

At the end of the discussions the Chairman sought agreement from members that:

- The Committees make a recommendation to Cabinet members through Policy Review that the Council should not apply for the Transition Grant
- That a joint response from the Co-operative & Communities and Budget & Finance Scrutiny Committees would be submitted as part of the consultation on the CTS scheme and that the Scrutiny Officer would draft the response based on the discussion for comment and agreement by Members.

On a show of hands all Members except one were in agreement with both points.

RESOLVED:

- **That the Committees make a recommendation to Cabinet members at Policy Review that the Council does not apply for the Transitional Grant**
- **That a joint response on the CTS scheme will be submitted as part of the consultation**
- **That the Co-operative & Communities Scrutiny Committee and Budget & Finance Scrutiny Committee carry out a joint review of the CTS scheme post-implementation and other aspects to be scoped.**

CCSC-14 2012/14 WORK PROGRAMME

Members noted the date and agenda items for the next meeting at 6.0pm on 27th November 2012.

The meeting ended at 7.50 p.m.

Chairman:.....

Date:.....

SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD

Minutes of the meeting of the Scrutiny Management Board held on Friday, 14th September 2012 at 10.30am in the Scrutiny Meeting Room Civic Offices, Telford

PRESENT: Councillors D. White (Chair), V. Fletcher, A. McClements, S. Reynolds, C. Turley, C. Mollett

IN ATTENDANCE: Cllr. B. McClements, Cabinet Member Resources and Service Delivery; Fiona Bottrill, Scrutiny Group Specialist; Stephanie Jones, Scrutiny Officer.

SMB-10 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meetings of the Scrutiny Management Board held on the 4th July 2012 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman subject to clarification provided by Cllr. McClements on the funding for regeneration programmes.

Members were told that schemes were funded from a mix of borrowing, capital receipts and other income. Members were reminded that the 100-Day review of the 2011/12 budget had led to a scaling back of the capital programme to reduce borrowing requirements and the cost of borrowing on the revenue budget. The following revision had been made:

Wellington - only £900k had been allocated

Oakengates – the scheme would continue but had been scaled back

Hadley – the external money was identified while negotiating with Government on the Gorge funding.

Brookside – of the £6.5m of funding for the regeneration of Brookside, £3.5m was new money.

The Cabinet member recognised that capital receipts are a big issue for the Council and it is planned that over several years the Council will achieve £110 million. The changes to the funding mechanism for business rates would also affect Council income. The Government was currently consulting on a mechanism to replace part of local authorities' grant funding with funding from business rates. Initial proposals had been scaled back and the current proposal was that Council's would keep half of the business rates generated.

SMB-11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr. Mike Ion.

SMB-12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr. S. Reynolds declared a pecuniary interest in Item 4.

SMB-13 HOLDING THE EXECUTIVE TO ACCOUNT

The Chair informed the Committee that Item 5 on the agenda would be taken next as the Cabinet Member was present.

The Chair welcomed Cllr. McClements to the meeting. This was the first Cabinet 'Holding to Account Session'. Cllr. Bill McClements circulated the response he had drafted to the questions agreed by the Scrutiny Management Board.

The first question was "What were your priorities when you became Cabinet Member?"

Cllr. B. McClements introduced himself and explained that his background had

been as a mechanical engineer and that mathematics had been his strength. He had worked at Director level in industry and having retired wanted to take a

leading role in difficult times. He set out his priorities were to ensure that cost savings continue. Following his election he met with the Chief Executive and made it clear that no changes would be made until the new administration had come to a view. The priorities that were identified were:

- To find cheaper accommodation to replace the Civic Offices – this has been delivered
- Reduce the impact of the capital debt on the revenue budget – this was a long-term problem and had been discussed at the start of the meeting
- To protect front line services – of £21m savings found so far only £2.1m had been taken from front line services. The issue was that it would be more difficult to continue to make savings from non-front line services.
- Building Schools for the Future – the priority was to develop a balanced programme to protect children in the most vulnerable parts of the borough. The government was changing the funding formula for schools so that social deprivation was no longer a criterion which meant the BSF funding should be used to balance the position. The BSF funding had been cut by 30% and the Council had allocated £2m of Council capital to the scheme.
- Senior Management Restructure – To introduce a flatter management structure with a more 'hands on' person at the top.

In preparing for this meeting Cllr. McClements had identified areas that he wanted to monitor more closely and meetings would be set up to put this into action.

The Chair asked if the new structure is working?

Cllr. B. McClements responded that he felt the new structure was working.

The Council is smaller and so there is less bureaucracy and the Council is closer to the people. Larger organisations get out of touch – this is my experience in other organisations.

The Chair asked if there are currently too few Directors?

Cllr. B. McClements responded that this could be a concern but could be managed through delegating and setting targets. For example the Managing Director has been given specific tasks as part of his contract.

Members asked about the move to new office accommodation.

Members were informed that the Managing Director and Senior Management Team will be on the 3rd floor at Addenbrook House along with legal and Member services.

Cllr. A. McClements commented that Members had not been informed of the accommodation moves and that it would be important to monitor the moves to make sure the changes were right.

Cllr. B. McClements responded that changes had been made in response to comments from staff and Members. Members will also have to change the way they work to adapt to the changes.

In response to questions about communication, once staff are in different buildings it was commented that Addenbrook House will be closer to Darby House than the current Civic Offices. The staff based at Wellington are more technical but some people will still need to travel for meetings.

The Chair asked about the use of teleconferencing following a visit to the hospital trust where they are looking at using telemedicine to reduce the need for staff travel and providing services closer to home.

Cllr. B. McClements responded that this is something that the Council could look at post January 2013 when the Civic Offices have been vacated.

However staff will continue to move as the accommodation at White Chapel is temporary while the Hub in the Town Centre is built to provide better public access to Council services. The Hub will include a new library and there are plans for a cafe franchise to generate revenue.

Cllr. V Fletcher requested that the members of the Board receive a copy of the accommodation plans.

The Chair asked about the progress with Single Status.

Cllr. B. McClements acknowledged that Single Status has been a long process but that the aim is to deliver it in 18 months.

The Chair highlighted that Scrutiny had looked at the process 8 years ago and

had recognised that national scheme would not work locally. He also raised concern that staff have already been through restructures and re-grading and many staff had to re-apply for posts, and that the Single Status process will de-motivate staff again.

Cllr. B. McClements responded that Single Status was agreed nationally and if we were starting the process again, we may not start here. There is an issue with staff on different terms and conditions across the organisation that needs to be resolved.

In response to further questions regarding Single Status Cllr. B. McClements said that :

- Some Job Evaluation had been done as part of the restructure and further work was on-going.
- There would be a cost to Single Status but up until 2011/12 a contingency had been set aside each year towards the costs.
- The provision of staff pensions will not be affected and will continue to be provided by Shropshire County Pension Fund.
- Additional support (1 person) is being provided for 6 months to support Single Status
- Some staff will be negatively affected. Other councils that have been through the process have found that if over 20% of staff are negatively affected the process breaks down. The Council is aiming to get this figure to 15-16%. Staff who are negatively affected will receive some pay protection.
- It was confirmed that the aims for Single Status are that similar jobs should receive similar pay and equal pay for men and women. Scrutiny Members agreed that these principles were correct but the Chair commented that this should have been achieved through the restructure. The Council does not have 'blue collar' issues as these services have been outsourced. Other Council's have had big issues in these services.
- In terms of timing there will be detailed discussions with staff from Spring 2013.

In response to the question "How did you communicate your priorities" Cllr. B. McClements explained that he had met with relevant Directors and Senior staff once the new administration was in place to understand the financial pressures, planned savings and alternative accommodation options. Members were informed that prior to May 2011 some information provided about Capital Receipts had not been correct – but he was not able to provide the correct information to the Committee as this is commercially sensitive information.

Cllr. B. McClements informed Members that he did 'walk abouts' without senior staff present which he found very informative.

Cllr. Angela McClements asked if these walk abouts included outreach areas e.g. cleaners who work in schools.

Cllr. S Reynolds reported that the Co-operative Commission is looking at communication.

Cllr. B. McClements responded that a meeting has been held with catering staff – but more could always be done

The Chair asked if the Executive had considered transferring council services rather than making further savings through cuts in all service areas.

Cllr. McClements responded that this was not planned – but in his view it would be good if some staff wanted to take over running some services e.g. leisure or care services. There are opportunities for local providers who do not have to include the cost of running a national organisation.

The Chair commented that people want local services and in many cases low level intervention is enough. He gave the example of a self-help and support group for young people and adults with autism/aspergers that had been considered by the Health Scrutiny Committee.

Cllr. B. McClements said that when he considered his responses to the questions put by scrutiny, he had identified some areas where he was not monitoring costs regularly enough and he had now set up a programme for regular monitoring. For example, in children's services the weekly unit costs for children in care placements ranged from £279 for internal foster care, £804 for external foster care to £3070 for external residential care. This identified the need to reduce average unit costs by reducing reliance on external care. The allowance for internal foster carers had been increased to attract more internal foster carers which would reduce the need for external placements and reduce costs. There had been investment in early intervention and preventative support which was aimed at reducing the need for these costly interventions. There was also an issue with the use of agency social workers.

Cllr. V Fletcher commented that hospital have reduced their need for agency nurses by setting up their own 'nursing banks' could the council use this model?

Cllr. B. McClements replied that the recruitment of social workers remains a national problem.

In response to the question "What lessons have you learned?" Cllr. B. McClements answered that being a Cabinet Member involved hard work and that it is important to treat all people with respect and honesty. It takes time for people to build up trust and this is important when relying on the correct information to make decisions.

Cllr. B. McClements set out his priorities for the next 12 months as:

Delivering this year's budget. There had been a good outturn for 2011/12. A contingency of £7 million had been set aside for 2012/13. £2.6 million of this has been used to date, and part of the remaining £4.2m would be carried forward to support the 2014/15 budget.

Cllr. V. Fletcher requested clarification on the decision made by Audit that there will be no contingency funds available at the end of the term.

Cllr. McClements replied that it would be disappointing if this happened.

The Chair asked how the use of reserves compared to other authorities e.g. Shropshire?

Cllr. B. McClements responded that he was not able to comment on the budget of other Council's. He informed Members that the Assistant Director Finance, Audit & Information Governance is reviewing reserves to determine what level of reserves is needed and whether any should be put into contingencies. A report would be taken to Cabinet over the next few months.

Members were also informed that the Government was not going to transfer the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) land to the Council as previously expected. The Council can take over managing the land which could help the Council to work better with businesses, but receipts from sales will go to the government.

The Chair asked about the role of the HCA in regeneration programmes.

Cllr. B. McClements answered that the HCA does not have to participate in the schemes – the involvement of the HCA in schemes is taken on a case by case basis and they can decide whether to put funding into schemes.

The Chair asked about the impact of Continuing Healthcare Funding (CHC) on the Council and any other health costs that are being transferred to the Council?

Cllr. B. McClements responded that in 2009/10 the PCT spent £13.9 million on CHC funding. This funding covered costs for patients who are assessed as having a primary healthcare need. Within 2 years the funding for CHC care was reduced to £3.8 million. In his view Cllr. B. McClements said that this cannot be accounted for through efficiency savings. He outlined a case in his ward where the family believe that the fact that a patient did not receive CHC funding was a contributory factor in his death.

The Chair commented that at a visit to the stroke units at the Royal Shrewsbury (RSH) and Princess Royal (PRH) hospitals Members of the Joint Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee were informed that the lack of appropriate care and support at home was delaying discharges.

Cllr. B. McClements informed the Board that the PCT is currently providing

some one-off funding to enable the Council to provide the support that patients need. However, there is no guarantee that this money will be available in the future. The Council recognised that the PCT had provided CHC funding at a higher level than other areas – but the reduction in this funding over the last 2 years has meant that the rate of CHC funding is now one of the lowest in the country.

The Chair informed the Committee that he had written to the Chief Operating Officer at the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and has had a response. This issue has been included in the work programme for the Health and Adult Care Scrutiny Committee.

Cllr. B. McClements commented that this is one of the most important areas for scrutiny this year.

Another area of concern is the transfer of Public Health to the Local Authority. The PCT currently spend £10.8 million on public health but the proposals are that the Council will receive £7.2 million to do the same work. There are issues around the contracts that public health hold as these are worth £7.5 million. The Board were informed that the current public health staff will be TUPEd across to the Council. Discussions were taking place as to how these roles will fit with the Council's structure and responsibilities.

Cllr. B. McClements said that accommodation will be a priority as we have to be out of the Civic Offices by January. Addenbrook House is about 20 years old but is being refurbished. The move to Addenbrook House would make big savings on business rates which are most expensive in the Town Centre. New Invest to Save initiatives had been set up in 6/7 capital areas to generate £0.25m savings each year for example from lighting or energy.

Cllr. A McClements asked about the Council will deliver the priority on being a business friendly council and how this will be different from other authorities?

The Council is looking at ideas to generate money. One example could be to become a housing provider again as the government has changed the rules enabling local authorities to borrow money at rates lower than the private sector. The Council could set up its own care homes to drive down the cost of care or have its own B&B to reduce costs of emergency accommodation.

The Chair asked whether the Council could work with other like-minded Councils to procure or provide these kinds of services.

Cllr. B. McClements informed Members that Telford & Wrekin have one of the lowest unit costs of care in the West Midlands. The only authority in the West Midlands that has lower costs is Walsall. There was a risk that working with other authorities could disadvantage Telford & Wrekin and increase our costs. In relation to procurement, the Council has set up a Procurement Task Force to look at driving out savings from procurement. In some areas such as schools the Council had to use the government's approved list so there were limitations on procurement. New posts had been created as an "Invest to Save" initiative to increase procurement resource particularly looking at the

care sector.

Cllr. B. McClements gave some feedback on the scrutiny process and said that he has found preparing for the Holding to Account Session a useful process and as described earlier it has prompted closer monitoring of some areas. Cllr. McClements commented that if he cannot explain what he is doing to the Scrutiny Management Board how can he answer to the public?

The Chair and all the Members thanked Cllr. B. McClements for attending and answering all the questions so fully and openly.

SMB-14 APPOINTMENT OF TOWN AND PARISH COUNCIL CO-OPTees TO SCRUTINY COMMITTEES

Cllr. S. Reynolds declared a pecuniary interest and left the room.

The Scrutiny Group specialist presented the report. Seven nominations had been received from Town and Parish Councils. As there had been more nominations for the Housing, Economy and Infrastructure Scrutiny Committee than there were places, the Scrutiny chairmen met and recommended the nominations as set out in Section 5.1 of the report.

RESOLVED:

- **That the recommendation be agreed and the co-optees be appointed as set out in Section 5.1 of the report.**

SMB-15 UPDATE FROM SCRUTINY CHAIRS

The Chair informed that Board that item 7 would be taken before Item 6. A summary of the work of the Scrutiny Committees was circulated by the Scrutiny Group Specialist.

Cllr. S. Reynolds reported on the work of the Budget and Finance Scrutiny Committee. The majority of the work for this Committee will take place during the budget consultation process. However, as the work of this Committee cuts across the work of other Council Committees, work had been joined up to avoid duplication. Members of the Committee had been invited to attend the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee to look at value for money of Care Placements and to the Audit Committee to consider a report on Capital Receipts. Attendance at meetings has been good.

Cllr. A. McClements reported on the work of the Co-operative and Communities Scrutiny Committee. The new members are gaining an understanding of the work of the Committee and its role in challenging the Executive. The Committee had made reports to Cabinet on changes to the leisure concessions policy and the establishment of a First Point (single point of contact) for businesses. There had been good cross-party working on some controversial issues. The Committee would now monitor the

implementation of the recommendations agreed. Cllr. A. McClements reported that during the year she had met informally with the Managing Director and relevant Cabinet Members which had helped to ensure that scrutiny was involved early in the policy development process.

The Chair suggested that the Scrutiny Chairmen should take responsibility for monitoring the implementation of previous recommendations and bring updates to the Committee if this is needed.

Cllr. A. McClements informed the Board that the report on the Management of Community Centres will be taken to Cabinet in October. The Members had visited many Community Centres managed by both the Council and other organisations. Recommendations had been made that the Council should make a concerted effort to develop the centres, working co-operatively with partners and local people. It was found that the Community Centre in Priorslee was not operating as a community centre as it is used by a nursery Monday to Friday. Cllr. V. Fletcher commented that it is a community centre but the take up of other activities provided at the Centre has not been good e.g. dance mats that have been bought. Cllr. A. McClements said that the report and recommendations were based on the evidence the Committee received which showed that there had been little take up of the activities at the Centre.

Cllr. C. Turley reported on the work of the Housing Economy and Infrastructure Scrutiny Committee. The Committee met informally for a briefing on the procurement process for the waste management services so that members understand the elements of the process. Members also had a further confidential briefing on the selection process for the bidders. The Committee will undertake a site visit in October to a recycling facility to see the materials recovery and paper recycling processes. The other topics agreed informally for the work programme are the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), Business Improvement Districts and housing issues. Attendance at the meeting has been good.

The Chair reported on the work of the Health and Adult Care Scrutiny Committee. The committee has met and agreed the work programme and received a report from the Hospital Trust. This report included a presentation on the review of Urgent Care and Stroke Services. The Committee was aware that there had been some concerns that one of the A & E services would close. However the Chair of Telford and Wrekin Clinical Commissioning Group is chairing a group looking at the provision of A& E services

Other work undertaken by the Committee has been a visit to the stroke units on both hospital sites. Following the visit members were of the view that there is a single stroke service across the county and it is vital that this service is maintained.

SMB – 16 SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD WORK PROGRAMME

RESOLVED

Members agreed the Work Programme for the Scrutiny Committee as set out in the document tabled under the previous agenda item.

TIME AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The time and date of the next meeting at 10.30am on Friday, 16th November in the Reception Suite at Civic Office was noted.

The meeting ended at 12.00pm.

Chairman:

Date:

SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD

Minutes of the meeting of the Scrutiny Management Board held on Friday, 16th November 2012 at 10.30am in the Scrutiny Meeting Room Civic Offices, Telford

PRESENT: Councillors D. White (Chair), V. Fletcher, M. Ion, A. McClements, C. Mollett, S. Reynolds, C. Turley.

IN ATTENDANCE: Cllr. L. Clare, Cabinet Member Adult Social Care; Fiona Bottrill, Scrutiny Group Specialist; Stephanie Jones, Scrutiny Officer.

SMB-17 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

RESOLVED– that the minutes of the meetings of the Scrutiny Management Board held on the 14th September 2012 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

SMB-18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None

SMB-19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

SMB-20 HOLDING THE EXECUTIVE TO ACCOUNT

The Chair welcomed Cllr. Liz Clare, Cabinet Member Adult Social Care, to the meeting for the Board's second Holding the Executive to Account Session. Cllr. Clare had been sent a list of questions to address in advance of the meeting.

- The Chair began by asking Cllr. Clare what the biggest challenge was facing adult social care. Cllr. Clare replied that the biggest problem was money. She hoped that the service would remain within budget but doubted that this would happen given the overall budget pressures and in particular the reduction in Continuing Healthcare (CHC) funding by the PCT. Telford & Wrekin PCT had gone from being one of the most generous funders of CHC to one of the lowest over a short space of time which meant the Council was spending an additional £8-9million from the social care budget to offset the reduction. The Council was committed to working with the PCT, and the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) going forward, but Cllr. Clare did not believe the PCT was taking responsibility for the healthcare of some patients being discharged from hospital. A case example was given to

illustrate the potential risks of CHC funding being refused. The Council had fought the decision but the PCT had refused to reconsider. Cllr. Clare felt the PCT was distant from the patient and the argument had been about money when the real issue was the care of the patient. The CCG would be inheriting this problem from the PCT and Cllr. Clare felt that they needed to get this right from day one otherwise it would reflect badly on the CCG. The Council's approach had been to tackle issues while the patient was still in hospital so that patients were not discharged until any problems had been sorted out. The Chairman added that Telford & Wrekin PCT had gone from being in the top 5 most generous funders of CHC to the bottom 5 within 2 years and that the issue was with the interpretation of the guidelines for eligibility for funding. The issue affected self-funders as well as the Council. This was being looked at in some detail by the Health & Adult Care Scrutiny Committee.

- Cllr. McClements asked whether other authorities had similar problems with CHC funding, whether the matter had been taken up with other Councils and whether other Councils were considering raising the threshold for social care funding to "critical". Cllr. Clare replied that this was a national problem. The problem had been taken up with partners locally for example Shropshire Partners in Care (SPIC). There were some good elements of the Health & Social Care Act but social care funding was still an issue and there would not be a policy decision until after the next election. The Chairman said that he had met some care home owners who were worried about financial sustainability. He also said that there was an issue with the training of staff carrying out initial assessments in that they took patients' answers at face value regardless of the mental capacity of the patient and that a properly constituted group of professionals was needed to carry out the assessments and that the patient's family should be involved. Cllr. Clare said this was a good idea but that it would require resources and the Chair suggested this could be an "invest to save" opportunity for the Council.
- Cllr. McClements asked what different ways of delivering services to save costs were being looked at because the problem would grow with demographic changes. Cllr. Clare said that adult social care did not just look after older people but looked after younger adults with disabilities some of whom need long term care. The strategy was to move to enablement. Traditionally, care packages were put in place and stayed in place. Now people go through an enablement programme which assessed (or re-assessed) people's needs and helped them develop competencies to look after themselves without the need for unnecessary care packages. This promoted independent living at home and saved money but was not an overnight solution.
- Cllr. Fletcher asked what Cllr. Clare as Cabinet member was doing to challenge the PCT on CHC decisions to ensure patients receive the care they need. Cllr. Clare replied that patients were being kept in hospital. Cllr. Fletcher queried this further because the hospital's ethos was for early discharge and the Council had a responsibility to ensure patients receive the right care. Cllr. Clare said what can happen is that the hospital carries out an assessment before discharge and if the patient is assessed as

needing residential care they are placed in residential care. The care home may then dispute the assessment if they judge the patient needs nursing care and the Council will challenge and put pressure on the PCT to reconsider decisions. Decisions can only be challenged after the event and the Council has been putting pressure on the hospital to put the right people in place to carry out the assessments, and if the Council was not happy with a decision it carries out its own assessment. It was not possible to comment on the outcome of individual cases but out of 10 challenges the Council had been successful in 5. Adult social care needs to be on the assessment team. We have made a decision to bed-block and we have made a decision to pay.

- Cllr. Ion sought clarity on the assessment process and, if an integrated assessment approach was needed, who co-ordinates this. Cllr. Clare explained that the Council has a team at the hospital which identifies patients on admission so that they come into the system early and the team can find out what support the patient has at home so this information can be fed into the assessment. It was hoped that this change in the way of working would eventually eliminate the need for Notification 2 notes issued by wards when patients were ready to be discharged.
- Cllr. Ion said that the Council has a leadership role and asked whether the Cabinet member was satisfied that when an assessment is done there is alignment and a shared understanding across partners. Cllr. Clare was satisfied that this was the case but that there was dissatisfaction about some decisions. Cllr. Ion again asked whether Cllr. Clare could assure members that partners were aligned and with a shared understanding, and Cllr. Clare gave this assurance. The Chair said he was concerned that there was not a proper team in place to carry out initial and repeat assessments and that in his view the teams were in place but not working together and Cllr. Fletcher agreed the system was erratic. The Chairman was concerned that all people should be treated fairly and should get NHS funding where it was needed. Again this was an issue for self-funders as well as the Council.
- Cllr. McClements was concerned about the first assessments for people with dementia. Cllr. Clare said that teams were working well together but that there were issues with the hospital assessments and the Council was putting pressure on to make sure family and friends were involved.
- Members made a number of comments expressing confusion and concerns about the assessment and challenge process arising from the discussion. The Chairman said that the Health & Adult Care Scrutiny Committee was gathering evidence on the assessment process and this would be taken up with partners including the CCG, and Age UK which provides an advocacy service for older people without family or friends.
- Cllr. Fletcher asked for further clarification on how well the Council was challenging decisions. Cllr. Clare said that day-to-day if the Council believed a person needed a level of care then the Council would pay for it because it could not wait for days or weeks for a decision to be made. This

did not happen often, but it did happen.

- Cllr. McClements asked about the checks and balances in place for people with personalised budgets. Cllr. Clare explained that personalised budgets had been introduced about 6 years ago to enable people to choose and buy their care provision and that this seemed to be the future direction of government policy. Personalised budgets were monitored by adult care and assessed to ensure the care met the person's needs. The Council also provided advice to people managing their own budgets but there could be a tendency to refer people to larger agencies. The Chair commented that this could impact on smaller care homes struggling to survive.

Cllr. Ion pursued a line of questioning about the processes for gathering feedback from service users and what it tells us. Cllr. Clare said there was a formal process - questionnaires are sent to service users or people could feedback on-line. There was also a lot of other consultation for example with the Senior Citizens' Forum to get their views. The Council publishes an annual Local Account to report to the public on the priorities, services and performance in adult social care. The Scrutiny Manager undertook to send the link to the report to Committee Members. Cllr. Clare urged members to read the Local Account for 2011/12 which was due to be published on the website. A picture version for people with reading problems would also be available. In terms of what the feedback tells us, Cllr. Clare said that overall satisfaction was above average but below the national average for the speed of dealing with assessments and this issue had been picked up to be dealt with. The Chair made the point that patients and service users may not express dissatisfaction with CHC funding as the Council currently providing the service for people who are not self funding. People using services do not distinguish between the different sources of funding if they are receiving the service they need.

- Cllr. Fletcher asked what ideas the Cabinet member had for income generation. Cllr. Clare said there had already been an increase in the charge for preventative care and savings from Meals on Wheels although she was disappointed that she had not been kept up to date about scrutiny of the Meals on Wheels service. A process was in place to review and monitor finances all the time. Repayment of loan-based home improvement funding was being chased and collected for cases funded under the regional Kick Start programme. Cllr. Clare said she would welcome any ideas from scrutiny for saving money. Overall the financial outlook for was not good and there will be continued budget pressures. Cllr Clare said she is asking the question "What services do we have a statutory duty to provide?". This is a quality of life issue, and there are opportunities to involve whole communities in projects around social care - the BBCs Big Build was an example of how local people and the private sector could work together on projects.
- Cllr. Ion asked how Cllr. Clare worked with Cabinet colleagues and in particular about the working between children's and adult services at Cabinet level. She replied that issues are addressed at informal Cabinet meetings and there is a good relationship and communication between Cabinet members. One role is to keep colleagues informed and the other

is to improve transition arrangements. Adult social care was working more closely with the Transition Team and this was working better but still needed improvements.

- Cllr. Ion asked whether, in the event of a serious case review in Telford & Wrekin, Cllr. Clare would be able to say that there was close alignment between children and young people and adult social care. Cllr. Clare confirmed that she would be able to say this.
- The Chairman wanted to know what had changed with the Council becoming a Co-operative Council and what was being planned to protect non-statutory services. Cllr. Clare said that when she had come into the Cabinet she had found a lot of work was being done with the voluntary sector through service level agreements. Some services could be run as co-operatives – it may be difficult for staff moving to a new company – but this could be a way forward. The TWIGS gardening service was given as an example. Cllr. Clare said that she would not propose that a service became a co-operative to save money - the Council would need to ensure that co-operatives provide people with what they need and want, that there are formal processes and professionals in place and that they are accountable. Cllr. Clare pointed to the excellent Age Concern clubs but was concerned that they did not always reach people who are isolated or in need and felt there was scope for developing these kind of activities. Adult social care had no assets to sell so in terms of generating income would have to look towards services. There were no plans to join up services with other Councils but Telford & Wrekin and Shropshire both worked together with SPIC and had jointly funded training for staff in care homes although there had been an issue with homes releasing staff for training. The Chair commented on the work carried out by Scrutiny last year on autism which identified the need to provide funding for support groups which can provide low level intervention which can save resources in the long term. The Commissioner has been asked to provide an update on this work.
- Cllr. Ion picked up on the example given about Age Concern clubs and asked whether the Council was missing opportunities to work with other organisations and in particular churches. Cllrs. Ion and Fletcher gave various examples of churches working with volunteers to provide free or subsidised meals for homeless or other groups. Cllr. Fletcher said the Diocese was looking at how the churches could interact better with people at home and Cllr. Ion said that mosque leaders had met the clergy at All Saints to discuss using their facilities and working together. Cllr. McClements suggested that Scrutiny and the Council needed to think about co-operative working with the churches. Cllr. Clare replied that where there were opportunities to join up with other organisations, we join up. The Council could provide information about people who may need help and where they are, and could work together with, for example, churches so they could offer help to people in need or isolated. The Lifelong Learning Centre had been awarded Fairshare funding to attract people into the cafe and had branched out into a local Meals on Wheels service. Cllrs. McClements and Ion felt there was a role for ward Members in bringing together local groups, organisations and businesses to work together.

- Cllr. Fletcher asked Cllr. Clare what she felt was her biggest challenge, and Cllr. Clare again said the biggest issue was money – not just today but for tomorrow. The government had deferred a decision on adult social care funding until 2015 but Councils needed clarity so they could plan for the future. Some Council's were looking at equity backed funding, but potentially this could take a long time to recoup as people were living longer. Savings had already been made from cuts to service staff and senior management which had been cut to the bone leaving little scope for further staff savings. There was a lot of pressure on senior management to find money, but there was now a risk that cracks in services would start to appear.

There were no further questions and the Chairman thanked Cllr. Clare for attending the meeting and asked for her feedback on the "holding to account" process. Cllr. Clare replied that she was accountable to Cllr. Sahota as the Leader.

SMB-21 CHANGES TO THE CONSTITUTION AND SCRUTINY HANDBOOK

The Scrutiny Group Specialist summarised the report on changes to the Scrutiny Handbook and Constitution. Changes to the Scrutiny Handbook were required to reflect the new Scrutiny Committee structure and evolving scrutiny practices, and a copy of the Handbook with suggested changes marked as tracked had been circulated as Appendix 1 of the report for Members to consider. Changes to the Constitution were required following regulations related to the process for publishing notice of Cabinet meetings and decisions under the Localism Act 2012 as set out in Sections 5.2 - 5.7 of the report. The regulations would affect the role of the Scrutiny Chairmen and scrutiny arrangements. Further changes to the Constitution would be required once regulations relating to health scrutiny under the Health & Social Care Act 2012 were published in 2013.

Cllr. Fletcher suggested that further changes should be made to the Scrutiny Handbook as follows:

- To include a process for urgent matters to be considered by a Scrutiny Committee
- That the Scrutiny and the Media Protocol should include sending press releases/statements to the relevant Scrutiny Committee members for information prior to release
- That the co-optee expense allowance should be clarified
- That provision should be made for the withdrawal of the co-optee allowance for non-attendance after 6 months.

The Scrutiny Group Specialist sought advice from the Board as to whether the Call-in section of the Handbook should be amended to clarify the role of the scrutiny team in advising Call-in members. This would be limited to advising on the wording of the call-in to ensure the request is clear for voting purposes when the Scrutiny Management Board hears the call-in. This was agreed by

members.

The Scrutiny Group Specialist suggested that the Board may wish to review the criteria for scrutiny suggestions as they were referred to but not included in the Handbook and had not been reviewed for several years. It was agreed that the scrutiny team would draft proposed criteria for the Board to consider at a future meeting.

RESOLVED

- **That further amendments to the Scrutiny Handbook be made as suggested by Cllr. Fletcher, with a further amendment to the Call-in process as agreed, and e-mailed to the Scrutiny Management Board for approval prior to circulation to the Scrutiny Assembly.**
- **That the changes to the Constitution relating to the regulations under the Localism Act 2012 as set out in sections 5.2 – 5.7 of the report be agreed to take to the Council Constitution Committee.**
- **That authority be delegated to the Statutory Scrutiny Officer, in consultation with the Scrutiny Chairman, to take changes in respect of health scrutiny to the Council Constitution Committee.**

SMB-22 UPDATE FROM SCRUTINY COMMITTEE CHAIRS

The Scrutiny Chairmen provided updates of the work and progress of their Committees.

- Cllr. Turley, Chair of the Housing, Economy & Infrastructure Scrutiny Committee left the meeting at the start of this item but had provided a written update which was read out by the Scrutiny Group Specialist
- Cllr. McClements, Chair of the Co-operative & Communities Scrutiny Committee reported that the recommendations in the report on the Management of Community Centres had been presented and agreed by Cabinet in September; the next meeting would monitor the implementation of previous recommendations on the development of a one-stop-shop for businesses and changes to the leisure concessions policy; a review of the Employee Commission and Co-operative Values would be scoped in November; the Committee had worked jointly with the Budget & Finance Scrutiny Committee to scrutinise the proposed Council Tax Support scheme and the Transitional Grant and had fed into the decision making process on both; there were good examples of Members taking responsibility for their own work when 2 had attended meetings of the Co-operative Commission and Employee Commission and had written reports to feed back to the Committee.
- Cllr. Reynolds, Chair of the Budget & Finance Scrutiny Committee reported that the Committee had done a lot of joint working, with the Co-operative & Communities Scrutiny Committee on the Council Tax Support and Transitional Grant, the Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee on value for money of children in care placements and members had attended Audit Committee to monitor Capital Receipts and had reported back to other

Budget & Finance Committee members. The Committee had a heavy work schedule coming up with meetings throughout January to look at the budget proposals and the consultation process, and a meeting in December to review the schools funding formula and the additional savings proposals already released for consultation from the September Cabinet report.

- Cllr. Ion, Chair of the Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee, reported that the Committee had had 3 meetings including a briefing on the findings of the Ofsted inspection which rated safeguarding and looked after children services as adequate and had implications for the work programme. Meetings would be held in non-Council venues relevant to the issues under scrutiny; the September meeting had been held at Shortwood school which enabled members to see a modern infant and primary school and to hear about some of the issues for Head Teachers. The Committee was focussing on an in-depth review of the Children in Care Placement Strategy with three key strands:
 - a) To check that current policies and procedures keep children in the Council's care safe. There had been a good session with some reassuring information, but further lines of enquiry were being pursued with children in care homes outside the borough, social workers and foster carers.
 - b) That the placement strategy provides best value for money. This had been less satisfactory and scrutiny had discovered that information about the unit cost of internal foster care which had been in the public domain for months was not a true cost. This had led to further questioning and clarity on costs was being sought.
 - c) The Council's responsibility (if any) for children placed in the borough by other authorities. The lead officer from West Mercia Police had been invited to a meeting to talk about the role of the police in the context of children in care homes in Telford and Wrekin, the regulatory framework for care homes and the role of the local authority.

A sub-group had been set up to take stock of work and the start to shape recommendations.

Cllr. Fletcher expressed concerns about unregulated private care homes in the borough and the Chairman expressed concern about the number of children coming into care. Cllr. Ion replied that these issues were being looked at by the committee and findings would be taken up with the Cabinet Member and Director of Children's Services.

- Cllr. White, Chair of the Health & Adult Care Scrutiny Committee reported three strands of work:
 - a) Telford was hosting the regional Health Scrutiny Chair's network meeting in December
 - b) The Joint Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee had taken up several key issues with Shropshire including A&E services as there were concerns about the sustainability of 24/7 A&E on two hospital sites, and the Travel & Transport Plan relating to the reconfiguration of the acute services.
 - c) The Health & Adult Care Scrutiny Committee was focussing on the issue of CHC funding as discussed at length during this meeting. A report on

the scrutiny arrangements would be taken to the Health & Wellbeing Board.

SMB-23 SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME

The Scrutiny Group Specialist presented the report on the Scrutiny Work Programme which had been circulated with papers for the meeting. The number and type of meetings held in the municipal year to date, the issues considered by the Scrutiny Committees and the schedule of future reviews were shown in the report. The Scrutiny Group Specialist pointed out that there had been more working group meetings than anticipated which, if this continued to be the case, may impact on the number of formal Committee meetings which could be held and the Board may need to revisit the benchmark number of formal meetings (6 per Committee per year) over time.

The Scrutiny Officer raised an issue with managing scrutiny of the welfare reforms as many aspects cut across more than one Scrutiny Committee. The Chairman said it was a matter for the relevant Chairmen to agree between themselves which Committee would lead or join up on work.

RESOLVED

That the work programme be noted.

TIME AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The time and date of the next meeting at 10.30am on Friday, 18th January 2013 in Meeting Room 7, Ground Floor, Darby House was noted. Members agreed that they would like Cllr. Shaun Davies to be invited as the next Cabinet member to be held to account at the January meeting.

The meeting ended at 12.30pm.

Chairman:

Date: