

## **BUDGET & FINANCE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of a meeting of the Budget & Finance Scrutiny Committee held at 6.30pm on Tuesday, 7<sup>th</sup> January 2014 in Meeting Room 3, Darby House, Telford.**

**PRESENT:** Councillors S. Reynolds (Chair), K. Austin, N. Dugmore, R. Evans, A. Lawrence, C. Mollett, G. Reynolds and Co-optee R. Williams.

Also attending: Cllr. W. McClements, Cabinet Member Finance & Enterprise; K. Clarke, Assistant Director Finance, Audit & Information Governance and Chief Financial Officer; F. Bottrill, Scrutiny Group Specialist; S. Jones, Scrutiny Officer.

### **BFSC-24 MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – that the minutes of the meeting of the Budget & Finance and Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee held on 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2013 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

### **BFSC-25 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Cllr. K. Guy and Co-optee F. Robinson.

### **BFSC-26 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None

### **BFSC-27 SERVICE & FINANCIAL PLANNING STRATEGY 2014/15-2015/16**

The Chair welcomed members to the first of the meetings to scrutinise the Service & Financial Planning Strategy. There were difficult decisions to be made and she looked forward to a non-political scrutiny process. The Chair invited the Cabinet Member and Chief Financial Officer (CFO) to present the key proposals from the budget report.

The CFO made the following points:

- The report was subject to agreement by Cabinet on 9<sup>th</sup> January 2104
- The Council had received the provisional settlement on 18<sup>th</sup> December which was very late. The final settlement would be notified in late January/early February but was not expected to be radically different.
- The timetable was: 4<sup>th</sup> February – end of consultation; 20<sup>th</sup> February – Cabinet agree final proposals; 27<sup>th</sup> February – Council agree budget.
- There were major investment proposals for Youth Unemployment (Telford and Wrekin being above regional and national levels) and environmental and infrastructure improvements which were included in the budget report with separate reports also going to Cabinet.

- Key proposals included:
  - Council Tax freeze for 2 years. The proposal was to accept the freeze grant following confirmation from government that the grant would be paid on-going and would not be time limited.
  - £52.9million cuts had already been made, more than generated annually though Council Tax and equivalent to around £750 per household.
  - Following the scrutiny recommendation to increase the level of base budget provision for children’s care placements, the response was a proposal to create a £1.2m draw-down contingency budget for safeguarding for 2014/15.
  - £8m capital and £1.5m revenue investment for environmental improvements over 2 years including a doubling of the community chest fund from £1,000 to £2,000 per ward member for the next 2 years. Capital spending would be phased, £4m in 2014/15 and £4m in 2015/16. The cost of borrowing would be entirely offset by the changed approach to debt repayment.
  - £2m per year for 3 years to maintain the road network (£6m total).
  - £0.7m one-off match funding for facilities to help disabled people live independently at home.
  - £1.3m over 2 years to tackle youth unemployment
  - £100k for Destination Telford to promote the borough as a place to live, work and visit
  - Lobbying on key issues for the borough:
    - A “Growth Deal” to ensure more of the proceeds of sale of government land is invested back into the borough and to increase the proportion of business rates generated from 49% to come back to the Council;
    - Government to change of rules around business rate exemptions to end abuse
    - CCG to increase the level of CHC funding in Telford and Wrekin - £8.5m costs have been shunted from the NHS to the Council from the withdrawal of CHC, equivalent to about £120 per household. The table in section 2 of the report showed people in Shropshire were 4 times more likely to receive CHC funding despite the fact that Shropshire has less deprivation, better health and community hospitals. The Council’s view was that the CCG ought to be spending about £4m extra per year on CHC to close the gap with other areas.
- The table in Section 2 summarised the projected budget gap. The projected base budget gap reported to Cabinet in November had been: 2014/15 - £12.147m, 2015/16 £23.710m (cumulative). There had been a number of changes since November including an improved position on the pension fund contributions which was projected to bring a benefit of £694k in 2014/15 and £1.5m by 2015/16. After factoring in all the changes the updated projected budget gap was £11.428m for 2014/15 and £22.263m for 2015/16.
- Appendix 3 set out over 200 savings proposals with the rationale and impacts. If all the savings proposals were implemented and delivered on time, they would generate more savings than needed. The surplus from the delivery of early savings would fund the revenue investments in the Pride in Your Community and Youth Unemployment initiatives, an additional investment of £30k in the leaving care grant as recommended by scrutiny, the £1.2m draw-down contingency for safeguarding and the £100k investment in Destination Telford. There would be a revenue benefit of £1.5m (2014/15) and £1.2m (2015/16) from the revised

approach to calculating the Minimum Revenue Provision which would fund the debt charge for the £8m capital investment in Pride in Your Community. Funding from the surplus required for 2015/16 would be transferred to a provision and drawn down in 2015/16.

- Section 5.4 set out the revised approach to debt repayment. Local authorities have a duty to make provision for debt redemption known as Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP). Different options are available to Councils for calculating MRP. A review had been carried out of all treasury management policies which identified potential benefits from changing the method of calculation of asset life repayments from Equal Instalments of Principal (EIP) to the annuity method i.e. similar to a domestic repayment mortgage (whereby repayment of interest is frontloaded and the principal repaid at the end). The change had been discussed with external auditors who had confirmed in writing that they were satisfied with the change and this had given additional comfort to the CFO as Section 151 Officer that it was the right thing to do. The revised approach would be included in the Treasury Management Strategy and reviewed by the Audit Committee. The change would bring a £4.8m one-off benefit and then a £1.48m saving in 2014/15 and on-going but reducing saving each year. The different method of calculation would make commercial investments more viable.
- The revenue base budget was set out in Appendix 8a showing a total net expenditure of £136.5m. Appendix 9 summarised the overall reserves and balances which after committed funds left usable balances of £3.7m. The base budget assumed a 1% pay award for staff. General inflation had not been built in but provision had been made for contractual inflation. £2.5m had been built in as a general contingency. Any under-spend at year end would be used to make a contribution to the severance fund and residual amounts to increase capacity or as invest to save funds or to increase general fund balances.
- The list of Appendices was at the end of the report and included the savings proposals (3), the capital programme (5), council tax comparisons (6, 7) and the communication and engagement plan (11).

Cllr. McClements then made the following remarks:

- He thanked the CFO and Managing Director for their work on refinancing the debt. The EIP structure for capital repayments had made it difficult for the Council to compete with businesses and moving to the annuity calculation would enable the Council to compete on a more equal footing. It would give the Council £4.8m back as a one-off and would fund the £8m capital for environmental improvements for 12 years with no impact on the tax payer. This was good news.
- He and the Managing Director and CFO had met Brendon Lewis MP (Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government) on 6<sup>th</sup> January and had raised 3 issues:
  - a) CHC funding – he felt Brendon Lewis had understood the Councils' arguments and he had asked to be copied into future communication on the matter. The government wanted common budgets for health and social care with Better Care and so he seemed sympathetic.
  - b) The Growth Deal – he was aware of the issues and the response was not negative.
  - c) Abuse of the business rates system (e.g. businesses avoiding business rates by registering as charities) – he was aware of the issue and requested data to

help build a case for change.

- Adult care accounted for 36% of the Council's budget. The cost shunt from the NHS to the Council from the withdrawal of CHC funding was a long running issue with the CCG/PCT which had been going on for longer than three years and it was now time for action. Cllr. McClements had been pressing CCG lay Board members to urge them to listen, and had been putting pressure on David Wright MP who was raising the issue in Parliament. It was important to resolve the issue by next year because of the need to make significant savings and the Council needed adequate funding from the CCG.
- The Public Health grant was ring-fenced for 2013/14 and 2014/15 but there was uncertainty after that.
- The government had announced the complete withdrawal of Crisis Assistance funding from 2015/16 which was another pressure and there would need to be a debate about how this would be funded in future.
- He asked members to note that £3m of the proposals to meet the budget gap were from generating extra income from Council Tax growth, Business Rate growth, New Homes Bonus and leisure income. Income from housing had done better than expected.
- They would continue to drive savings through procurement, for example £5.4m of the adult care budget was spent on block contracts i.e. buying blocks of beds which may not all be occupied and these costs would be attacked. There were some tough messages on adult care because the soft savings had been made and there would now be difficult decisions. Other areas to tackle were domiciliary care costs and to push personalised budgets. There was a proposal to save £900k from technology for the elderly. Historically, the Council had funded eligible care needs to allow people to remain living at home but where the cost of care at home was higher than the cost of residential care the Council would now insist that the person moves into residential care or that they or their family top up the cost difference stay at home. Care packages of less than 3 hours a week were being reviewed to see if they were sustainable.
- There would be £770k p.a. savings from the new waste contract with changes from 2014 and 2019.
- £6m had been committed to road building over 3 years.
- There were some good ideas in the Youth Unemployment proposals such as the Job Junctions, the apprenticeship hub, work placements etc.
- Figures released before Christmas showed GVA in Telford & Wrekin grew by 3.7% i.e. £114m per year which would contribute an extra £47m tax to the treasury. This was higher than the West Midlands average (1.3%) and the rate of growth needed to continue. This meant that 25-27% of the budget gap would be met by growth and not by cuts.

The Chair thanked Cllr. McClements for the presentation. She said that the Committee would need to decide what issues to look at during the budget scrutiny process but from her point of view the adult care budget should be one of the areas to look at. Her approach to scrutinising the budget would be to allow members from other scrutiny committees to attend meetings and take part in the discussion but it would be the Budget & Finance Scrutiny Committee which would agree the response to the budget proposals. She was pleased to see Youth Unemployment on the agenda as she knew from her employment at TCAT that this was an issue for the borough. She then invited questions from members.

- Cllr. Lawrence referred to the data in the Adult Care & Support section and wanted to know why the level of CHC funding in Telford & Wrekin was so low. The CFO explained that there is a standard methodology but that it is subject to interpretation by the individuals undertaking the assessments. If the needs are deemed to be health, the NHS pays, if the needs are deemed to be social care, the Council pays. In the Council's judgement, people in a comparable state of health are more likely to get CHC funding if they live in Shropshire than if they live in Telford and Wrekin. This also affects self-funders who are not eligible for social care funding. Cllr. Lawrence wanted to know who the staff are that make the decisions, and the CFO said they were CCG staff.
- Cllr. Lawrence wanted to know how actuaries in Shropshire had been persuaded to reduce the pension fund contributions and whether the reductions would leave the fund low. The CFO said the actuaries were very cautious and they tend to look at the worst case scenario. Their first position had been that an extra £4m cash was needed but this had been revised. The first change was to the liabilities on the pension fund. Liabilities are calculated with reference to prevailing gilt yields and the actuaries had changed from using the gilt yield at a particular point around a year ago – to using the yield calculated over the medium term to reflect the fact that gilt yields are at historic low levels. This had reduced the deficit and therefore the additional contributions required for next year significantly. They then looked at the value of assets. The stock market had increased significantly since the initial valuation and this had also reduced the level of deficit and therefore the additional contributions required. The actuaries also agreed that the increases in contributions could be phased in over a 6 year period. This meant more would be paid over the long term but on a phased basis that could be built in to future financial planning projections.
- Cllr. Lawrence questioned where the saving from changing the MRP to the annuity method which he thought would cost more over the course of the loan. Cllr. McClements said that annuity option worked out better because it takes account of the value of cash over time (i.e. £100 in 40 years is worth less than £100 now). The CFO clarified that the advantage of the annuity method was that the repayments were lower for the first few years of the loan which was prudent at this time when the Council needed to make savings and allowed time to plan for the additional costs in later years which can be calculated well in advance. The new approach also allows projects which will result in growing incomes over time to be afforded e.g. the potential housing investment where if the project proceeds the rents should increase with inflation over time and therefore be capable of supporting increased debt costs.
- Cllr. G. Reynolds wanted to know how the lobbying activity would continue. Cllr. McClements said that the Managing Director had met the Chair and Chief Executive of the CCG that day and the MD had said there was some more positive feedback. They would continue to raise the issue with the CCG and to keep the profile up. David Wright MP had raised the issue in Parliament that day. The Health & Adult Care Scrutiny Committee had done a review of CHC and had made a number of recommendations. The CCG was not acknowledging the trends and he felt they needed to take what the Council is saying on board. Cllr. White who

was present at the meeting added that the scrutiny report had been presented to the CCG and the Council for a response. The issue was not just with new cases but also CHC being withdrawn on reassessment. The government had issued revised guidance on the criteria for CHC which the CCG had not adopted. He was meeting the Chief Executive the following day and the CCG would be asked to show how things had improved following scrutiny's recommendations and if there had been no improvement the scrutiny committee had reserved the right to refer the matter to the Secretary of State. Decisions about CHC funding affect self-funders as well as the Council. Over the last few years, the amount of CHC funding had reduced from around £14m to £3m and although there had been a slight increase recently the situation was still perilous. The Cabinet Member also said the CCG had argued that the age profile is different between Telford & Wrekin and Shropshire which accounted for the variation in levels of funding, but the under-65s had been taken out of the analysis to remove any potential bias so that data could be compared on a like for like basis and the level was still below Shropshire's.

- Cllr. McClements added that in terms of consultation they were trying a new type of event which was a rolling event throughout one day outside Debenhams with key partners like the police to try to reach out and consult with people on the budget.

There were no further questions the Cabinet member and CFO left the meeting.

There was then a discussion about items for the meetings on 21<sup>st</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup> January and 4<sup>th</sup> February and the following was agreed:

- It had been confirmed with the scrutiny team that the conservative group would be putting forward alternative budget proposals to come to scrutiny. It was agreed that the alternative proposals would be presented at the meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> January subject to the proposals being approved and available in time for the meeting. Cllr. Austin requested that papers should be sent out a week in advance to give members time to read them. The Scrutiny Group Specialist suggested that the Committee could scrutinise each set of proposals on their own merits and comment separately on each - members did not have to support one set of proposals over the other. There would also be discussions about the presentation of the proposals so that any potential conflict of interest for members of the Committee would be clarified beforehand.
- It was agreed that the meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> January would focus on the adult social care budget subject to availability of the Cabinet member and officers. Members of the Health & Adult Care Scrutiny Committee would be invited to attend and the Chair said she would welcome their expertise.
- As Members had not had much time to read or digest the budget report and savings proposals, the Chair proposed that members read them in detail, identify issues they wish to look at as part of the budget scrutiny process and send their questions to the scrutiny team by 13<sup>th</sup> January for the scrutiny team to collate the questions and make appropriate arrangements. Members should state whether they required a written response or attendance of a Cabinet member or officers at a future meeting.

- The Scrutiny Group Specialist reminded members that the Audit Commission’s Tough Times report and the LGA’s Rewiring Public Services report had been circulated to the Committee and members may find them useful to help shape some of their lines of enquiry. The reports would be re-circulated after the meeting.
- The Scrutiny Group Specialist suggested that members may find it useful to ask Cabinet members attending future meetings whether they could identify any specific issues or savings proposals which scrutiny could look at as part of the work programme.
- The Chair said she felt that the Council should consider the language for communicating with the public. She felt that the word “savings” could give people the impression that the Council had money (savings) that could be squeezed out and she felt that “cuts” was a better message. Cllr. Lawrence disagreed and said that “cuts” is a very politically motivated word and there was a general suggestion that service reduction may be appropriate which no one disagreed with.

The meeting ended at 7.50pm.

**Chair:**.....

**Date:**.....

## TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL

### Budget Proposals 2014/15

#### REPORT OF MAIN OPPOSITION GROUP

## 1. OVERVIEW

The Opposition key budget strategy proposals for 2014/15 include:-

**Freezing Council Tax for the next two years** - Following unsuccessful attempts to persuade the Current Administration to freeze Council Tax for residents in the Borough over the past two years, we welcome the change in policy to freeze Council Tax during 2014/15 and again in 2015/16. This measure recognises the severe pressure placed on many local people by the nation's financial situation and retains additional disposable income in the local economy.

**Protecting Adult Social Care** – The current Administration's proposals include a reduction in adult social care budgets of £6.0m by 2014/15 rising to £7.65m by 2015/16. In addition, a further £2.85m will need to be saved to address ongoing overspends against the current budget giving a total savings target of £10.5m. put forward by the Administration. We propose additional funds of £2.3m to cushion the impact of the worst reductions in Adult Care and Support services.

**Investment in highways** – Following many successive years of under investment we propose to invest £7.1m per year in highways for 5 years in order to clear the backlog of highways works in the Borough and return the highways to a high standard desired by residents and business.

We recognise that the Current Administration's proposals to commit £2m from the Councils Capital Programme per year for highways over a 3 year period is much less than what is required to offset day to day wear and tear and that their proposed programme will result in even further deterioration in the Borough's road system. (Although we accept that the Administration's Pride in Your Community proposals would make around £2.5m additional funding available pa over the next two years).

**Investing in Safeguarding Children from harm and neglect** – We support the creation of an additional budget of £1.2m to be drawn down as required by the Council's safeguarding service and protection of essential front-line early intervention and prevention services.

**Review of Remuneration packages** – We propose a review of employee terms and conditions to generate ongoing annual savings of £1.8m pa. Areas for consideration in this review would include sick pay entitlements, potential reduction to all salary grades of up to 2.25% and a reduction in entitlements to car user allowances.

**Partnering with other authorities** – We believe that significant savings can be achieved over time by partnering with adjacent authorities and have provided a list of potential areas which may be suitable. Part Year savings of £125K are included as a part of this proposal.

**Spending Review** - We have identified a number of non-essential posts and spending that can be undertaken in other ways or deleted from the council budget.

**Parking Charges** – We propose to cancel the proposed increase to parking charges

**CSO / Environmental** – We propose to cancel the proposed cuts to Community Support Wardens and Environmental budget items

**Contingency** – We have included a contingency figure of £475K, to cover slower than envisaged implementation of our proposals or any additional one-off implementation costs.

## 2. SUMMARY

The current Administration's proposals include a reduction in adult social care budgets of £6.0m by 2014/15 rising to £7.65m by 2015/16. In addition, a further £2.85m will need to be saved to address ongoing overspends against the current budget giving a total savings target of £10.5m. put forward by the Administration

Our proposals seek to cushion the impact of the Adult Social Care cuts by making £2.3m of other savings available during 2014/15 to alleviate the worst of these proposals and to use the MRP fund reserve (see below) to cover the cost of financing the Highways capital spend to cover the remedial work programme.

A revenue saving has been identified of £4.89m as part of a change to accounting for interest and capital repayments on the Councils Borrowing. (Known as MRP) The current Administration has proposed to place this 'windfall' in a reserve to fund their unspecified Pride in the community scheme. **It should be noted that this change to accounting does not involve any cash savings over the life of a loan, and increases the level of future interest payments to balance the savings in the earlier years.**

Highways' spending is a key concern of residents, though only £2m per year has been committed from the Councils Capital resources to this area by the current Administration as part of the council's long term highways capital program. (Although we recognise that the Administration's Pride in Your Community proposals would increase this amount by around £2.5m for the next two years). This compares poorly to the £7.1m per annum needed to clear the backlog of Highways remedial works.

## **Adult Social Care**

This is a particularly challenging area for the council as it involves some of the most vulnerable and needy members of our community

The focus of the current Administration is to realise these savings over a two year period by:-

- Re-commissioning and negotiating down provider costs (c. £3.3m)
- Lobbying Telford & Wrekin CCG for £2.0m of funding due following their transfer of Continuing Health Care (CHC) Cases to the Council.
- Efficiencies, service re-design, reviewing block care contracts, more effective enablement, and review and maximisation of income (c.£3.4m)
- Reducing care packages for existing people in the community care system where there is likely to have been historical over-prescription of essential need or support elements can be replaced by, for example, assistive technology or community-based support of lower cost (c.£1.4m)
- Restricting access to the community care system for people with a relatively low level of need and supporting families and communities to do more to support their own without the need for funded care (c. £0.4m).

**We propose to make £2.3m additional funding available to help protect Adult Care Services from the worst of these cuts. Detailed proposals on the use of this funding would be developed should this budget be approved.**

**Furthermore, successful lobbying of CCG to achieve fair ongoing funding (over and above the £4.4m assumed) for the Borough would reduce cuts to front line services during 2014/15.**

## **Highways**

Our proposals include an investment in highways of £7.1m per annum, this is based on advice and recommendations from officers as to what incremental spending levels, above and beyond that contained within the current administration's budget, are required to bring our highways back to up to an acceptable standard.

The current Administrations budget contains £2m per year for 3 years (Although we recognise that the Administration's Pride in Your Community proposals would increase this amount by around £2.5m for the next two years) and nothing allocated for years 4 or 5 as financial planning is limited to a 3 year period only. Our proposal takes a 5 year view of highways condition



<b>Funding</b>						
<b>DfT Grant</b>	3,400	3,400	3,400	3,400	3,400	17,000
<b>Existing capital programme</b>	2,000	2,000	2,000			6,000
Pride	2,500	2,500				5,000
<b>Additional Capital Funding required</b>	2,600	2,600	5,100	7,100	7,100	24,500

**At current investment levels, including any potential PIC capital monies, highways spend is still £24.5m short of what is required to clear the highways backlog.**

**This table has been provided by highways officers based on their understanding of the “Pride” proposal**

Council Officers have provided the following overview of the highways backlog as follows:

**Highways Backlog** - The figures provided are an estimate of the costs of addressing the highways maintenance backlog and are based upon two options; the first option with an annual additional investment of £4.1m pa will address the backlog by ‘asset sweating.’ This seeks to gain as much value from the asset (highway) as possible but is only a short term solution to extending the asset life until further infrastructure improvements are required. This will be done by maximising the surface dressing programme to extend the carriageway life.

The second option with an estimated additional annual investment of £7.1m pa will allow for an improvement to the condition of the network, remove the existing backlog and address many of the current issues highlighted by residents, businesses and Councillors, including addressing maintenance issues on the ‘unclassified’ roads within the borough.

A capital investment at this level would bring the highway network up to an acceptable standard and reduce the pressure on future years capital programme. An ongoing maintenance programme would be required to maintain the highway at this standard and to address pressures from growth in the network.

Some marginal savings in the annual reactive maintenance budgets for highways would be expected; however these savings would need to be offset against the increase in revenue borrowing costs as a result of the investment. Five years has been used as a planning and modelling assumption, but programmes could be adapted to other timeframes

**Putting aside the PIC program the administration is proposing a level of highways spend below that needed to cover wear and tear of highways**

## **Youth Unemployment**

More than one in four young people in the Borough are out of work, putting T&W above national and regional averages. We need to help young people build their future and the Council has a duty to take a lead role on this agenda working with businesses and partners to create training and job opportunities for young people. We support this initiative to invest £1.3m revenue funding over a 2-year period (2014/15 and 2015/16) to deliver a programme of pledges and action to tackle youth unemployment and ensure that every 16-24 year old who is seeking employment or training is supported.

## **Partnering with other authorities**

We envisage partnership working with other neighbouring authorities, as has been achieved elsewhere across the country. We would welcome a close working arrangement with the Unitary Shropshire Council, which is our nearest neighbour where significant savings could be realised due to close proximity, shared borders and many similar issues. However, when considering joint working, and after careful consideration, any proposal to formally merge has been ruled out due to reasons of community identity and significant differences in make up.

There are a number of areas of the council that can be usefully shared to achieve costs savings. A comprehensive list has been passed to officers but examples include

- Payroll
- Internal Audit
- Finance Team
- Legal
- Treasury Management
- Senior Officer team / Directors
- Architectural services
- Highway maintenance for example shared use of equipment such as pot-hole busters

Officers are confident that £125K can be saved in 2014/15 with an annual saving potential of £250K per annum achievable thereafter. This strategy has been successfully pursued by other authorities although some implications may arise. We anticipate that a more comprehensive review of the areas proposed could lead to far higher levels of usable savings. We also recognise the potential for conflicts of interest to arise from sharing senior officers and propose that back office functions be evaluated initially.

## **Review of staff Terms and Conditions**

Given the difficult financial position of the authority, we would review the terms and conditions of staff with a view to streamline the benefits available.

The following areas have been identified for review out of which we would seek to generate additional annual ongoing savings of £1.8m pa with an assumption of £0.8m being available during 2014/15.

- Apply a reduction to all pay grades of up to 2.25% saving up to £1.5m pa in a full year (after allowing for any impact of known changes to NMW)
- Sick Pay – the council offers 6 months of full sick pay and 6 months of half pay for employees with more than 5 years of service. - Potential Savings: £500K in 2014/15 and £1.5m in a full year if we only paid Statutory Sick Pay.
- Essential Car users allowance. – Potential Savings: £300K

We would seek to renegotiate contracts with staff and have only shown a part year saving for 2014/15 due to introduction timescales.

We recognise that a change like this would entail a number of costs which would be charged to the restructuring reserve. Where possible we would seek to achieve this through negotiation and discussion with staff.

A number of Officers currently receiving an Essential Car Users Allowance would be able to claim recompense through the council's standard millage allowance scheme.

## **Single Status Accrual and Employers NIC**

Tax consulting firms who specialised in Single Status advise that other authorities who have settled single status have come to arrangement with HMRC over employer's national insurance. Rather than going into detailed calculations and listing NI numbers etc- they simply agreed a % with HMRC and paid it. The typical % being around 5.5% compared to the current employers rate of NIC of 11.8%

We suggest a similar approach is taken reducing the accrual rate for Employers national insurance retrospectively which dependent on the eventual terms of settlement of the Council's equal pay project may offer scope for some one-off saving..

There may additionally be an opportunity to fill vacancies with Apprentice roles, reducing the ongoing cost to the authority whilst further benefiting youth employment opportunities within the Borough. The Administration are assuming 150 specific apprentice roles and these would be additional opportunities for Apprentices over and above that number.

## **Other savings**

A list is included with Appendix A. We have identified a number of roles and functions that can be undertaken by other team members and our proposals include the removal of

- Direct Financial Support for Trades Unions
- Indirect Union support via free accommodation
- Reductions to membership subscriptions
- Reductions to conference attendance

Union membership and participation is welcomed; however it is considered iniquitous that tax payers in Telford & Wrekin should be paying for Union representation for Council Officers, facilities which should be paid for by employees themselves. In many instances Council Officers also live outside of the Borough.

## **Contingency**

We have included a £475K contingency to cover non-deliverability or delays in delivery of some of the savings

Any associated one-off implementation costs e.g. data migration costs and system changes where services are to be shared would be charged to reserves.

Ongoing Savings. Our proposals include ongoing savings of £1.8m in respect of the Review of Remuneration, we consider that there are a number of different approaches which could achieve that, individually or using a different combination of approaches.

Higher savings may be achieved via Partnering with Other Authorities

Greater use of Apprentices within the authority could make savings and at the same time promote youth employment.

## **Access to data**

Inaccessibility, for the main Opposition Group, to Officer Saving's proposals prior to the publication of the Administration's budget has made the identification of alternative savings more problematic than would otherwise have been the case. In our experience other savings are likely to be available however, given the timescales available, we have used information readily available to us.

We support the Administration's proposal to bring forward savings proposals from future years where they are possible and practical to achieve within existing resources. Savings delivered early can be used to create one-off

resources to fund 'Invest to Save' initiatives, support and preserve 'key' front line services and build capacity to review services and support the development of more cost effective methods of future service delivery.

It may for example be possible to limit the extent of reductions to the staff sick pay scheme, reduction in pay grades or the removal of essential user car allowances by indentifying alternative savings such as more extensive partnering with other authorities.

### **Lobbying for a fair deal**

Councils are losing income from some businesses that abuse Business Rates exemptions – we will lobby Government for changes in the law to end this abuse. This Council, like most other administrations before it, is also lobbying Government for a "Growth Deal" to ensure that more of the proceeds from the sale of Government land in the Borough is invested back in the Borough and for more than 49% of the business rates generated in the Borough to be retained by the Council in order to help the Council deliver growth.

### **3. COUNCIL TAX**

Council Tax, under the last Administration, reached historic low levels and, prior to the local elections of 2011, Telford & Wrekin had the lowest Unitary Council tax in the entire Midlands and was the fifth lowest unitary in England.

Over the past two years the current Administration have reintroduced Council Tax increases and in so doing have taken in excess of £2m from the pockets of the local community to the detriment of the local economy.

Although we consider it to have arrived two years too late, we welcome the policy u-turn from last years budget strategy and the introduction of a Council Tax freeze in line with our neighbouring Unitary Authority in Shropshire,

The Government's decision to include council tax support grant within the RSG was predicted by Opposition Members but dismissed by the administration at the Council's Budget setting meeting in 2013.

### **Damping**

A factor that has reduced resources in this area is "grant damping" whereby part of the grant calculated by the Government for Telford & Wrekin is withheld and used to support spending by councils that would otherwise receive less grant e.g. as a result of reducing population numbers. In the calculations used to establish the new local government finance system which came in to effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2013, £1.6m pa of this loss was perpetuated in the new baseline funding settlement for the Council and will be withheld from us for the foreseeable future.

#### **4. REVIEW OF APPROACH TO DEBT REPAYMENT**

The Local Authorities (Capital Finance and accounting) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 08 (SI 08/414) places a duty on local authorities to make a prudent provision for debt redemption. Guidance on Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) has been issued by the Secretary of State and local authorities are required to “have regard” to such Guidance under section 21(1A) of the Local Government Act 2003.

Given the scale of the accounting entries, this approach has been discussed with the Council’s External Auditors who have looked at the information that we have provided and have also reviewed the relevant guidance, which “gives councils quite a lot of breadth in assessing and calculating a prudent minimum revenue provision,” and have confirmed that the current administrations proposals appear to satisfy the conditions in the guidance.

**We do however remind members that this is not a windfall or one off gain, but a re-phasing of interest from earlier budget years to later ones, and that future councils and budgets, and hence tax payers, will need to support the higher interest charges that will feature as a result of this change.**

We do accept and concur with the concept of ‘net present value’ as the future value of money will be less than its current value due to inflation. This change is therefore acceptable given the economic circumstance and financial challenges facing the council.

However, given the different and difficult circumstances we now face, we fully support this change

**Our strategy is to invest the full benefit of this reserve into the restoration of the highways condition for 5 years as this long term benefit appears to be the most appropriate use of future tax payer’s monies.**

**We do not agree with using future tax payers money to fund cosmetic, short term, or unsustainable measures limited to narrow segments of the community as appears to be embedded within the PIC proposal of the current administration.**

**Report prepared by:-**

- **Councillor Adrian Lawrence FCA – Main Opposition Shadow Cabinet Member for Resources**
- **Andrew Eade – Main Opposition Group Leader**

Budget Summary Table - 2014/15

	Cabinet Budget	Main Opposition Proposals	Main Opposition Budget
Projected Budget Gap	2014/15 £m	2014/15 £m	2014/15 £m
Base Budget gap per report to Cabinet 14 November 2013	12.147		12.147
Changes to projected budget gap since November:-			
• Cut in Housing benefit/council tax support admin. grant	0.095		0.095
• Cost of capital investments	0.515		0.515
• Additional New Homes bonus	- 0.100	-	0.100
• Pension fund contributions	- 0.694	-	0.694
• Other changes	- 0.535	-	0.535
<b>Updated Budget Gap</b>	11.428	-	11.428
Savings proposals (net of provision for "leakage" from general fund and savings needed to cover service pressures)	- 14.133	- 1.213	- 15.346
Reduction in Care & Support Savings		2.338	2.338
Revised approach to calculation of Minimum Revenue Provision	- 1.489		- 1.489
Revenue investment over two years, in "Pride In Your Community" initiative *	1.608	- 1.608	-
Revenue Investment over two years in Initiatives to tackle youth unemployment *	1.305		1.305
Revenue investment increasing care Leavers Grant per scrutiny recommendation	0.030		0.030
Additional "Draw-down" budget for Safeguarding	1.200		1.200
Destination Telford initiative	0.100		0.100
Budget Contingency - provision for one-off costs/phasing, non-delivery of savings and any leakage from savings		0.483	0.483
<b>Projected net Budget shortfall</b>	<b>0.049</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>0.049</b>
Contribution from Provision to fund debt charges on the proposed "Pride In Your Community" initiative	- 0.049		- 0.049
<b>Restated shortfall before use of general balances or identification of further savings</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>0.000</b>

Breakdown of £1.213m savings changes:

	£
<b>Additional Savings</b>	
Stop funding translation/interpreting for Council documents and services	- 23,000
Cease employing an equality officer	- 39,000
Cease employing sustainability development officers	- 66,000
Reduce memberships and subscriptions across the council	- 55,000
Reduce attendance at conferences across the council	- 20,000
Reduce the costs of recruitment advertising	- 25,000
Cease paying staff to work for trade unions	- 82,000
Charge trade unions for office accommodation	- 14,000
Reduce Delivery & Planning and Policy & Strategy spend by around 10%	- 87,000
Savings through partnership working/shared services with other authorities	- 125,000
Re-negotiate sick pay entitlements and/or % reduction to pay grades	- 500,000
Cease paying essential car user lump sum payments	- 300,000
<b>Savings Deleted</b>	
Environmental	80,000
Parking Charges	25,000
COS	18,000
<b>Total Additional Savings</b>	<b>- 1,213,000</b>

**SCHEDULE OF MAIN OPPOSITION SAVINGS PROPOSALS**

No.	Service	Description of Saving	2014/15 £	2015/16 £	Total £	Rationale	Impact on the Community and possible alternative/mitigation	Staffing impact	Impact on other council service or partner budget	Other risks and impacts and possible mitigation
1	Cooperative Council	Stop funding translation/interpreting for Council documents and services	23,000		23,000		Total spend across Council from 1.4.13 to 31.12.13 = £16,994 40% of the expenditure relates to Sign Language. Sign Language is provided as a 'reasonable adjustment' within the scope of the Equality Act 2010. There is a direct instruction in the Act that public bodies provide information to disabled people in a format that they can understand. It is likely that there would be some cost to the Council for the provision of this service even if delivered in an alternative way.		Translation and interpretation costs are funded from services own budgets. The contract for translation and interpretation is managed and monitored by the Equality Officer who was responsible for the new contract that was implemented in 2012. If a corporate contract or provision wasn't in place services would need to access their own provision in terms of translation and interpretation.	Public bodies have a legal responsibility to provide information to disabled people in a format that they understand, this provision generally relates to sign language. If the Council did not have a mechanism to provide this service would be open to legal challenge and the related costs of contesting the challenge and any award that might be made. The risk of the Council not providing some level of community language interpretation and translation relates to consequential costs. There is no requirement within the Equality Act 2010 for public bodies to provide translation and interpretation for community languages, however we could be subject to significant consequential costs if the Council was found to have failed to meet the General Equality Duty and discriminated on the grounds of race and nationality.
2	Cooperative Council	Cease employing an equality officer	39,000		39,000		The role of the Equality Officer relates to developing the Council's policies and providing advice to services on implementing these policies, each service area carries out their own impact assessments within the framework developed by the Equality Officer and Team Leader. The Council is required to demonstrate how it meets its General Equality Duty under the Equality Act 2010, the way in which public bodies do this is not prescribed. If this was not delivered in the current format there would be the need for the Council to demonstrate how it ensures that it meets the General Equality Duty. It is likely that the Council would need to use external resources to develop our policies to ensure that we comply with our duties under the Equality Act as there is insufficient capacity with the remaining members of the team to deliver this service. The Equality Officer also delivers community engagement activity to the wider community and supports the Armed Forces Covenant Partnership. The removal of this post would impact on the Council's ability to deliver its commitments within the Armed Forces Covenant and wider community engagement activity.	1 employee would be placed at risk - and the post would be deleted.	Services would need to ensure that they met their responsibility within the General Equality Duty without advice and guidance from within the Council. A number of Local Authorities have been subject to Judicial Reviews as the process that they have followed in relation to reviewing services and making savings was not robust. Reduced capacity to support services to deliver community engagement activity.	The Equality Officer is also the Lead Officer in relation to the delivery of the Armed Forces Covenant and supports the Partnership. If this post was removed there would be limited capacity to deliver this work. Also the Equality Officer directly delivers Community Engagement activity with other members of the team. There would be a reduction in capacity to deliver community engagement activity on behalf of the Council.
3	Customer Services	Cease employing sustainability development officers	66,000		66,000			2 employees would be placed at risk		The Sustainability team made up of 2 officers are now the only energy related posts operating in the Council, so consequently their work is very varied and links with a number of other Council services. The work that the 2 officers undertake with Council staff and clients is integral to driving efficiencies in energy usage in both operational and school buildings. The service they offer is one that is well received by schools with the vast majority of primary schools and some secondary schools buying back their support service, which not only helps schools identify savings on their energy consumption but also helps to educate both staff and pupils to become more sustainable. A proportion of the 2 officers salaries (approx 50%) are reimbursed from schools buyback. The team are actively involved with a number of building projects and play a leading role in assessing and reviewing utilities charges for Academies within the BSF programme and the PFI, to ensure that the recharges for utilities usage for Council services operating from these sites are equitably split. They are responsible for reviewing all utilities charges across the Council operational buildings and with ensuring that the Council receives best value when procuring its energy packages and energy initiatives. The officers' work has been vital in enabling the Council to achieve the excellent CRC rating we received and without the team's contribution, the Council could have been issued with significant financial penalties.
4	Council Wide	Reduce memberships and subscriptions across the council	55,000		55,000	Spend was £158k in 2012/13 across the whole council	This represents a cut of just over 1/3 but specific proposals for which memberships and subscriptions would be deleted are not available so the impacts can not be assessed.	This represents a cut of just over 1/3 but specific proposals for which memberships and subscriptions would be deleted are not available so the impacts can not be assessed.	This represents a cut of just over 1/3 but specific proposals for which memberships and subscriptions would be deleted are not available so the impacts can not be assessed.	This represents a cut of just over 1/3 but specific proposals for which memberships and subscriptions would be deleted are not available so the impacts can not be assessed.
5	Council Wide	Reduce attendance at conferences across the council	20,000		20,000	Spend was £32k in 2012/13 across the whole council	This represents a cut of over 60% but specific proposals for which events would no longer be attended are not available so the impacts can not be assessed. However, access to knowledge about the significant changes taking place affecting local government and best practise would be reduced which may impact on the ability to identify further opportunities for efficiency savings.	This represents a cut of over 60% but specific proposals for which events would no longer be attended are not available so the impacts can not be assessed. However, access to knowledge about the significant changes taking place affecting local government and best practise would be reduced which may impact on the ability to identify further opportunities for efficiency savings.	This represents a cut of over 60% but specific proposals for which events would no longer be attended are not available so the impacts can not be assessed. However, access to knowledge about the significant changes taking place affecting local government and best practise would be reduced which may impact on the ability to identify further opportunities for efficiency savings.	This represents a cut of over 60% but specific proposals for which events would no longer be attended are not available so the impacts can not be assessed. However, access to knowledge about the significant changes taking place affecting local government and best practise would be reduced which may impact on the ability to identify further opportunities for efficiency savings.
6	Council Wide	Reduce the costs of recruitment advertising	25,000		25,000	Spend was £57k in 2012/13.		Saving of a few hours		Currently implementing new recruitment/advertising process which will deliver savings.
7	Law, Democracy & People Services	Cease paying staff to work for trade unions	82,000		82,000			Redundancy of two employees		Negotiation framework becomes unstructured. Changes, redundancies etc become more difficult to agree. Likely to be a greater number of disputes with greater call on elected member's time. More tribunal/legal claims as regional officers will place holding applications because of time pressures.
8	Law, Democracy & People Services	Charge trade unions for office accommodation	14,000		14,000					May not be easy to cash this saving as the space used by the Unions is shared with the Civil Resilience Team.

9	Cooperative Council	Reduce Delivery & Planning and Policy & Strategy spend by around 10%	87,000		87,000		We have just completed a restructure of the whole of the Co-operative Council and Commercial Delivery Team. This will deliver £40k more savings than our original target. As part of this, the Policy & Strategy Team has become the Co-operative and Commercial Projects Team and will provide corporate project management capacity to deliver a range of projects linked to the Council's priorities and to generate additional income for the Council. These include youth employment, therefore any further reduction in capacity would impact on our ability to meet the priorities and needs of the community. It would also reduce the capacity available to deliver commercial projects and generate additional income, which would potentially mean more reductions to services for the community. Similarly, Delivery & Planning is primarily focussed on supporting service delivery (existing and new ways of working), partnership working and the provision of performance and management information.	To deliver the proposed saving, at least 1 post in the new Projects Team and additional 1.5 posts in Delivery & Planning would be deleted.	Many of the projects being delivered by the new Projects Team are being delivered on behalf of or in conjunction with different service areas across the Council and partner agencies. Any further reduction in capacity would place additional pressures on other council services who in some cases would not be in a position to take projects forward.  Delivery & Planning has a key role supporting services to deliver+N6 savings through the provision of management and performance data (for example around adult social care and children social care) and developing new ways of working. Further savings for the service would impact on the ability of the team to do this.	A key role of Delivery and Planning is to complete a number of statutory activities including data returns to Government, partnership working, and inspection activities including, for example, OFSTED's inspection of children safeguarding. A further cut to the team would impact on the ability of the team to complete these activities and potentially have a negative impact on the reputation of the Council.
10	Council Wide	Savings through partnership working/shared services with other authorities	125,000	125,000	250,000		There is a potential for conflicts of interest to arise if senior roles are shared e.g. the attraction of inward investment which could generate additional business rates - which authority's interests would the officer put first?	Asking senior officers to fulfil their role for two authorities may be unrealistic given the hours currently worked by senior officers following the halving of resource at this level and the scale and pace of change demanded by the radical changes taking place in local government. Staffing structures and areas of responsibility may need to be rationalised between the two authorities.	Some of the services identified as potentially being shared are already generating external income (e.g. from schools in Shropshire) which is reducing the Council's net costs. If services are shared it is unclear how this income being earned by T&WC from schools in Shropshire would be treated.	A list of potential services to share with Shropshire has been identified but no discussions have taken place at officer level between the authorities to identify the one-off costs associated with for example data migration or system developments, timescales or how any savings generated would be apportioned between the two authorities. In the absence of any specific detailed business case the savings figure is a target.
11	Law, Democracy & People Services	Re-negotiate terms and conditions including sick pay policy and/or potential % reduction to all pay grades	500,000	1,000,000	1,500,000					Sick pay is governed by national terms and conditions agreements, If the Council only paid SSP there will be impacts on the level of sickness absence which are difficult to have a sound basis to estimate. It will be necessary to enter into lengthy collective negotiations to change employment contracts but ultimately the council is likely to have to terminate the contracts of all employees and offer revised terms of engagement. This will lead to employment tribunal applications and legal costs. In the time available the estimated saving was the best figure that could be arrived at but has a high degree uncertainty.
12	Law, Democracy & People Services	Cease paying essential car user lump sum payments	300,000		300,000					This is an area a number of council's have changed.
<b>Total</b>			<b>1,336,000</b>	<b>1,125,000</b>	<b>2,461,000</b>					

## Summary of Savings Proposals - Main Opposition Budget

Category	2013/14 £	2014/15 £	2015/16 £	2016/17 £	Total £
Funding	366,856	1,449,010	872,360	-	2,688,227
Income	404,526	1,401,157	656,276	179,000	2,640,959
Non-Staff	632,145	1,661,609	451,000	38,000	2,782,754
Procurement	123,000	2,120,912	658,500	-	2,902,412
Property Rationalisation	108,100	194,826	75,000	30,000	407,926
Service Review/Redesign	743,960	5,464,179	1,989,200	8,000	8,205,339
Strategic Review of Capacity (Staffing)	216,480	2,807,070	2,131,784	103,000	5,258,334
<b>Total Savings</b>	<b>2,595,067</b>	<b>15,098,763</b>	<b>6,834,121</b>	<b>358,000</b>	<b>24,885,951</b>
Less Pressures	- 726,334	- 1,333,146	- 43,000	- 10,000	- 2,112,480
<b>Savings Less Pressures</b>	<b>1,868,733</b>	<b>13,765,617</b>	<b>6,791,121</b>	<b>348,000</b>	<b>22,773,471</b>
Less Provisions for leakage and pensions adjustment	- 80,000	- 208,000	- 86,000	- 5,000	- 379,000
<b>Net Savings</b>	<b>1,788,733</b>	<b>13,557,617</b>	<b>6,705,121</b>	<b>343,000</b>	<b>22,394,471</b>
<b>Cumulative</b>		<b>15,346,350</b>	<b>22,051,471</b>	<b>22,394,471</b>	

### Notes

The savings are a combination of additional savings together with those already included in the budget strategy for 2014/15 to 2016/17, approved by Council on 7 March 2013

A provision has been included to take into account leakage where an element of the saving benefits capital/DSG; and also to adjust for the changes to the employers pension contribution which wef April 2014 will include a fixed, lump sum element which cannot be reduced.

There are a number of savings proposals which relate to the council's funding where the benefit will arise through increased business rates and increased council tax.

**Capital Programme - 2013/14 - 2016/17 & Later Years**

<b>Policy Area</b>	<b>Total £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>	<b>2014/15 £'000</b>	<b>2015/16 £'000</b>	<b>2016/17 £'000</b>	<b>Later Years £'000</b>
Adult Care & Support	2,049	1,499	550	0	0	0
Development Business & Employment	55,782	36,014	16,728	1,570	970	500
Neighbourhood & Leisure Services	83,316	17,796	28,595	15,300	7,425	14,200
Education & Corporate Parenting	123,456	41,567	70,440	10,048	469	932
Customer & People Services	2,970	870	700	700	700	0
Co operative Council	1,000	500	500	0	0	0
Corporate	116	879	(763)	0	0	0
	<b>268,689</b>	<b>99,125</b>	<b>116,750</b>	<b>27,618</b>	<b>9,564</b>	<b>15,632</b>
<b>Resources</b>						
Borrowing Approval	1,950	1,292	658	0	0	0
Government Grant	141,238	57,764	75,018	6,198	655	1,603
Prudential	41,648	33,915	1,404	(5,120)	920	10,529
Capital Receipts	81,655	5,374	38,252	26,540	7,989	3,500
Revenue	(1)	(41)	40	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
External	2,199	821	1,378	0	0	0
<b>Total funding</b>	<b>268,689</b>	<b>99,125</b>	<b>116,750</b>	<b>27,618</b>	<b>9,564</b>	<b>15,632</b>

**Capital Programme - 2013/14 - 2016/17 & Later Years**  
**Scheme Summary showing major schemes separately**

Scheme	Expenditure						Funding					
	Total £'000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Later Years £'000	Grant £'000	Prudential £'000	Receipts £'000	Borrowing £'000	S106/Other £'000	Revenue/External £'000
Social Care Capital Grant	662	662	0	0	0	0	662	0	0	0	0	0
ICT Social Care Review	1,037	637	400	0	0	0	235	550	0	0	0	252
Social Education Centre	350	200	150	0	0	0	0	0	350	0	0	0
	<b>2,049</b>	<b>1,499</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>897</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>252</b>
Supported Independent Living - Disabled Facilities Grant	2,867	1,446	1,421	0	0	0	1,424	1,443	0	0	0	0
Extra Care	1,000	800	200	0	0	0	0	1,000	0	0	0	0
Town Centre - Phase 1 & Accommodation Strategy	22,623	17,926	4,697	0	0	0	4,688	4,817	13,118	0	0	0
Telford Ice Rink	35	35	0	0	0	0	0	-742	777	0	0	0
Housing Related Schemes	4,270	2,805	1,465	0	0	0	1,735	2,426	335	0	0	66
Sutton Hill	292	160	132	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hadley Local Centre Phase 1 & 2	1,870	703	1,167	0	0	0	885	985	0	0	0	0
Woodside	269	61	208	0	0	0	0	39	230	0	0	0
Brookside	5,592	3,551	2,041	0	0	0	0	4,457	980	0	0	155
Borough Towns Initiative	743	743	0	0	0	0	50	-24,166	24,859	0	0	0
Improve Local People's Prospects All Other Schemes	10,056	6,129	3,927	0	0	0	8,754	24	618	161	0	499
Asset Management Plan - General Works & Surveys	2,947	847	700	700	700	0	0	2,947	0	0	0	0
Managing the Organisation Other Schemes	3,268	858	770	870	270	500	0	1,330	1,938	0	0	0
	<b>55,832</b>	<b>36,064</b>	<b>16,728</b>	<b>1,570</b>	<b>970</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>17,536</b>	<b>-5,440</b>	<b>42,855</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>720</b>
Oakengates	691	691	0	0	0	0	0	691	0	0	0	0
Parks for People	2,186	1,013	223	950	0	0	1,360	301	525	0	0	0
Newport Fitness facility	1,019	1,019	0	0	0	0	0	1,019	0	0	0	0
Crazy Golf in the Town park	100	100	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0
Improved Health & Well Being Other Schemes	767	77	690	0	0	0	33	722	0	0	0	12
Transport & Highways Schemes	31,387	12,773	13,964	2,325	2,325	0	16,195	13,131	0	521	0	1,540
Highways Investment Programme	29,500	0	5,100	5,100	5,100	14,200	0	29,500	0	0	0	0
Ironbridge Gorge Stability	17,256	1,713	8,618	6,925	0	0	11,656	5,600	0	0	0	0
Jiggers Bank Stabilization	410	410	0	0	0	0	302	108	0	0	0	0
	<b>83,316</b>	<b>17,796</b>	<b>28,595</b>	<b>15,300</b>	<b>7,425</b>	<b>14,200</b>	<b>29,546</b>	<b>51,172</b>	<b>525</b>	<b>521</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,552</b>
Building Schools For The Future	123,456	41,567	70,440	10,048	469	932	93,259	-1,165	30,420	1,268	0	-326
	<b>123,456</b>	<b>41,567</b>	<b>70,440</b>	<b>10,048</b>	<b>469</b>	<b>932</b>	<b>93,259</b>	<b>-1,165</b>	<b>30,420</b>	<b>1,268</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-326</b>
ICT/ eGov	2,920	820	700	700	700	0	0	2,920	0	0	0	0
	<b>2,920</b>	<b>820</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,920</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Commercial & Business Fund	1,000	500	500	0	0	0	0	0	1,000	0	0	0
	<b>1,000</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Managing the funding of the Capital Programme	116	879	-763	0	0	0	0	-6,389	6,505	0	0	0
	<b>116</b>	<b>879</b>	<b>-763</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-6,389</b>	<b>6,505</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
	<b>268,689</b>	<b>99,125</b>	<b>116,750</b>	<b>27,618</b>	<b>9,564</b>	<b>15,632</b>	<b>141,238</b>	<b>41,648</b>	<b>81,655</b>	<b>1,950</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,198</b>