

**When telephoning, please ask for:** Member Services  
**Direct dial** 0115 914 8481  
**Email** memberservices@rushcliffe.gov.uk

**Our reference:**  
**Your reference:**  
**Date:** 29 February 2016

To all Members of the Council

Dear Councillor

A meeting of the CABINET will be held on Tuesday 8 March 2016 at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Pavilion Road, West Bridgford to consider the following items of business.

Yours sincerely



Service Manager Corporate Governance

## **AGENDA**

1. Apologies for absence
2. Declarations of Interest
3. Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 9 February 2016 (pages 1 - 6).

### **Key Decisions**

None

### **Non Key Decisions**

4. Leisure Facilities Strategy  
The report of the Executive Manager – Communities is attached (pages 7 - 9).
5. Draft Rushcliffe Waste Strategy 2016 - 2020  
The report of the Executive Manager – Neighbourhoods is attached (pages 10 - 29).
6. Disposal of Electricity Substations  
The report of the Executive Manager - Operations and Transformation is attached (pages 30 - 33).

7. Business Rates Pooling Update

The report of the Chief Executive is attached (pages 34 -36).

**Budget and Policy Framework Items**

8. Revenue and Capital Budget Monitoring 2015/16 – Quarter 3 Update

The report of the Executive Manager - Finance and Corporate Services is attached (pages 37 - 44).

**Matters referred from Scrutiny**

None

**Non Key Decisions - continued**

9. Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012

It is RECOMMENDED that the public be excluded from the meeting for consideration of the following item of business pursuant to Regulation 4 (2) of the above Regulations on the grounds that it is likely that exempt information may be disclosed as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

10. Edwalton Golf Course - Glendale Contract Extension

The report of the Chief Executive is attached (pages 45 - 49).

Membership

Chairman: Councillor J N Clarke,

Vice-Chairman: Councillor S J Robinson

Councillors: R L Butler, J E Cottee, N C Lawrence, D J Mason

<b>Meeting Room Guidance</b>
------------------------------

**Fire Alarm Evacuation:** in the event of an alarm sounding please evacuate the building using the nearest fire exit, normally through the Council Chamber. You should assemble in the Nottingham Forest car park adjacent to the main gates.

**Toilets** are located opposite Committee Room 2.

**Mobile Phones:** For the benefit of others please ensure that your mobile phone is switched off whilst you are in the meeting.

**Microphones:** When you are invited to speak please press the button on your microphone, a red light will appear on the stem. Please ensure that you switch this off after you have spoken.

**MINUTES  
OF THE MEETING OF THE  
CABINET  
TUESDAY 9 FEBRUARY 2016**

Held At 7.00pm in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Pavilion Road, West Bridgford

**PRESENT:**

Councillors J N Clarke (Chairman), R L Butler, J E Cottee, N C Lawrence,  
S J Robinson

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

Councillors H Chewings, S J Hull, R Jones, G R Mallender, A MacInnes  
7 members of the public

**OFFICERS PRESENT:**

A Graham	Chief Executive
P Linfield	Interim Executive Manager – Finance and Commercial
K Marriott	Executive Manager - Transformation
V Nightingale	Constitutional Services Officer
A Poole	Constitutional Services Team Leader

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:**

Councillors D J Mason

**43. Declarations of Interest**

There were none declared.

**44. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 12 January 2016 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**45. Bridgford Hall Procurement**

Councillor Robinson presented a report which outlined information about the procurement of the contractor for the Bridgford Hall redevelopment. He stated that, as an Authority, the Borough Council was committed to bringing a very important building back in to use in April 2017 both as a Registry Office and an aparthotel run by Corona Park Hotel. Income from the Hall was profiled at £60k in 2017/18 and £115k in 2018/19.

Councillor Robinson explained that, as this was a specialist refurbishment of a listed building, of the five contractors invited to submit proposals, only two compliant tenders had been received. Each tender had been scored against predetermined criteria and the pricing structure assessed. The price proposals for both tenders had come in above pre-tender estimates, due to the current upturn in the construction industry coupled with shortages in skills and

supplies. Price proposals had been verified independently by cost consultants and the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF).

Councillor Robinson recognised that officers had worked hard to get contractors in place and achieve value for money. It was also noted that officers were negotiating with the contractor and it was hoped that there would be £100,000 of value engineering of costs.

In support of the proposal Councillor Cottee queried whether the £200,000 was contingency funding for the project. The Executive Manager – Operations and Transformation explained that the contingency covered two areas – contingency within the contract sum and a separate contingency following the HLF guidelines. It was anticipated that by June 2016, there would be a firm idea as to whether the contingency was required. She explained to Members that although the contractors had visited the site on many occasions it was not possible to envisage what work would be required until work started on some areas of the building.

Councillor Butler queried how receptive the HLF would be to a request for extra supportive funding. The Executive Manager – Operations and Transformation explained that they were aware that a contribution towards the additional uplift would be requested.

Councillor Clarke supported the proposal and stated that it was important that the correct contractor was appointed as this was an important Grade II building and it would require specialist heritage work to be undertaken. Officers explained that both the HLF and English Heritage would be supervising the build.

RESOLVED that:

- a) Contractor A is appointed to undertake the construction works for the Bridgford Hall project.
- b) The capital programme allocation for Bridgford Hall is increased by £200k from £2.122m to £2.322m to reflect the increase in contract price.
- c) The Chief Executive is asked to undertake a value engineering exercise with contractor A to secure the most cost effective price for the works.
- d) The Chief Executive submits a request to the Heritage Lottery Fund to seek further funding along the existing apportionment split (65 percent Heritage Lottery Fund : 35 percent Rushcliffe Borough Council).

#### 46. **Draft Corporate Strategy**

Councillor Clarke presented the draft Corporate Strategy for 2016-2020, explaining that it continued the good work carried out by the Borough Council, enabling it to deliver the important agendas of housing and economic growth and ensuring that the Borough of Rushcliffe was a great place to live. He asked officers how this document would be publicised. The Chief Executive stated that it would be featured in the Council's Rushcliffe Reports and be published on the Council's website.

Councillors Robinson, Butler, and Lawrence supported the comments made. He stated that the document focused on building the economy of the area and maintaining/enhancing the residents' quality of life.

RESOLVED that Cabinet had considered the Corporate Strategy 2016-2020 and recommended it to Council for endorsement and publication.

**47. Strategic Asset Review – Edwalton Golf Course**

Councillor Robinson explained that Edwalton Golf Course was a significant financial and community asset for the Borough, covering 40 hectares. It was currently under lease to Glendale Golf until December 2017 who had requested an extension to the contract to 2025. This extension would bring them this contract in line with the leisure contracts run by Parkwood Leisure Limited. It was noted that both companies were part of the Parkwood Group.

The proposals included a request for a reduced payment of £110,000 to Rushcliffe Borough Council, which would result in a significant drop in income. However, the offer did include a commitment to a capital spend of £50,000 on the facility in 2016/17.

Councillor Robinson proposed that a cross party working group should be established to consider the proposal and the way forward for the Golf Course. He highlighted the terms of reference and the timescales for the Group. It was noted that the Chairman would be a member of the Cabinet,

In support Councillors Cottee, Lawrence and Clarke stated that they welcomed the proposals however they were concerned about the reduction in revenue.

RESOLVED that:

- a) Members of the Executive Management Team, in consultation with the Portfolio Holders (Finance and Communities), are tasked with continuing negotiations with Glendale regarding the current request for an extension of the contract prior to bringing back a further report recommending a final decision at the March 2016 Cabinet meeting.
- b) A Cabinet-led Member Working Group be formed to consider the future viability and use of the land at Edwalton and make recommendations to Cabinet as detailed within the timeline and Terms of Reference detailed in Appendices 1 and 2.

**48. Budget and Financial Strategy**

Councillor Robinson presented a report which outlined the detail of the 2016/17 budget and the 5 year Medium Term Financial Strategy from 2016/17 to 2020/21. He explained that there was currently a unique and significant environment of financial reform and he acknowledged the excellent work undertaken by the Interim Executive Manager – Finance and Commercial and his Team.

He stated that Government policies had recommended that, as the Borough Council was in the bottom quartile, it could increase its Council Tax allocation by £5.00. It was proposed that the Borough Council would increase its Council Tax by £4.95 (4.2%) for a Band D property in each of the next 2 years, and thereafter a 2% per annum increase had been included for budgetary purposes. This still ensured that Rushcliffe's Council Tax remained the lowest in Nottinghamshire and among the lowest in the country. He also stated that the Revenue Support Grant would be reduced to zero by 2020, a reduction of 85% since 2013/14.

Councillor Robinson explained that the revenue generated from business rates was a significant challenge. This was mainly due to the situation with the power station, which formed a significant proportion of the Council's income from business rates as the policy allowed the company to appeal against the charge. The Borough Council was required to refund the business rates, but, in turn, this was not refunded by Government. He informed Members that the Government was presently consulting on how Business Rates were decided and that there would be future reports on this matter.

He explained that the Government were also consulting on the New Homes Bonus and therefore a more prudent approach had been taken when considering this income.

Members were informed that, as part of the Transformation Strategy, the Borough Council had worked hard and made savings of £4.5 million but it was recognised that an extra £1.24 million needed to be saved in the next 5 years.

Councillor Robinson explained that he was proud of the Borough Council's ambitious capital programme recognising that few local authorities had such ambitious plans. He detailed projects such as the Bridgford Hall redevelopment and the Arena, and several smaller projects. He explained that £2.6m will be retained as a general fund and contingency going forward.

He stated that the Member Budget workshops had enabled Members to work through the items to create more revenue with minimum impact on services and he was pleased to say that savings of £137,000 had been identified. The deficit would be £15,000, which without the savings there would still have been a requirement for £152,000 to be found in 2016/17.

Councillor Clarke updated Members that the Secretary of State had made a formal announcement of the final settlement, allocating transitional funding of £70,000 to Rushcliffe, which was helped by the Council lobbying Government.

He also explained that the Secretary of State planned to consult on an increase to planning fees in line with inflation over the last 4 years. Councillor Clarke explained that this would support the resourcing of administering planning applications, as it was acknowledged that the ambitious targets for building and housing could have an adverse effect on the Development Control team.

Members were informed that it had also been announced that transitional arrangements and extra income would be in place to support local authorities

in meeting the challenges. However, it was expected that finances could be more pressurised.

Councillor Clarke stated that, the fact that the Council Tax would increase by only £4.95 over a year, which equated to less than 10 pence per week, illustrated that the Council was being prudent. He reminded Members that the Government had planned that all local authorities would be self-financing and would no longer receive central funding.

In proposing the recommendations Councillor Robinson asked that the word 'consider' in recommendation 'e' be changed to 'accept'.

Councillor Lawrence supported the proposal recognising the hard work put in by officers to achieve such a balanced budget. He also stated that he had spoken with residents who supported the rise in Council Tax rather than a reduction in the service offered. He highlighted the Garden Waste Scheme which was proposed to raise approximately £1million in income. He said that this was a good example of how services were being delivered to hold costs down and maximise revenue.

Councillor Clarke supported the comments stating that there was no Government grant for freezing the Council Tax, as had previously been the case.

The Chief Executive thanked Members for their support to officers in developing the budget, in a very challenging year.

Councillor Butler supported the comments made.

RESOLVED that Cabinet recommends that Council:

- a) adopts the budget setting report and associated financial strategies 2016/17 to 2020/21 (attached Annex) including the Capital Strategy (Appendix 5) and the Transformation Strategy and Programme (Appendix 3) to deliver efficiencies over the five year period.
- b) adopts the Capital Programme as set out in Appendix 4.
- c) sets Rushcliffe's 2016/17 Council Tax for a Band D property at £122.94 (increase from 2015/16 of £4.95 or 4.2%).
- d) sets the Special Expenses for West Bridgford, Ruddington and Keyworth, Appendix 1, resulting in the following Band D Council tax levels for the Special Expense Areas:
  - i) West Bridgford £52.92 (£52.44 in 2015/16)
  - ii) Keyworth £1.48 (£1.76 in 2015/16)
  - iii) Ruddington £3.53 (£3.57 in 2015/16)
- e) accepts the 'four year offer' as part of the draft financial settlement

43. RESOLVED that the public be excluded from the meeting for consideration of the following item of business pursuant to Regulation 4 (2) of the above Regulations on the grounds that it is likely that exempt information may be disclosed as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

44. **Land North of Bingham**

Cabinet considered the report of the Executive Manager - Transformation and Operations in respect of acquiring a piece of land in Bingham.

RESOLVED that:

- a) Cabinet acquires the additional 0.8 hectares and delegates the final negotiations within the agreed price envelope to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Resources
- b) the 2016/17 capital programme is amended to include this purchase price plus associated fees
- c) following acquisition Cabinet agrees to the marketing of the site with a view to disposal of part of the site to local businesses wishing to expand as detailed in the report of 8 September
- d) Cabinet considers the results of the marketing at a future Cabinet report, to include comments and feedback from the Bingham and Radcliffe Growth Board, and Bingham Town Council.

The meeting closed at 7.55pm.

CHAIRMAN



## Report of the Executive Manager – Communities

### Cabinet Portfolio Holder Councillor J E Cottee

#### 1. Summary

- 1.1 The Council has a Leisure Facilities Strategy (2006 to 2016) which supports healthy, active lifestyles, and contributes to the corporate priority of 'maintaining and enhancing our residents' quality of life'.
- 1.2 The current Strategy was updated in 2011 after a 15 month review by a Cabinet Member Group. A further refresh of the strategy is required in order to both ensure that the timescale of the strategy is within date, and to reflect changes in the operating environment.
- 1.3 It is proposed that rather than set up a dedicated Member Group to oversee this work that the Community Development Scrutiny Group undertakes this role within its' work programme and reports back to Cabinet with recommendations for an updated strategy.

#### 2. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that Cabinet delegate responsibility to the Community Development Group to review the current Leisure Facilities Strategy and report back to Cabinet in March 2017, with a recommendation of an updated strategy.

#### 3. Reasons for Recommendation

- 3.1. It is important that Rushcliffe Borough Council (RBC) has an up to date Leisure Facilities Strategy in order to guide and help support future provision so that as housing growth is delivered facilities reflect the needs of residents and support public health.
- 3.2. As there have been some notable achievements within the current strategy the revised strategy is deemed to be more of a refresh than a total rewrite. As such it is proposed that it could be accommodated within the normal work programme of the Community Development Scrutiny Group without the need to establish a dedicated working group.

#### **4. Supporting Information**

- 4.1 The 2015 Kings Fund report; (commissioned by the District Council Network) *'The district council contribution to public health'* highlights the important contribution that local councils play through leisure provision. Stating that; 'Physical inactivity is one of the biggest health challenges facing the nation. Overall, physical inactivity is responsible for up to one in five premature deaths and is estimated to cost the UK economy more than £7 billion annually'.
- 4.2 The vision for leisure within the RBC Leisure Facilities Strategy 2006-2016 is *"To enable and encourage healthy, accessible and sustainable alternatives for leisure time to enhance the quality of life of all Rushcliffe residents and visitors to the Borough"*.
- 4.3 The addendum to the Leisure Strategy published in December 2011 outlines a framework to reduce the number of leisure centres from six to five, (which will be achieved with the current investment into Rushcliffe Arena) and an overview of improvements for the remaining facilities subject to various 'triggers'. The strategy also sets out local standards for the provision of open space, and outdoor sport and recreation facilities.
- 4.4 It is proposed that the new strategy covers a 10 year timescale, with an interim update after 5 years. The proposed scope of the strategy is to include indoor leisure centres owned by RBC, outdoor leisure facilities owned by RBC and open space standards across the whole Borough, to support provision associated with new housing developments.

#### **5. Other Options Considered**

There is no statutory requirement to produce a Leisure Facilities Strategy so a decision could be made not to refresh the strategy and to allow the current strategy to expire. However this would make it increasingly difficult to secure developer and other external funding contributions towards sustainable fit for purpose leisure provision.

#### **6. Finance**

Financial implications from the Leisure Strategy, once finalised, will need to be factored into the Councils Medium Term Financial Strategy, with a focus on affordability, sustainability and prudence.

#### **7. Legal**

No legal issues arise from this report.

## 8. Corporate Priorities

Leisure provision contributes directly to two corporate priorities, namely; Maintaining and enhancing our residents' quality of life and Transforming the Council to enable the delivery of efficient high quality services.

<b>For more information contact:</b>	Name: Dave Mitchell Job title: Executive Manager - Communities 0115 914 8267 email <a href="mailto:dmitchell@rushcliffe.gov.uk">dmitchell@rushcliffe.gov.uk</a>
<b>Background papers Available for Inspection:</b>	Leisure Facilities Strategy (2006-2016) – addendum produced December 2011
<b>List of appendices (if any):</b>	



Rushcliffe  
Borough Council

Cabinet

8 March 2016

Draft Rushcliffe Waste Strategy 2016 - 2020

5

## Report of the Executive Manager – Neighbourhoods

### Cabinet Portfolio Holder Councillor N C Lawrence

#### 1. Summary

- 1.1. Building on the previous Rushcliffe Waste Strategy 2009 - 2015 and in accordance with national guidance the Council have developed a draft Waste Strategy for 2016 – 2020 and an associated action plan. The draft strategy and action plan have been further shaped through a consultation process involving Community Development Scrutiny Group, key partners and stakeholders. The resulting strategy is designed to provide the key principles and actions upon which the Council can continue to deliver an effective and efficient waste collection service that combines good value for money with a customer centric approach.

#### 2. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that the Waste Strategy 2016 - 2020 be approved.

#### 3. Reasons for Recommendation

##### 3.1. The draft Waste Strategy seeks to:

- a) Fulfil Section 49 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 which encourages local waste authorities to develop their own strategies or action plans.
- b) Raise awareness among Members, officers, partners and the public about the waste management challenges facing the Borough and the Council's actions in response.
- c) Position the Council as forward-looking in regard to how it continues to focus on waste reduction and recycling whilst recognising the difficulties in providing additional waste services due to technical and financial restrictions.
- d) Establish a strategy for working with a range of partners to improve waste and recycling services, maintaining existing recycling rates and focusing resources on projects that make a practical difference.
- e) Continue to deliver cost effective and efficient refuse and recycling services which help resident's to manage their waste.

#### 4. **Supporting Information**

- 4.1 Rushcliffe has an enviable record in regards to waste and recycling. The recycling2go service was awarded Beacon Status in 2007 and was one of the top performers in the national recycling and composting league tables for many years. It remains the top recycler across Nottinghamshire with a recycling and composting rate consistently around 50%.
- 4.2 Rushcliffe Borough Council published its first waste strategy in 2009 under which there has been continued progress and many waste collection achievements which are summarised in the new waste strategy. However, it is recognised that to continue to increase recycling rates will take significant financial and technical investment along with strong partnership cooperation.
- 4.3 In a two tier local authority arrangement waste collection is carried out by Rushcliffe, as the designated Waste Collection Authority (WCA) whereas disposal arrangements and costs are the responsibility of Nottinghamshire County Council as the Waste Disposal Authority (WDA). Nottinghamshire County Council awarded a 26 year PFI contract to Veolia Environmental Services Ltd in 2006. Rushcliffe are therefore responsible for collecting and delivering waste to contractually designated disposal sites and has limited influence in what can be collected and subsequently recycled.
- 4.4 Cooperation on waste in Nottinghamshire is supported by the member led Nottinghamshire Joint Waste Management Committee which meets on a quarterly basis under an agreed terms of reference. Rushcliffe is an active member of the committee and whilst keen to see improvements in the range of recycled items collected and subsequently reprocessed it is recognised that significant changes would be needed at the Material Recycling Facility (MRF) in Mansfield that would come at an additional cost to the County Council. Veolia would also need to ensure secure and financially viable end markets for any additional recyclable items collected.
- 4.5 It is recognised that the introduction of future service improvements such as food and textile recycling and any expansion to the existing MRF input specification would be at an additional cost to both Rushcliffe and significantly Nottinghamshire County Council. In the current financial climate further changes in the short term are therefore extremely unlikely.

#### 5. **The New Waste Strategy 2016 - 2020**

- 5.1 In accordance with the report to Community Development Group on 26 January 2016 the draft strategy was distributed to a list of consultees and the consultation process ran until the 19 February 2016. Following the consultation process the comments received were gathered and considered and a summary of the key points raised along with the action taken, including any specific policy amendments is shown in **Appendix A** of this report.
- 5.2 The Council's new draft waste strategy attached at **Appendix B** reflects on past achievements but primarily focuses on maintaining or improving, where possible, Rushcliffe's own recycling and composting rate whilst keeping a focus on encouraging a reduction in residual waste. This will be underpinned by the continuing to deliver an efficient and cost effective refuse and recycling

service and maintaining the existing high resident satisfaction ratings e.g. 80% in the latest 2015 residents' survey.

- 5.3 The new strategy also focuses on greater partnership and collaboration and details plans to continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and Veolia Environmental Services to explore the expansion of the range of materials collected and investigate the feasibility and costs involved in textile and food waste recycling at the kerbside over the life of the strategy.
- 5.4 As before the new strategy is supported by a more detailed action plan which will be reviewed on an annual basis and provide a link to the Council's performance management framework.
- 5.5 An Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken and no major change or adverse impacts were identified.
- 5.6 If Cabinet approve the strategy and action plan the document will be graphically enhanced, prior to publication, to ensure that it conforms to the Council's design brief for corporate documents.

## **6. Other Options Considered**

- 6.1 The Council could decide to not have a Waste Strategy and associated action plan as it is not a legal requirement however the reasons stated in paragraph 3.1 provide a strong driver to support the continued adoption of a waste strategy to help shape future waste collection arrangements.

## **7. Risks and Uncertainties**

- 7.1 Given the different functional arrangements as detailed in 4.3 there is always a potential risk that the Waste Disposal Authority can utilise its powers of direction over the Council as the Waste Collection Authority. However this risk is mitigated on a practical level through the effective partnership working arrangements of the Nottinghamshire Joint Waste Management Committee.

## **8. Implications**

### **8.1 Finance**

Given the current economic climate and financial challenges, it is envisaged that the vast majority of the actions outlined in the new strategy will be achieved within existing secured and projected resources and budget available to the Council and its partners.

### **8.2 Legal**

There is no statutory requirement to produce a waste strategy. The Council does however have a statutory duty to deliver a refuse and recycling service. There are currently no statutory recycling targets set by central government, although the EU Waste Framework Directive does place an emphasis on members states to, by 2020, ensure at least 50% by weight of waste from households is prepared for re-use or recycled.

### 8.3 Corporate Priorities

The new Waste Strategy 2016 -2020 links in with two of the corporate priorities which are;

- a) **Maintaining and Enhancing our resident's quality of life**
- b) **Transforming the Council to enable the delivery of efficient high quality services**

<b>For more information contact:</b>	David Banks Executive Manager - Neighbourhoods 0115 914 8405 email <a href="mailto:dbanks@rushcliffe.gov.uk">dbanks@rushcliffe.gov.uk</a>
<b>Background papers Available for Inspection:</b>	None
<b>List of appendices (if any):</b>	Appendix A – Consultation Comments Appendix B - Draft Waste Strategy 2016 -2020

## APPENDIX A

### Waste Strategy Consultation Responses

Consultee	Consultee Comments	RBC Response
<p>Paul Phillips RBC Environment Sustainability Officer</p>	<p>The strategy seems to cover the majority of waste streams and is a good comprehensive document. One potential further consideration could be separate collection of domestic fluorescent tubes / CFT bulbs, which are currently likely to go into the grey bin, although whether this is feasible and practicable would need to be considered.</p> <p>For bring sites, there perhaps needs to be an aim to increase participation as well as increase streams available, e.g. food and drink containers, (tetrapak) I would expect most go into the grey bin. While the reducing glass weight may have reduced tonnages, reduced participation may also have an impact, with people relying more on only recycling the kerbside collected items.</p>	<p>The disposal of domestic fluorescent tubes/CFT bulbs is catered for through the existing network of Household Waste Recycling Centres.</p> <p>The collection of any additional items at kerbside will always be considered based on a feasibility study being carried out to investigate demand for the service along with operational costs to collect and dispose. At present there are no plans to introduce additional kerbside collection services for these items.</p> <p>In terms of brings sites although some sites have limited space for expansion there are certain larger sites already that accept tetrapak and the Council will continue to explore any further opportunities.</p>
<p>S Gardener Cotgrave Town Council</p>	<p>An interesting report and I agree with your proposals for the future of waste collection services.</p>	<p>No response required</p>
<p>Sue Lewis Assistant Parish Clerk East Leake Parish Council</p>	<p>Following our Full Council Meeting in January, East Leake Parish Council has the following observations to make:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council were not very enthusiastic about the report in general</li> <li>• No doorstep glass recycling</li> <li>• No mention of food waste</li> <li>• Item 7 not a good idea</li> </ul>	<p>The Waste Strategy and subsequent Cabinet report refers to the Council's existing policy of facilitating glass recycling through an extensive network of bring sites. This approach is well supported by the public and the resulting tonnage is comparable with many other local authorities with kerbside glass recycling. In addition the glass collected at the kerbside becomes 'contract waste' under the terms and conditions of the PFI contract in 2019 meaning any potential income is lost to NCC/Veolia Environmental Services.</p> <p>Item 6 in the Waste Action Plan covers the feasibility and business plan needed to further explore the introduction of food waste collections</p> <p>It is felt that item 7 in the Waste Action Plan (Promote Recycling Initiatives in Parish Councils) recognises the important role that Parish and Town Councils can play in this field and their support is essential to encourage more residual waste diversion and recycling at a local level</p>



<p><b>Jacki Grice</b> Parish Clerk Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council</p>	<p>Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council has read the document and just make this one observation:</p> <p>‘There does not appear to be any strategy regarding Fly Tipping, why is it omitted?’</p>	<p>The Waste Strategy concentrates on the collection and recycling of domestic residual and recyclable waste. Fly tipping is monitored and dealt with separately by the Council and in conjunction with Streetwise Environmental Ltd. However efforts are made to recycle any fly tipped waste brought into the Abbey Road Depot by Streetwise Environmental Ltd</p>
<p>Nottinghamshire County Council</p>	<p>Various minor comments made – overall positive support for the new RBC Waste Strategy</p>	<p>Some minor changes made to the Waste Strategy</p>

# Rushcliffe Borough Council

## Waste Strategy 2016 – 2020



CONTENTS		
Section		Page Number
1	Foreword by Councillor Nigel Lawrence	2
2	Our Past Achievements (Waste Strategy 2009 -2015)	3
3	Purpose of this Waste Strategy	4
4	Residual Wastes	5
5	Recyclable Wastes	6 - 7
6	Organic Wastes	8
7	Other Wastes	8 - 10
8	New Developments, Future Legislation, Nottinghamshire County Council and Veolia,	10
9	New Legislation	10
10	Nottinghamshire County Council & Veolia ES	10
11	Summary	10
Appendix A	Waste Action Plan	11- 12
Appendix B -	Consultees	12

# 1. Foreword by Councillor Nigel Lawrence – Portfolio Holder for Environment

The Rushcliffe Borough Council Waste Management Strategy 2016 – 2020 is a strategy for the future to allow for our continued commitment to recycle and compost, wherever possible, over 50% of the waste produced in Rushcliffe

Our previous waste strategy 2009 – 2015 built on the strong position the council were already in, having achieved Beacon Status for waste and recycling in 2006/2007. We have continued to develop the service moving forward, focusing on providing excellent customer care and choice, as well as continuing to invest in new technology to allow for efficient and effective collection services. We have continued to develop our services, and work with partners across Nottinghamshire in order to try and expand the range of services we can provide. We have shared our excellence across district borders and continue to work with partners such as Gedling Borough Council and Newark and Sherwood District Council.

However, we also face increasing pressures in the future to ensure we deliver sustainable and cost efficient services. To do this we will need to continue to work with partners, collaborate and ensure our costs are kept down whilst continuing to deliver our services

The council's priority will be to improve services within existing resources, and where possible our recycling and composting performance, plus increase waste minimisation awareness and encourage behavioural change. This waste management strategy will pave the way for Rushcliffe to continue to manage municipal waste and links to two of the Councils corporate priorities:

- a) **Maintaining and enhancing our residents' quality of life** – through the delivery of high quality waste collection service which is an important foundation of public health
- b) **Transforming the Council to enable the delivery of efficient high quality services** – through the on-going work to maximise the efficiency and effectiveness of waste collection services

The Councils role within the waste hierarchy is influenced by many stakeholders. So we will endeavour to work with all stakeholders from residents to manufacturers, retailers and national bodies who influence the waste industry. In doing so we will also collaborate with our partners, other district councils and Nottinghamshire County Council to deliver a waste collection service that we can all be proud of.



## 2. Our Past Achievements (Waste Strategy 2009-2015)

Our previous waste strategy covered the period 2009 through to 2015 and incorporated a comprehensive action plan to ensure the Council continued to maintain our high levels of performance. Key achievements during the lifetime of this strategy have included:

- Introduced a highly successful paid for garden waste scheme, helping to ensure the garden waste service remains sustainable whilst supporting recycling objectives
- Increased our income and maximised resources by working cross borders to collect garden waste in Newark and Sherwood
- Reduced our costs with an innovative co-operation agreement with Nottingham City Council who now maintain our fleet of refuse vehicles
- Following an in depth evaluation we have been able to extend the life span of our waste collection vehicles to maximise asset value and reduce capital expenditure
- Following a review of the health care waste service, successfully incorporated Gedling Borough Council's customers into our existing rounds, utilising any spare capacity and increasing income
- Completed a trial of on street recycling litter bins in central West Bridgford
- Continue to work with landlords and students (including attending landlord forums) to promote recycling and reduce contamination
- Continued to raise awareness of 'reduce, reuse and recycle' messages through the 'Are You Bin Smart?' and 'Bin There Done That' campaigns
- Ensure we practice what we preach by recycling as much waste as possible that is brought into our Abbey Road Depot
- Enhanced our glass recycling bring sites which now bring in more tonnes of glass than many other councils who operate more expensive doorstep glass recycling services
- Successful partnership working with trade waste service providers
- Carried out Nottinghamshire first TEEP assessment to ensure our services remained compliant with new legislation
- Invested in new 'in cab' technology to reduce the levels of missed collections and increase customer satisfaction
- Invested in our young people by launching waste and recycling apprenticeships
- Carried out a full review of our tanker waste service, increased our customer database and income ensuring the service was profitable
- Maintaining a high recycling and composting rate for each year and being the top performer across Nottinghamshire
- Contributed at a national level to the Pledge 4 Plastics campaign and Plastics Industry Recycling Action Plan aimed at packaging recovery
- Introduced a new working agreement in 2010 leading to more integrated team working and improved collection services

### 3. Purpose of this Waste Strategy.

There are currently no statutory targets set by the central UK government for recycling rates and whilst there is the overarching EU Waste Framework Directive target, this lack of direct targets, along with other factors such as good progress to date and reducing packaging on many products, is widely acknowledged to be contributing to the plateauing of recycling rates. It is therefore imperative that a suitable strategy and approach is determined in order to encourage recycling and where economically feasible maintain current performance levels.

The underlying core principle of sustainable wastes management is to follow the Waste Hierarchy. The Waste Hierarchy emphasis is prevention as a sustainable method of waste management rather than disposal, this strategy underpins the five principles.



These five principles will consistently run through all of the Council's policies which contribute to waste minimisation in its broadest interpretation. The adoption of these principles will ensure that the Council conforms to the Government's requirements

The aim of this strategy is to work with partners to encourage waste minimisation and where economically feasible increase recycling and composting rates in Rushcliffe Borough Council to exceed local recycling & composting targets of 50% by 2020 whilst taking into account any future legislative requirements.

Rushcliffe will, through publicity and promotion actively look at reducing levels of dry recycling contamination, and continue to promote the recycling2go service. We will continue to explore the technical and economic feasibility, with partners, of collecting and recycling other waste types.

## 4. Residual Wastes. (The Grey Bin)

The Council operates an alternate weekly residual waste collection service 'normal' domestic waste. Capacity is a 240/1100 litre wheeled refuse container with a closed lid policy (no side waste). For a small number of properties who do not have sufficient space or access for a wheeled bin, a grey plastic sack collection system is in place. The Council has responded to the differing needs of its residents and are able to supply additional residual waste bins for those families of five or more or those families who have two or more children in nappies, as well as one bin between two students at student properties. Regular reviews take place at such properties ensuring that recycling is also taking place wherever possible, and that the circumstances are still applicable.

Table 1 below details residual waste tonnage for the last 6 years. As property growth continues in Rushcliffe overall tonnage will increase however due to local and national measures to minimise waste and smaller households it is expected that Kg's of residual waste per household (Table 2) should remain relatively consistent and ideally reduce. It is however noted that consumer buying habits change for many reasons and nationally residual waste per household is beginning to rise again which can be linked to the country's improving financial position and the way this indicator is recorded can change such as the inclusion of street sweepings in 2013/2014

Table 1 – Residual Waste Tonnages

Tonnages	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Energy from Waste	14,447	18,184	18,570	17,718	18,520	18,134
Landfill	4,687	1,183	920	2,103	1,413	2,472
Total	19134	19367	19490	19821	19933	20606

Table 2 – Residual Waste Kg/per household

	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
KG's of residual waste per household	453	442	436	442	455

### Future Focus

Over the lifetime of this Strategy the Council will;

- a) Work with key partners and stakeholders to encourage waste minimisation
- b) Seek to maximise the transfer of recyclable material from the residual waste stream (grey bin) to the blue bin, green bin or other recycling routes

## 5. Recyclable Wastes.

### 5.1. Kerbside Collections: (The Blue Bin)

The Council operates an alternate weekly collection of mixed dry recyclables (paper, card, mixed food & drinks cans and plastic bottles as well as yoghurt pots/margarine tubs) using 240/1100 litre wheeled refuse containers. For a small number of properties that are unable to house wheeled bins alternative arrangements are in place. Flat packed cardboard can also be placed next to the blue wheeled bin on collection day. The Council will also provide an additional blue bin to help increase recycling and meet customer needs where requested. Regular monitoring of the blue bin takes place to ensure that contamination levels are kept to a minimum. These measures are key to ensure the Council have a robust checking system to help meet the requirements of the revised Waste Framework Directive Regulation 12. As can be seen from table 3 below overall dry recycling tonnages are on the decrease. This trend is occurring across country and is in line with national guidance on reducing packaging thus meeting the waste hierarchy of reduction before recycling.

Table 3 – Recyclable Materials Tonnage

Tonnages	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
MRF Input	8,727	8,599	8,275	7,943	7,714	7,642
Contamination	226	223	215	206	317	458
Recycled	8,500	8,375	8,060	7,736	7,397	7,184

However when comparing this data alongside table 1 for overall residual waste tonnages there is an obvious potential for recycling rates to be put under pressure as can be seen in table 4 below

Table 4 - Council Recycling Rates

	Ashfield DC	Bassetlaw DC	Broxtowe BC	Gedling BC	Mansfield DC	NSDC	Rushcliffe BC
2010/11	34%	23%	43%	37%	41%	26%	54%
2011/12	34%	23%	42%	37%	39%	26%	51%
2012/13	34%	22%	41%	36%	36%	24%	51%
2013/14	33%	21%	40%	37%	38%	26%	51%
2014/15	33%	19%	39%	36%	36%	27%	49%

Note this data includes green waste (where applicable) where tonnages can fluctuate dependent on weather conditions

### **Future Focus**

Over the lifetime of this Strategy the Council will;

- a) Seek to reduce contamination levels through publicity and promotion and targeting areas where contamination is particularly prevalent
- b) Investigate methods to support good recycling practice in multiple household situations e.g. provision of 1100 litre bulk containers with clear windows to help reduce contamination levels
- c) Working with key partners to expand the current MRF input specification to allow for a broader range of materials to be recycled

**5.2. Bring Site Collections:**

The domestic waste collection service provides residents with the opportunity to recycle and compost their waste however this service is further supplemented by a network of over 60 bring sites which are located across the Borough.

Bring sites provide an important service to facilitate textile & shoe reuse, food & drinks carton recycling and colour segregated glass recycling, there are some newsprint and card board recycling banks placed around the borough at our super bring sites to help with capacity for larger households. The bring sites feature external sound proofing measures where the need arises and acoustic measures fitted into glass recycling banks to reduce the noise of glass on glass resonating from the container.

In line with reducing the weight of the products they produce as part of their wider responsibilities, the glass industry have been reducing the amount of glass used in in number of glass bottle types which has played a significant contribution in the recent overall reduction in bring site tonnage as shown in Table 5.

Table 5 – Bring site Tonnage

Tonnages	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Bring Sites	3,002	2,735	2,700	2,480	2,545	2,342

**Future Focus**

Over the lifetime of this Strategy the Council will;

- a) Explore with partners the technical and economic feasibility for introducing new recycling streams at bring sites



## 6. Organic Wastes. (The Green Bin)

The Council operates an alternate weekly collection of garden waste. This is a discretionary opt in paid for service where residents are registered as members of the Rushcliffe Garden Waste Club. The green wheeled bin is collected on the same day as the blue bin and provides a 240 litre capacity for grass cuttings, leaves, twigs weeds etc. The Council also provides additional green bins up to a maximum of 4 per property again to help increase more efficient composting and meet customer demand. The current arrangements for green waste collections is to suspend them over the Christmas and New Year period to reflect the seasonal reduction in tonnage. In addition and for those who would prefer alternative disposal options, the Council continues to promote home composting and offers compost bins at competitive prices to residents of the Borough through a national framework agreement. The total annual tonnage for organic waste collected is detailed in Table 6.

The Council has also extended the club scheme to provide an alternate weekly collection subscription service for some areas of Newark & Sherwood District Council using a brown bin. This is a partnership agreement to help meet the demand for their residents as well as seeking to maximise the Council's own collection resources.

Table 6

Tonnages	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Rushcliffe	11,602	12,385	10,258	11,174	11,509	11,408
Newark & Sherwood						452

### Future Focus

Over the lifetime of this Strategy the Council will;

- a) Identify future partners to further expand the current garden waste club scheme

## 7. Other Wastes

### 7.1. Healthcare Wastes:

Healthcare wastes generated at home is designated as either 'offensive' or 'infectious'. In essence this means most domestic generated healthcare waste can be classed as offensive and be disposed of through the residual (grey bin) wastes stream. The Council will provide additional residual waste containers based on assessed need for offensive domestic generated healthcare wastes, it also provides

a separate collection of infectious wastes on receipt of the healthcare professional's assessment.

#### 7.2. Bulky Wastes:

The Council supports local residents to offer a collection service for items that are not normally disposed of during the normal collection arrangements. Large bulky items are collected by the Council for a small charge on a weekly basis. The Council also promotes re-use wherever possible and offers residents alternatives to disposal such as specific local charities that may be interested in such items.

#### 7.3. Waste Electronic Electrical Equipment: (WEEE)

The Council promotes the use of local registered scrap metal dealers for residents to dispose of WEEE (fridges, washing machines, etc.) Details of such dealers are promoted on the Rushcliffe website.

#### 7.4. Commercial Wastes:

The Council works with other providers to facilitate the delivery of a commercial waste service and encourages business to recycle their waste wherever practicable.

#### 7.5. Effluent Wastes:

The Council provides an emptying service for private and commercial cesspools/grease traps and septic tanks within the Borough. A charge is levied for this service. We offer a 24 hour emergency call out service. The costs for the service vary and are detailed on the Council's website.

#### 7.6. Battery Recycling:

The Council provides a kerbside collection battery recycling scheme in response to resident demand. Our battery recycling service compliments the existing network of recycling points located in many retailers across the borough resulting from the EU Battery Directive, which placed the onus on suppliers of batteries to offer bring back facilities.

### **Future Focus**

Over the lifetime of this Strategy the Council will;

- a) Ensure that bulky waste is, working with local charitable groups, re-used wherever possible as an alternative to disposal

- b) Optimise and expand the number of tanker service customers across Rushcliffe and into other neighbouring districts where financially viable

## 8. New Developments

Developers are made aware, through the planning process, of the Council policy to charge for the provision of refuse wheeled containers.

## 9. New Legislation

The Council will respond to any new legislation brought forward by central government. Rushcliffe Borough Council led on producing a TEEP assessment, (*technically, environmentally and economically practicable*) which became necessary as part of the revised Waste Framework Directive. This helps to provide evidence that the Council is providing the best type of recycling service to produce high quality recyclables.

## 10. Nottinghamshire County Council & Veolia ES

Whilst actual disposal of waste is controlled by Nottinghamshire County Council as the Waste Disposal Authority, landfill is not seen as a sustainable long-term option, this has already become established policy for Rushcliffe Borough Council which views materials collected as a resource rather than a waste.

The County Council are required to produce an annual Recycling and Composting plan to demonstrate work towards achieving the 52% Recycling and Composting target by 2020 set in the PFI Contract.

The Waste Reduction, Re-use and Composting Plan is drafted by the County Council and key stakeholders (Districts/Boroughs, Veolia and Defra) are able to feed comments/suggestions in to it

Rushcliffe will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council as a key partner and will continue to contribute to both the Nottinghamshire Waste Management Committee and the Nottinghamshire Joint Waste Officers Group.

## 11. Summary

Rushcliffe has an enviable record on waste and recycling and is the top performing collection authority in Nottinghamshire. However this strategy has sought to identify the pressures and constraints placed upon local authorities and key partners which in turn will ultimately shape future waste collection and recycling performance. In

particular as pressures on costs increase the Council will continue to look at ways of maintaining performance within existing resources whilst ensuring that customer service remains at the heart to what we do. Looking to the future we will continue to work closely with partners and explore further joint working opportunities in order to benefit both parties and where possible increase income.

DRAFT

## Appendix A

<b>WASTE ACTION PLAN</b>		
	<b>Key Actions</b>	<b>Outcomes</b>
1	Review the TEEP assessment annually	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Working with all districts to review the county wide TEEP assessment with a view to remaining compliant.</li> </ul>
2	Communications campaigns – Promote and deliver <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bin There Done That – the councils newly launched campaign to reduce contamination and increase recycling.</li> <li>Love Food Hate Waste – national campaign to reduce food waste</li> <li>Recyclenow – use of the national resource to promote recycling where appropriate.</li> <li>On Pack Recycling Labels (OPRL) – making residents aware of what OPRL is on packaging labels and how it can assist when choosing whether to recycle something</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To continue to raise awareness of the recycling2go service and help to reduce residual waste, divert recyclable waste from the grey residual bin, increase recycling and reduce contamination levels</li> </ul>
3	Expand the range of recyclable materials taken in the kerbside recycling schemes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The inclusion of ridged plastics would help to support residents making the right choice about which plastics can be recycled.</li> <li>Additional collection of lightweight plastics isn't likely to increase recycling tonnages and performance on its own however evidence does suggest an increase in overall service participation will increase material capture as a result</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enhanced residents engagement with plastics recycling</li> <li>Increase recycling rates</li> <li>Decrease in contamination levels</li> </ul>
4	Garden waste collections – Expand and promote the service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Creation of a garden waste members club, inclusion of added value to the service through voucher promotions.</li> <li>Target residual bins that have garden waste included.</li> <li>Raising awareness of the garden waste club benefits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase recycling rates</li> <li>Reduction in operational and back office costs during the renewal process</li> </ul>
5	Explore the feasibility of textile recycling <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work with Nottinghamshire County Councils as the disposal authority.</li> <li>Alternatively, work with schools to realise value. Raise awareness of the value to a school where parents bring textile to the school bank</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Diversion of potential residual waste</li> <li>Increase in recycling rates</li> </ul>
6	Explore the feasibility of food waste collections at the kerbside	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council to establish a business case for the recycling of food waste.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raised recycling rates (by up to 6%)</li> </ul>
7	Promote recycling initiatives in parish councils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create local area recycling champions to encourage recycling in villages</li> <li>• Potential for inter village competition to divert recyclables from the grey bin</li> </ul>
8	Explore the recycling of large bulky items of furniture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that all waste collected as part of the 'bulky waste service' is recycled or re-used</li> </ul>
9	On-going work with our own collection teams to improve customer service, reduce missed collections and decrease contamination levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce contaminations at source rather than simply refusing to take a bin which, on the face of it, is not overly contaminated.</li> <li>• Reduce missed bins and increase levels of customer satisfaction</li> </ul>
10	Work with Streetwise Environmental Services to ensure all waste delivered to our depot site is recycled wherever possible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Practicing what we preach ensuring as little waste as possible from the depot is sent to energy from waste recovery or landfill</li> </ul>

DRAFT

## Appendix B - List of Consultees

1. All Parish and Town Councils
2. Environment Agency
3. Nottinghamshire County Council
4. Nottinghamshire District and Borough Councils
5. Rushcliffe Borough Council Environmental Sustainability Officer
6. West Bridgford Local Area Forum
7. Veolia Environmental Services Ltd
8. Streetwise Environmental Services Ltd

DRAFT

## Report of the Executive Manager - Operations and Transformation

### Cabinet Portfolio Holder Councillor S J Robinson

#### 1. Summary

- 1.1. The Council has been approached by Western Power Distribution who would like to acquire the electricity substations in the Council's ownership.
- 1.2. A decision is required regarding the proposed disposal of the sites in question.
- 1.3. The issue has been considered by the Executive Management Team which recommends disposal.

#### 2. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that the 32 electricity substations detailed in paragraph 4.1 are disposed of to Western Power Distribution for the price of £112,000 (£3,500 per site).

#### 3. Reasons for Recommendation

- 3.1. Western Power Distribution has approached the Council requesting the purchase of the 32 electricity substations in the Council's ownership. These substations are largely located in former council housing areas. At the time of the Large Scale Voluntary Transfer of housing stock to Rushcliffe Homes in 2002, the Council retained ownership of the substations.
- 3.2. The proposed purchase by Western Power is in keeping with Western Power's current policy and they have recently agreed similar purchases from Newark and Sherwood District Council.
- 3.3. Negotiations have been undertaken with Western Power Distribution and heads of terms have been agreed at £3,500 per site. This would provide a capital receipt to the Council of £112k. Currently the Council receives a variable peppercorn rent from Western Power Distribution of around £100pa.
- 3.4. Individually the sites are de minimis assets that do not feature on the Council's asset register (value below £10,000). However as a lot, they come within the Council's threshold for seeking approval from Cabinet for a capital disposal.



#### 4. Supporting Information

- 4.1. The 32 electricity substations are as follow below. All sites have been considered by the Executive Management team and it is not considered that any should be retained for strategic reasons. The conveyancing for all sites will include a “lift and shift” clause which enables the Council to develop around the substations at a future date if it provides a suitable alternative provision.

##### LIST OF ELECTRICITY SITES TO BULK PURCHASE FROM RUSHCLIFFE BOROUGH COUNCIL

1. Abbey Circus,	West Bridgford 47	NG2 5LY	(52D1709)
2. Adbolton Lane,	West Bridgford 51	NG2 5AR	(52D0058)
3. Albert Road,	West Bridgford 46	NG2 5GS	(52D1710)
4. Boundary Road,	West Bridgford 23	NG2 7BZ	(52D0844)
5. Bridgford Park, adjacent to Albert Road,	West Bridgford	NG2 5GS	
6. Candleby Lane,	Cotgrave 15	NG12 3JQ	(52D1557)
7. Cloverdale Road,	Cotgrave 10	NG12 3NJ	(52D1380)
8. Coachgap Lane,	Langar	NG13 9HP	
9. Devonshire Road,	West Bridgford 50	NG2 6EU	(52D1726)
10. Eltham Road,	West Bridgford 10	NG2 5JT	(52D0073)
11. Flagholme,	Cotgrave 7	NG12 3PE	(52D1307)
12. Furness Close,	West Bridgford 66	NG2 6LR	(52D1966)
13. Hallfields Golf Club,	Edwalton 13	NG12 4AA	(52D2476)
14. Hazelwood,	Cotgrave 4	NG12 3LT	(52D1097)
15. Holme Avenue,	East Leake 23	LE12 6QL	(52D0442)
16. Landsdowne Drive,	West Bridgford 63	NG2 7FJ	(52D0201)
17. Loughborough Road,	West Bridgford 13	NG2 7JE	(52D0813)
18. Lutterell Road,	West Bridgford 43	NG2 6HR	(52D1587)
19. Manor Road,	Keyworth 3	NG12 5HW	(52D0678)
20. Moor Road,	West Bridgford 97	NG11 6NR	(52D1627)
21. Off Edward Road,	West Bridgford 118	NG2 5GB	(52D1280)
22. Ring Leas,	Cotgrave 11	NG12 3PQ	(52D1379)
23. Ringleas, Spring Meadow,	Cotgrave 3	NG12 3LU	(52D1099)
24. Ruddington Lane,	Wilford, Nottm 288	NG11 7BY	(52D1233)
25. Rugby Road,	West Bridgford 92	NG2 7ER	(52D2515)
26. Stamford Road,	West Bridgford 52	NG2 6GF	(52D1797)
27. Stratford Road,	West Bridgford 48	NG2 6BQ	(52D1725)
28. Valley Road,	West Bridgford 65	NG2 6HQ	(52D0253)
29. Wellin Lane,	Edwalton 2	NG12 4AT	(52D0301)
30. Woodview,	Cotgrave 8	NG12 3PG	(52D1308)
31. Melton Road,	West Bridgford 97	NG2 6EL	(52D0085)
32. Pavilion Road,	West Bridgford 97	NG2 5FE	(52D1001)

- 4.2. Each party (the Council and Western Power Distribution) will be responsible for their own legal costs and it is anticipated that the Council will do its conveyancing in-house.

## 5. Asset Disposal Policy

- 5.1 Under the Council's Asset Disposal Policy, an asset can be considered for disposal if it falls within either category of surplus or under-used, as defined below:

An asset is deemed to be surplus to the Council's requirements if one or more of the following is true:

- a) it makes minimal contribution to the delivery of the Council's priorities and services as demonstrated through the options appraisal
- b) it does not generate sufficient income to be retained for investment purposes when compared to alternative rates of return estimated to be available in the longer term.
- c) it has no potential for future service delivery or strategic regeneration/ redevelopment or wider community purposes
- d) an alternative asset has been identified which would achieve a more cost effective service delivery
- e) the asset has no alternative use

An asset is deemed to be under-used if one or more of the following is true:

- a) the income being generated from the site is below that which would be achieved from:
  - i. an alternative use
  - ii. disposing of the site and investing the receipt
  - iii. intensifying the use; or
- b) part of the site is vacant and is likely to remain vacant for the foreseeable future
- c) it makes insufficient contribution to the delivery of the Council's priorities and services as demonstrated through the options appraisal

An asset will be assessed against the above criteria in the context of the long-term potential, as well as the immediate situation.

- 5.2 The assets in question (32 electricity substations) can be classed as surplus as they do not contribute to the Council's priorities or services. They can also be classed as underutilised as the annual income (c£100) is less than could be achieved if the capital receipt (£112k) was put to an alternative use.

## 6. Other Options Considered

- 6.1. The alternative option is to do nothing. There is no requirement for the Council to progress this disposal but it does produce a capital receipt which will contribute to the Council's capital reserves.

## 7. Risk and Uncertainties

- 7.1. There are no other risks and uncertainties related to this disposal. The Council's future interest will be protected by a "lift and shift" clause in the agreement.

## 8. Implications

### 8.1. Finance

The financial implications are included in the body of the report.

### 8.2. Corporate Priorities

This disposal is in keeping with the corporate priority of maximising the potential of the Council's property portfolio.

<b>For more information contact:</b>	Name: Katherine Marriott Job title: Executive Manager, Operations and Transformation 0115 914 8291 email <a href="mailto:kmariott@rushcliffe.gov.uk">kmariott@rushcliffe.gov.uk</a>
<b>Background papers Available for Inspection:</b>	Nil
<b>List of appendices (if any):</b>	

## Report of the Chief Executive

### Cabinet Portfolio Holder Councillor - Councillor S J Robinson

#### 1. Summary

1.1. Cabinet resolved at its meeting on 13 October 2015 to:

- a) Note the financial outturn position for the Nottinghamshire Business Rates Pool for the years 2013/14 and 2014/15;
- b) Ratify the decision of the City of Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Economic Prosperity committee to retain the entire pool surplus generated in 2013/14 for use by the Combined Authority; and
- c) Ratify the decision of the City of Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Economic Prosperity Committee to retain 50% of the Pool surplus generated in 2014/15 for use by the Combined Authority and distribute the other 50% to Pool members.

1.2. Should Rushcliffe Borough Council enter an agreement to proceed with the Government to become a constituent member of a Combined Authority then a decision is required to authorise capital spending on the setting up of a Combined Authority in preparation for the deal's acceptance.

#### 2. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that Cabinet confirms that funds allocated for use by the Combined Authority can be used by the agreement of the Economic Prosperity Committee to support set-up and preparation costs for a Combined Authority.

#### 3. Reasons for Recommendation

3.1. To provide clarity and transparency regarding the intentions of the resolved items of the Cabinet meeting on 13 October 2015.

#### **4. Supporting Information**

4.1. At its meeting held on 13 October 2015 Cabinet resolved that it:

- a) Noted the financial outturn position for the Nottinghamshire Business Rates Pool for the years 2013/14 and 2014/15;
- b) Ratified the decision of the City of Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Economic Prosperity committee to retain the entire pool surplus generated in 2013/14 for use by the Combined Authority; and
- c) Ratified the decision of the city of Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Economic Prosperity Committee to retain 20% of the Pool surplus generated in 2014/15 for use by the combined Authority and distribute the other 50% to Pool member.

4.2. The purpose of the decision was to ensure funds were provided through the Nottinghamshire Economic Prosperity Committee to support a Combined Authority.

4.3. As discussions have progressed to implement a devolution deal with the Government it has become clear that a 'shadow Combined Authority' would be required to be set-up prior to the final agreement. The work of the shadow Combined Authority would be to establish the required governance arrangements and carry out further due diligence of the agreed devolution deal and the setting up of the Combined Authority.

4.4. The previous decision could be interpreted to exclude set-up costs and therefore to provide clarity and transparency it is recommended that the Cabinet makes a further decision to support the Economic Prosperity Committee's work (as a shadow Combined Authority) in setting up the Combined Authority.

#### **5. Other Options Considered**

5.1. There are no other options.

#### **6. Risk and Uncertainties**

6.1. The report mitigates any risk and uncertainty which may have materialised from the decision made on 15 October 2015.

#### **6.2. Finance**

6.2.1. Should the Combined Authority and devolution deal not materialise then any costs incurred would be lost. Given Rushcliffe has accrued little business rate surplus in the first two years of pooling the financial impact to Rushcliffe is minimal.

### 6.3. Legal

6.3.1. The Council is committed to full use of the 2013/14 surplus and 50% of the 2014/15 surplus, through the Economic Prosperity Committee for use by the shadow Combined Authority and thereafter the Combined Authority.

### 6.4. Corporate Priorities

6.4.1. The establishment of the Combined Authority follows from the decision of full Council to pursue a devolution deal with the Government.

<b>For more information contact:</b>	Name: Allen Graham Job title: Chief Executive email <a href="mailto:agraham@rushcliffe.gov.uk">agraham@rushcliffe.gov.uk</a>
<b>Background papers Available for Inspection:</b>	Cabinet Report 13 October 2015 – Business Rates Pooling Update
<b>List of appendices (if any):</b>	None

## Report of the Interim Executive Manager - Finance and Commercial

### Cabinet Portfolio Holder Councillor S J Robinson

#### 1. Summary

- 1.1 This report presents the budget position for revenue and capital as at the 31 December 2015. Given the current financial climate it is imperative that the Council maintains due diligence with regards to its finances and ensures necessary action is taken to maintain a robust financial position. This report has already been considered by the Corporate Governance Group on 9 February 2016.

#### 2 Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that Cabinet:

- a) note the projected revenue and capital underspend positions for the year of £1,037k and £2,804k respectively;
- b) approve anticipated use of the underspend from the Organisation Stabilisation Reserve for temporary support in 2016/17 and 2017/18 of £80k (in total for the 2 years) for Economic Development (paragraph 4.3); and
- c) in terms of capital, approve the carry forward of the anticipated underspend of £0.5m for Funding Circle loans to be added to the Asset Investment Strategy Fund going forward. Such loans will still be accommodated from the fund, if required (paragraph 4.5).

#### 3 Reasons for Recommendation

- 3.1 To demonstrate good governance in terms of scrutinising the Council's ongoing financial position and compliance with Council Financial Regulations.

#### 4 Supporting Information

##### *Revenue Monitoring*

- 4.1 The revenue monitoring statement by service area is attached at **Appendix A** with detailed variance analysis as at 31 December 2015 attached at **Appendix B**. This shows an underspend against profiled budget to date of £677,000 and a projected underspend for the year of £845,000 for Departmental budgets. With additional s31 grants this amounts to £1.037m.
- 4.2 As documented at **Appendix B** the underspend to date reflects a number of positive variances including better income returns through more proactive

management of council investment strategies; employee cost savings across the authority; projected increased income from planning fees arising from a number of major applications; the lack of current calls made on the contingency budget; reduction in diesels costs and additional green waste income within the Waste Collection budget; and a projected slippage (£80k) on the use of the Growth Fund to support Growth Boards. As reported in the Quarter 2 finance report this will be carried forward into 2016/17.

- 4.3 In 2016/17 and 2017/18 additional costs will be incurred arising from the employment of temporary staff to assist in the delivery of the Growth Agenda. The underspend from 2015/16 will fund this additional cost estimated to be £80,000.

#### *Capital Monitoring*

- 4.4 The updated Capital Programme monitoring statement as at 31 December 2015 is attached at **Appendix C**. A summary of the projected outturn and funding position is shown in the table below:-

<b>CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - DECEMBER 2015</b>			
<b>EXPENDITURE SUMMARY</b>	<b>Current Budget £000</b>	<b>Projected Actual £000</b>	<b>Projected Variance £000</b>
Transformation	2,142	1,100	(1,042)
Neighbourhoods	1,955	1,938	(17)
Communities	302	173	(129)
Corporate Governance	550	455	(95)
Finance & Commercial	11,336	9,878	(1,458)
Contingency	63	0	(63)
	<b>16,348</b>	<b>13,544</b>	<b>(2,804)</b>
<b>FINANCING ANALYSIS</b>			
Capital Receipts	(3,957)	(2,874)	1,083
Government Grants	(297)	(292)	5
Other Grants/Contributions	(1,087)	(415)	672
Use of Reserves	(5,021)	(4,942)	79
Internal Borrowing	(5,986)	(5,021)	965
	<b>(16,348)</b>	<b>(13,544)</b>	<b>2,804</b>
<b>NET EXPENDITURE</b>	-	-	-

- 4.5 The original Capital Programme of £9.6 million has been supplemented by a brought forward of £4million from 2014/15 together with an adjustment of £2.7million to support a new loan to Nottinghamshire County Cricket club giving a revised total of £16.3million. This is an ambitious Capital Programme which sees the commencement of the building works at the Arena site and Bridgford Hall. The programme also contains a provision of £0.5million for Funding Circle Loans, the anticipated underspend is to be added to the Asset Investment Strategy fund and will no longer be solely ring fenced for such loans. This is also referenced in the budget report to Full Council.



#### 4.6 **Transformation**

The projected actual spend of £1.1million is just over 50% of the current budget primarily due to the uncertainty of projecting expenditure levels for strategic acquisitions in Cotgrave and contract costs for Bridgford Hall. The programme contains a provision of £100,000 for enhancement work on the Civic Centre, it is requested that £50,000 is returned to Capital Contingency, retaining a provision of £50,000 to support any future work required for the Civic Centre lifts.

#### 4.7 **Neighbourhoods**

A small variance is currently projected. This comprises of a planned £409,000 underspend on investment in Social Housing which is offset by a potential overspend of £432,000 on the vehicle replacement programme (the accelerated replacement programme was agreed in the Quarter 1 report). Acquisitions to date include seven Refuse Freighters (4 brought forward), two vehicles for Rushcliffe Country Park, a new Tanker and Bartec Units. Approval has been given for enhancement works to The Bungalow, Boundary Road to house Syrian refugees (December 2015 Cabinet).

#### 4.8 **Communities**

This programme continues to deliver Partnership Grants but it is difficult to predict the level of spend due to the timing of grant awards and completion of works carried out by third parties. The projected actual for Capital Grant Funding is based on likely grant payments in the year but claims continue to be assessed during the year and new grants could still be approved. Fencing and landscaping works have been carried out at Alford Road Play Area leaving an uncommitted provision of £45,000. This can only be used for works to Special Expense Play Areas. No schemes have been identified at this stage so the £45,000 will be an underspend.

#### 4.9 **Corporate Governance**

The in-year provision of £369,000 has been supplemented by a brought forward of £181,000 from 2014/15 to support infrastructure, Superfast Broadband, Digital Strategy enhancement commitments together with technologies arising from the Leisure Strategy capital project. Expenditure to date includes ICT replacement kit, technical infrastructure and a contribution towards an HR/Payroll enhancement. Future commitments include server replacements, and a telephony solution. Any unspent balance will need to be carried forward to support IS Strategy costs associated with the move to the Arena.

#### 4.10 **Finance & Commercial**

A variance of £1,458,000 is showing and arises from the uncertainty with regard to the level of Funding Circle loan approvals and a revision to the profile of main contractor payments on the Arena scheme as works progress. Given the lack of activity with Funding Circle loans the Member budget workshops gave support to the view that £0.5m should be carried forward and added to the Asset Investment Strategy fund. September Cabinet approved a new loan of £2,700,000 for Nottinghamshire County Cricket Club. This investment decision accords with the objectives of the Asset Investment Strategy. The balance in capital contingency is £63,000 following an allocation of £30,000 for the Bungalow, Boundary Road.

#### 4.11 Summary

The report overall projects underspends for both revenue and capital. It should be noted that whilst we are near the year end opportunities and challenges can arise which may impact on the projected year-end position. There remain external financial pressures from developing issues such as the impact of the localisation of business rates, welfare reform, and continued financial pressures on individuals, businesses and partners. Against such a background it is imperative that the Council continues to keep a tight control over its expenditure, identifies any impact from income streams and maintains progress against its Transformation Strategy.

### 5 Risk and Uncertainties

- 5.1 Failure to comply with Financial Regulations in terms of reporting on both revenue and capital budgets could result in criticism from stakeholders, including both members and the Council's external auditors.
- 5.2 Areas such as income can be volatile according to external pressures such as the general economic climate. For example Planning income is variable according to the number and size of planning applications received.

### 6 Implications

#### 6.1 Finance

Financial implications are covered in the body of the report.

#### 6.2 Legal

None

#### 6.3 Corporate Priorities

Changes to the budget enable the Council to achieve its corporate priorities.

#### 6.4 Other Implications

None

<b>For more information contact:</b>	Name: Peter Linfield Interim Executive Manager - Finance and Commercial 0115 914 8439 email <a href="mailto:plinfield@rushcliffe.gov.uk">plinfield@rushcliffe.gov.uk</a>
<b>Background papers Available for Inspection:</b>	Corporate Governance Group (9 February 2016) Revenue and Capital Budget Monitoring 2015/16 – Quarter 3 Update
<b>List of appendices (if any):</b>	Appendix A –Revenue Outturn Position 2015/16 – Quarter 3 Appendix B – Revenue Variance Analysis Explanations Appendix C – Capital Programme 2015/16 – Quarter 3 Position

## Revenue Outturn Position 2015/16 – Quarter 3

	Q3 Position - excl recharges			Total Costs				Variation Explanation
	Budget YTD £'000	Actual YTD £'000	Total Variation £'000	Budget £'000	Projected Outturn £'000	Total Variation £'000	Variation %	
Communities	463	306	(157)	2,638	2,521	(117)	(4)	Additional income (£145k), unused Land Charges provision (£38k), public enquiry £24k and NNDR costs £23k
Corporate Governance and Operations	2,433	2,425	(8)	1,364	1,430	66	5	Employee associated costs £62k, External printing £30k. Election costs (£26k)
Finance and Commercial	1,983	1,728	(255)	3,153	2,679	(474)	(15)	Investment Income (£218k), Staff savings (£146k), unspent contingencies (£86k), housing benefits (£50k)
Neighbourhoods	2,228	2,177	(51)	4,321	4,322	1	0	Additional income (£65k) and transport savings (£33k), offset by agency staff £70k and the re-profiling of service delivery outcomes into 2016/17 £20k
Transformation	746	572	(174)	176	(145)	(321)	(182)	Staff vacancies (£71k), strategic growth slippage (£80k), rental income (£95k), Bridgford Hall works not being undertaken in 2015/16
<b>Net Service Expenditure</b>	<b>7,853</b>	<b>7,208</b>	<b>(645)</b>	<b>11,652</b>	<b>10,807</b>	<b>(845)</b>	<b>(7)</b>	
Shelford & Newton Budget				20	20		0	
Capital Accounting Adjustments				(1,503)	(1,503)	0	0	
Revenue contribution to capital				159	159	0	0	
Transfer to/from (-) Reserves				868	1,905	1,037	0	Projected revenue underspend (£845k), specific grants (£129k), SBRR (£63k)
<b>Total Net Service Expenditure</b>				<b>11,196</b>	<b>11,388</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>0</b>	
Central Government Grant				(1,679)	(1,679)	0		
Localised Business Rates (includes SBRR)				(2,053)	(2,116)	(63)		Additional SBRR
Collection Fund Surplus				(84)	(84)	0		
Council Tax Income				(5,428)	(5,428)	0		
Specific Grants (including NHB)				(1,893)	(2,022)	(129)		Additional S31 grants
Council Tax Freeze Grant				(59)	(59)	0		
<b>Total Funding</b>				<b>(11,196)</b>	<b>(11,388)</b>	<b>(192)</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Gross Budget Deficit</b>				<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(0)</b>	

**Revenue Variance Explanations**

<b>ADVERSE VARIANCES</b>	<b>Projected Outturn Variance £'000</b>
<b>Communities</b>	
Development Control - Planning enquiry costs	24
Outdoor Sports - Backdated NNDR for Gresham meeting room	23
<b>Corporate Governance</b>	
Performance & Reputation - Increase costs of external printing	31
Elections - Additional election fees	29
IT - Net cost of CIO position and making IT manager cost full-time offset by increase in Streetwise SLA income	27
Mayoral Expenses - Reorganisation costs	21
Democratic Representation - Member induction training	13
Electoral Registration - Additional costs associated with IER	12
<b>Finance</b>	
Rushcliffe Arena - Inspection costs	25
Corporate Management - The increase is due to rise in electronic banking charges and higher volumes linked to green waste payments (recovered as part of green waste charges).	14
<b>Neighbourhoods</b>	
Waste Collection & Recycling - Cost of tyres and less glass recycling income due to drop in price	50
Food Safety - Staff vacancies offset by agency costs	24
Homelessness - Agency costs to cover vacancies	11
Pest Control - Review unlikely to deliver transformation savings in current year	10
Animal & Public Health - Review unlikely to deliver transformation savings in current year	10
<b>Transformation</b>	
Investment Properties - Service Charges less than budgeted for at The Point	25
<b>Total Adverse Variances</b>	<b>302</b>

## Appendix B (cont)

<b>FAVOURABLE VARIANCES</b>	<b>Projected Outturn Variance £'000</b>
<b>Communities</b>	
Development Control - Increased application fees	(100)
Land Charges - Return of over-provision for Tinkler claims due to receipt of grant	(52)
<b>Corporate Governance</b>	
Elections - Election costs over-budgeted	(42)
Human Resources - Vacant post	(36)
Executive Management Team - Savings on employee costs	(23)
Democratic Representation - Savings on employee costs	(19)
Legal services - Partial retirement of Chief Legal Officer	(11)
<b>Finance &amp; Commercial</b>	
Investment Interest - increase in income due to more creative investment strategies	(218)
Finance – Savings on staff vacancies and trainee	(90)
Contingencies - Contingency dependant on risks identified	(86)
Housing Benefits - Additional income from that budgeted	(50)
HB/Council Tax Benefits - Savings on employee costs	(34)
Revenues Admin - Savings on employee costs	(24)
East Leake Leisure Centre - Renegotiated contract sum	(23)
<b>Neighbourhoods</b>	
Waste Collection & Recycling - Green waste income above target and savings on diesel	(87)
Homelessness - 100% occupancy at Hound Lodge hostel	(20)
<b>Transformation</b>	
Land Holdings - Land transfer at Gamston and Bridgford Hall works not commenced	(99)
Economic Development - Slippage re. strategic growth	(80)
Investment Properties - Rental income due to higher occupancy levels	(65)
Industrial Sites - Income up due to occupancy levels	(30)
Transformation - Staff vacancies	(23)
Business Support Unit - Staff vacancies and post deletions	(19)
Customer Services - Staff vacancy and post deletion	(15)
<b>Total Favourable Variances</b>	<b>(1,246)</b>
<b>Sum of Minor Variances</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>TOTAL VARIANCE</b>	<b>(845)</b>

## Capital Programme 2015/16 – Quarter 3 Position

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - DECEMBER 2015						
	Original Budget	Current Budget	Budget YTD	Actual YTD	Projected Actual	Variance
		£000	£000	£000	£000	£'000
<b>TRANSFORMATION</b>						
Cotgrave Masterplan	0	572	25	23	249	(323)
The Point Enhancements	0	80	70	72	80	0
Civic Centre Level 4	0	29	29	29	29	0
Colliers Way Industrial Units	20	20	0	0	0	(20)
Bingham Market Place Improvements	0	80	70	68	80	0
Bridgford Hall Refurbishment	500	1,099	365	137	500	(599)
Civic Centre Enhancements - General	0	100	0	0	0	(100)
Nottinghamshire Broadband	162	162	162	162	162	0
	<b>682</b>	<b>2,142</b>	<b>721</b>	<b>491</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>(1,042)</b>
<b>NEIGHBOURHOODS</b>						
Support for Registered Housing Providers	369	409	7	5	0	(409)
The Bungalow Boundary Road	0	30	0	0	30	0
Hound Lodge Enhancements	60	60	27	16	60	0
Wheeled Bins Acquisition	60	60	60	50	60	0
Disabled Facilities Grants	375	403	302	247	403	0
Discretionary Top Ups	0	60	0	0	20	(40)
Vehicle Replacement	877	933	849	856	1,365	432
	<b>1,741</b>	<b>1,955</b>	<b>1,245</b>	<b>1,174</b>	<b>1,938</b>	<b>(17)</b>
<b>COMMUNITIES</b>						
Community Partnership Reward Grants	0	25	0	0	0	(25)
Nottinghamshire Cricket Club - Grant	90	90	90	90	90	0
Capital Grant Funding	60	97	0	0	38	(59)
Alford Road Play Area	50	90	45	39	45	(45)
	<b>200</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>(129)</b>
<b>CORPORATE GOVERNANCE</b>						
IS Strategy	369	550	309	260	455	(95)
	<b>369</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>309</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>455</b>	<b>(95)</b>
<b>FINANCE &amp; COMMERCIAL</b>						
BLC Floodlights	50	50	50	48	48	(2)
RLC - Gym Centre Enhancements	0	47	47	47	47	0
Arena Development	6,405	7,965	2,962	1,880	7,000	(965)
BLC Enhancements	0	34	32	28	43	9
RLC - Additional Car Parking Spaces	0	40	37	0	40	0
NCCC loan 2015-16	0	2,700	0	0	2,700	0
Funding Circle Loans	0	500	0	0	0	(500)
	<b>6,455</b>	<b>11,336</b>	<b>3,127</b>	<b>2,002</b>	<b>9,878</b>	<b>(1,458)</b>
<b>CONTINGENCY</b>						
Contingency	150	63	0	0	0	(63)
	<b>150</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(63)</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9,597</b>	<b>16,348</b>	<b>5,537</b>	<b>4,056</b>	<b>13,544</b>	<b>(2,804)</b>