

**When telephoning, please ask for:** Liz Reid-Jones  
**Direct dial** 0115 9148214  
**Email** lreid-jones@rushcliffe.gov.uk

**Our reference:** LRJ  
**Your reference:**  
**Date:** 22 February 2012

To all Members of the Council

Dear Councillor

A meeting of the RUSHCLIFFE BOROUGH COUNCIL will be held on Thursday 1 March 2012 at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Pavilion Road, West Bridgford to consider the following items of business.

Yours sincerely

Head of Corporate Services

### **AGENDA**

Opening Prayer

1. Apologies for absence
2. Declarations of Interest
3. Minutes

To receive as a correct record the minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on Thursday 15 December 2011 (pages i - xiii).

4. Mayor's Announcements
5. Leader's Announcements
6. Chief Executive's Announcements
7. Budget 2012/13 and Financial Strategy

The report of the Interim Head of Financial Services is attached (pages 1 - 65).

8. Council Tax Resolution 2012/13

The report of the Interim Head of Financial Services will follow.

9. Pay Policy Statement 2012/13 – Referral from Cabinet

The report of the Head of Corporate Services is attached (pages 66 – 72).

10. Corporate Strategy 2012 - 2016

The report of Head of Corporate Services is attached (pages 73 - 80).

11. To answer questions under Standing Order 11(2).

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

**Fire Alarm - Evacuation** - in the event of an alarm sounding you should 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** - Facilities, including those for the disabled, are located opposite Committee Room 2.

**Mobile Phones** – For the benefit of other users 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  
COUNCIL  
THURSDAY 15 DECEMBER 2011**

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

**PRESENT:**

G S Moore - Mayor  
I I Korn – Deputy Mayor

Councillors L J Abbey, R A Adair, Mrs S P Bailey, J R Bannister, D G Bell, Mrs D M Boote, S J Boote, N K Boughton-Smith, N A Brown, B Buschman, R L Butler, H A Chewings, J N Clarke, T Combellack, L B Cooper, J A Cranswick, B G Dale, G Davidson, A M Dickinson, J E Fearon, J E Greenwood, M G Hemsley, R Hetherington, R M Jones, K A Khan, N C Lawrence, E J Lungley, A MacInnes, Mrs M M Males, G R Mallender, S E Mallender, D J Mason, F J Mason, B A Nicholls, E A Plant, F A Purdue-Horan, S J Robinson, D V Smith, Mrs J A Smith, P Smith, Mrs M Stockwood, B Tansley, H Tipton, D G Wheeler

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

14 Members of the public

**OFFICERS PRESENT:**

|               |                               |
|---------------|-------------------------------|
| C Bullett     | Deputy Chief Executive (CB)   |
| P Cox         | Senior Solicitor              |
| A Graham      | Chief Executive               |
| S Griffiths   | Deputy Chief Executive (SG)   |
| V Nightingale | Senior Member Support Officer |
| P Randle      | Deputy Chief Executive (PR)   |

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:**

Councillors J E Cottee, Mrs J M Marshall, J A Stockwood and T Vennett-Smith

**CHRISTMAS CAROLS**

The Mayor welcomed to the Chamber, children from Cropwell Bishop Primary School. The children sang three carols for the Members of the Council. The Mayor sincerely thanked the children and their teachers and wished them a very happy Christmas and New Year.

**OPENING PRAYER**

The Meeting was led in prayer by the Mayor's Chaplain

**32. Declarations of Interest**

There were none declared.

**33. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 22 September 2011 were received as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

**34. Mayor's Announcements**

The Mayor informed Members that he had completed 52 engagements since the last Council meeting, which had included many carol services. He highlighted two major engagements. Firstly the Remembrance Sunday for which he thanked all Councillors who had attended services on the Council's behalf. He felt that it was important that people honoured the brave men and women who had fought, and continued to fight, for the country and for freedom. He stated that he had attended the Launch of the Poppy Appeal on the Embankment and reminded Members that the British Legion was celebrating its 90<sup>th</sup> year of existence.

The second memorable event was the opening of the Maggie's Centre at the City Hospital, which was his chosen charity for the year. He said that over £2.8 million had been raised and the Centre was growing quickly. Currently the organisers were advertising for a Benefits Officer as the consequences of dealing with cancer were far wider than medical problems. He was pleased to announce that his own fundraising was progressing well and he had currently raised over £15,000 during the last six months. He thanked the Mayoress for all her hard work in helping with the events.

Finally, the Mayor had great honour in presenting a gift to Councillor Clarke who had served the residents of Rushcliffe for over 25 years.

Councillor Clarke thanked the Mayor and said he had enjoyed representing the constituents of the Borough.

**35. Leader's Announcements**

Councillor Clarke stated that the Council had been shortlisted for the Local Government Chronicles' efficiency award. He felt it was a great honour to be shortlisted and informed Members that the final would be held in March 2012. He thanked all officers and staff for their hard work.

**36. Chief Executive's Announcements**

The Chief Executive, on behalf of all staff, wished Members a happy and peaceful Christmas and a prosperous New Year.

He informed Members that this was Susan Griffiths' last meeting before she retired. Sue had started at Rushcliffe in 2007 and was his first appointee to the Senior Management Team. He stated that Sue was a dynamic person, a real strength to the organisation and had helped the organisation to be recognised nationally. Her professionalism and skills had assisted the Council to reach decisions on areas such as the Leisure Facilities Strategy, the Customer Services Centre and its subsequent move to the Rushcliffe Community Contact Centre, and East Leake Leisure Centre. He wished her well in all her future projects.

On behalf of the Members Councillor Clarke echoed the sentiments made by the Chief Executive and thanked her for the valuable contribution she had made.

In response the Deputy Chief Executive (SG) informed the Council that she had enjoyed her time with Rushcliffe and especially the work undertaken with Members. She felt that democracy was strong and healthy and that the discussions had always been robust and challenging but respectful. In these current difficult times she wished all Members and officers well.

### 37. **Local Development Framework – Draft Core Strategy Proposals**

Councillor Bell presented a report regarding the draft Core Strategy Proposals. He stated that it was a long and complex document and was the culmination of five years hard work undertaken by the Local Development Framework Group. He thanked all Councillors, past and present, and officers for their input into the process. He reminded Members that it was important that the Council kept abreast of new legislation, such as the Localism Act and the emerging National Planning Policy Framework. He stated that the Localism Act would abolish the Regional Spatial Strategy which had placed an unnecessary housing burden on Rushcliffe, although some of the evidence that underpinned those numbers of houses was still relevant. Also, the Council had a duty to co-operate with its neighbours in the Nottingham Housing Market Area, on strategic planning. He stated that the key message was that in the absence of a Plan there would be an assumption of sustainable development which could leave the Borough in a vulnerable position in respect of unwanted development. It was vital that the Plan was fit for purpose and would withstand public examination. He realised that not everyone would agree with every aspect of the Plan but the Council needed to look at a Borough wide picture. It was regretful that not all the infrastructure would be in place at the beginning of the Plan but this would be taken into account as individual planning applications were considered. However, it was necessary to look at all the Borough especially as in some of the villages the populations were declining and without further development the areas could become unsustainable. It was also necessary to provide houses in the villages to enable young people to be able to live in their own areas.

He stated that the document contained many policies and strategies, some of which were incomplete, however these policies were not contentious and would be referred to the Local Development Framework Group before the document was published for representations. As a result of a recent ministerial comment regarding the A453, Policy 2 had been amended, part 8 was to be deleted as the site could now be identified as an allocation in the Policy and part 7 would now read

7. *The following strategic sites have the status of allocations:*
  - i) *Sustainable Urban Extension on land off Melton Road, Edwalton;*
  - ii) *Sustainable Urban Extension to the South of Clifton;*
  - iii) *North of Bingham*
  - iv) *Former RAF Newton; and*
  - v) *Former Cotgrave Colliery.*

*As allocations, each site is identified on the Key Diagram, the site boundaries are shown on the accompanying Proposals Map and the distribution of proposed uses of each site is indicatively illustrated on Figures 1 to 4. Planning permission will be granted for mixed use development at these locations which comply with the detailed development principles and requirements set out in Policies 19, 20, 21, 22 and 23.*

*A new Policy 23 would be created – Strategic Allocation at South of Clifton.*

Councillor Bell stated that he had asked for Policy 23 to be produced in consultation with himself in accordance with recommendation ii) before consultation with residents. However, he wanted to take the final draft back to the Local Development Framework Group before finalisation.

Councillor Davidson welcomed the fact that Councillor Bell would be taking the final document back to the Local Development Framework Group before consultation. He had been concerned that some of the larger developments were not sustainable as they were heavily reliant on people using cars to travel to and from work, etc. It was imperative that the infrastructure was there before the developments to help reduce their carbon impact.

In respect of affordable housing Councillor Davidson wished to strengthen this point. He felt that there should be a minimum of 30% throughout the Borough as there was very little affordable housing in the area. Socially rented housing was the only real affordable housing as it had been shown that part ownership did not have the required impact.

Regarding the Land North of Bingham he noted that neither the Highways Agency nor Nottinghamshire County Council had objected. He stated that they had not considered the traffic on the A52 or the A6097, especially during the rush hour. With regard to public transport it was difficult for buses to get through at the moment. Nor did the documents contain any details about the railways. Another concern was that there was no easy way to cross the railway line where, even since the widening of the A46, there was always serious congestion, which would have to be addressed. For these reasons he could not support the recommendation.

Councillor MacInnes asked for a point of clarification. He wanted to clarify which parts of the document would be referred back to the Local Development Framework Group. He was assured that all the documents would be taken to the Group before finalisation.

Councillor D Boote proposed that the motion should be amended to give the Local Development Framework Group delegated authority to effect the changes. The Chief Executive clarified that the Constitution did not allow a Member Group to have delegated authority. Following a discussion and confirmation that all the changes would be presented to the Local Development Framework Group prior to publication Councillor D Boote withdrew her amendment.

Councillor Bannister agreed that this document represented a vast amount of work by both officers and Members. He recognised that not everyone would

welcome all the developments but this was a densely populated country and more housing was a necessity. He regretted that not all the infrastructure would be in place as there was little funding available but advocated that people changed to two wheel transport instead. He hoped that the Strategy would be well received throughout the Borough.

Councillor S Mallender thanked all the officers and Members for their hard work and was glad to see that the Local Development Framework Group would be consulted on the final document. However, she agreed with Councillor Davidson that there was not enough emphasis on sustainability to aid the Development Control Committee to develop carbon neutrality, micro energy generation, solar panels, etc. She stated that the definition for sustainability should be ecological as well as economical. In respect of affordable housing it should be more than 30% with a mandatory 30% of rented housing. She stated that she would abstain when this was put to the vote.

Councillor D Mason stated that every Councillor had agreed that the previous number of houses allocated to Rushcliffe had been unrealistic and the Strategy replaced these with realistic figures. Without a Local Plan the Council had not been able to stop unwanted developments and Members needed to adopt the Plan to help defend the Borough. She reminded Members that the Secretary of State had decided about the housing at Edwalton after the Council had refused planning permission. She also stated that the document was not just about housing it contained issues such as climate change, bio diversity, etc. An important part was affordable housing and developers contributions would help towards meeting the need. This was a very positive document although lengthy.

Councillor Khan welcomed Councillor Bell's assurances. He wanted to ensure that adequate time was put aside for consultation and reminded Members of the letter from Barton in Fabis residents. He urged that all the issues raised were seriously discussed and that the residents should see democracy in action.

Councillor Jones supported the reduction in the number of houses and agreed that the document contained other policies. However, he was concerned that when the document had been considered by Cabinet it had contained two extra pages on climate change. He was pleased that all the work in progress policies would be presented to the Local Development Framework Group. In respect of developments at Cotgrave and Sharphill Woods it was important that the Green Belt was protected. In West Bridgford people were interested in ensuring the survival of local shops and felt that this should be an important part of the document. Also the Council should be firmer with developers in relation to affordable housing.

Councillor Tansley stated that Members were here as Borough Councillors and should consider the document as such. It was noted that it was difficult to be 100% happy but he was sad to hear that some Members would be abstaining from the vote as he felt it was such an important issue. He reminded Councillors that Policy 4 outlined the provision of employment land. Within the development at Cotgrave there was 4.5 hectares of land identified which would create about 500 jobs. He agreed that the infrastructure was

lagging behind development but the 453 improvements were on stream, the A46 was nearing completion and it was hoped that the A52 would follow. In respect of the Green Belt the proposed allocations would only take 1.6%; he felt that this was a relatively small amount to help regenerate the Borough.

Councillor Adair stated that it would take approximately ten to fifteen years for the proposed developments to be built, and it would have to be market led which in the current climate would be slow. He stated that the locations had been well thought out and that local people had been consulted about their villages. It was important that the correct information was readily available for everyone, including details on health, leisure, employment and shops for families. Infrastructure was an issue but rail and bus links would be developed when a need was evidenced however it was important to note that employment trends were changing and more people were working from home. With regard to the Green Belt he did not like to see it attacked but the small reduction was acceptable in order to prepare for the next generation. He supported the document as it focussed development into the right areas.

Councillor Butler spoke of the work undertaken by the cross party Member Group. He recognised that planning was always a controversial and emotive subject. However he felt that doing nothing was not an option. By agreeing the Plan the process would move forward with further consultation and examination. He reminded Members that there was Government advice stating that local authorities should agree their plans as soon as possible. He supported the comments that the developments would take time to build.

Councillor Mrs Stockwood supported the comments in relation to employment trends and infrastructure. She also stated that over 40% of the Borough would still be Green Belt land.

Councillors Cooper and Lawrence supported the comments made. Councillor Lawrence also stated that land at Cotgrave and Newton was in the Green Belt but the developments proposed were on brownfield sites. He felt that the Plan would protect the villages of Rushcliffe especially those near to the proposed larger developments.

In summary Councillor Clarke reiterated that this was the culmination of five years hard work by Members and officers and that it was vitally important that the Core Strategy was adopted. With regard to the letter from Barton in Fabis he informed Members that, with officers, he had met with representatives from Barton, Gotham and Thrumpton to discuss all the points. In respect of the Green Belt this could alter with any new boundaries. If anyone was to make objections to developments these would have to be evidence based. With regard to any missing pages Councillor Clarke assured Members that the complete final document would be presented to the Local Development Framework Group. It was vitally important that the Plan was adopted and taken forward. Finally, he requested a recorded vote.

Councillor Cranswick said that firstly that this process was not yet finished as it was not guaranteed that the Planning Inspectorate would find the proposed figures acceptable. Secondly the document represented the bible for planning for the Borough for the next few years. It would be the rules that any planning decision could be set against.



In summing up Councillor Bell stated that putting a percentage against affordable housing would not always be appropriate but the figures within the document would provide room for negotiations. With regard to the Green Belt all non-Green Belt sites would be considered first. Finally he commended the report and stated that all the comments had been very useful to give a complete picture of how to improve facilities and enhance the Borough for all.

On being put to the vote these were recorded as

For:

Councillors R A Adair, Mrs S P Bailey, J R Bannister, D G Bell, N K Boughton-Smith, N A Brown, B Buschman, R L Butler, H A Chewings, J N Clarke, T Combellack, L B Cooper, J A Cranswick, B G Dale, A M Dickinson, J E Fearon, J E Greenwood, M G Hemsley, R Hetherington, I I Korn N C Lawrence, E J Lungley, A MacInnes, Mrs M M Males, D J Mason, F J Mason, G S Moore B A Nicholls, E A Plant, F A Purdue-Horan, S J Robinson, D V Smith, Mrs J A Smith, P Smith, Mrs M Stockwood, B Tansley, H Tipton, D G Wheeler (38)

Against: Nil

Abstain:

Councillors L J Abbey, Mrs D M Boote, S J Boote, G Davidson, R M Jones, K A Khan, G R Mallender, S E Mallender (8)

RESOLVED that:

- i. Council agree the draft Core Strategy, in order that it be published for a six week period of representations; and
- ii. the Deputy Chief Executive (PR) be given delegated authority, following consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, to effect such changes as are considered necessary to strengthen or to provide clarity to the draft Core Strategy up to its publication, provided that such changes are neither strategic nor directional, in order to ensure its soundness.

### **38. The Review of Polling Districts and Polling Places**

Councillor Cranswick presented the report outlining the Council's four year review of all polling stations used in the Borough. He also presented a revised appendix 2, following negotiations with representatives from Bingham the polling station for Bingham East had reverted to the Robert Miles School. He stated that the work had been undertaken by the Registration Office and that 78% of responses were supportive of keeping the existing sites. The report highlighted the ten responses that did not support these sites and the Returning Officer's responses.

Councillor Davidson stated that he was one of the Bingham representatives who had met with the Returning Officer to discuss the proposed changes. It had been felt that the Town Pavilion was not the best site for electors. He said

that they had accepted the present situation as they had been assured that it would be kept under constant review.

Councillor S Mallender spoke on the proposals for the Lady Bay Ward. She stated that she had complained as the existing site had been difficult for people with mobility problems; although it would have to be kept as there were no other suitable places yet. She informed Members that there were other commercial buildings that she was hoping could be used if the owners could be contacted.

Councillor S Boote said that although there had been no official complaints about the use of Crossdale Drive Primary School he had been informed that it was felt to be a disruption to the school's curriculum. He reminded Members that due to the high number of postal votes in the Borough polling day was not a large event but because the school was used it caused problems for parents who had to arrange childcare and for the teachers as it was an extra holiday for the pupils. These were concerns for all schools used. He said that public houses had been used as polling stations in other areas of the country. He proposed an amendment that iv) should read "that Council makes every reasonable effort to avoid disrupting the normal work of schools when choosing polling places".

In support of this amendment Councillor Abbey stated that special schools were not chosen as polling stations because of the disruption to pupils, however because of the use of inclusion now many disabled pupils were in main stream schools. Also because of the problems with childcare this had a larger impact on the more vulnerable one parent families.

Councillor Cranswick did not accept the amendment. Councillor Clarke stated that this was singling out one type of location and these concerns could be applied to other locations. He was not concerned as he had confidence that the Returning Officer and staff made these judgements when considering premises. Councillor Cranswick stated that only six schools were used.

Councillor Boote replied that although the number of schools used had reduced over the years it was still a concern if it was your child's school used. He stated that the law had changed in 2007 to widen the type of premises that could be used.

On being put to the vote the amendment was lost.

Councillor Purdue-Horan said that candidates did not appreciate the work undertaken by officers and other individuals in respect of polling stations. He and his fellow Bingham colleagues would work with officers and the Chief Executive to find a long term and sustainable solution for the two Bingham wards, whilst leaving the present sites in operation for the Police Commissioners' election on 15 November 2012.

Councillor Mrs Stockwood supported these comments and also stated that the ward boundaries might change and have to be addressed again.

RESOLVED that

- i. Council approve the (a) recommendations at paragraph six of the report setting out changes to polling districts, polling places and polling stations, and (b) proposed revised schedule of polling districts and polling places as set out in the revised **Appendix 2**.
- ii. Council requests that the Head of Corporate Services formally publish the Review report and its findings on 23 December 2011.
- iii. Should a polling place be unavailable in the run up to an election, the (Acting) Returning Officer be given the authority to select an appropriate alternative and formal retrospective approval be sought by Council following the election should this be a permanent proposed change.

**39. Electoral Review – Proposed Council Size Submission**

Councillor Clarke presented the Council's proposed submission to the Boundary Commission to reduce the number of councillors from 50 to 45. He stated that there were good reasons for making this amendment as it would make councillors more efficient and give a better balance to the numbers of electors represented. Also it gave an opportunity for the ratio between councillor and elector to be brought into line with other Nottinghamshire councils. It would also give an opportunity to look at the work councillors undertook and to generate some savings. He said that other councils were also looking at reducing their numbers as well as a proposal at Westminster to reduce the number of MP's by 10%.

Councillor Davidson put forward an amendment that

- i. notes the Council size submission (attached) as recommended by Cabinet which proposes a reduction from 50 to 45 Councillors, and considers that a sufficiently strong case for a reduction to 45 councillors has not been made and agrees that the Council should comprise 50 councillors; and
- ii. requests that the Chief Executive make arrangements for a revised submission and recommendation of 50 Councillors be sent to the Boundary Commission as the Council's agreed submission.

He stated that it was necessary to have a review as the percentage variance was more than an acceptable level and this needed addressing. There had previously been a review that came into operation in 2003, which had reduced the number of councillors from 54 to 50; at that time a reduction to 45 had been considered but was rejected. The Borough had increased in size and this trend was going to continue. It was noted that the Commission had been interested in the predicted number of electors in five years' time. With regard to councillors workload this was increasing not decreasing. He felt that the reasons for the reduction had not been made nor was it clear how this figure had been reached. He felt it would be difficult for the Commission to arrive at equal numbers for wards and still keep community cohesion. He was concerned about the logic in relation to reducing the number of scrutiny groups to three to accommodate the reduction in numbers to 45 and he felt that this

was unacceptable. There was no sound justification and the submission was flawed.

Councillor S Boote explained that the last review has taken place in 2001 and that over the last ten years the population had increased and was continually growing. The workload for both Members and officers had also increased through legislation, finance, service delivery, communication and would continue to grow due to the development of localism and neighbourhood plans. The amount of police consultation had doubled, the work on the budget had increased, the formula grant and council tax capping was unknown, the number of Member Groups and Panels, consultations and workshops had all increased. He stated that the number of hours he spent on council business had increased from 30 to 50 hours per week. To say this was a cost saving exercise was wrong, if the Council wanted to save money it could reduce the Members' allowances by 10%. A review of boundaries would stretch and distort the community boundaries that existed. He felt that there should not be a reduction as this would impact on residents contacting councillors.

Councillor MacInnes stated that he could not support the amendment as the Labour party had drawn up their own proposal and sent it to the Boundary Commission. It was possible to make a reduction but not at the expense of good governance. He said that 45 should be the minimum number and 50 should be a maximum. There were some merits in having 45 but it was felt that it would be better to have a flexible approach to ensure that boundaries relate to communities. In smaller wards there would have to be significant changes to reach the average of 1,974 electors. Where the community dictates there should be single member wards but also where preferred multi member wards. There would need to be reforms to the governance arrangements and also a reduction in the membership of some committees. He understood that the workload of a councillor had increased but evidence from the survey had indicated that there was scope to do more. He felt that all non-executive members should be involved in scrutiny. Scrutiny should be changed to make it more investigative, this could lead to it being effective and efficient and save time. There could be effective neighbourhood delivery, shaping of local services and local issues raised. In West Bridgford there was no parish or town council which could be introduced to make democracy fairer, meet localism and increase voter turnout. He suggested that there should be a working group set up to consider this issue. He stated that this should not be seen as the end but the beginning of the process.

Councillor Jones agreed that a review of ward sizes was necessary because of the wide variations of elector numbers between wards. He felt that the current submission did not give enough weight to the proposed changes in the number of electors. The last review had been based on the 1998 figures and the electorate had increased by 6.2% since then; at that time the projected increase had been about 4,000 where it had actually increased by 5,081. The submission referred to the forecasted number for 2016 but this figure was not in the document, it merely stated that the increase in housing growth would not resolve the disparity between wards.

He believed that there was no case put forward to revise the Council structure and he stated that this issue had not been considered by Councillors or a scrutiny group. In particular he did not feel that a reduction in the membership

of the Development Control Committee would be beneficial as it would reduce the safe spread of geographic knowledge and range of opinion. He stated that the proposal did not take into account Councillor involvement in member training, consultations or information events. He reminded Members that the Audit Commission had praised the high level of Member involvement in the Borough but he felt that this was ignored in order that the Cabinet could be kept at six yet still reduce the number of councillors.

The report referred to the effect of town and parish councils but did not refer to the democratic deficit in respect of West Bridgford. He believed that multi member wards provided residents with greater choice and variety and maximised the responsiveness of the local councillor. Councillor Jones stated that his major concern was that by putting this into effect it would not encourage new people to put themselves forward to join the Council but would create a job only for those who had retired.

Councillor G Mallender supported some of the comments made, especially those relating to communities, local areas and reflecting diversity. There was a need to create wards that people felt they could represent. The survey had evidenced that the majority of councillors were male and retired. He felt that the impact of this submission would be to increase the number of barriers and make it more difficult for people to stand for election, thereby reducing representation. If Members felt that they did not have enough work to do there was always the Big Society ethos or a return to the committee system.

Following a comment Councillor Clarke stated that the submission was based on councillors duties for this Council and it could not take into account Members wishes to sit on other bodies such as parish or county councils.

Councillor Cranswick informed Members that the submission had been based on the 2016 projections. He was surprised that councillors felt they had too much work as the new scrutiny arrangements had been criticised as backbenchers had stated that they did not sit on enough committees and only attended once every three months. This submission was not about creating work but to achieve a sensible number of councillors to carry out the work. The submission was the Council's suggestion but the Boundary Commission who had the ultimate authority to make the decision, they could decide that 55 would be better or even 35.

In summarising Councillor Davidson did not feel that an adequate reason had been given for the reduction to 45 and why this was best.

On being put to the vote the amendment was lost.

Councillor MacInnes stated that he would not support the recommendation as the Labour party had prepared their own submission. He was disappointed that there had been no consultation with the opposition parties and that the document had only been circulated shortly before the Group Leaders' meeting.

RESOLVED that

- i. agrees the Council size submission (attached) as recommended by Cabinet which proposes a reduction from 50 to 45 Councillors, and

- ii. requests that the Chief Executive make arrangements for the document to be sent to the Commission as the Council's agreed submission.

**40. Motion to Extend the Meeting**

The Mayor proposed a motion to extend the meeting to 10.30 pm which was agreed unanimously.

**41. Review of Scheme of Delegation**

Councillor Clarke presented a report outlining the changes to the Scheme of Delegation and Article 12, which had previously been considered by Cabinet and the Corporate Governance Group. The changes were of a technical nature and were not contentious.

RESOLVED that

Council agrees the proposed revisions to the Scheme of Delegation - Part 3 – Responsibility for Functions and Article 12 – Officers within the Council's Constitution.

**42. Questions Under Standing Order 11(2)**

**a) Question from Councillor S J Boote to Councillor J N Clarke**

Following the Government's announcement that the A453 dualling is to go ahead, how certain is it that this Council's contribution of £500,000 is still necessary and desirable?

Councillor Clarke replied that the offer had been made and it was now up to the Government to ask the Council for the sum of money. He had heard that Nottinghamshire County Council had received a request for their money.

*Supplementary question*

Councillor Boote asked that as the Council had found it appropriate to spend £500,000 on the A453 how much would the Council contribute towards the A52 before the houses were built.

Councillor Boote was reminded by the Mayor that the supplementary question should relate to the A453 and therefore no answer was given.

**b) Question from Councillor S J Boote to Councillor J N Clarke**

What mechanisms will be put in place to ensure that the New Homes Bonus will be equitably distributed to communities in proportion to their need and/or to the numbers of new homes which will be built in their areas?

Councillor Clarke informed Councillor Boote that he had received an answer to this question when it had been raised at scrutiny.

*Supplementary question*

Councillor Boote asked Councillor Clarke if the public would be consulted or would Councillor Clarke use implicit consultation.

Councillor Clarke responded that he felt that questions should be reasonable and respectful and not have a personal slant. He informed Members that the public had been consulted during the Local Development Framework process and would continue to be. This consultation would provide the evidence for any further proposals.

**c) Question from Councillor D G Wheeler to Councillor J N Clarke**

Could the Leader comment on what the effect will be on Rushcliffe as a result of the A453 improvements announced in the Chancellor's Autumn statement?

Councillor Clarke replied that he was very pleased to hear the news. He believed that the effect on Rushcliffe would be to make the economic regeneration quicker and would relieve congestion and rat running. The overriding benefit would be that when the economy recovered it would make the situation easier in Rushcliffe and would enhance the Borough's reputation.

The meeting closed at 10.00 pm.

MAYOR

## REPORT OF THE INTERIM HEAD OF FINANCIAL SERVICES

### CABINET PORTFOLIO HOLDER – COUNCILLOR CLARKE

#### Purpose of the Report

1. The purpose of the report is to: -
  - i. Report to Full Council the recommendations from Cabinet to enable a formal decision to be made in respect of the following;
    - o The General Fund budget 2012/13;
    - o Special Expenses for 2012/13;
    - o The Council Tax increase for 2012/13.
    - o The Capital Programme 2012/13 – 2016/17;
  - ii. The report also includes the Treasury Management Strategy statutory Prudential Borrowing Indicators, which although a technical issue, need to be approved by Council in accordance with statutory requirements.

#### Recommendations

2. It is RECOMMENDED that Council approve: -
  - i. The General Fund Budget for 2012/13 (as detailed at **Appendix B**);
  - ii. The Special Expenses for West Bridgford, Ruddington and Keyworth (as detailed at **Paragraph 17**);
  - iii. A 0% Council Tax increase for 2012/13;
  - iv. The Capital Programme 2012/13 – 2016/17 (as detailed at **Appendix D**);
  - v. The Treasury Management Strategy and Prudential Borrowing Indicators 2012/13 (as detailed in **Appendix E**);
3. It is RECOMMENDED that Council receives: -
  - i. The report of the Council's Responsible Finance Officer (as detailed in **Appendix A**);
  - ii. The Medium Term Financial Forecast (as detailed at **Paragraph 21**);



## Background

4. On the 11<sup>th</sup> October 2011 Cabinet considered a report setting the context for the budget cycle for 2012/13. It also revised the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy and Forecast and updated members on national issues, expected to impact on the proposed budget process;
5. Member budget workshops were held in November 2011, which considered the following:
  - i. The Financial Outlook and Budget Context;
  - ii. The Government's business rate reform proposals;
  - iii. The impact of the Council Tax freeze;
  - iv. The Government's proposals for Council Tax support;
  - v. How we can promote and grow business in Rushcliffe;
  - vi. How we can recognise vulnerable people in Rushcliffe;
  - vii. The draft Corporate Strategy.
6. Further Member Budget Workshops were held in January 2012, which considered the following:
  - i. Feedback from the November workshops;
  - ii. An update on business rate reform proposals;
  - iii. An update on proposals for Council Tax support;
  - iv. The draft budget 2012 and MTFs;
  - v. Savings and service redesign update;
  - vi. Scenario and risk analysis;
  - vii. Requests for members' feedback.
7. On 14<sup>th</sup> February 2012, the Cabinet considered a report containing draft Budget Proposals including consideration of comments from the Member Budget Workshops.
8. Cabinet made specific budget recommendations to Council including a recommended level of Council Tax for 2012/13.
9. The following sections of this report highlight the key elements covered in the February Cabinet report. **Please bring a copy of the Cabinet report to the meeting.**
10. Appendix A contains a statutory report from the Council's Responsible Finance Officer under Section 25 of the Local Government Act 2003. The report provides commentary on the robustness of the Councils budgets and the adequacy of its reserves and balances.

## **Medium Term Financial Strategy**

11. The Cabinet approved its Medium Term Financial Strategy for the 2012/13 budget in October 2011. It approved 5 high level “*guiding principles*” to provide an overarching framework to operate within when setting the budget, council tax and medium term forecasts. These are:
  - i. General Fund balance should not fall below £1.25m and overall revenue reserves should not fall below 20% of net revenue expenditure;
  - ii. In setting Council Tax, Members should consider the medium term to ensure that a sustainable budgetary position is preserved;
  - iii. Where the budget is in deficit Members should consider the level of inflation and potential capping criteria when approving the annual Council Tax increase;
  - iv. When setting the Capital Programme, consideration is given to allocating capital resources to schemes that are beneficial to the Council's overall revenue budget position (invest to save);
  - v. To maximise the resources available the Council will actively lobby the Government on relevant issues (e.g., Business Rate reform / Welfare Reform - Council Tax benefits and Universal Credit).

## **General Fund Budget**

12. This section provides a summary of the key issues for:
  - i. Revenue Budget 2012/13;
  - ii. Special Expenses 2012/13;
  - iii. Council Tax Setting 2012/13;
  - iv. Medium Term Financial Forecast and Reserves;
  - v. Medium Term Risks & Scenario Analysis.

### **Revenue Budget 2012/13**

13. The Council's detailed budget for 2012/13 is attached at Appendix B. The budget has been reviewed and revised to bring it in line with the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy's (CIPFA) Service Reporting Code of Practice (SerCOP).
14. Explanations for major variances between the Original Budgets for 2011/12 and 2012/13 have been provided but it should be noted that the change in number and treatment of holding accounts has resulted in variances between services and between operating expenditure and central support service costs.
15. This makes it difficult to make meaningful comparisons however it must be stressed that these do not have an impact on the Net Council Budget (the Council's bottom line)

## Special Expenses 2012/13

16. In 2012/13 a new special expense is required for cemetery maintenance costs at the St Mary Magdelene churchyard in Keyworth.
17. The table below details the proposed costs to be included as special expenses for the budget for 2012/13 for West Bridgford, Ruddington and Keyworth.

|                               | 2011/12        | 2012/13        |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
|                               | £              | £              |
| <b>West Bridgford</b>         |                |                |
| Parks and Playing Fields      | 415,000        | 417,980        |
| West Bridgford Town Centre    | 51,300         | 50,990         |
| Community Halls               | 44,250         | 39,300         |
| Seats & Bins                  | 1,840          | 1,840          |
| Burial Subsidy                | 19,320         | 19,330         |
| Contingency                   | 13,270         | 15,550         |
| Annuity Charges               | 106,880        | 97,810         |
| RCCO                          | 100,000        | 100,000        |
|                               | <b>751,860</b> | <b>742,800</b> |
| <b>Ruddington</b>             |                |                |
| Cemetery & Annuity Charges    | 6,650          | 6,650          |
|                               | <b>6,650</b>   | <b>6,650</b>   |
| <b>Keyworth</b>               |                |                |
| Cemetery Maintenance          |                | 3,970          |
|                               | <b>0</b>       | <b>3,970</b>   |
| <b>TOTAL SPECIAL EXPENSES</b> | <b>758,510</b> | <b>753,420</b> |

## Council Tax Setting 2012/13

18. At the meeting of 14<sup>th</sup> February 2012, the Cabinet recommended a 0% increase in Council Tax for 2012/13 to take advantage of the Governments Council Tax Freeze Grant of £136,000 for 2012/13 only.
19. The Cabinet before recommending a level of Council Tax received detailed criteria related to Council Tax referenda. The table below illustrates proposed levels of council tax for each band for this authority.

| Band   | A      | B      | C       | D       | E       | F       | G       | H       |
|--|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Proposed Council Tax for 2012/13             | £75.48 | £88.06 | £100.64 | £113.22 | £138.38 | £163.54 | £188.70 | £226.44 |
| Increase per week (rounded to nearest pence) | 0.00p  | 0.00p  | 0.00p   | 0.00p   | 0.00p   | 0.00p   | 0.00p   | 0.00p   |
| Increase                                     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%      | 0%      | 0%      | 0%      | 0%      | 0%      |

## Medium Term Financial Forecast and Reserves

20. The February Cabinet Report and presentations at the Budget Workshops have identified and explained in some detail three major national issues, which will impact on the Council's finances in the future. These are:
- i. Economic conditions – affecting interest rates, inflation, income streams and pressure on services such as homelessness and benefits;
  - ii. Localisation of Business Rates – affecting the level of government funding the Council will receive;
  - iii. Localisation of Council Tax Support – affecting how Council Tax benefits are awarded and transferring risk from Government to the Council.
21. The council's medium term financial forecast is illustrated below; the forecast reflects the impact of the Council Tax freeze for 2012/13. For future years an indicative council tax increases of 3% have been included for illustration purposes only.

|                                   | CERTAINTY          |                     | UNCERTAINTY         |                     |                     |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
|                                   | 2011/12<br>Current | 2012/13<br>Forecast | 2013/14<br>Forecast | 2014/15<br>Forecast | 2015/16<br>Forecast |
|                                   | £000               | £000                | £000                | £000                | £000                |
| <b>Net Service Expenditure</b>    | <b>12,060</b>      | <b>11,446</b>       | <b>11,648</b>       | <b>11,060</b>       | <b>11,184</b>       |
| Contingency                       | 80                 | 80                  | 80                  | 80                  | 80                  |
| Revenue Contribution to Capital   | 860                | 200                 | 200                 | 200                 | 200                 |
| Interest Receipts                 | (560)              | (450)               | (450)               | (700)               | (900)               |
| Special Expenses                  | (759)              | (753)               | (771)               | (781)               | (790)               |
| Use of Earmarked Reserves         | (1,320)            | (591)               | (345)               | (76)                | (70)                |
| <b>Net Council Budget</b>         | <b>10,361</b>      | <b>9,932</b>        | <b>10,362</b>       | <b>9,783</b>        | <b>9,704</b>        |
| <b>Forecast Resources:</b>        |                    |                     |                     |                     |                     |
| Central Government Grant          | (5,550)            | (4,872)             | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
| Localised Business Rates          | 0                  | 0                   | (4,628)             | (4,397)             | (4,177)             |
| Council Tax / Coll'n Fund         | (50)               | (94)                | (25)                | 0                   | 0                   |
| Income From Council Tax           | (4,660)            | (4,694)             | (4,859)             | (5,030)             | (5,206)             |
| Council Tax Freeze Grant          | (136)              | (272)               | (136)               | (136)               | 0                   |
| <b>Total Resources</b>            | <b>(10,396)</b>    | <b>(9,932)</b>      | <b>(9,648)</b>      | <b>(9,563)</b>      | <b>(9,383)</b>      |
| <b>Budget (Surplus) / Deficit</b> | <b>(35)</b>        | <b>0</b>            | <b>714</b>          | <b>221</b>          | <b>321</b>          |
| Service Redesign Savings          | 0                  | 0                   | (714)               | (221)               | (321)               |
| <b>Budget (Surplus) / Deficit</b> | <b>(35)</b>        | <b>0</b>            | <b>(0)</b>          | <b>(0)</b>          | <b>(0)</b>          |
| <b>Council Tax Increase</b>       | <b>0.00%</b>       | <b>0.00%</b>        | <b>3.00%</b>        | <b>3.00%</b>        | <b>3.00%</b>        |

22. The overall impact of the Council Tax freeze is additional on-going cost £163,000. This has been incorporated into the medium term financial forecast and increased the level of savings required to be met through service redesign from 2013/14. The programme will need to be reviewed during 2012/13 and reported back through the 2013/14 budget cycle.

23. The Medium Term Financial Forecast reflects a strong financial position, particularly given the testing economic conditions. The Council has also retained its debt free status and is expected to do so into the medium term.
24. The following table sets out the Council's current General Fund Balance and Earmarked Reserves along with changes estimated over the medium term:

| <b>ESTIMATED REVENUE RESERVES - FEBRUARY 2012</b> |                        |                        |                        |                        |                        |                        |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
|   | <b>Mar 11<br/>£000</b> | <b>Mar 12<br/>£000</b> | <b>Mar 13<br/>£000</b> | <b>Mar 14<br/>£000</b> | <b>Mar 15<br/>£000</b> | <b>Mar 16<br/>£000</b> |
| <b>GF Balance</b>                                 | <b>2,604</b>           | <b>2,639</b>           | <b>2,639</b>           | <b>2,639</b>           | <b>2,639</b>           | <b>2,639</b>           |
| <b>Earmarked Reserves</b>                         |                        |                        |                        |                        |                        |                        |
| Planning Front Runners                            | 20                     | 20                     | 20                     | 20                     | 20                     | 20                     |
| Community & Consultation                          | 7                      | 7                      | 7                      | 7                      | 7                      | 7                      |
| VAT   | 484                    | 304                    | 214                    | 123                    | 123                    | 123                    |
| Risk Management                                   | 74                     | 74                     | 54                     | 34                     | 28                     | 28                     |
| Capital Programme                                 | 2,221                  | 1,941                  | 1,941                  | 1,941                  | 1,941                  | 1,941                  |
| Leisure Centre Maintenance                        | 209                    | 209                    | 209                    | 209                    | 209                    | 209                    |
| IT Development                                    | 312                    | 342                    | 372                    | 402                    | 432                    | 462                    |
| Partnerships                                      | 145                    | 145                    | 145                    | 145                    | 145                    | 145                    |
| Superannuation                                    | 257                    | 257                    | 257                    | 257                    | 257                    | 257                    |
| Planning Delivery Grant                           | 183                    | 183                    | 183                    | 183                    | 183                    | 183                    |
| Building Control                                  | 41                     | 41                     | 41                     | 41                     | 41                     | 41                     |
| Equal Pay Audit                                   | 345                    | 345                    | 345                    | 345                    | 345                    | 345                    |
| Planning Appeals                                  | 500                    | 500                    | 500                    | 500                    | 500                    | 500                    |
| Lottery   | 54                     | 54                     | 54                     | 54                     | 54                     | 54                     |
| Planned Maintenance                               | 100                    | 100                    | 100                    | 100                    | 100                    | 100                    |
| Local Area Agreement                              | 142                    | 142                    | 142                    | 142                    | 142                    | 142                    |
| E-Petitions                                       | 4                      | 4                      | 4                      | 4                      | 4                      | 4                      |
| Civil Emergencies                                 | 75                     | 75                     | 75                     | 75                     | 75                     | 75                     |
| Interest Equalisation                             | 974                    | 564                    | 164                    | 0                      | 0                      | 0                      |
| Property Rationalisation                          | 250                    | 250                    | 250                    | 250                    | 250                    | 250                    |
| Invest to Save                                    | 1,334                  | 854                    | 743                    | 643                    | 543                    | 443                    |
| <b>Total Earmarked Reserves</b>                   | <b>7,731</b>           | <b>6,411</b>           | <b>5,820</b>           | <b>5,475</b>           | <b>5,399</b>           | <b>5,329</b>           |
| <b>Total Revenue Reserves</b>                     | <b>10,335</b>          | <b>9,050</b>           | <b>8,459</b>           | <b>8,114</b>           | <b>8,038</b>           | <b>7,968</b>           |

25. The Council through the four-year service redesign programme has the plans in place for generating savings to maintain a balanced budget through these turbulent times.
26. However the level of uncertainty for future years is unprecedented and maintaining flexibility will undoubtedly be key in managing the budget into the medium term.
27. The Forecast, Four-Year plan, Debt Free status and Healthy Reserves give the Council maximum flexibility for dealing with the significant challenges and changes which will be faced in the future.

## Medium Term Risks & Scenario Analysis

28. The February Cabinet Report and presentations at the Budget Workshops outlined the major risks and potential scenarios for 2012/13 and the medium term. The tables are set out at Appendix C.

### Capital Programme 2012/13 - 2016/17

29. The capital programme recommended by Cabinet is attached at Appendix D along with the individual scheme appraisal. The table below sets out the associated available capital funding:

|                                | 2012/13         | 2013/14         | 2014/15         | 2015/16         | 2016/17        |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
|                                | £000            | £000            | £000            | £000            | £000           |
| <b>Available Resources B/F</b> | (18,275)        | (15,416)        | (13,014)        | (11,305)        | (9,424)        |
| Capital Receipts (Useable)     | (74)            | (115)           | (115)           | (115)           | (115)          |
| Grants & Contributions         | (1,230)         | (622)           | (365)           | (220)           | (220)          |
| Revenue Contributions          | (100)           | (100)           | (100)           | (100)           | (100)          |
| <b>Sub-total</b>               | <b>(19,679)</b> | <b>(16,253)</b> | <b>(13,594)</b> | <b>(11,740)</b> | <b>(9,859)</b> |
| Programmed Expenditure         | 4,263           | 3,239           | 2,289           | 2,316           | 6,240          |
| <b>Available Resources C/F</b> | <b>(15,416)</b> | <b>(13,014)</b> | <b>(11,305)</b> | <b>(9,424)</b>  | <b>(3,619)</b> |

### Prudential Borrowing Indicators 2012/13

30. To comply with recommended best practice, the Council is required to set a number of Prudential Borrowing Indicators at the same time as it sets its annual budget.
31. The indicators are a technical accounting requirement and are based upon a range of different external borrowing scenarios that may happen during the medium term. These are reviewed and updated annually by the Council and provide a statutory framework for officers to work within during the year.
32. The Treasury Management Strategy for 2012/13, which contains the Prudential Indicators was approved by Cabinet on 14<sup>th</sup> February 2012 and is attached at Appendix E.

**Financial Comments**

The financial impact of the Borough's spending plans is described in the report

**Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act**

The budget supports the Council's work in tackling crime and disorder.

**Diversity**

In the development of proposals within the financial strategy due regard is being given to the potential equalities impact, in order to ensure fair financial decisions. Where necessary assessment will be made to measure and evaluate any such impact and this will help to identify methods for mitigating or avoiding it. This process will help to ensure that agreed courses of action are justifiable and, where necessary plans are in place to alleviate negative impact.

**Background Papers for Inspection: Nil**

**REPORT UNDER SECTION 25 OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2003**

(To be read in conjunction with the Council budget report to which it is appended)

**Purpose:**

The purpose of this report is to provide Members with information on the robustness of the Council's estimates and the adequacy of reserves so that Members have authoritative advice available when they take their budget and Council Tax decisions.

**Background:**

Local authorities decide each year how much council tax they need to raise. The decision is based upon a budget that sets out estimates of what they plan to spend on each of their services.

The decision on the level of council tax is taken before the year begins and cannot be changed once set. It follows that an allowance for risks and uncertainties, that could adversely impact on net service costs, must be made by : -

- a. making prudent allowance in the estimates for each of the services, and in addition;
- b. ensuring that there are adequate reserves to draw on if the service estimates turn out to be insufficient.

Section 25 of the Local Government Act 2003 requires that an authority's responsible finance officer reports to the authority when it is considering its budget and council tax. The report must deal with the robustness of the estimates and the adequacy of the reserves allowed for in the budget proposals so that members have authoritative advice available to them when making their decisions.

**Robustness of Estimates**

The Council has followed a comprehensive and detailed budget process when preparing the budget for 2012/13. To the best of my knowledge this complies with both Statutory and Best Practice requirements.

The Council recognised that the Comprehensive Spending Review would signal significant cuts in the Council's funding. This at a time when income and service budget were already under pressure because of the poor economic conditions.

The Council responded proactively by identifying some initial efficiency measures, which were to be supplemented by a full programme of service re-design. Whilst the funding cuts have been much greater than originally anticipated the efficiency measures and service re-design programme has delivered sufficient savings to balance the budget for 2012/13 without the need to use the general fund balance.

In addition, the service re-design programme sets targets for savings currently sufficient to maintain year-on-year balanced budgets into the medium term. However the Council recognises that future funding and service provision is uncertain and that risks and particularly financial risks are at an all-time high. The re-design programme must therefore be sufficiently flexible to respond to changes in funding levels or the impact of the economic climate.



The approach for identifying and implementing efficiency savings has always been to agree and test savings before incorporating into detailed budgets. Whilst this is still the objective it hasn't always been possible due to the level of savings required. Close monitoring will therefore be required during 2012/13 via the Council's performance management systems, which include performance clinics at CMT and regular monitoring reports to Cabinet, Corporate Governance Group and Performance Management Board.

The draft budget proposals have been scrutinised through member budget workshops and consultation has been undertaken with business ratepayers.

Members are reminded that the budget is a paper exercise and whilst, I believe the estimates are robust, the financial landscape remains especially turbulent and delivery will require a great deal of commitment and hard work.

### **Adequacy of Reserves**

The CIPFA Local Authority Accounting Panel has issued a guidance note on Local Authority Reserves and Balances (LAAP Bulletin 77) to assist local authorities. This guidance is not statutory, but compliance is recommended in CIPFA's Statement on the Role of the Finance Director in Local Government. It would be best practice to follow this guidance.

The guidance states that no case has yet been made to set a statutory minimum level of reserves either as an absolute amount or a percentage of budget. Each local authority should take advice from its Responsible Finance Officer and base its judgment on local circumstances. A well run authority, with a prudent approach to budgeting should be able to operate with a relatively low level of general reserves.

Reserves can be held for two main purposes:

- ◆ A working balance to help cushion the impact of uneven cash flows and unexpected events emergencies (General Fund Balance);
- ◆ Reserves used to build up funds to meet known or predicted requirements (Earmarked Reserves).

In October 2011 the Cabinet approved, as part of its Medium Term Financial Strategy, the following "*guiding principle*."

*"General Fund balance should not fall below £1.25m and overall revenue reserves should not fall below 20% of net revenue expenditure."*

In my view, if the Council were to accept the Cabinet's recommended budget proposals and increase in council tax for the General Fund and Capital Programme then the level of risks identified in the budget process alongside the authority's financial management arrangements mean that the current level of reserves is adequate.

Colin Bullett  
Responsible Finance Officer  
24<sup>th</sup> February 2011

**SUMMARY OF GENERAL FUND REVENUE ESTIMATES**

| Ref. |                                     | Original<br>2011/12 | Original<br>2012/13 |
|------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
|      |                                     | £                   | £                   |
|      | <b>SERVICE EXPENDITURE</b>          |                     |                     |
| 1.   | Cultural and Related Services       | 2,994,090           | 2,922,890           |
| 2.   | Environmental & Regulatory Services | 4,852,930           | 4,817,660           |
| 3.   | Planning Services                   | 1,441,950           | 1,737,500           |
| 4.   | Highways & Transport Services       | (197,390)           | (203,230)           |
| 5.   | Housing Services                    | 2,127,900           | 1,735,030           |
| 6.   | Central Services                    | 5,061,980           | 3,757,690           |
| 7.   | Capital Financing Costs             | (3,316,240)         | (3,320,740)         |
| 8.   | <b>NET COST OF SERVICES</b>         | <b>12,965,220</b>   | <b>11,446,800</b>   |
| 9.   | General Contingency                 | 80,000              | 80,000              |
| 10.  | Revenue Contribution to Capital     | 0                   | 200,000             |
| 11.  | Interest On Balances/Investments    | (1,069,760)         | (450,000)           |
| 12.  | Special Expenses                    | (758,510)           | (753,420)           |
| 13.  | Transfers to/from Reserves          | (150,000)           | (591,000)           |
| 14.  | <b>NET COUNCIL BUDGET</b>           | <b>11,066,950</b>   | <b>9,932,380</b>    |

**Variance Explanations**

The following pages outline detailed service budgets and variances from the Original Budget 2011/12. It is important to note that the change in methodology creates many variances within services but not against the overall Net Council Budget.

The changes had three major impacts.

1. Central Support Costs have been re-classified as Operating Expenditure.
2. Corporate Management costs have been re-allocated to Services.
3. Capital charges costs for support services have been re-allocated to Services.

Where these variances occur in the following detailed budgets they are referenced with an X.

## CULTURAL AND RELATED SERVICES

| Ref | Service  | Original<br>2011-12 | Original<br>2012-13 |
|-----|--|---------------------|---------------------|
|     |  | £                   | £                   |
|     | <b>CULTURE &amp; HERITAGE</b>                        |                     |                     |
|     | <b>Arts &amp; Events</b>                             |                     |                     |
| x   | Operating Expenditure                                | 58,930              | 116,640             |
|     | Operating Income                                     | (6,400)             | (9,190)             |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>                     | <b>52,530</b>       | <b>107,450</b>      |
| x   | Central Support Costs                                | 75,290              | 32,950              |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                               | <b>127,820</b>      | <b>140,400</b>      |
|     | <b>RECREATION &amp; SPORT</b>                        |                     |                     |
|     | <b>Community Centres</b>                             |                     |                     |
| x   | Operating Expenditure                                | 67,750              | 168,670             |
|     | Operating Income                                     | (107,150)           | (111,850)           |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>                     | <b>(39,400)</b>     | <b>56,820</b>       |
| x   | Central Support Costs                                | 70,660              | 10,400              |
|     | Capital Charges                                      | 25,330              | 25,330              |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                               | <b>56,590</b>       | <b>92,550</b>       |
|     | <b>Sports Development &amp; Community Recreation</b> |                     |                     |
| x   | Operating Expenditure                                | 54,600              | 94,520              |
|     | Operating Income                                     | (24,870)            | (28,320)            |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>                     | <b>29,730</b>       | <b>66,200</b>       |
| x   | Central Support Costs                                | 55,430              | 13,140              |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                               | <b>85,160</b>       | <b>79,340</b>       |

### Variance Explanations

## CULTURAL AND RELATED SERVICES

| Ref | Service  | Original<br>2011-12 | Original<br>2012-13 |
|-----|--|---------------------|---------------------|
|     |  | £                   | £                   |
|     | <b>RECREATION &amp; SPORT CONT'D</b>             |                     |                     |
|     | <b>Indoor Sport &amp; Recreation Facilities</b>  |                     |                     |
| 1   | Operating Expenditure                            | 1,149,490           | 1,169,130           |
|     | Operating Income                                 | (130,160)           | (130,790)           |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>                 | <b>1,019,330</b>    | <b>1,038,340</b>    |
| x   | Central Support Costs                            | 81,800              | 24,350              |
|     | Capital Charges                                  | 189,810             | 189,810             |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                           | <b>1,290,940</b>    | <b>1,252,500</b>    |
|     | <b>Outdoor Sport &amp; Recreation Activities</b> |                     |                     |
| x   | Operating Expenditure                            | 210,100             | 292,510             |
|     | Operating Income                                 | (65,500)            | (68,660)            |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>                 | <b>144,600</b>      | <b>223,850</b>      |
| x   | Central Support Costs                            | 105,910             | 13,100              |
|     | Capital Charges                                  | 37,830              | 37,830              |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                           | <b>288,340</b>      | <b>274,780</b>      |
|     | <b>Golf Courses (Edwalton)</b>                   |                     |                     |
| x   | Operating Expenditure                            | 21,240              | 25,960              |
| 2   | Operating Income                                 | (83,350)            | (93,350)            |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>                 | <b>(62,110)</b>     | <b>(67,390)</b>     |
| x   | Central Support Costs                            | 6,040               | 2,020               |
|     | Capital Charges                                  | 19,780              | 19,780              |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                           | <b>(36,290)</b>     | <b>(45,590)</b>     |

### Variance Explanations

- 1 The contract sum with Parkwood details a reduction in 2012/13 and other smaller general savings have been identified on unspent budgets.
- 2 The management contract provides for an inflationary uplift which has been incorporated into the 2012/13 budget.

## CULTURAL AND RELATED SERVICES

| Ref | Service  | Original<br>2011-12 | Original<br>2012-13 |
|-----|--|---------------------|---------------------|
|     |  | £                   | £                   |
|     | <b>OPEN SPACES</b>                             |                     |                     |
|     | <b>Community Parks &amp; Open Spaces</b>       |                     |                     |
| 3   | Operating Expenditure                          | 505,340             | 585,640             |
| 4   | Operating Income                               | (46,770)            | (70,750)            |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>               | <b>458,570</b>      | <b>514,890</b>      |
| x   | Central Support Costs                          | 116,000             | 55,110              |
| 5   | Capital Charges                                | 262,590             | 162,590             |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                         | <b>837,160</b>      | <b>732,590</b>      |
|     | <b>Countryside Recreation &amp; Management</b> |                     |                     |
| 6   | Operating Expenditure                          | 312,610             | 381,120             |
|     | Operating Income                               | (20,870)            | (22,810)            |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>               | <b>291,740</b>      | <b>358,310</b>      |
| x   | Central Support Costs                          | 42,720              | 28,100              |
|     | Capital Charges                                | 5,570               | 5,570               |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                         | <b>340,030</b>      | <b>391,980</b>      |
|     | <b>Allotments</b>                              |                     |                     |
|     | Operating Expenditure                          | 4,340               | 4,340               |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                         | <b>4,340</b>        | <b>4,340</b>        |

### Variance Explanations

- 3 The increase in the 2012/13 budget is due to a review of work undertaken through the grounds maintenance SLA. This has been offset by possible savings identified in the service review of security cost reductions at Rushcliffe Country Park (RCP).
- 4 As part of the service review, income generation has been identified at Rushcliffe Country Park for the ice cream concession and additional parking income potential at Bridgefield.
- 5 In accordance with SerCOP direct revenue financing costs are no longer shown on the face of the service budgets.
- 6 The increase in the 2012/13 budget is due to a review of work undertaken through the grounds maintenance SLA.

|  |                  |                  |
|--|------------------|------------------|
| <b>CULTURAL &amp; RELATED SERVICES TOTAL</b> | <b>2,994,090</b> | <b>2,922,890</b> |
|--|------------------|------------------|

## ENVIRONMENTAL AND REGULATORY SERVICES

| Ref | Service  | Original<br>2011-12 | Original<br>2012-13 |
|-----|--|---------------------|---------------------|
|     |  | £                   | £                   |
|     | <b>CEMETERY, CREMATION &amp; MORTUARY SERVICES</b> |                     |                     |
|     | <b>Cemetery &amp; Mortuary Services</b>            |                     |                     |
| 7   | Operating Expenditure                              | 27,830              | 34,180              |
|     | Operating Income                                   | (400)               | (410)               |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>                   | <b>27,430</b>       | <b>33,770</b>       |
|     | Central Support Costs                              | 2,060               | 0                   |
|     | Capital Charges                                    | 3,220               | 3,220               |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                             | <b>32,710</b>       | <b>36,990</b>       |
|     | <b>COMMUNITY SAFETY</b>                            |                     |                     |
|     | <b>Crime Reduction &amp; Safety Services</b>       |                     |                     |
| 8   | Operating Expenditure                              | 49,930              | 107,310             |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>                   | <b>49,930</b>       | <b>107,310</b>      |
| x   | Central Support Costs                              | 246,970             | 43,060              |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                             | <b>296,900</b>      | <b>150,370</b>      |
|     | <b>FLOOD DEFENCE &amp; LAND DRAINAGE</b>           |                     |                     |
|     | <b>Land Drainage</b>                               |                     |                     |
| 9   | Operating Expenditure                              | 33,630              | 30,970              |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>                   | <b>33,630</b>       | <b>30,970</b>       |
| x   | Central Support Costs                              | 17,380              | 0                   |
|     | Capital Charges                                    | 5,660               | 5,660               |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                             | <b>56,670</b>       | <b>36,630</b>       |

### Variance Explanations

- 7 The review of the Street Cleansing/Grounds Maintenance SLA has resulted in additional costs.
- 8 Staff savings have been identified as part of the savings exercise , contributing to the overall net reduction in the 2012/13 budget.
- 9 The review of the Street Cleansing/Grounds Maintenance SLA has resulted in the small saving.

## ENVIRONMENTAL AND REGULATORY SERVICES

| Ref | Service                           | Original<br>2011-12 | Original<br>2012-13 |
|-----|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
|     |                                   | £                   | £                   |
|     | <b>REGULATORY SERVICES</b>        |                     |                     |
|     | <b>Animal &amp; Public Health</b> |                     |                     |
| x   | Operating Expenditure             | 156,350             | 505,910             |
| 10  | Operating Income                  | (209,410)           | (211,490)           |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>  | <b>(53,060)</b>     | <b>294,420</b>      |
| x   | Central Support Costs             | 369,780             | 78,850              |
|     | Capital Charges                   | 10,580              | 10,580              |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>            | <b>327,300</b>      | <b>383,850</b>      |
|     | <b>Environmental Protection</b>   |                     |                     |
| x   | Operating Expenditure             | 25,480              | 226,880             |
|     | Operating Income                  | (10,240)            | (10,250)            |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>  | <b>15,240</b>       | <b>216,630</b>      |
| x   | Central Support Costs             | 192,100             | 33,870              |
|     | Capital Charges                   | 8,210               | 8,210               |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>            | <b>215,550</b>      | <b>258,710</b>      |
|     | <b>Food Safety</b>                |                     |                     |
| x   | Operating Expenditure             | 3,340               | 170,360             |
|     | Operating Income                  | (2,520)             | (2,600)             |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>  | <b>820</b>          | <b>167,760</b>      |
| x   | Central Support Costs             | 144,640             | 25,370              |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>            | <b>145,460</b>      | <b>193,130</b>      |

### Variance Explanations

- 10 The loss of Anti Social Behaviour grant has been offset by an increase in income from Tanker Services due to marketing and price increases.

## ENVIRONMENTAL AND REGULATORY SERVICES

| Ref | Service                           | Original<br>2011-12 | Original<br>2012-13 |
|-----|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
|     |                                   | £                   | £                   |
|     | <b>REGULATORY SERVICES CONT'D</b> |                     |                     |
|     | <b>Health &amp; Safety</b>        |                     |                     |
| x   | Operating Expenditure             | 0                   | 77,030              |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>  | <b>0</b>            | <b>77,030</b>       |
| x   | Central Support Costs             | 130,570             | 24,360              |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>            | <b>130,570</b>      | <b>101,390</b>      |
|     | <b>Housing Standards</b>          |                     |                     |
| x   | Operating Expenditure             | 3,910               | 206,920             |
|     | Operating Income                  | 0                   | (9,310)             |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>  | <b>3,910</b>        | <b>197,610</b>      |
| x   | Central Support Costs             | 163,800             | 26,380              |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>            | <b>167,710</b>      | <b>223,990</b>      |
|     | <b>Infectious Diseases</b>        |                     |                     |
| x   | Operating Expenditure             | 0                   | 14,290              |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>  | <b>0</b>            | <b>14,290</b>       |
| x   | Central Support Costs             | 26,330              | 1,820               |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>            | <b>26,330</b>       | <b>16,110</b>       |
|     | <b>Licensing</b>                  |                     |                     |
| x   | Operating Expenditure             | 63,940              | 162,710             |
|     | Operating Income                  | (203,440)           | (203,440)           |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>  | <b>(139,500)</b>    | <b>(40,730)</b>     |
| x   | Central Support Costs             | 146,140             | 111,500             |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>            | <b>6,640</b>        | <b>70,770</b>       |

### Variance Explanations



## ENVIRONMENTAL AND REGULATORY SERVICES

| Ref | Service                           | Original<br>2011-12 | Original<br>2012-13 |
|-----|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
|     |                                   | £                   | £                   |
|     | <b>REGULATORY SERVICES CONT'D</b> |                     |                     |
|     | <b>Pest Control</b>               |                     |                     |
| x   | Operating Expenditure             | 13,860              | 90,540              |
|     | Operating Income                  | (42,310)            | (43,580)            |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>  | <b>(28,450)</b>     | <b>46,960</b>       |
| x   | Central Support Costs             | 84,660              | 43,670              |
|     | Capital Charges                   | 6,130               | 6,130               |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>            | <b>62,340</b>       | <b>96,760</b>       |
|     | <b>Public Conveniences</b>        |                     |                     |
|     | Operating Expenditure             | 38,080              | 38,060              |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>  | <b>38,080</b>       | <b>38,060</b>       |
| x   | Central Support Costs             | 5,130               | 1,620               |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>            | <b>43,210</b>       | <b>39,680</b>       |
| 11  | <b>STREET CLEANSING</b>           |                     |                     |
|     | Operating Expenditure             | 840,850             | 759,760             |
|     | Operating Income                  | (4,590)             | (31,030)            |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>  | <b>836,260</b>      | <b>728,730</b>      |
|     | Central Support Costs             | 9,410               | 96,530              |
|     | Capital Charges                   | 0                   | 66,360              |
|     | Recharge to other services        | 0                   | (157,920)           |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>            | <b>845,670</b>      | <b>733,700</b>      |

### Variance Explanations

11 The Streewise service has been disaggregated to show two distinct services - Street Cleansing and Grounds Maintenance. In doing so the service has been recast into the recipient service areas which has in most cases resulted in a variance from the previous combined recharge. The Streewise service, prior to disaggregation, has made savings in employee costs by removing the cleaners in the villages and removing 3 posts where the current level of work allowed for the reduction in staff.

However, the savings made have been offset by an increase in support services following a change in the method of time apportionment.

## ENVIRONMENTAL AND REGULATORY SERVICES

| Ref       | Service                           | Original<br>2011-12 | Original<br>2012-13 |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
|           |                                   | £                   | £                   |
| <b>12</b> | <b>WASTE COLLECTION</b>           |                     |                     |
|           | <b>Household Waste Collection</b> |                     |                     |
|           | Operating Expenditure             | 1,359,350           | 1,380,770           |
|           | Operating Income                  | (466,670)           | (724,130)           |
|           | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>  | <b>892,680</b>      | <b>656,640</b>      |
|           | Central Support Costs             | 292,250             | 406,860             |
|           | Capital Charges                   | 348,090             | 342,450             |
|           | <b>Net Expenditure</b>            | <b>1,533,020</b>    | <b>1,405,950</b>    |
|           | <b>Trade Waste</b>                |                     |                     |
|           | Operating Expenditure             | 97,480              | 0                   |
|           | Operating Income                  | (91,410)            | 0                   |
|           | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>  | <b>6,070</b>        | <b>0</b>            |
|           | Central Support Costs             | 23,480              | 0                   |
|           | <b>Net Expenditure</b>            | <b>29,550</b>       | <b>0</b>            |
|           | <b>Recycling</b>                  |                     |                     |
|           | Operating Expenditure             | 771,950             | 838,150             |
|           | Operating Income                  | (182,660)           | (168,350)           |
|           | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>  | <b>589,290</b>      | <b>669,800</b>      |
|           | Central Support Costs             | 150,740             | 198,720             |
|           | Capital Charges                   | 193,270             | 201,110             |
|           | <b>Net Expenditure</b>            | <b>933,300</b>      | <b>1,069,630</b>    |

### Variance Explanations

**12** The Waste Collection service area has made savings due to the redesign project in the collection of Green Waste, from the cessation of Trade Waste and from a small reduction in costs apportioned from the Environment & Waste Management and support staff. However these savings have been more than offset by the change in the method of support service costs apportionment resulting in an overall increase to the service expenditure. Income for 2012/13 on household waste has increased due to charging for the collection of garden waste. Income on recycling has reduced due to the resale price of glass cullet falling. Medical waste income has reduced as a result of a change in legislation affecting the items that can be charged for.

|   |                  |                  |
|---|------------------|------------------|
| <b>ENVIRONMENTAL &amp; REGULATORY TOTAL</b> | <b>4,852,930</b> | <b>4,817,660</b> |
|---|------------------|------------------|

## PLANNING SERVICES

| Ref | Service                          | Original<br>2011-12 | Original<br>2012-13 |
|-----|----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
|     |                                  | £                   | £                   |
|     | <b>BUILDING CONTROL</b>          |                     |                     |
| x   | Operating Expenditure            | 18,260              | 438,360             |
| 13  | Operating Income                 | (324,960)           | (267,860)           |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b> | <b>(306,700)</b>    | <b>170,500</b>      |
| x   | Central Support Costs            | 501,880             | 105,630             |
|     | Capital Charges                  | 0                   | 2,150               |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>           | <b>195,180</b>      | <b>278,280</b>      |
|     | <b>DEVELOPMENT CONTROL</b>       |                     |                     |
| x   | Operating Expenditure            | 54,460              | 843,570             |
| 14  | Operating Income                 | (663,120)           | (536,120)           |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b> | <b>(608,660)</b>    | <b>307,450</b>      |
| x   | Central Support Costs            | 1,027,120           | 281,110             |
|     | Capital Charges                  | 0                   | 2,160               |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>           | <b>418,460</b>      | <b>590,720</b>      |
|     | <b>PLANNING POLICY</b>           |                     |                     |
| x   | Operating Expenditure            | 150,630             | 493,360             |
|     | Operating Income                 | (6,930)             | (7,660)             |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b> | <b>143,700</b>      | <b>485,700</b>      |
| x   | Central Support Costs            | 384,350             | 78,640              |
|     | Capital Charges                  | 23,430              | 10,010              |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>           | <b>551,480</b>      | <b>574,350</b>      |

### Variance Explanations

- 13** The reduction in budget for 2012/13 reflects the current years level of income and market expectations for next year.
- 14** The reduction in budget for 2012/13 reflects the current years level of income and market expectations for next year.

## PLANNING SERVICES

| Ref | Service                          | Original<br>2011-12 | Original<br>2012-13 |
|-----|----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
|     |                                  | £                   | £                   |
|     | <b>ENVIRONMENTAL INITIATIVES</b> |                     |                     |
| x   | Operating Expenditure            | 60,030              | 122,490             |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b> | <b>60,030</b>       | <b>122,490</b>      |
| x   | Central Support Costs            | 77,850              | 35,880              |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>           | <b>137,880</b>      | <b>158,370</b>      |
|     | <b>BUSINESS SUPPORT</b>          |                     |                     |
| 15  | Operating Expenditure            | 13,390              | 210                 |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b> | <b>13,390</b>       | <b>210</b>          |
| x   | Central Support Costs            | 50                  | 8,900               |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>           | <b>13,440</b>       | <b>9,110</b>        |
|     | <b>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</b>      |                     |                     |
| 16  | Operating Expenditure            | 73,220              | 70,010              |
|     | Operating Income                 | (38,220)            | (38,220)            |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b> | <b>35,000</b>       | <b>31,790</b>       |
|     | Central Support Costs            | 9,860               | 8,900               |
|     | Capital Charges                  | 5,320               | 5,320               |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>           | <b>50,180</b>       | <b>46,010</b>       |
|     | <b>COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT</b>     |                     |                     |
| x   | Operating Expenditure            | 75,330              | 78,130              |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b> | <b>75,330</b>       | <b>78,130</b>       |
| x   | Central Support Costs            | 0                   | 2,530               |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>           | <b>75,330</b>       | <b>80,660</b>       |

### Variance Explanations

15 Budget has been reallocated following the creation of the Transformation Team.

16 Savings have resulted from the demolition of Borough premises that located Shopmobility. This responsibility has now passed to Notts CC following its relocation into the refurbished library in West Bridgford.

|  |                                |                  |                  |
|--|--------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
|  | <b>PLANNING SERVICES TOTAL</b> | <b>1,441,950</b> | <b>1,737,500</b> |
|--|--------------------------------|------------------|------------------|

## HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT SERVICES

| Ref | Service  | Original<br>2011-12 | Original<br>2012-13 |
|-----|--|---------------------|---------------------|
|     |  | £                   | £                   |
|     | <b>ENVIRONMENTAL, SAFETY &amp; ROUTINE<br/>MAINTENANCE</b> |                     |                     |
| x   | Operating Expenditure                                      | 20,200              | 22,500              |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>                           | <b>20,200</b>       | <b>22,500</b>       |
| x   | Central Support Costs                                      | 6,440               | 1,920               |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                                     | <b>26,640</b>       | <b>24,420</b>       |
|     | <b>PARKING SERVICES</b>                                    |                     |                     |
| x   | Operating Expenditure                                      | 103,980             | 147,750             |
| 17  | Operating Income   | (457,110)           | (462,110)           |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>                           | <b>(353,130)</b>    | <b>(314,360)</b>    |
| x   | Central Support Costs                                      | 70,900              | 28,510              |
|     | Capital Charges  | 58,200              | 58,200              |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                                     | <b>(224,030)</b>    | <b>(227,650)</b>    |

### Variance Explanations

17 The possibility of growth in parking income in 2012/13 has been identified as part of the savings exercise.

|  |  |                  |                  |
|--|--|------------------|------------------|
|  | <b>HIGHWAYS &amp; TRANSPORT SERVICES TOTAL</b> | <b>(197,390)</b> | <b>(203,230)</b> |
|--|--|------------------|------------------|

## HOUSING SERVICES

| Ref | Service                               | Original<br>2011-12 | Original<br>2012-13 |
|-----|---------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
|     |                                       | £                   | £                   |
|     | <b>HOUSING STRATEGY</b>               |                     |                     |
| x   | Operating Expenditure                 | 6,550               | 29,430              |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>      | <b>6,550</b>        | <b>29,430</b>       |
| x   | Central Support Costs                 | 132,350             | 6,570               |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                | <b>138,900</b>      | <b>36,000</b>       |
|     | <b>HOUSING ENABLING</b>               |                     |                     |
| x   | Operating Expenditure                 | 631,090             | 704,160             |
|     | Operating Income                      | (12,000)            | (12,000)            |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>      | <b>619,090</b>      | <b>692,160</b>      |
| x   | Central Support Costs                 | 220                 | 35,380              |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                | <b>619,310</b>      | <b>727,540</b>      |
|     | <b>HOUSING ADVICE</b>                 |                     |                     |
| x   | Operating Expenditure                 | 0                   | 22,770              |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>      | <b>0</b>            | <b>22,770</b>       |
| x   | Central Support Costs                 | 7,800               | 38,210              |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                | <b>7,800</b>        | <b>60,980</b>       |
|     | <b>PRIVATE SECTOR HOUSING RENEWAL</b> |                     |                     |
| x   | Operating Expenditure                 | 577,570             | 641,450             |
|     | Operating Income                      | (229,040)           | (220,000)           |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>      | <b>348,530</b>      | <b>421,450</b>      |
| x   | Central Support Costs                 | 192,340             | 23,450              |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                | <b>540,870</b>      | <b>444,900</b>      |

### Variance Explanations

## HOUSING SERVICES

| Ref | Service                          | Original<br>2011-12 | Original<br>2012-13 |
|-----|----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
|     |                                  | £                   | £                   |
|     | <b>HOMELESSNESS</b>              |                     |                     |
| x   | Operating Expenditure            | 81,270              | 227,890             |
|     | Operating Income                 | (148,650)           | (151,300)           |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b> | <b>(67,380)</b>     | <b>76,590</b>       |
| x   | Central Support Costs            | 280,280             | 93,300              |
|     | Capital Charges                  | 12,050              | 12,050              |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>           | <b>224,950</b>      | <b>181,940</b>      |
| 18  | <b>HOUSING BENEFITS</b>          |                     |                     |
|     | Operating Expenditure            | 14,388,210          | 15,226,470          |
|     | Operating Income                 | (14,817,320)        | (15,319,080)        |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b> | <b>(429,110)</b>    | <b>(92,610)</b>     |
|     | Central Support Costs            | 1,067,690           | 400,690             |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>           | <b>638,580</b>      | <b>308,080</b>      |
|     | <b>HOUSING SUPPORT</b>           |                     |                     |
| x   | Operating Expenditure            | 93,790              | 106,460             |
|     | Operating Income                 | (147,350)           | (147,350)           |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b> | <b>(53,560)</b>     | <b>(40,890)</b>     |
| x   | Central Support Costs            | 11,050              | 16,480              |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>           | <b>(42,510)</b>     | <b>(24,410)</b>     |

### Variance Explanations

18 The overall reduction in the 2012/13 budget includes savings identified in the Revenues & Benefits service review.

|                               |                  |                  |
|-------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| <b>HOUSING SERVICES TOTAL</b> | <b>2,127,900</b> | <b>1,735,030</b> |
|-------------------------------|------------------|------------------|

## CENTRAL SERVICES

| Ref       | Service                                | Original<br>2011-12 | Original<br>2012-13 |
|-----------|--|---------------------|---------------------|
|           |  | £                   | £                   |
| <b>19</b> | <b>CORPORATE &amp; DEMOCRATIC CORE</b> |                     |                     |
| x         | Operating Expenditure                  | 763,220             | 847,910             |
|           | Operating Income                       | (16,150)            | (16,630)            |
|           | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>       | <b>747,070</b>      | <b>831,280</b>      |
| x         | Central Support Costs                  | 1,572,970           | 714,440             |
|           | Capital Charges                        | 13,220              | 26,640              |
|           | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                 | <b>2,333,260</b>    | <b>1,572,360</b>    |
|           | <b>NON DISTRIBUTED COSTS</b>           |                     |                     |
| <b>20</b> | Operating Expenditure                  | 842,990             | 654,820             |
|           | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>       | <b>842,990</b>      | <b>654,820</b>      |
|           | Recharge Income                        | (109,190)           | 0                   |
|           | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                 | <b>733,800</b>      | <b>654,820</b>      |
|           | <b>CENTRAL SERVICES TO THE PUBLIC</b>  |                     |                     |
| <b>21</b> | <b>Local Tax Collection</b>            |                     |                     |
| x         | Operating Expenditure                  | 5,199,290           | 6,175,060           |
|           | Operating Income                       | (5,373,290)         | (5,639,800)         |
|           | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>       | <b>(174,000)</b>    | <b>535,260</b>      |
| x         | Central Support Costs                  | 1,040,000           | 715,360             |
|           | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                 | <b>866,000</b>      | <b>1,250,620</b>    |

### Variance Explanations

- 19** The 2012/13 budget includes savings on consultation and external audit fees.
- 20** Notification of the latest actuarial revaluation of the superannuation fund , effective from April 2011, was received too late to be reflected in the 2011/12 budget. The direct payment in respect of leisure centre staff has been replaced with an increase in the overall percentage rate. This payment had been set at too high a level previously and the full effect is shown in the 2012-13 budget.
- 21** The 2012/13 budget includes savings identified in the Revenues & Benefits service review. In accordance with SerCOP staff costs have been split between Housing Benefits and Local Tax Collection.



## CENTRAL SERVICES

| Ref | Service                                      | Original<br>2011-12 | Original<br>2012-13 |
|-----|--|---------------------|---------------------|
|     |  | £                   | £                   |
|     | <b>CENTRAL SERVICES TO THE PUBLIC CONT'D</b> |                     |                     |
|     | <b>Elections</b>                             |                     |                     |
| 22  | Operating Expenditure                        | 231,230             | 170,020             |
|     | Operating Income                             | (2,890)             | (2,980)             |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>             | <b>228,340</b>      | <b>167,040</b>      |
|     | Central Support Costs                        | 185,530             | 75,110              |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                       | <b>413,870</b>      | <b>242,150</b>      |
|     | <b>Emergency Planning</b>                    |                     |                     |
|     | Operating Expenditure                        | 28,410              | 28,410              |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>             | <b>28,410</b>       | <b>28,410</b>       |
| x   | Central Support Costs                        | 870                 | 25,270              |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                       | <b>29,280</b>       | <b>53,680</b>       |
|     | <b>Local Land Charges</b>                    |                     |                     |
| x   | Operating Expenditure                        | 30,090              | 101,770             |
| 23  | Operating Income                             | (92,000)            | (142,400)           |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>             | <b>(61,910)</b>     | <b>(40,630)</b>     |
| x   | Central Support Costs                        | 120,210             | 44,270              |
|     | Capital Charges                              | 9,740               | 9,740               |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                       | <b>68,040</b>       | <b>13,380</b>       |
|     | <b>Grants</b>                                |                     |                     |
| x   | Operating Expenditure                        | 135,470             | 130,550             |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>             | <b>135,470</b>      | <b>130,550</b>      |
| x   | Central Support Costs                        | 0                   | 5,050               |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                       | <b>135,470</b>      | <b>135,600</b>      |

### Variance Explanations

22 The budget primarily reflects the fallout of the election held in 2011/12.

23 The income budget on Land Charges has been increased to reflect current income trends.

## CENTRAL SERVICES

| Ref | Service                               | Original<br>2011-12 | Original<br>2012-13 |
|-----|---------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
|     |                                       | £                   | £                   |
|     | <b>PRECEPTS &amp; LEVIES</b>          |                     |                     |
|     | Operating Expenditure                 | 231,130             | 233,440             |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                | <b>231,130</b>      | <b>233,440</b>      |
|     | <b>CENTRAL SUPPORT SERVICES COSTS</b> |                     |                     |
| x   | Central Support Costs (Not Recharged) | 545,910             | 0                   |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                | <b>545,910</b>      | <b>0</b>            |
|     | <b>TRADING SERVICES</b>               |                     |                     |
| 24  | <b>Grounds Maintenance</b>            |                     |                     |
|     | Operating Expenditure                 | 516,330             | 601,220             |
|     | Operating Income                      | (815,610)           | (5,730)             |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>      | <b>(299,280)</b>    | <b>595,490</b>      |
|     | Central Support Costs                 | 166,870             | 68,100              |
|     | Capital Charges                       | 132,710             | 66,350              |
|     | Recharge Income                       | 0                   | (729,940)           |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                | <b>300</b>          | <b>0</b>            |
|     | <b>Industrial Sites</b>               |                     |                     |
| 25  | Operating Expenditure                 | 170,050             | 119,670             |
|     | Operating Income                      | (349,440)           | (353,440)           |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b>      | <b>(179,390)</b>    | <b>(233,770)</b>    |
|     | Central Support Costs                 | 50,610              | 46,400              |
|     | Capital Charges                       | 10,990              | 10,990              |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>                | <b>(117,790)</b>    | <b>(176,380)</b>    |

### Variance Explanations

- 24** The Streetworks service has been disaggregated to show two distinct services - Street Cleansing and Grounds Maintenance. In doing so the service has been recast into the recipient service areas which has in most cases resulted in a variance from the previous combined recharge. The Streetworks service, prior to disaggregation, has made savings in employee costs by removing the cleaners in the villages and removing 3 posts where the current level of work allowed for the reduction in staff. However, the savings made have been offset by an increase in support services following a change in the method of time apportionment.
- 25** The funding agreement with EMDA for the Manvers Business Park, where a proportion of rental income is paid over, ceases in 2012/13 resulting in savings. The void allowances on rental income has been reviewed to reflect actual occupancy rates, leading to the additional increase in budgeted income.

## CENTRAL SERVICES

| Ref | Service                          | Original<br>2011-12 | Original<br>2012-13 |
|-----|----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
|     |                                  | £                   | £                   |
|     | <b>Investment Properties</b>     |                     |                     |
| 26  | Operating Expenditure            | 32,360              | 21,120              |
|     | Operating Income                 | (227,260)           | (224,260)           |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b> | <b>(194,900)</b>    | <b>(203,140)</b>    |
| x   | Central Support Costs            | 12,820              | 30,830              |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>           | <b>(182,080)</b>    | <b>(172,310)</b>    |
|     | <b>Land Holdings</b>             |                     |                     |
|     | Operating Expenditure            | 10,770              | 10,380              |
| 27  | Operating Income                 | (160,700)           | (173,030)           |
|     | <b>Net Operating Expenditure</b> | <b>(149,930)</b>    | <b>(162,650)</b>    |
|     | Central Support Costs            | 27,770              | 31,030              |
|     | Capital Charges                  | 8,230               | 8,230               |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>           | <b>(113,930)</b>    | <b>(123,390)</b>    |
|     | <b>Property Maintenance</b>      |                     |                     |
| 28  | Operating Expenditure            | 118,720             | 73,720              |
|     | <b>Net Expenditure</b>           | <b>118,720</b>      | <b>73,720</b>       |

### Variance Explanations

- 26** Savings have arisen from reduced insurance costs following the renegotiated tender.
- 27** Void rates have been reassessed to reflect current occupancy patterns, resulting in an increase in budgeted income.
- 28** Plans for roofing maintenance at the Civic Centre are being reconsidered to establish the full extent of works required and the most effective way of funding those works. An adjustment has therefore been made to the revenue budget for 2012/13.

|                               |                  |                  |
|-------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| <b>CENTRAL SERVICES TOTAL</b> | <b>5,061,980</b> | <b>3,757,690</b> |
|-------------------------------|------------------|------------------|

**SCENARIO & RISK ANALYSIS - 2012/13 (Variations from Budget Model)**

| Worse than Budget Model (£000) |    |    |    | Better than Budget Model (£000) |    |                 |     |
|--------------------------------|----|----|----|---------------------------------|----|-----------------|-----|
| 100                            | 75 | 50 | 25 | 25                              | 50 | 75              | 100 |
| Investment Income              |    |    |    |                                 |    |                 |     |
| Green Waste Fees               |    |    |    |                                 |    |                 |     |
| Car Parking Charges            |    |    |    |                                 |    |                 |     |
| Planning Fees                  |    |    |    |                                 |    |                 |     |
| Building Control Fees          |    |    |    |                                 |    |                 |     |
| Search Fees                    |    |    |    |                                 |    |                 |     |
| Pay Inflation                  |    |    |    |                                 |    |                 |     |
| Benefits                       |    |    |    |                                 |    |                 |     |
| Homelessness                   |    |    |    |                                 |    |                 |     |
| <b>Possible Variation</b>      |    |    |    | <b>£625,000</b>                 |    | <b>£225,000</b> |     |

# SCENARIO & RISK ANALYSIS - MEDIUM TERM (Variations from Budget Model)

| Worse than Budget Model (£000)  |     |     |     |     |  |                  |   |  |    | Better than Budget Model (£000) |                 |     |     |     |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|------------------|---|--|----|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----|-----|-----|
| 500   | 450 | 400 | 350 | 300 | 250  | 200              | 150                                       | 100  | 50 | 50                              | 100             | 150 | 200 | 250 |
|   |     |     |     |     |  |                  |   |  |    |                                 |                 |     |     |     |
|   |     |     |     |     |  |                  | Business Rates -<br>Baseline (3%)         |  |    |                                 |                 |     |     |     |
|   |     |     |     |     | Business Rates - Growth (+/- 1.5%)             |                  |   |  |    |                                 |                 |     |     |     |
| Business Rates Example - Impact if the Power Station closed (Safety Net ??) |     |     |     |     |  |                  |   |  |    |                                 |                 |     |     |     |
|   |     |     |     |     |  |                  | Council Tax<br>Support - 10%<br>Overspend |  |    |                                 |                 |     |     |     |
|   |     |     |     |     |  | Universal Credit |   |  |    |                                 |                 |     |     |     |
|   |     |     |     |     |  |                  |   | Economic Recovery (Fees & Service Pressures) |    |                                 |                 |     |     |     |
|   |     |     |     |     | Economic Recovery (Inflation & Interest Rates) |                  |   |  |    |                                 |                 |     |     |     |
| <b>Possible Variations</b>  |     |     |     |     |  |                  |   | <b>£1,500,000</b>                            |    |                                 | <b>£750,000</b> |     |     |     |

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2012/13 - 2016/17

|                            | 2012/13           | 2013/14             | 2014/15             | 2015/16             | 2016/17             |
|----------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
|                            | Original Estimate | Indicative Estimate | Indicative Estimate | Indicative Estimate | Indicative Estimate |
|                            | £000              | £000                | £000                | £000                | £000                |
| <b>EXPENDITURE</b>         |                   |                     |                     |                     |                     |
| Revenues & ICT             | 495               | 677                 | 125                 | 125                 | 125                 |
| Partnerships & Performance | 1,639             | 473                 | 329                 | 58                  | 0                   |
| Environment & Waste        |                   |                     |                     |                     |                     |
| Management                 | 1,178             | 1,521               | 1,266               | 1,563               | 5,543               |
| Community Shaping          | 801               | 418                 | 419                 | 420                 | 422                 |
| Financial Services         | 150               | 150                 | 150                 | 150                 | 150                 |
| <b>Total</b>               | <b>4,263</b>      | <b>3,239</b>        | <b>2,289</b>        | <b>2,316</b>        | <b>6,240</b>        |
| <b>FUNDED BY</b>           |                   |                     |                     |                     |                     |
| Usable Capital Receipts    | (2,212)           | (2,417)             | (1,724)             | (1,896)             | (5,820)             |
| Disabled Facilities Grants | (220)             | (220)               | (220)               | (220)               | (220)               |
| Use of Reserves            | (821)             | (200)               | (200)               | (200)               | (200)               |
| Grants and Contributions   | (760)             | (152)               | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
| Section 106 Monies         | (250)             | (250)               | (145)               | 0                   | 0                   |
| <b>Total</b>               | <b>(4,263)</b>    | <b>(3,239)</b>      | <b>(2,289)</b>      | <b>(2,316)</b>      | <b>(6,240)</b>      |

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2012/13 - 2016/17

| Scheme   | Risk | 2012/13           | 2013/14             | 2014/15             | 2015/16             | 2016/17             |
|--|------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
|  |      | Original Estimate | Indicative Estimate | Indicative Estimate | Indicative Estimate | Indicative Estimate |
|  |      | £000              | £000                | £000                | £000                | £000                |
| <b>Revenues and ICT Services</b>                               |      |                   |                     |                     |                     |                     |
| Carbon Management Plan Lighting                                | M    | 0                 | 72                  | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
| Boiler Room Insulation   | M    | 0                 | 10                  | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
| Park Lodge Structural Repairs                                  | M    | 23                | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
| Bridgford Hall Refurbishment                                   | H    | 0                 | 470                 | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
| Information Systems Strategy                                   | M    | 447               | 100                 | 100                 | 100                 | 100                 |
| Footpath Enhancement   | L    | 25                | 25                  | 25                  | 25                  | 25                  |
| <b>Sub total</b>   |      | <b>495</b>        | <b>677</b>          | <b>125</b>          | <b>125</b>          | <b>125</b>          |
| <b>Partnerships and Performance</b>                            |      |                   |                     |                     |                     |                     |
| Cotgrave Masterplan  | H    | 1,550             | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
| Pitch Upgrade Keyworth LC                                      | M    | 0                 | 25                  | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
| Changing Room Supply and Extraction Unit - Rushcliffe LC       | H    | 14                | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
| Warm Air Unit - Rushcliffe LC                                  | H    | 0                 | 17                  | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
| Car Park Surfacing - Rushcliffe LC                             | M    | 0                 | 0                   | 29                  | 0                   | 0                   |
| Car Park Resurfacing Cotgrave LC                               | M    | 75                | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
| Bowls Rink Cloth - Arena                                       | L    | 0                 | 36                  | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
| Sports Hall Floor - Arena                                      | L    | 0                 | 0                   | 0                   | 58                  | 0                   |
| Community Contact Centre Spokes                                | H    | 0                 | 150                 | 300                 | 0                   | 0                   |
| Nottinghamshire Broadband                                      | M    | 0                 | 245                 | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
| Car Park Pay & Display Machines                                | L    | 0                 | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
| <b>Sub total</b>   |      | <b>1,639</b>      | <b>473</b>          | <b>329</b>          | <b>58</b>           | <b>0</b>            |
| <b>Environment and Waste Management</b>                        |      |                   |                     |                     |                     |                     |
| New Depot  | H    | 0                 | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 4,000               |
| Nitrogen Dioxide Monitor                                       | L    | 16                | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
| Wheeled Bins   | L    | 63                | 63                  | 63                  | 63                  | 63                  |
| Vehicle Replacement  | L    | 549               | 908                 | 653                 | 950                 | 930                 |
| Disabled Facilities Grants                                     | H    | 550               | 550                 | 550                 | 550                 | 550                 |
| <b>Sub total</b>   |      | <b>1,178</b>      | <b>1,521</b>        | <b>1,266</b>        | <b>1,563</b>        | <b>5,543</b>        |
| <b>Community Shaping</b>                                       |      |                   |                     |                     |                     |                     |
| Support for Registered Housing Providers                       | H    | 250               | 250                 | 250                 | 250                 | 250                 |
| Partnership Grants   | H    | 67                | 68                  | 69                  | 70                  | 72                  |
| Play Areas and Facilities for Older Children - Special Expense | L    | 100               | 100                 | 100                 | 100                 | 100                 |
| Alford Road Pavilion Re-development - Special Expense          | H    | 384               | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
| <b>Sub total</b>   |      | <b>801</b>        | <b>418</b>          | <b>419</b>          | <b>420</b>          | <b>422</b>          |
| <b>Financial Services</b>                                      |      |                   |                     |                     |                     |                     |
| Contingency  |      | 150               | 150                 | 150                 | 150                 | 150                 |
| <b>Sub total</b>   |      | <b>150</b>        | <b>150</b>          | <b>150</b>          | <b>150</b>          | <b>150</b>          |
| <b>PROGRAMME TOTAL</b>   |      | <b>4,263</b>      | <b>3,239</b>        | <b>2,289</b>        | <b>2,316</b>        | <b>6,240</b>        |

**PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM**

|  |                         |   |                        |
|--|-------------------------|---|------------------------|
| <b>Project Name: Carbon Management Plan Lighting</b>   |                         | <b>Cost Centre: 0380</b>                          | <b>Ref: 1</b>          |
| <b>Detailed Description:</b><br>As part of the Carbon Management Plan, the Council aims to reduce carbon emissions from its own operations. The lighting project will include upgrading lighting across the Council's portfolio, including lighting rationalisation, active labelling scheme, mirror reflector fittings, T5 upgrades, high frequency to electronic switch start, and controls where feasible.  |                         |   |                        |
| <b>Location:</b> Various   |                         | <b>Head of Service:</b> Revenues and ICT Services |                        |
| <b>Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives:</b><br><b>Corporate Theme:</b> Our Council<br><b>Corporate Task:</b> Examine the future viability of all Council owned property to maximise the potential of the Council's property portfolio.<br><br>In March 2010 Cabinet approved the Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan. One of the key actions identified within the plan is the development and implementation of a Carbon Management Plan. In September 2010 Rushcliffe Borough Council began work with Climate East Midlands to put together a Carbon Management Plan with the support of the Carbon Trust. Under the Climate Change Act 2008, government has certain obligations to meet to reduce the carbon emissions from the UK. Local Authorities are encouraged to act as community leaders in this work and lead by example by working to reduce the carbon emissions from their operations. The Carbon Management Plan sets out the Council's intentions to reduce carbon emissions from its own estate, thereby leading by example. |                         |   |                        |
| <b>Community Outcomes:</b> Property owned by the Council is utilised to its full potential.<br><br>The Council will work to embed Carbon Management across the organisation, changing attitudes and culture. To this end, the Carbon Management Plan will become the responsibility of all managers and they will work towards the target of reducing the Council's carbon emissions by 15 percent by 2015.  |                         |   |                        |
| <b>Other Options Rejected and Why:</b> Failure to take action will not support plans to reduce carbon emissions.   |                         |   |                        |
| <b>Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L): M</b>   |                         |   |                        |
| <b>Start Date:</b> April 2013  |                         | <b>Completion Date:</b> March 2014                |                        |
| <b>Capital Cost (Total) :</b>  | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b>    | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b>                              |                        |
| £72,000  | £0                      | £72,000   |                        |
| <b>Capital Cost (Breakdown):</b>   |                         |   |                        |
| <b>Works</b><br>£62,000  | <b>Equipment</b>        | <b>Other</b>                                      | <b>Fees</b><br>£10,000 |
| <b>Revenue cost per annum:</b>   | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b> £0 | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b> £0                           |                        |
| <b>Proposed Funding</b>  |                         |   |                        |
| <b>External:</b>   |                         | <b>Internal:</b> Capital Receipts                 |                        |
| <b>Useful Economic Life (years):</b> 10  |                         | <b>New/Replacement:</b> Replacement               |                        |
| <b>Depreciation per annum:</b> £7,200  |                         | <b>Capital Financing Costs:</b> £1,260            |                        |
| <b>Residual Value:</b> N/A   |                         | <b>Category of Asset:</b> Equipment               |                        |



**PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM**

|  |  |                          |   |                         |  |
|--|--|--------------------------|---|-------------------------|--|
| <b>Project Name: Boiler Room Insulation</b>  |  | <b>Cost Centre: 0383</b> |   | <b>Ref: 2</b>           |  |
| <b>Detailed Description:</b>   |  |                          |   |                         |  |
| As part of the Council's Carbon Management Plan, this project includes the installation of calorifiers, heat exchangers, boilers, pipework, valves and flanges not already or fully insulated.   |  |                          |   |                         |  |
| <b>Location:</b> Various   |  |                          | <b>Head of Service:</b> Revenues and ICT Services |                         |  |
| <b>Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives:</b>  |  |                          |   |                         |  |
| <b>Corporate Theme:</b> Our Council  |  |                          |   |                         |  |
| <b>Corporate Task:</b> Examine the future viability of all Council owned property to maximise the potential of the Council's property portfolio.   |  |                          |   |                         |  |
| In March 2010 Cabinet approved the Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan. One of the key actions identified within the plan is the development and implementation of a Carbon Management Plan. In September 2010 Rushcliffe Borough Council began work with Climate East Midlands to put together a Carbon Management Plan with the support of the Carbon Trust. Under the Climate Change Act 2008, government has certain obligations to meet to reduce the carbon emissions from the UK. Local Authorities are encouraged to act as community leaders in this work and lead by example by working to reduce the carbon emissions from their operations. The Carbon Management Plan sets out the Council's intentions to reduce carbon emissions from its own estate, thereby leading by example. |  |                          |   |                         |  |
| <b>Community Outcomes:</b>   |  |                          |   |                         |  |
| Property owned by the Council is utilised to its full potential.   |  |                          |   |                         |  |
| The Council will work to embed Carbon Management across the organisation, changing attitudes and culture. To this end, the Carbon Management Plan will become the responsibility of all managers and they will work towards the target of reducing the Council's carbon emissions by 15 percent by 2015.   |  |                          |   |                         |  |
| <b>Other Options Rejected and Why:</b> Failure to take action will not support plans to reduce carbon emissions.   |  |                          |   |                         |  |
| <b>Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L): M</b>   |  |                          |   |                         |  |
| <b>Start Date:</b> April 2013  |  |                          | <b>Completion Date:</b> March 2014                |                         |  |
| <b>Capital Cost (Total) :</b>  |  | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b>     | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b>                              |                         |  |
| £10,000  |  | £0                       | £10,000   |                         |  |
| <b>Capital Cost (Breakdown):</b>   |  |                          |   |                         |  |
| <b>Works</b> £9,000  |  | <b>Equipment</b>         |   | <b>Other</b>            |  |
|  |  |                          |   | <b>Fees</b> £1,000      |  |
| <b>Revenue cost per annum:</b>   |  | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b> £0  |   | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b> £0 |  |
| <b>Proposed Funding</b>  |  |                          |   |                         |  |
| <b>External:</b>   |  |                          | <b>Internal:</b> Capital Receipts                 |                         |  |
| <b>Useful Economic Life (years):</b> 10  |  |                          | <b>New/Replacement:</b> New and replacement       |                         |  |
| <b>Depreciation per annum:</b> £1,000  |  |                          | <b>Capital Financing Costs:</b> £175              |                         |  |
| <b>Residual Value:</b>   |  |                          | <b>Category of Asset:</b> Plant/Equipment         |                         |  |

## PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM

|  |                          |   |
|--|--------------------------|---|
| <b>Project Name: Park Lodge Structural Repairs</b>   | <b>Cost Centre: 0909</b> | <b>Ref: 3</b>   |
| <b>Detailed Description:</b><br>Park Lodge is a traditionally constructed detached property built circa late 1800's. A former park keepers dwelling which was later converted and upgraded for use as offices. Park Lodge is currently occupied by The Spiritualist Church on a short term tenancy.<br><br>The scheme to carry out structural remedial works to Park Lodge, works mainly comprise of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traditional underpinning or mini piling at the rear of the building.</li> <li>• Brickwork and drainage</li> <li>• Flooring and roofing</li> </ul> |                          |   |
| <b>Location:</b> Central Avenue<br>West Bridgford Nottingham   |                          | <b>Commissioning Officer:</b> Revenues and ICT Services |
| <b>Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives:</b><br><b>Corporate Theme:</b> Our Council<br><b>Corporate Task:</b> Examine the future viability of all Council owned property to maximise the potential of the Council's property portfolio.   |                          |   |
| <b>Community Outcomes:</b><br>Property owned by the Council is utilised to its full potential or used to generate income for the Council.  |                          |   |
| <b>Other Options Rejected and Why:</b><br>Park Lodge was the original gateway to Bridgford Hall (which was listed in 1949) and therefore has heritage value to West Bridgford Town Centre<br><br>The option of not carrying out the works will result in this asset falling into serious disrepair, thus making the asset uninhabitable for occupation and incapable of income generation.   |                          |   |
| <b>Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L): M</b>   |                          |   |
| <b>Start Date:</b> April 2012  |                          | <b>Completion Date:</b> March 2013                      |
| <b>Capital Cost (Total) :</b>  | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b>     | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b>                                    |
| £23,000  | £23,000                  | £0  |
| <b>Capital Cost (Breakdown) £:</b>   |                          |   |
| <b>Works</b> £20,000   | <b>Equipment</b> £       | <b>Other</b> £  |
|  |                          | <b>Fees</b> £3,000                                      |
| <b>Revenue cost per annum :</b>  | <b>Year 1:</b> £0        | <b>Year 2:</b> £0                                       |
| <b>Proposed Funding</b>  |                          |   |
| <b>External:</b>   |                          | <b>Internal:</b> Capital Receipts                       |
| <b>Useful Economic Life (years):</b> 20  |                          | <b>New/Replacement:</b> Replacement                     |
| <b>Depreciation per annum:</b> £1,150  |                          | <b>Capital Financing Costs:</b> £400                    |
| <b>Residual Value:</b> N/A   |                          | <b>Category of Asset:</b> Investment Property           |

**PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM**

|   |                         |   |                     |
|---|-------------------------|---|---------------------|
| <b>Project Name: Bridgford Hall Refurbishment</b>   |                         | <b>Cost Centre: 0382</b>                          | <b>Ref: 4</b>       |
| <p><b>Detailed Description:</b><br/>         Bridgford Hall is a Grade II listed building, owned by the Borough Council, which is currently leased to Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC).<br/>         The Community Hall is a building of the Arts and Crafts architectural movement and is of local heritage interest.<br/>         As part of the West Bridgford Town Centre Design Study the following works were identified: £470,000 to carry out a basic refurbishment.<br/>         This will ensure that, when the property is vacated by the present occupiers, the premises will be fit for letting purposes. It will ensure that income is maximised and that the asset remains in good condition. The work will also ensure the preservation of an important heritage asset. Works will be scheduled to coincide with the termination of the lease by NCC/completion of the NCC library project.</p> |                         |   |                     |
| <b>Location:</b> West Bridgford Town Centre   |                         | <b>Head of Service:</b> Revenues and ICT Services |                     |
| <p><b>Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives:</b><br/> <b>Corporate Theme:</b> Our Council<br/> <b>Corporate Task:</b> Examine the future viability of all Council owned property to maximise the potential of the Council's property portfolio.</p>   |                         |   |                     |
| <p><b>Community Outcomes:</b><br/>         Property owned by the Council is utilised to its full potential or used to generate income for the Council enabling it to keep Council Tax increases at a minimum.</p>   |                         |   |                     |
| <p><b>Other Options Rejected and Why:</b><br/>         The option of not carrying out any works will result in this asset falling into serious disrepair, thus making the asset uninhabitable for occupation and unable to generate an income stream.</p>   |                         |   |                     |
| <b>Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L): H</b>  |                         |   |                     |
| <b>Start Date:</b> April 13   |                         | <b>Completion Date:</b> March 14                  |                     |
| <b>Capital Cost (Total) :</b>   | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b>    | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b>                              |                     |
| £470,000  | £0                      | £470,000  |                     |
| <b>Capital Cost (Breakdown) :</b>   |                         |   |                     |
| <b>Works</b> £400,000   | <b>Equipment</b> £0     | <b>Other</b> £0                                   | <b>Fees</b> £70,000 |
| <b>Revenue cost per annum:</b>  | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b> £0 | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b> £0                           |                     |
| <b>Proposed Funding</b>   |                         |   |                     |
| <b>External:</b> N/A  |                         | <b>Internal:</b> Capital Receipts                 |                     |
| <b>Useful Economic Life (years):</b> 25   |                         | <b>New/Replacement:</b> Replacement               |                     |
| <b>Depreciation per annum:</b> £18,800  |                         | <b>Capital Financing Costs:</b> £8,225            |                     |
| <b>Residual Value:</b> N/A  |                         | <b>Category of Asset:</b> Investment Property     |                     |

## PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM

|   |  |                          |   |                      |  |
|---|--|--------------------------|---|----------------------|--|
| <b>Project Name: Information Systems Strategy</b>   |  | <b>Cost Centre: 0596</b> |   | <b>Ref: 5</b>        |  |
| <p><b>Detailed Description:</b><br/>                 On 8 September 2009, the Cabinet adopted a new Information Systems Strategy to run from 2009 to 2012. (The report gives details of the planned investment).</p> <p>The purpose of the strategy is to provide clear direction and a robust and flexible platform on which future service transformation can be built. The strategy reflects the need to keep the Council's information technology infrastructure and software solutions fit for purpose and meet the Government's "Greening ICT" agenda.</p> <p>From 2012/13 a provision of £100,000 has been made per year to support investment in Information Systems. The provision in £100,000 in 2012/13 has been topped up by a carry forward from 2011/12 of £347,000. The main element of the carry forward is for the review and implementation of a Middleware solution. This should provide a method/system of capturing data so that this can be manipulated and shared with relevant service areas.</p> |  |                          |   |                      |  |
| <b>Location:</b> Civic Centre   |  |                          | <b>Head of Service:</b> Revenues and ICT Services |                      |  |
| <p><b>Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives:</b></p> <p><b>Corporate Theme:</b> Our Council</p> <p><b>Corporate Task:</b> Develop the use of technology to drive out efficiencies and review viability of all Council owned property to include equipment and software.</p>   |  |                          |   |                      |  |
| <p><b>Community Outcomes:</b><br/>                 Property, including equipment and software, is utilised to its full potential and residents are able to access Council services and information at convenient locations.</p> <p>The IS Strategy is closely aligned to the Council's "Four Year Plan" reviews and ICT will be instrumental in delivering the outcomes identified during these reviews.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the implementation of tools to improve integration between front and back office systems</li> <li>• IT solutions offering a wider choice of access channels that support improved standards of service for customers</li> <li>• an improved ICT infrastructure that will deliver savings and reductions in energy usage</li> <li>• better information and support for Members through electronic channels</li> <li>• efficiency savings and a more resilient service by working in partnership with other authorities</li> </ul>                                    |  |                          |   |                      |  |
| <p><b>Other Options Rejected and Why:</b> Each project is the subject of a business case approved by a corporate ICT Projects Commissioning Group in order to ensure that the best IT solution is chosen. The option of doing nothing would lead to out dated technology which would result in lower performance and hinder the drive for greater efficiencies.</p>   |  |                          |   |                      |  |
| <b>Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L): M</b>  |  |                          |   |                      |  |
| <b>Start Date:</b> Nov 09   |  |                          | <b>Completion Date:</b> Ongoing                   |                      |  |
| <b>Capital Cost (Total) :</b>   |  | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b>     |   | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b> |  |
| £547,000 (2 years)  |  | £447,000                 |   | £100,000             |  |

|                                  |                      |  |                         |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|--|-------------------------|
| <b>Capital Cost (Breakdown):</b> |                      |  |                         |
| <b>Works</b>                     | <b>Equipment</b>     | <b>Other</b> £437,000                  | <b>Fees</b> £110,000    |
| <b>Revenue cost per annum:</b>   | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b> | £0                                     | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b> £0 |
| <b>Proposed Funding</b>          |                      |  |                         |
| <b>External:</b> N/A             |                      | <b>Internal:</b> Spend to Save reserve |                         |

|  |   |   |  |
|--|---|---|--|
| <b>Useful Economic Life (years):</b><br>To be determined | <b>New/Replacement:</b> New and Replacement |   |  |
| <b>Depreciation per annum:</b><br>To be determined       | <b>Capital Financing Costs:</b> £9,575      |   |  |
| <b>Residual Value:</b> N/A                               | <b>Replaces Fleet No:</b> N/A               | <b>Category of Asset:</b> Intangible Assets and Equipment |  |

**PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM**

|   |                         |   |                    |
|---|-------------------------|---|--------------------|
| <b>Project Name: Footpath Enhancement</b>   |                         | <b>Cost Centre: 0943</b>                          | <b>Ref: 6</b>      |
| <b>Detailed Description:</b><br>The Borough is responsible for many footpaths and hard standings within open areas, mainly inherited from the Large Scale Voluntary Transfer (LSVT) of housing stock to a Registered Housing Provider. A survey of footpaths was carried out in 2009/10 to identify a prioritised rolling programme of footpath enhancements.   |                         |   |                    |
| <b>Location:</b> Various  |                         | <b>Head of Service:</b> Revenues and ICT Services |                    |
| <b>Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives:</b><br><b>Corporate Theme:</b> Our Council<br><b>Corporate Task:</b> Examine the future liability of all Council owned property to maximise the potential of the Council's property portfolio.  |                         |   |                    |
| <b>Community Outcomes:</b><br>Property owned by the Council is utilised to its full potential or used to generate income for the Council enabling it to keep Council Tax increases at a minimum.  |                         |   |                    |
| <b>Other Options Rejected and Why:</b><br>The footpaths are in need of resurfacing and improvement works to maintain a good quality, safe surface for users. In some cases, they are not safely accessible for disabled people. The option not to undertake the works was rejected as this would not maintain the Council's assets which may lead to insurance claims and action against the Council under DDA legislation. |                         |   |                    |
| <b>Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L):</b> L  |                         |   |                    |
| <b>Start Date:</b> On-going   |                         | <b>Completion Date:</b> On-going                  |                    |
| <b>Capital Cost (Total) :</b>   | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b>    | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b>                              |                    |
| £50,000 (2 years)   | £25,000                 | £25,000   |                    |
| <b>Capital Cost (Breakdown)</b>   |                         |   |                    |
| <b>Works</b> £42,000  | <b>Equipment</b> £0     | <b>Other</b> £0                                   | <b>Fees</b> £8,000 |
| <b>Revenue cost per annum:</b>  | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b> £0 | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b> £0                           |                    |
| <b>Proposed Funding</b>   |                         |   |                    |
| <b>External:</b>  |                         | <b>Internal:</b> Capital Receipts                 |                    |
| <b>Useful Economic Life (years):</b> 15   |                         | <b>New/Replacement:</b> Replacement               |                    |
| <b>Depreciation per annum:</b> £1,670   |                         | <b>Capital Financing Costs:</b> £875              |                    |
| <b>Residual Value:</b> N/A  |                         | <b>Category of Asset:</b> Infrastructure          |                    |

**PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM**

|   |  |                          |  |                      |  |
|---|--|--------------------------|--|----------------------|--|
| <b>Project Name: Cotgrave Masterplan</b>  |  | <b>Cost Centre: 0303</b> |  | <b>Ref: 7</b>        |  |
| <b>Detailed Description:</b><br>To work in partnership to secure an improved town centre environment for Cotgrave through the regeneration of the area in conjunction with the development of Cotgrave Colliery Site to include new housing. It is expected that the budget allocation will be used on the whole for strategic acquisitions – eg the shopping centre, Hot Pot café. Any balance will go towards infrastructure costs.   |  |                          |  |                      |  |
| <b>Location:</b> Cotgrave   |  |                          | <b>Head of Service:</b> Community Shaping  |                      |  |
| <b>Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives:</b><br><b>Corporate Theme:</b> Our economy<br><b>Corporate Task:</b> Support the regeneration of Cotgrave including new housing, employment opportunities and a vibrant town centre.  |  |                          |  |                      |  |
| <b>Community Outcomes:</b><br>To enhance Cotgrave Shopping Centre and lever investment into the town centre in order to increase the economic viability of the town.<br>To facilitate the mixed use redevelopment of the Colliery Site.<br>To improve linkages between Cotgrave Town Centre and the redeveloped Colliery Site in order to increase the population base using the town centre facilities.<br>To consolidate the siting of all Public Sector organisations present with a view to reducing public sector spend and operating costs.<br>In the long-term to balance the housing type and tenure within the town. |  |                          |  |                      |  |
| <b>Other Options Rejected and Why:</b><br>Failure to provide the required leadership to champion and support the community to deliver the Masterplan could result in a lost opportunity for Cotgrave residents and businesses. This could lead to a cycle of decline which would have a negative impact on community cohesion and vibrancy. In addition, funding streams may not be accessed and secured and this could lead to a vast reduction in the benefits achievable.  |  |                          |  |                      |  |
| <b>Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L):</b> H  |  |                          |  |                      |  |
| <b>Start Date:</b> January 12   |  |                          | <b>Completion Date:</b> to be determined   |                      |  |
| <b>Capital Cost (Total) :</b>   |  | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b>     | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b>   |                      |  |
| £3,550,000  |  | £1,550,000               |  |                      |  |
| <b>Capital Cost (Breakdown)</b>   |  |                          |  |                      |  |
| <b>Works/Acquisition</b>  |  | <b>Equipment</b>         |  | <b>Other</b>         |  |
| £1,400,000  |  |                          |  | Fees £150,000        |  |
| <b>Revenue cost per annum:</b>  |  | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b>     |  | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b> |  |
|   |  | To be assessed           |  | To be assessed       |  |
| <b>Proposed Funding</b>   |  |                          |  |                      |  |
| <b>External:</b><br>Homes and Communities Agency funding<br>£650,000  |  |                          | <b>Internal:</b><br>Capital Receipts £900,000  |                      |  |
| <b>Useful Economic Life (years):</b> to be determined   |  |                          | <b>New/Replacement:</b> New  |                      |  |
| <b>Depreciation per annum:</b> to be determined   |  |                          | <b>Capital Financing Costs:</b> £27,125 short-term   |                      |  |
| <b>Residual Value:</b> N/A  |  |                          | <b>Category of Asset:</b> Potential investment property and Revenue Expenditure funded from capital under statute. |                      |  |

**PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM**

|   |                      |  |               |
|---|----------------------|--|---------------|
| <b>Project Name: Pitch Upgrade Keyworth Leisure Centre</b>  |                      | <b>Cost Centre: 0403</b>   | <b>Ref: 8</b> |
| <b>Detailed Description:</b><br>To support a contribution towards costs of replacing the artificial turf pitch carpet. The scheme will be managed by the South Wolds school.  |                      |  |               |
| <b>Location:</b> Keyworth Leisure Centre  |                      | <b>Head of Service:</b> Partnerships & Performance                               |               |
| <b>Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives:</b><br><b>Corporate Theme:</b> Our Residents<br><b>Corporate Tasks:</b> Activate the Leisure Strategy to best provide leisure facilities and activities as the conditions prescribed in the Strategy arise. |                      |  |               |
| <b>Community Outcomes:</b><br>Rushcliffe residents continue to be able to access a wide range of leisure facilities and activities helping them to maintain healthy and active lifestyles.  |                      |  |               |
| <b>Other Options Rejected and Why:</b><br>Not replacing the carpet would lead to a diminished quality and would be likely to see a drop in usage at the site.   |                      |  |               |
| <b>Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L): M</b>  |                      |  |               |
| <b>Start Date:</b>  |                      | <b>Completion Date:</b>  |               |
| <b>Capital Cost (Total) :</b>   | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b> | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b>   |               |
| £25,000   | £0                   | £25,000  |               |
| <b>Capital Cost (Breakdown):</b>  |                      |  |               |
| <b>Works</b>  | <b>Equipment</b>     | <b>Other</b><br>£25,000  | <b>Fees</b>   |
| <b>Revenue cost per annum:</b>  | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b> | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b>   |               |
| <b>Proposed Funding</b>   |                      |  |               |
| <b>External:</b>  |                      | <b>Internal:</b> Capital Receipts  |               |
| <b>Useful Economic Life (years): 10</b>   |                      | <b>New/Replacement:</b> Replacement  |               |
| <b>Depreciation per annum: N/A</b>  |                      | <b>Capital Financing Costs: £510</b>   |               |
| <b>Residual Value: N/A</b>  |                      | <b>Category of Asset:</b> Revenue expenditure funded from capital under statute. |               |



## PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM

|  |                          |  |                    |
|--|--------------------------|--|--------------------|
| <b>Project Name: Changing Room Supply and Extraction Unit – Rushcliffe Leisure Centre</b>  |                          | <b>Cost Centre: 0399</b>                             | <b>Ref: 9</b>      |
| <b>Detailed Description:</b> Removal of existing system and replace with modern, more energy efficient system.   |                          |  |                    |
| <b>Location:</b> Rushcliffe Leisure Centre   |                          | <b>Head of Service:</b> Partnerships and Performance |                    |
| <b>Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives:</b><br><b>Corporate Theme:</b> Our Residents<br><b>Corporate Task:</b> Activate the leisure strategy to best provide leisure facilities and activities as the conditions prescribed in the Strategy arise.   |                          |  |                    |
| <b>Community Outcomes:</b><br>Rushcliffe residents continue to be able to access a wide range of leisure facilities and activities helping them to maintain healthy and active lifestyles.<br><br>Improved air quality, temperatures better controlled with lower running costs and CO2 emissions.   |                          |  |                    |
| <b>Other Options Rejected and Why:</b><br>The changing rooms must have a ventilation system which is capable of providing sufficient air changes to meet legislative requirements and provide both heating and cooling as required.<br><br>Following on from the adoption by Cabinet in January of the Leisure Facilities Addendum, which identifies a potential withdrawal from this site in the future, a re-assessment of the viability of this scheme should be undertaken. Should the scheme be approved the costs are likely to be significantly more due to information provided by NCC following a detailed asbestos survey. |                          |  |                    |
| <b>Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L):</b> H   |                          |  |                    |
| <b>Start Date:</b> April 12  |                          | <b>Completion Date:</b> March 13                     |                    |
| <b>Capital Cost (Total) :</b>  | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b>     | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b>                                 |                    |
| £14,000  | £14,000                  | £0   |                    |
| <b>Capital Cost (Breakdown)</b>  |                          |  |                    |
| <b>Works</b>   | <b>Equipment</b> £12,000 | <b>Other</b>   | <b>Fees</b> £2,000 |
| <b>Revenue cost per annum:</b>   | <b>Year 1: £0</b>        | <b>Year 2: £0</b>                                    |                    |
| <b>Proposed Funding</b>  |                          |  |                    |
| <b>External:</b> N/A   |                          | <b>Internal:</b> Capital Receipts                    |                    |
| <b>Useful Economic Life (years):</b> 5   |                          | <b>New/Replacement:</b> Replacement                  |                    |
| <b>Depreciation per annum:</b> £2,800  |                          | <b>Capital Financing Costs:</b> £245                 |                    |
| <b>Residual Value:</b> n/a   |                          | <b>Category of Asset:</b> Plant                      |                    |

## PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM

|   |                             |  |                       |
|---|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| <b>Project Name: Warm Air Unit – Rushcliffe Gym Hall</b>  |                             | <b>Cost Centre: 0407</b>                           | <b>Ref: 10</b>        |
| <p><b>Detailed Description:</b> Replace the Air Handling Unit which provides heating and ventilation to the East Midlands Gymnastics Centre.<br/>         Currently this unit is working satisfactorily and is in better condition than the two units which provide heating and ventilation to the swimming pool hall. Any large expenditure on this site should be subject to review on the progress made in moving towards the Council's position of withdrawing from this site as identified in the Leisure Facilities Addendum.</p> |                             |  |                       |
| <b>Location:</b> Rushcliffe Leisure Centre  |                             | <b>Head of Service:</b> Partnerships & Performance |                       |
| <p><b>Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives:</b><br/> <b>Corporate Theme:</b> Our Residents<br/> <b>Corporate Task:</b> Activate the Leisure Strategy to best provide leisure facilities and activities as the conditions prescribed in the Strategy arise.</p>   |                             |  |                       |
| <p><b>Community Outcomes:</b><br/>         Rushcliffe residents continue to be able to access a wide range of leisure facilities and activities helping them to maintain healthy and active lifestyles.</p> <p>If the scheme goes ahead it will improve training conditions for all users of the centre particularly the elite athletes.</p> <p>The new unit will be more efficient to operate and lower costs and CO<sup>2</sup> emissions.</p>  |                             |  |                       |
| <p><b>Other Options Rejected and Why:</b><br/>         The options of either not progressing this scheme or diverting the monies to improve the air handling units that serve the swimming pool hall should be considered fully in light of the Leisure Strategy Addendum and discussions with NCC and Rushcliffe School over the future of the site.</p>   |                             |  |                       |
| <b>Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L): H</b>  |                             |  |                       |
| <b>Start Date:</b> To be determined   |                             | <b>Completion Date:</b>                            |                       |
| <b>Capital Cost (Total) :</b>   | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b>        | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b>                               |                       |
| £17,000   | £0                          | £17,000  |                       |
| <b>Capital Cost (Breakdown):</b>  |                             |  |                       |
| <b>Works</b>  | <b>Equipment</b><br>£15,000 | <b>Other</b>                                       | <b>Fees</b><br>£2,000 |
| <b>Revenue cost per annum:</b>  | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b>        | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b>                               |                       |
| <b>Proposed Funding</b>   |                             |  |                       |
| <b>External:</b>  |                             | <b>Internal:</b> Capital Receipts                  |                       |
| <b>Useful Economic Life (years):</b> 10   |                             | <b>New/Replacement:</b> Replacement                |                       |
| <b>Depreciation per annum:</b> £1,700   |                             | <b>Capital Financing Costs:</b> £300               |                       |
| <b>Residual Value:</b> N/A  |                             | <b>Category of Asset:</b> Plant                    |                       |

## PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM

|  |                      |  |                     |
|--|----------------------|--|---------------------|
| <b>Project Name: Car Park Resurfacing – Cotgrave Leisure Centre</b>  |                      | <b>Cost Centre: 0408</b>                             | <b>Ref: 11</b>      |
| <b>Detailed Description:</b> The existing surface is breaking up in places and the markings are badly faded. The surface needs to be replaced and relined to optimise spaces and the safety of users.  |                      |  |                     |
| <b>Location:</b> Cotgrave Leisure Centre   |                      | <b>Head of Service:</b> Partnerships and Performance |                     |
| <b>Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives:</b><br><b>Corporate Theme:</b> Our Residents<br><b>Corporate Task:</b> Activate the leisure strategy to best provide leisure facilities and activities as the conditions prescribed in the Strategy arise. |                      |  |                     |
| <b>Community Outcomes:</b><br>Rushcliffe residents continue to be able to access a wide range of leisure facilities and activities helping them to maintain healthy and active lifestyles.<br><br>A safer surface together with optimised car parking spaces.    |                      |  |                     |
| <b>Other Options Rejected and Why:</b><br>The car park requires a new surface to ensure the continuing safety of users.  |                      |  |                     |
| <b>Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L): M</b>   |                      |  |                     |
| <b>Start Date:</b> April 12  |                      | <b>Completion Date:</b> March 13                     |                     |
| <b>Capital Cost (Total) :</b>  | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b> | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b>                                 |                     |
| £75,000  | £75,000              | £0   |                     |
| <b>Capital Cost (Breakdown)</b>  |                      |  |                     |
| <b>Works</b> £65,000   | <b>Equipment</b> £0  | <b>Other</b>   | <b>Fees</b> £10,000 |
| <b>Revenue cost per annum:</b>   | <b>Year 1: £0</b>    | <b>Year 2: £0</b>                                    |                     |
| <b>Proposed Funding</b>  |                      |  |                     |
| <b>External:</b> N/A   |                      | <b>Internal:</b> Capital Receipts                    |                     |
| <b>Useful Economic Life (years):</b> 15  |                      | <b>New/Replacement:</b> Replacement                  |                     |
| <b>Depreciation per annum:</b> £5,000  |                      | <b>Capital Financing Costs:</b> £1,310               |                     |
| <b>Residual Value:</b> n/a   |                      | <b>Category of Asset:</b> Infrastructure             |                     |

## PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM

|   |                             |  |                       |
|---|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| <b>Project Name: Bowls Rink Cloth - Arena</b>   |                             | <b>Cost Centre: 0409</b>                           | <b>Ref: 12</b>        |
| <b>Detailed Description:</b><br>Replacement of the indoor bowls carpet to maintain the quality of the facility. This item falls within the scope of Landlord responsibilities following the transfer of leisure management to Parkwood.   |                             |  |                       |
| <b>Location:</b> Rushcliffe Arena   |                             | <b>Head of Service:</b> Partnerships & Performance |                       |
| <b>Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives:</b><br><b>Corporate Theme:</b> Our Residents<br><b>Corporate Task:</b> Activate the leisure strategy to best provide leisure facilities and activities as the conditions prescribed in the Strategy arise.  |                             |  |                       |
| <b>Community Outcomes:</b><br>Rushcliffe residents continue to be able to access a wide range of leisure facilities and activities helping them to maintain healthy and active lifestyles.<br><br>Social inclusion issues – most bowls players are aged over 60 years and many are women.   |                             |  |                       |
| <b>Other Options Rejected and Why:</b><br>Not replacing the carpet would lead to a diminished quality and would be likely to see a drop in bowls membership and activity at the Arena. Within the Leisure Contract Landlord/Tenant split the Council are responsible for the costs of wholesale replacement of large items of equipment such as the bowls carpet.<br>The Council's Leisure Facilities Addendum approved by Cabinet in January 2012 identifies the Rushcliffe Arena as a site that will, potentially, be developed and be the Council's flagship leisure centre. |                             |  |                       |
| <b>Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L): L</b>  |                             |  |                       |
| <b>Start Date:</b> August 13  |                             | <b>Completion Date:</b> August 13                  |                       |
| <b>Capital Cost (Total) :</b>   | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b>        | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b>                               |                       |
| £36,000   | £0                          | £36,000  |                       |
| <b>Capital Cost (Breakdown):</b>  |                             |  |                       |
| <b>Works</b>  | <b>Equipment</b><br>£33,000 | <b>Other</b>                                       | <b>Fees</b><br>£3,000 |
| <b>Revenue cost per annum:</b>  | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b>        | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b>                               |                       |
| <b>Proposed Funding</b>   |                             |  |                       |
| <b>External:</b>  |                             | <b>Internal:</b> Capital Receipts                  |                       |
| <b>Useful Economic Life (years): 7</b>  |                             | <b>New/Replacement:</b> Replacement                |                       |
| <b>Depreciation per annum:</b> £4,720   |                             | <b>Capital Financing Costs:</b> £630               |                       |
| <b>Residual Value:</b> N/A  |                             | <b>Category of Asset:</b> Equipment                |                       |

**PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM**

|   |                      |  |                      |
|---|----------------------|--|----------------------|
| <b>Project Name: Community Contact Centre - Spokes</b>  |                      | <b>Cost Centre: 0348</b>                           | <b>Ref: 13</b>       |
| <b>Detailed Description:</b><br>This provision of £150,000 in 2013/14 is to support the development of rural Community Contact Centres working in partnership with others to increase local accessibility of services reducing the need for residents to travel to West Bridgford.<br><br>Identification and enhancement of such facilities will underpin improved service accessibility through the use of new technology and provide opportunities to develop partnership working and collaborative service delivery.<br><br>The ability to provide new Contact Centres is reliant upon premises and opportunities being identified and so this carries a high risk rating. |                      |  |                      |
| <b>Location:</b> Various  |                      | <b>Head of Service:</b> Partnerships & Performance |                      |
| <b>Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives:</b><br><br><b>Corporate Theme:</b> Our Council.<br><b>Corporate Task:</b> Develop the use of technology to improve customer access and reduce costs by working in partnership to share staff, applications and best practice.   |                      |  |                      |
| <b>Community Outcomes:</b><br>Residents are able to access Council services and information at convenient locations.  |                      |  |                      |
| <b>Other Options Rejected and Why:</b><br>Failure to provide investment to develop remote Customer Contact Centres will not satisfy the Council's aim to improve access to its services or to be able to work collaboratively to improve service delivery. Each potential investment opportunity will be assessed in order to ensure that it is capable of delivering the desired outcome.  |                      |  |                      |
| <b>Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L): H</b>  |                      |  |                      |
| <b>Start Date:</b> to be determined   |                      | <b>Completion Date:</b>                            |                      |
| <b>Capital Cost (Total) :</b>   | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b> | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b>                               | <b>Year 3: 14/15</b> |
| £450,000 (2 years)  | £0                   | £150,000   | £300,000             |
| <b>Capital Cost (Breakdown):</b>  |                      |  |                      |
| <b>Works</b> £390,000   | <b>Equipment</b>     | <b>Other</b>                                       | <b>Fees</b> £60,000  |
| <b>Revenue cost per annum:</b>  | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b> | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b> to be determined              |                      |
| <b>Proposed Funding</b>   |                      |  |                      |
| <b>External:</b>  |                      | <b>Internal:</b> Capital Receipts                  |                      |
| <b>Useful Economic Life (years):</b> to be determined   |                      | <b>New/Replacement:</b> either                     |                      |
| <b>Depreciation per annum:</b> to be determined   |                      | <b>Capital Financing Costs:</b> £7,875             |                      |
| <b>Residual Value:</b> N/A  |                      | <b>Category of Asset:</b> to be determined         |                      |

**PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM**

|  |                         |   |                |
|--|-------------------------|---|----------------|
| <b>Project Name: Nottinghamshire<br/>Broadband</b>   |                         | <b>Cost Centre: 0410</b>  | <b>Ref: 14</b> |
| <p><b>Detailed Description:</b><br/> Capital contribution towards Nottinghamshire County Council's bid to get broadband infrastructure across Rushcliffe. This is to upgrade telecoms cabinets across the county where it is not commercially viable for the private sector to do so (ie there is market failure).<br/> The whole project is anticipated to cost £17m county wide. This comprises £4.25m public sector funding from NCC and the districts, £4.25m public sector funding from Broadband Delivery UK (BDUK) and £8.5m from the private sector.<br/> Rushcliffe Borough Council has been asked to contribute £245,000 to the project. This has been calculated based on the number of premises in Rushcliffe that currently do not have access to superfast broadband – around 13,000.</p> <p>NCC will lead on procuring the private sector delivery partner.</p> <p>It is proposed that £152,000 is provided from the LAA reward grant and £93,000 is provided from the Council's own capital resources.</p> |                         |   |                |
| <b>Location:</b> Rushcliffe  |                         | <b>Head of Service:</b> Partnerships & Performance                              |                |
| <p><b>Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives:</b><br/> <b>Corporate Theme:</b> Our Council and Our Economy<br/> <b>Corporate Task:</b> Develop the use of technology to improve customer/business access.</p>   |                         |   |                |
| <p><b>Community Outcomes:</b><br/> Residents/businesses are able to access Council and other services as Broadband will be available for all Rushcliffe residents and businesses if they choose to purchase it.</p>  |                         |   |                |
| <p><b>Other Options Rejected and Why:</b><br/> Failure to take up this investment opportunity will lead to Rushcliffe Borough falling behind other Districts in relation to broadband infrastructure. This could lead to economic decline as Businesses and potentially residents move elsewhere to access broadband.</p>  |                         |   |                |
| <b>Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L): M</b>   |                         |   |                |
| <b>Start Date:</b> Whole project 2012/13   |                         | <b>Completion Date:</b> Whole project 2015/16                                   |                |
| <b>Capital Cost (Total) :</b>  | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b>    | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b>  |                |
| £245,000   | £0                      | £245,000  |                |
| <b>Capital Cost (Breakdown):</b>   |                         |   |                |
| <b>Works</b>   | <b>Equipment</b>        | <b>Other £245,000</b>   | <b>Fees</b>    |
| <b>Revenue cost per annum:</b>   | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b> £0 | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b> £0   |                |
| <b>Proposed Funding</b>  |                         |   |                |
| <b>External:</b> LAA Reward Grant £152,000   |                         | <b>Internal:</b> Capital Receipts £93,000                                       |                |
| <b>Useful Economic Life (years):</b> N/A   |                         | <b>New/Replacement:</b> New   |                |
| <b>Depreciation per annum:</b> N/A   |                         | <b>Capital Financing Costs:</b> £4,290  |                |
| <b>Residual Value:</b> N/A   |                         | <b>Category of Asset:</b> Revenue expenditure funded from capital under Statute |                |

**PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM**

|  |                          |  |                    |
|--|--------------------------|--|--------------------|
| <b>Project Name: Nitrogen Dioxide Monitor</b>  |                          | <b>Cost Centre: 0311</b>                                 | <b>Ref: 15</b>     |
| <b>Detailed Description:</b><br>This is for a new Nitrogen Dioxide monitor in addition to the equipment we already have. The cost is for the actual monitor and all additions required to operate the monitor: roadside enclosure, pump, air conditioning etc. It will also factor in the first year of servicing.<br><br>The monitor will allow us to accurately measure the Nitrogen dioxide levels in the recently declared Air Quality Management area at Stragglethorpe junction – the levels are significantly higher than the national permitted value and the monitor will determine if the levels change following improvements planned along the A52 by the Highways Agency. Following submission of our annual progress report and Air Quality Action Plan DEFRA have strongly advised that we install a monitor in this area for accuracy and not to rely on tube data as we do now to determine the levels. |                          |  |                    |
| <b>Location:</b> Stragglethorpe  |                          | <b>Head of Service:</b> Environment and Waste Management |                    |
| <b>Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives:</b><br><b>Corporate Theme:</b> Our Economy and Our Residents<br><br>Our Objective is to reduce nitrogen dioxide levels in the Borough to comply with the Air Quality Standard.   |                          |  |                    |
| <b>Community Outcomes:</b><br><br>More accurate data capture to measure air quality improvements with a view to ensuring that overall quality of life for residents is improved.   |                          |  |                    |
| <b>Other Options Rejected and Why:</b><br>The need to have this additional monitor has been strongly advised by DEFRA. Failure to take action may lead to non-compliance with the Air Quality Standard.  |                          |  |                    |
| <b>Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/Low (L):</b> L  |                          |  |                    |
| <b>Start Date:</b> April 2012  |                          | <b>Completion Date:</b> September 2012                   |                    |
| <b>Capital Cost (Total) :</b>  | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b>     | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b>                                     |                    |
| £16,000  | £16,000                  | £0   |                    |
| <b>Capital Cost (Breakdown):</b>   |                          |  |                    |
| <b>Works</b>   | <b>Equipment</b> £15,000 | <b>Other</b>   | <b>Fees</b> £1,000 |
| <b>Revenue cost per annum:</b>   | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b>     | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b>                                     |                    |
| <b>Proposed Funding</b>  |                          |  |                    |
| <b>External:</b>   |                          | <b>Internal:</b> Capital Receipts                        |                    |
| <b>Useful Economic Life (years):</b> 10  |                          | <b>New/Replacement:</b> New                              |                    |
| <b>Depreciation per annum:</b> £1,600  |                          | <b>Capital Financing Costs:</b> £280                     |                    |
| <b>Residual Value:</b>   |                          | <b>Category of Asset:</b> Equipment                      |                    |

**PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM**

|  |                              |                          |  |                       |  |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|-----------------------|--|
| <b>Project Name: Wheeled Bins</b>  |                              | <b>Cost Centre: 0310</b> |  | <b>Ref: 16</b>        |  |
| <b>Detailed Description:</b><br>This funding is used to facilitate the replacement domestic wheeled bin programme for all residents across the borough. All wheeled bins are fixed assets which have a finite lifespan and it is important that the Council maintains a replacement programme which also deals with bins that become defective through accidental damage or loss.      |                              |                          |  |                       |  |
| <b>Location:</b> Central Works Depot/Borough   |                              |                          | <b>Head of Service:</b> Environment and Waste Management |                       |  |
| <b>Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives:</b><br><b>Corporate Theme:</b> Our Council<br><b>Corporate Task:</b> Ensure the future liability of all Council owned property including equipment.  |                              |                          |  |                       |  |
| <b>Community Outcomes:</b><br>Residents of the council continue to receive the services they require.<br><br>Residents provided with wheeled bins that are in good repair and condition resulting in high standards of customer satisfaction.<br><br>Compliance with health and safety legislation as it is important that operatives do not empty bins that are damaged or defective. |                              |                          |  |                       |  |
| <b>Other Options Rejected and Why:</b><br>Failure to invest in new wheeled bins could give rise to health and safety issues for residents and staff. Customer satisfaction may be affected giving rise to additional complaints to the Council.  |                              |                          |  |                       |  |
| <b>Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L):</b> L   |                              |                          |  |                       |  |
| <b>Start Date:</b> Ongoing   |                              |                          | <b>Completion Date:</b> Ongoing                          |                       |  |
| <b>Capital Cost (Total) :</b>  |                              | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b>     | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b>                                     |                       |  |
| £126,000 (2 years)   |                              | £63,000                  | £63,000  |                       |  |
| <b>Capital Cost (Breakdown)</b>  |                              |                          |  |                       |  |
| <b>Works</b><br>£0   | <b>Equipment</b><br>£120,000 | <b>Other</b><br>£0       |  | <b>Fees</b><br>£6,000 |  |
| <b>Revenue cost per annum:</b>   |                              | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b>     |  | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b>  |  |
|  |                              | £0                       |  | £0                    |  |
| <b>Proposed Funding</b>  |                              |                          |  |                       |  |
| <b>External:</b> N/A   |                              |                          | <b>Internal:</b> Capital Receipts                        |                       |  |
| <b>Useful Economic Life (years):</b> 10  |                              |                          | <b>New/Replacement:</b> New/Replacement                  |                       |  |
| <b>Depreciation per annum:</b> £6,300  |                              |                          | <b>Capital Financing Costs:</b> £2,205                   |                       |  |
| <b>Residual Value:</b> N/A   |                              |                          | <b>Category of Asset:</b> Equipment                      |                       |  |



## PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM

|  |  |                                 |
|--|--|---------------------------------|
| <b>Project Name: Vehicle Replacement</b>   | <b>Cost Centre: 0680</b>                                 | <b>Ref: 17</b>                  |
| <p><b>Detailed Description:</b><br/>                 The authority owns vehicles ranging from large refuse freighters to small vans and items of mechanical plant such as mowers, shredders, graffiti machine etc. As these vehicles and plant age and become uneconomic to maintain and run, they are replaced on a new for old basis. Although there is a programme for replacements for the next ten years, each vehicle or machine is assessed annually and the programme continually adjusted to take into account actual performance. This provision will be used to acquire new vehicles and plant and also to purchase second hand vehicles and plant as and when appropriate.</p>   |  |                                 |
| <b>Location:</b> Central Works Depot   | <b>Head of Service:</b> Environment and Waste Management |                                 |
| <p><b>Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives:</b><br/> <b>Corporate Theme:</b> Our Council<br/> <b>Corporate Task:</b> Examine the future viability of all Council owned property including vehicles and plant to maximise the potential of the Council's portfolio. To work in close alignment with the Council's Four Year Plan in order to deliver services more efficiently.</p> <p>To reduce waste and increasingly reuse and recycle to protect the environment for the future.</p> <p>The replacement of vehicles is critical to the performance of the front line services (recycling 2 go and streetwise). Regular vehicle and plant replacement with new updated engines helps to meet climate change and national indicator targets for emissions and helps maintain a cleaner air quality within the Borough.</p>         |  |                                 |
| <p><b>Community Outcomes:</b><br/>                 Property owned by the Council is utilised to its full potential.<br/>                 The introduction of new euro standard engines will lower emissions. The new vehicles will also reduce maintenance costs on the vehicles they replace however it should be noted that the remainder of the fleet ages and therefore the fleet profile and maintenance costs overall remain stable.</p>   |  |                                 |
| <p><b>Other Options Rejected and Why:</b><br/>                 In 2004 the authority considered the leasing and hiring in of vehicles. The conclusion was that it was uneconomic to do either of the two options. There are also distinct advantages in direct purchase:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The authority has control over the maintenance of the vehicles.</li> <li>b) It is difficult to change the terms and conditions of a lease.</li> <li>c) High performing vehicles can have their lifespan lengthened.</li> <li>d) Poor performing vehicles can have their lifespan shortened.</li> </ul> <p>Not being tied in to lengthy lease/hire contracts means the service can react and adapt to change quickly.</p> <p>The Council now actively looks at the possible purchase of 2<sup>nd</sup> hand vehicles.</p> |  |                                 |
| <b>Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L): L</b>   |  |                                 |
| <b>Start Date:</b> Ongoing   |  | <b>Completion Date:</b> Ongoing |
| <b>Capital Cost (Total) :</b>  | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b>                                     | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b>            |
| £1,457,000 (2 years)   | £549,000   | £908,000                        |

| <b>Capital Cost (Breakdown)</b>   |                                      |   |                        |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| <b>Works</b><br>£0  | <b>Equipment</b><br>£1,388,000       | <b>Other</b><br>£0                            | <b>Fees</b><br>£69,000 |
| <b>Revenue cost per annum</b><br>:  | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b><br>£0           | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b><br>£0                    |                        |
| As each vehicle replaces an existing vehicle there is no increase in the running costs the fleet profile remains constant, service budgets remain the same. |                                      |   |                        |
| <b>Proposed Funding:</b>  |                                      |   |                        |
| <b>External:</b> N/A  |                                      | <b>Internal:</b> Capital Receipts             |                        |
| <b>Useful Economic Life (years):</b> Various  |                                      | <b>New/Replacements:</b> New and Replacements |                        |
| <b>Depreciation per annum:</b> Various  |                                      | <b>Capital Financing Costs:</b> £25,500       |                        |
| <b>Residual Value:</b> Various  | <b>Replaces Fleet No:</b><br>Various | <b>Category of Asset:</b> Vehicle and Plant   |                        |

## PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM

|  |                             |   |                     |
|--|-----------------------------|---|---------------------|
| <b>Project Name: Play Areas and Facilities for Older Children (Special Expense)</b>  |                             | <b>Cost Centre: 0664</b>  | <b>Ref: 18</b>      |
| <b>Detailed Description:</b><br>The capital programme contains annual provisions of £100,000 each year for investment in Children's Play Areas and Facilities for Older Children.<br>The priority project for 2011/12 is the delivery of a new play facility at Alford Road for children and teenagers. In summer 2010 a consultation exercise was undertaken with local service users, this was used to inform the tender document. This project was tendered for prior to Christmas and Proludic were successful. A planning application is currently under consideration by the planning department and subject to approval, work will start on site on 20 <sup>th</sup> February with a view to complete by end March.<br>In 2012/13 the priority area for new equipment will be the Hook in Lady Bay. |                             |   |                     |
| <b>Location:</b> The Hook, West Bridgford  |                             | <b>Head of Service:</b> Community Shaping   |                     |
| <b>Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives:</b><br><b>Corporate Theme:</b> Our Residents<br><b>Corporate Task:</b> Activate the Leisure Strategy to best provide leisure facilities and activities as the conditions prescribed in the Strategy arise.   |                             |   |                     |
| <b>Community Outcomes:</b><br>Rushcliffe Residents continue to be able to access a wide range of leisure facilities and activities helping them to maintain healthy and active lifestyles.<br>Improved opportunities for social development and community cohesion for adults, young people, parents and children by meeting and mixing with others at these venues.   |                             |   |                     |
| <b>Other Options Rejected and Why:</b><br>Doing nothing would result in further deterioration and thereby, reduction of good quality play facilities in the Borough adversely affecting the reputation of RBC and ultimately leading to potential Health and Safety problems.  |                             |   |                     |
| <b>Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L):</b> L   |                             |   |                     |
| <b>Start Date:</b> Ongoing   |                             | <b>Completion Date:</b> Ongoing   |                     |
| <b>Capital Cost (Total) :</b>  | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b>        | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b>  |                     |
| £200,000 (2 years)   | £100,000                    | £100,000  |                     |
| <b>Capital Cost (Breakdown)</b>  |                             |   |                     |
| <b>Works</b> £70,000   | <b>Equipment</b> £110,000   | <b>Other</b>  | <b>Fees</b> £20,000 |
| <b>Revenue cost per annum:</b>   | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b> £5,000 | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b> £5,000   |                     |
| <b>Proposed Funding</b>  |                             |   |                     |
| <b>External:</b> N/A   |                             | <b>Internal:</b> Special Expense – General Fund reserve set aside for capital purposes. |                     |
| <b>Useful Economic Life (years):</b> 10  |                             | <b>New/Replacement:</b> New/Replacement   |                     |
| <b>Depreciation per annum:</b> £10,000   |                             | <b>Capital Financing Costs:</b> £3,500  |                     |
| <b>Residual Value:</b> Various   |                             | <b>Category of Asset:</b> Equipment   |                     |

## PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM

|  |                          |   |
|--|--------------------------|---|
| <b>Project Name: Alford Road Pavilion Re-development – Special Expense</b>   | <b>Cost Centre: 0381</b> | <b>Ref: 19</b>                            |
| <p><b>Detailed Description:</b><br/> The Alford Road Changing pavilion is a 1960's changing pavilion which serves the 3 adult football pitches, 1 adult rugby pitch and 2 mini football pitches on Alford Road. The facility is heavily used and provides open plan changing facilities. It is extensively used on Saturdays and Sundays, but due to its layout has only limited weekday usage by the local primary school who uses the pitches for extra curricular activities.</p> <p>The facility is no longer fit for purpose as it doesn't meet Football Association specifications particularly in relation to junior and female participation. It is unable to be used for junior football at the same time as adults due to child protection considerations, similarly girls' football is difficult to develop further. There are numerous community enquiries about using the facility for social groups which cannot currently be accommodated. Furthermore, the building has many design features which result in high levels of vandalism.</p> <p>In August 2009 a decision was taken to close the built facility as it was considered costly to maintain due to old and inefficient plant and equipment. It was also not possible to offer hot showers due to the potential risk of legionella. This has resulted in a waiting list of teams for other sites who are unwilling to use Alford Road because of the poor quality of the changing facilities.</p> <p>The current capital programme contains £384,000 for this project. Funding for this will come from a potential £10,000 Section 106 agreement, a possible £100,000 from the Football Foundation and the balance of £274,000 as a West Bridgford Special Expense. The budget will be used to provide a refurbished facility. <b>Further options will be considered for a new build but this will be financed from increased external funding to cap the Council's contribution at this level.</b></p> |                          |   |
| <b>Location:</b> Alford Road, West Bridgford   |                          | <b>Head of Service:</b> Community Shaping |
| <p><b>Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives:</b><br/> <b>Corporate Theme:</b> Our Residents<br/> <b>Corporate Task:</b> Activate the Leisure Strategy to best provide leisure facilities and activities as the conditions prescribed in the Strategy arise.</p> <p><b>Corporate Theme:</b> Our Council<br/> <b>Corporate Task:</b> Examine the future viability of all Council owned property to maximise the potential of the Council's property portfolio.</p>   |                          |   |
| <p><b>Community Outcomes:</b><br/> Rushcliffe residents continue to be able to access a wide range of leisure facilities and activities helping them to maintain healthy and active lifestyles. The scheme will provide quality facilities within the area that adults, children and young people can use. It is anticipated that this will lead to an increase in the number of people playing sport.</p> <p>Property owned by the Council is utilised to its full potential or used to generate income for the Council. The scheme will improve the efficiency of the building. Increased use and diversity will make the facility more cost effective.</p> <p>The scheme has also been designed with a view to reducing levels of crime and anti social behaviour to make people feel safer.</p>  |                          |   |
| <b>Other Options Considered:</b>   |                          |   |

Officers have produced a range of options for this site including the option to rebuild the pavilion with Football Foundation funding (if available), the option to extend the existing facility and the option to demolish the current building and not replace it. SMT have requested further detail on the revenue costs and income generation before a discussion is held with Members to decide on the proposed course of action.

**Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L): M**

|                               |                      |                                       |  |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Start Date:</b> June 12    |                      | <b>Completion Date:</b> Not yet known |  |
| <b>Capital Cost (Total) :</b> | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b> | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b>                  |  |
| £384,000                      | £384,000             | £0                                    |  |

**Capital Cost (Breakdown)**

|                                |                             |                            |                        |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| <b>Works</b><br>£322,000       | <b>Equipment</b><br>£10,000 | <b>Other</b>               | <b>Fees</b><br>£52,000 |
| <b>Revenue cost per annum:</b> | <b>Year 1: 12/13</b><br>£0  | <b>Year 2: 13/14</b><br>£0 |                        |

**Proposed Funding**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>External:</b><br>£10,000 Section 106<br>£100,000 Football Foundation | <b>Internal:</b><br>£274,000 Special Expense |
|---|--|

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Useful Economic Life (years):</b> 40 | <b>New/Replacement:</b> Replacement        |
| <b>Depreciation per annum:</b> £9,600   | <b>Capital Financing Costs:</b> £6,720     |
| <b>Residual Value:</b> N/A              | <b>Category of Asset:</b> Land & Buildings |

**TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY AND PRUDENTIAL INDICATORS  
2012/13****REPORT OF THE HEAD OF FINANCIAL SERVICES****Introduction**

The annual Treasury Management Strategy is required as part of the Treasury Management Policy. It details the framework within which borrowing and other treasury management activities will take place in 2012/13. The Prudential Code does not specifically cover investment activity. Instead, the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) has offered guidance on how local authorities should conduct their investment activities rather than by primary or secondary legislation. The resultant Annual Investment Strategy has been incorporated within the overall Treasury Management Strategy and both are presented in the following paragraphs.

**1. Executive summary**

The Borough's treasury management strategy aims to maximise the income from investments, without taking significant risk with the available capital. In order to achieve this, the treasury management policy determines the constraints within which the strategy must operate, while the strategy determines the operational parameters for the year. In particular:

- The Council has considered diversification of the assets and the underlying risk in its investment portfolio to provide the potential for enhanced returns over the medium term. The reasons for doing so are the continuing importance of investment returns in the Council's overall finances as well as a recognition that investment returns purely from cash or near cash instruments that the Council has utilised up until the current time will be lower in the future
- The Section 151 Officer, under delegated powers, will undertake with advice from the Council's treasury advisor, Arlingclose Ltd, the most appropriate form of investments in keeping with the Council's income and risk management requirements and Prudential Indicators.
- The Council will maintain a counterparty list based on credit criteria. The Council has determined a 'high credit rating' as a long term of A-/A3 or better, short term F1/P-1 or better. Counterparty limits will also apply. While this is the proposed formal position, a tighter restriction will apply during the current period of instability in the Banking system. This will have an effect on the level of interest achieved which is reflected in the revenue budget.
- A limit of 60% of the Council's overall investments will apply for investments which exceed one year which will include pooled funds/collective investment schemes which the Council may invest in.

- Any borrowing will be for short term only, pending receipt of income or investments on maturity. The Council sets an absolute limit of £4.0m for 2012/13 in respect of temporary borrowing, which represents a possible, but not worst case, scenario. It is anticipated that borrowing would be actively managed within the operational boundary based on accurate cash flow forecasting.
- The capital programme will be funded from existing usable resources and not from borrowing. Cash for this purpose will be drawn from investments.
- Cash available for investment will be shared between the cash manager and the in-house team. The level of investments is set to enable the capital programme to be funded leaving day to day cash flows to be managed by the in-house team.

## **2. Scope of the Strategy**

The suggested strategy for 2012/13 in respect of the following aspects of the treasury management function is based upon the Treasury officers' views on interest rates, supplemented with leading market forecasts provided by the Council's treasury adviser. The strategy covers:

- the current treasury position;
- prospects for interest rates;
- treasury limits in force which will limit the treasury risk and activities of the Council;
- Prudential Indicators;
- The Borrowing Strategy;
- In-House Investment Strategy;
- External Investment Managers;
- any extraordinary treasury issues

## **3. Treasury Limits For 2012/13 to 2014/15**

It is a statutory duty under Section 3 of the Local Government Act 2003, and supporting regulations, for the Council to determine and keep under review how much it can afford to borrow. The amount so determined is termed the "Affordable Borrowing Limit". In England and Wales the authorised limit represents the legislative limit specified in section 3 of the Local Government Act 2003.

The Council must have regard to the Prudential Code when setting the Affordable Borrowing Limit, which essentially requires it to ensure that total capital investment remains within sustainable limits and, in particular, that the impact upon its future council tax levels is 'acceptable'.

Whilst termed an "Affordable Borrowing Limit", the capital plans to be considered for inclusion incorporate those planned to be financed by both external borrowing and other forms of liability, such as credit arrangements. The affordable borrowing limit is to be set, on a rolling basis, for the forthcoming financial year and two successive financial years.

#### 4. Prudential Indicators for 2011/12 – 2014/15

The arrangements for “prudential guidelines” involve the following main features:

- The ability to set local limits for borrowing and capital expenditure subject to the Prudential Code of Practice developed by CIPFA and advice from the Section 151 officer;
- Capital investment plans are affordable, sustainable and prudent;
- The setting of “prudential indicators” to measure these factors;
- The monitoring of the indicators throughout the year to ensure compliance.

The proposed indicators are set out below: -

| <b>Capital Expenditure</b> |                            |                              |                              |                              |                              |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
|                            | 2010/11<br>Actual<br>£'000 | 2011/12<br>Estimate<br>£'000 | 2012/13<br>Estimate<br>£'000 | 2013/14<br>Estimate<br>£'000 | 2014/15<br>Estimate<br>£'000 |
| General Fund Total         | 5,834                      | 4,634                        | 4,263                        | 3,239                        | 2,289                        |

| <b>Ratio of financing costs to net revenue stream</b> |                   |                     |                     |                     |                     |
|---|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
|   | 2010/11<br>Actual | 2011/12<br>Estimate | 2012/13<br>Estimate | 2013/14<br>Estimate | 2014/15<br>Estimate |
| General Fund Total                                    | -4.08             | -5.37               | -4.75               | -4.36               | -6.42               |

| <b>Incremental impact on Council Tax of revised capital programme</b> |                          |                          |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|   | 2012/13<br>Estimate<br>£ | 2013/14<br>Estimate<br>£ | 2014/15<br>Estimate<br>£ |
| General Fund  | +0.06                    | 0.17                     | -0.18                    |
| West Bridgford Special expense  | Nil                      | Nil                      | Nil                      |

| <b>Capital Financing Requirement – end of</b> |                            |                              |                              |                              |                              |
|---|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
|   | 2010/11<br>Actual<br>£'000 | 2011/12<br>Estimate<br>£'000 | 2012/13<br>Estimate<br>£'000 | 2013/14<br>Estimate<br>£'000 | 2014/15<br>Estimate<br>£'000 |
| General Fund Total                            | -505                       | -505                         | -505                         | -505                         | -505                         |



| <b>Authorised limit for external debt</b> |                  |                  |                  |                  |
|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|   | 2011/12<br>£'000 | 2012/13<br>£'000 | 2013/14<br>£'000 | 2014/15<br>£'000 |
| <b>Borrowing</b>                          | 11,500           | 12,500           | 13,000           | 13,500           |
| <b>Other long term liabilities</b>        | Nil              | Nil              | Nil              | Nil              |
| <b>Total</b>                              | 11,500           | 12,500           | 13,000           | 13,500           |

| <b>Operational Boundary for external debt</b> |                  |                  |                  |                  |
|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|   | 2011/12<br>£'000 | 2012/13<br>£'000 | 2013/14<br>£'000 | 2014/15<br>£'000 |
| Borrowing                                     | 3,500            | 4,000            | 4,500            | 5,000            |
| Other long term liabilities                   | Nil              | Nil              | Nil              | Nil              |
| Total   | 3,500            | 4,000            | 4,500            | 5,000            |

## 5. Borrowing

As the Council is debt free and has set aside proceeds from the housing stock transfer to support capital expenditure over the next few years, it is envisaged there will be no requirement to take new long term loans. However, the Council's debt free status does not preclude the need for short term borrowing to cover cash flow requirements.

Whilst under the old regime the short term borrowing limit was set at a level to provide for "worst case scenario", the Prudential Code advises that the Authorised Limit should be set at a realistic level. The authorised limit for external debt in the table above is therefore set at a level to provide for insufficient investments being realised in time to fulfil the obligation of payment to Major Precepting Authorities and net Formula Grant and business rate pooling payments together with routine commitments.

The operational boundary is set at levels to accommodate the predicted peaks and troughs of cash flow during the year. It rises over the three year period to reflect less cash being available for investment overall and the increased use of longer dated maturities, both factors giving rise to a reduction in liquidity.

## 6. Prospects for Interest Rates

The Council appointed Arlingclose Ltd in July 2006 as treasury adviser to the Council and part of their service is to assist the Council to formulate a view on interest rates.

The table below gives Arlingclose Ltd.'s central view for interest rate movement and their economic commentary is attached at Appendix 1:

| Year    | Interest Rate |
|---------|---------------|
| 2012/13 | 0.5%          |
| 2013/14 | 0.5%          |
| 2014/15 | 0.5%          |
| 2015/16 | 0.5%          |
| 2016/17 | 0.5%          |

## 7. Permitted Investments

The Council may use any approved investment for the prudent management of its treasury balances during the financial year under the heads of Specified Investments and Non-Specified Investments. The Council will only use the following:

### Specified Investments:

Specified Investments will be those that meet the criteria in the DCLG Guidance, i.e. the investment:

- Is sterling denominated
- Has a maximum maturity of 1 year
- Meets the “high” credit criteria as determined by the Council or is made with the UK government or is made with a local authority in England, Wales and Scotland.
- The making of which is not defined as capital expenditure under section 25(1)(d) in SI 2003 No 3146 (i.e. the investment is not loan capital or share capital in a body corporate).

“Specified” Investments for the Council’s use are:

- Deposits in the DMO’s Debt Management Account Deposit Facility
- Deposits with UK local authorities
- Deposits with banks and building societies
- \*Certificates of deposit with banks and building societies
- \*Gilts: (bonds issued by the UK government)
- \*Bonds issued by multilateral development banks
- AAA-rated Money Markets Funds with a Constant Net Asset Value (Constant NAV) investing in predominantly in government securities
- AAA-rated Money Market Funds with a Constant Net Asset Value (Constant NAV) investing in instruments issued primarily by financial institutions
- Other Money Market Funds and Collective Investment Schemes – i.e. credit rated funds which meet the definition of a collective investment scheme as defined in SI 2004 No 534 and SI 2007 No 573.

*\*Investments in these instruments will be on advice from the Council’s treasury advisor.*

For Credit rated counterparties, the minimum criteria will be the short-term/long-term ratings assigned by one or more of the following agencies (Moody’s Investor Services, Standard & Poor’s, and Fitch Ratings)

The Council will also take into account information on corporate developments of and market sentiment towards investment counterparties.

### Non-Specified Investments

Having considered the rationale and risk associated with Non-Specified Investments, the following have been determined for the Council’

| Investment   | Maximum Maturity | Capital | In-House | Fund Managers |
|--|------------------|---------|----------|---------------|
| Deposits with banks and building societies   | 5 yrs            | X       | √        | √             |
| Certificates of Deposit with banks and building societies  | 5yrs             | X       | √        | √             |
| Gilts  | 10 yrs           | X       | √*       | √             |
| Bonds issued by multilateral development banks   | 10 yrs           | X       | √*       | √             |
| Bonds issued by financial institutions guaranteed by the UK government   | 10 yrs           | X       | √*       | √             |
| Sterling denominated bonds by non-UK sovereign governments   | 10 yrs           | X       | √*       | √             |
| Money Market Funds and Collective Investment Schemes (pooled funds which meet the definition of a collective investment scheme as defined in SI 2004 No 534 and SI 2007 No 573) but which are not credit rated | N/A              | X       | √*       | X             |
| Government guaranteed bonds and debt instruments (e.g. floating rate notes) issued by corporate bodies   | 10 yrs           | √       | √        | X             |
| Non-guaranteed bonds and debt instruments (e.g. floating rate notes) issued by corporate bodies  | 10 yrs           | √       | √        | X             |
| Collective Investment Schemes (Pooled funds) which do not meet the definition of collective investment schemes in SI 2004 No 534 or SI 2007 No 573   | N/A              | √       | √*       | X             |

*\* Investment only on advice from treasury advisor*

In determining the period to maturity of an investment, the investment should be regarded as commencing on the date of the commitment of the investment rather than the date on which funds are paid over to the counterparty.

The use of the above instruments by the Council's fund manager(s) will be by reference to the fund guidelines contained in the agreement between the Council and the individual manager.

The Debt Management Agency Deposit Facility (DMADF) is run by the Debt Management Office which is an Executive Agency of Her Majesty's Treasury; investments in the DMADF are therefore considered very secure.

The table below shows the maximum periods together with maximum amount for which funds may be prudently invested in term deposits with any one institution:

| Institution                                 | Short Term Credit Rating | Long Term Credit Rating      | Up To 365 Days |                | Over 365 Days  |                |
|---|--------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|   |                          |                              | Maximum Amount | Maximum Period | Maximum Amount | Maximum Period |
| Money Market Funds                          |                          | AAA                          | £10M           | 1 YEAR         | N/A            | N/A            |
| Debt Management Account                     |                          |                              | £55M           | 1 YEAR         | N/A            | N/A            |
| English Local Authorities                   |                          |                              | £3M            | 1 YEAR         | £3M            | 5 YEARS        |
| UK and Foreign Banks and building societies | F1 or equivalent         | A-, A, A+, AA- or equivalent | £10M           | 1 YEAR         | £3M            | 2 YEARS        |
| UK and Foreign Banks and building societies | F1+ or equivalent        | AAA, AA+, AA or equivalent   | £10M           | 1 YEAR         | £3M            | 5 YEARS        |

There are no aggregate limits per market sector. Lower limits may be operated by the Section 151 Officer determined by reference to other ratings available in support of the main credit rating. However, while this is the proposed formal position, the Council has currently restricted its investment activity to:

- The Debt Management Agency Deposit Facility (The rates of interest from the DMADF are below equivalent money market rates. However, the returns are an acceptable trade-off for the guarantee that the Council's capital is secure)
- AAA-rated Money Market Funds with a Constant Net Asset Value (CNAV)
- Deposits with other local authorities
- Business reserve accounts and term deposits. *These have been primarily restricted to UK institutions that are rated at least AA- long term, and have access to the UK Governments' 2008 Credit Guarantee Scheme (CGS)*
- Bonds issued by Multilateral Development Banks

## 8. Investment Objectives

All investments will be in sterling. The general policy objective is the prudent investment of its treasury balances, which may include monies borrowed for the purpose of expenditure in the reasonably near future. The Council's investment priorities are:

- (a) the security of capital and
- (b) liquidity of its investments.

The Council will aim to achieve the optimum return on its investments commensurate with the proper levels of security and liquidity.

Borrowing of monies purely to invest or on-lend and make a return is unlawful and the Council will not engage in such activity.

## **9. Security of Capital by the use of Credit Ratings**

The Council receives creditworthiness advice from its treasury advisors. The credit crisis has refocused attention on the treasury management priority of security of capital monies invested. The Council will continue to maintain a counterparty list based on its criteria and will monitor and update the credit standing of the institutions on a regular basis. This assessment will include credit ratings and other alternative assessments of credit strength (for example, statements of potential government supports). The Council will also take into account information on corporate developments of and market sentiment towards investment counterparties.

## **10. Investment balances and liquidity**

The table below shows the balance of funds available for investment. The diminishing level in later years is a result of the need to support the current capital programme.

|          |           |           |           |           |           |
|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 1/4/2010 | 31/3/2011 | 31/3/2012 | 31/3/2013 | 31/3/2014 | 31/3/2015 |
| £36.7m   | £33.0m    | £28.0m    | £27.0m    | £23.7m    | £21.2m    |

Giving due consideration to the Council's level of balances over the next 3 years, the need for liquidity, its spending commitments and provisioning for contingencies, a limit of 60% of the Council's overall investments will apply for investments which exceed one year which will include pooled funds/collective investment schemes which the Council may invest in.

## **11. Provisions for credit-related losses**

If any of the Council's investments appeared at risk of loss due to default, i.e. the demise of the counterparty, and not one resulting from a fall in market value due to movements in interest rates, the Council will make appropriate provisions from its resources.

## **12. In-house investment strategy**

The Council's shorter-term investments will be made with reference to the outlook for money market rates. For these monies, the Council will mainly utilise term deposits, business reserve accounts and money market funds.

The global financial market storm in 2008 and 2009 has forced investors of public money to reappraise the question of risk versus yield. Income from investments is a key support in the Council's budget.

The UK Bank Rate has been maintained at 0.5% since March 2009. Short-term money market rates are likely to remain at very low levels which will have a significant impact on investment income. The Council's strategy must

however be geared towards this development whilst adhering to the principal objective of security of invested monies.

The Council will undertake the most appropriate form of investments in keeping with the investment objectives, income and risk management requirements and Prudential Indicators.

### **13. External Cash Fund Management**

The Council no longer has an external fund manager.

### **14. Balanced Budget Requirement**

The Council complies with the provisions of S32 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 to set a balanced budget.

### **15. End of Year Report**

Activities during the year will be submitted to Corporate Governance Group in the form of an Annual Treasury Management Activities report.

### Economic Background

- The recovery in growth is likely to be weak and uncertain.
- The initial reaction to the CSR is positive, but implementation risks remain.
- The path of base rates reflects the fragility of the recovery and the significantly greater fiscal tightening of the emergency budget. With growth and underlying inflation likely to remain subdued, the Bank of England will stick to its lower for longer stance on policy rates.
- Uncertainty surrounding Eurozone sovereign debt and the risk of contagion will remain a driver of global credit market sentiment.

#### Underlying assumptions:

- Financial market stress is expected to remain a feature of 2012. Rates within interbank markets (where banks fund the majority of their day to day operations) have continued to climb. This dynamic was a characteristic of the 2008 banking crisis and whilst the authorities have flooded the markets with liquidity, it is still a strong indicator of market risk.
- Inflation has moderated back to 4.8% in November. CPI is expected to drop gradually back towards the 2% target as the January 2011 VAT increase, the surge in oil prices and the large energy price hikes fall out of the twelve month comparison.
- Recent data and surveys suggest that since the summer the UK economy has lost the admittedly fragile momentum. Business and consumer surveys point to continued weakness in coming months. Public spending cuts, austerity measures, credit constraints, low business and consumer confidence could result in the economy stalling (Q3 excepted, when the 2012 Olympics will provide a temporary boost) and most likely pressure the Bank of England to provide further QE.
- Faltering global growth will not be helped by the considerable uncertainty and expansion of risks presented by the crisis in the Eurozone and gridlock in the US going into an election year. The knock-on effects could in turn weigh on growth in China and emerging market countries.
- Gilt supply is expected to be higher in 2012-13 than earlier forecast by the Treasury. However, over the short-term, gilts will retain their safe-haven status as euro area contagion risks grow.
- Sizeable European bond redemptions and refinancing (Italy in particular) in the first half of 2012 remain significant challenges. Headwinds to fiscal convergence and treaty changes could intensify downgrade pressures on the AAA core nations as well as peripheral countries. The effectiveness of the European Financial Stability Fund (EFSF) may prove limited, increasing the possibility of a sovereign failure or the break-up of the euro area.

## GLOSSARY OF TERMS

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Actively managed funds                 | Funds in which the aim is to outperform a benchmark by asset allocation, market timing or stock selection (or a combination of these) rather than passively following the benchmark   |
| Asset backed security (ABS)            | A type of bond which is for which the collateral is made up of assets (such as automobile loans, credit card receivables, home equity loans, student loans, etc. ABS enables institutions such as finance companies or corporations to raise capital by borrowing against these assets.                               |
| Bank Rate                              | The official interest rate set by the Bank of England's Monetary Policy Committee and what is generally termed at the "base rate". Until recently this rate was also referred to as the 'repo rate'.  |
| Bid-offer spread                       | The difference between the selling price and the buying price of an asset or commodity  |
| Bond                                   | A certificate of debt issued by a company, government, or other institution. The bond holder receives interest at a rate stated at the time of issue of the bond. The price of a bond may vary during its life.   |
| Capital growth                         | Increase in the value of the asset (in the context of a collective investment scheme, it will be the increase in the unit price of the fund)  |
| Credit Ratings                         | Formal assessments by registered agencies of a counterparty's future ability to meet its liabilities  |
| Collective Investment Schemes          | Funds in which several investors collectively hold units. The assets in the fund are not held directly by each investor, but as part of a pool (hence these funds are also referred to as 'Pooled Funds'). Unit Trusts and Open-Ended Investment Companies are types of collective investment schemes / pooled funds. |
| Corporate Bonds                        | Corporate bonds are bonds issued by companies. The term is often used to cover all bonds other than those issued by governments in their own currencies and includes issues by companies, supranational organisations and government agencies.  |
| Corporate Bond Funds                   | Collective Investment Schemes investing predominantly in bonds issued by companies and supranational organisations.   |
| CPI                                    | Consumer Price Index. (This measure is used as the Bank of England's inflation target.)   |
| Discretionary fund management          | Fund management where the investment manager is given total authority to manage the assets as the fund manager sees fit within pre-agreed guidelines and limits.  |
| Diversification / diversified exposure | The spreading of investments among different types of assets or between markets in order to reduce risk.  |
| ECB                                    | European Central Bank   |
| Federal Reserve                        | The US central bank. (Often referred to as "the Fed")   |
| Floating Rate Notes                    | A bond issued by a company where the interest rate paid on the bond changes at set intervals (generally every 3 months). The rate of interest is linked to LIBOR and may therefore increase or decrease at each rate setting  |



|                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Income distribution         | The payment made to investors from the income generated by a fund; such a payment can also be referred to as a 'dividend'  |
| Investment Grade Securities | Securities where the probability of default is considered to be low. Investments with long-term ratings between AAA and BBB are considered investment grade.   |
| Maturity                    | The date when an investment is repaid or the period covered by a fixed term investment   |
| Money Market Funds          | MMFs invest in a range of short term assets with the highest level of credit worthiness and provide low risk with high liquidity. Specifically approved for LA use by SI 2002 no. 451.   |
| Non-Specified Investments   | Any investment for periods greater than one year. Investment with bodies that do not have a high credit rating, use of which must be justified.  |
| Pooled funds                | See <i>Collective Investment Schemes</i> (above)   |
| Property Funds              | Collective Investment Schemes whose assets predominantly comprise commercial and industrial property and shares in companies which own or operate real estate.   |
| Quantitative Easing         | In March 2009, the Monetary Policy Committee announced that, in addition to setting Bank Rate at 0.5%, it would start to inject money directly into the economy in order to meet the inflation target. The instrument of monetary policy shifted towards the quantity of money provided rather than its price (Bank Rate). But the objective of policy is unchanged – to meet the inflation target of 2 per cent on the CPI measure of consumer prices. Influencing the quantity of money directly is essentially a different means of reaching the same end |
| Short Term Credit Rating    | Indicates capacity for timely payment of financial commitments. This rating has a time horizon of less than 12 months. The range of ratings for investment grade institutions is F1+ (highest) to F3 (lowest), all other ratings being of a speculative grade.   |
| Specified Investments       | Investments that offer high security and high liquidity, in sterling and for no more than 1 year. UK Government, local authorities and bodies that have a high credit rating.  |
| Supranational Bonds         | Instruments issued by organisations created by governments through international treaties. Either carries an AAA rating in their own right or guaranteed by the parent government.   |
| Temporary Borrowing         | Borrowing to cover peaks and troughs of cash flow, not to fund spending.   |
| Term Deposits               | Deposits of cash with terms attached relating to maturity and rate of return (interest)  |

## REPORT OF THE HEAD OF CORPORATE SERVICES

### Summary

Section 38 of the Localism Act 2011 requires local authorities to publish a Pay Policy Statement by 31 March each year. This report sets out the Council's Pay Policy Statement 2012/13 as recommended by Cabinet to Council for approval.

### Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that Council approve the Pay Policy Statement 2012/13.

### Background

1. The Localism Act 2011 received royal assent on 15 November 2011. Section 38 of the Act placed a new requirement on local authorities to publish a Pay Policy Statement by 31 March each year. The Statement must set out the Council's policies relating to the:
  - a) remuneration of its Senior Officers,
  - b) remuneration of its lowest paid employees, and
  - c) the relationship between the remuneration of its Senior Officers and the remuneration of its employees who are not Senior Officers.
2. Senior Officers have been defined as the posts of Chief Executive, Deputy Chief Executives and the seven Heads of Service for the purposes of the Pay Policy Statement.
3. At its meeting on 14 February 2012 Cabinet considered a report setting out a proposed Pay Policy Statement and recommended it to Council for approval. Attached as **Appendix A** is the proposed Pay Policy Statement which sets out the Council's policies in relation to the pay of its workforce, particularly its Senior Officers. It does not supersede the responsibilities and duties placed on the Council in its role as an employer and under employment law. These responsibilities and duties have been considered when formulating the Statement.
4. This Statement aims to ensure the Council's approach to pay attracts and retains a high performing workforce whilst ensuring value for money. It sits alongside the information on pay that the Council already publishes as part of its responsibilities under the Code of Practice for Local Authorities on Data Transparency.

5. The Statement has been put together taking into account the relevant sections within Chapter 8 'Pay Accountability' of the Localism Act 2011. In its development consideration has also been given to the draft guidance produced by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) entitled 'Openness and Accountability in local pay – draft guidance under section 40 of the Localism Act'. Additionally consideration has been given to the Code of Recommended Practice for Local Authorities on Data Transparency published by the DCLG in September 2011.
6. As this is the first time local authorities have been required to produce a Pay Policy Statement and a relatively short time scale was given for its completion, it is anticipated that DCLG may provide further guidance on its scope and content in the future. If, and when, such guidance becomes available then it may be necessary to review the Statement accordingly to reflect any new requirements.
7. The Council is required to approve the Statement before 31 March each year and as soon as possible publish it on its website demonstrating an open and transparent approach to pay policy. The Statement may be amended by resolution of full Council during the year to which it relates.

#### **Financial Comments**

There are no direct financial implications arising from this report as the Pay Policy Statement sets out the Council's policies relating to remuneration. It does not serve to set or agree specific rates or numerical amounts.

#### **Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act**

There are no direct implications arising from this report.

#### **Diversity**

This Pay Policy Statement aims to ensure the Council presents an open and transparent approach to pay which attracts and retains a high performing and diverse workforce whilst ensuring value for money.

#### **Background Papers Available for Inspection:**

Openness and Accountability in local pay – draft guidance under section 40 of the Localism Act - Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG)

Code of Recommended Practice for Local Authorities on Data Transparency by the DCLG - September 2011 (DCLG)

Localism Act 2011 – Chapter 8 'Pay Accountability'

**Rushcliffe Borough Council**

**Pay Policy Statement 2012 / 13**

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1 This Statement sets out the Council's policies in relation to the pay of its workforce, particularly its Senior Officers, in line with Section 38 of the Localism Act 2011. The Statement is approved by full Council each year and published on the Council's website demonstrating an open and transparent approach to pay policy.
- 1.2 This Statement draws together the Council's policies relating to the payment of the workforce particularly:
- Senior Officers
  - its lowest paid employees; and
  - the relationship between the pay of Senior Officers and the pay of other employees
- 1.3 For the purposes of this statement 'pay' includes basic salary, pension and all other allowances arising from employment.

**2. Objectives of this Statement**

- 2.1 This Statement sets out the Council's key policy principles in relation to pay evidencing a transparent and open process. It does not supersede the responsibilities and duties placed on the Council in its role as an employer and under employment law. These responsibilities and duties have been considered when formulating the Statement.
- 2.2 This Statement aims to ensure the Council's approach to pay attracts and retains a high performing workforce whilst ensuring value for money. It sits alongside the information on pay that the Council already publishes as part of its responsibilities under the Code of Practice for Local Authorities on Data Transparency. Further details of this information can be found on the Council's website at the following address:

<http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/councilanddemocracy/aboutthecouncil/seniorofficers/roleandremuneration/>

**3. Senior Officers**

- 3.1 For the purposes of this Statement Senior Officers are defined as those posts with a salary above £58,200 which is the current Senior Civil Service minimum pay band. This definition is in line with the Code of Recommended Practice for Local Authorities on Data Transparency published in September 2011. Senior Officers within Rushcliffe currently consists of 10 posts out of a current establishment of 379. The posts are as follows:-

Chief Executive

Deputy Chief Executive (Section 151 officer)

Deputy Chief Executive

Head of Corporate Services (Monitoring Officer)

Head of Community Shaping

Head of Environment and Waste Management

Head of Financial Services

Head of Partnerships and Performance

Head of Planning and Place Shaping

Head of Revenues and ICT Services

- 3.2 The policies the Council consults in setting pay for all employees is shown at **Appendix One**. The Council will meet or reimburse authorised travel, accommodation and subsistence costs for attendance at approved business meetings and training events. The Council does not regard such costs as remuneration but as non-pay operational costs.

#### **4. Pay of the Council's Lowest Paid Employees**

- 4.1 The total number of Council employees is presently 379. The Council has defined its lowest paid employees by taking the average salary of five permanent staff (employed on a part-time basis) on the lowest pay grade the Council operates, who are not undergoing an apprenticeship. On this basis the lowest paid full-time equivalent employee of the Council earned £12,145 in 2011/12.

#### **5. Pay Relationships**

- 5.1 The Localism Act 2011 requires the Council to set out its policy relating to the relationship between the pay of its Senior Officers and the pay of the rest of its employees. This relationship is demonstrated by the Council's grading structure and the information is available from the Council's Website.
- 5.2 The Council does not explicitly set the pay of any individual or group of posts by reference to a pay multiple. The Council feels that pay multiples cannot capture the complexity of a dynamic and highly varied workforce in terms of job content, skills and experience required. In simple terms, the Council sets different levels of basic pay to reflect differences in levels of responsibility. Additionally the highest paid employee of the Council's salary does not exceed 10 times that of the lowest paid group of employees.
- 5.3 The Head of Paid Service, or his delegated representative, will give due regard to the published Pay Policy Statement before the appointment of any officers. Full Council will have the opportunity to discuss any appointment exceeding £100,000 before an offer of appointment is made, in line with the Council's Officer Employment Procedure Rules within Part 4 of the Council's Constitution.

### **Policies on other aspects of pay**

#### **Process for setting the pay of Senior Officers**

The pay of the Chief Executive is based on an agreed pay scale which is agreed by Council prior to appointment. Changes to this are determined by the Leader, Deputy Leader and Leader of the Opposition, who are advised by an agreed external professional and the Monitoring Officer. The last remuneration panel met on 27 October 2010.

The pay of all officers including Senior Officers is determined by levels of responsibility, job content and the skills and experience required. Consideration is also given to benchmarking against other similar roles, market forces and the challenges facing the authority at that time and to maximise efficiency. The pay of these posts is determined through the Chief Executive, or his nominated representative, in consultation with the Strategic Human Resources Manager and in line with the Council's pay scales and its agreed scheme of delegation.

The Council moved away from the national conditions of service in 1990 and pay scales are set locally.

As with all employees, the Council would look to appoint on the lowest point of the scale to secure the best candidate. However, there are factors that could influence the rate offered to an individual, including the relevant experience of the candidate, their current rate of pay and market forces.

All Senior Officers are expected to devote the whole of their service to the Authority and are excluded from taking up additional business, ad hoc services or additional appointments without consent.

#### **Terms and Conditions – All Employees**

All employees are governed by the local terms and conditions as set out in the Employee handbook.

#### **Local Government Pension Scheme**

All employees may join the Local Government Pension Scheme. The Scheme is a statutory scheme with contributions from employees and from employers. For more comprehensive details of the local government pension scheme see: <http://www.lgps.org.uk/>

Neither the Scheme nor the Council adopt different policies with regard to benefits for any category of employee and the same terms apply to all staff. It is not normal Council policy to enhance retirement benefits but there is flexibility contained within the policy for enhancement of benefits and the Council will consider each case on its merits.

#### **Car Lease Scheme - Discontinued**

The Council operated a car lease scheme until March 2011 which provided a scaled contribution towards the annual cost of a lease car. The scheme was discontinued as part of a review of management costs across the Authority resulting in a phased withdrawal of contributions with all contributions being withdrawn by April 2014.

### **Car Allowances**

The Council pays car allowances in accordance with the National Joint Council scales which are the same for the Senior Officers and other staff. These rates can be found on the Council's website.

The car allowances and mileage rates are reviewed in line with the publication of the nationally agreed scales.

### **Pay Increments**

Increments for all employees including Senior Officers are paid on an annual basis until the maximum of the scale is reached. The Chief Executive, or his nominated representative, has the discretion to award and remove increments of officers' pay dependant on satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance in consultation with the Strategic Human Resources Manager.

### **Relocation Allowance**

Where it is necessary for a newly appointed employee to relocate to take up an appointment, the Council may make a contribution towards relocation expenses. The same policy applies to Senior Officers and other employees. Payment will be made against a range of allowable costs for items necessarily incurred in selling and buying a property and moving into the area. The costs include estate agent's fees, legal fees, stamp duty, storage and removal costs, carpeting and curtains, short term rental etc. The Council will pay 80% of some costs and 100% of others or make a fixed sum available. If an employee leaves within three years of first employment, they may be required to reimburse a proportion of any relocation expenses.

### **Professional fees**

The Council currently meets the cost of professional fees and subscriptions for employees where it is a requirement of their employment or their contract. Only one professional fee or subscription is paid.

### **Returning Officer Payments**

In accordance with the national agreement the Chief Executive is entitled to receive and retain the personal fees arising from performing the duties of Returning Officer, Acting Returning Officer, Deputy Returning Officer or Deputy Acting Return Officer and similar positions which he or she performs subject to the payment of pension contributions thereon, where appropriate.

Fees for Returning Officer and other electoral duties are identified and paid separately for local government elections, elections to the UK Parliament and EU Parliament and other electoral processes such as referenda. As these relate to performance and delivery of specific elections duties they are distinct from the process for the determination of pay for Senior Officers.

### **Managing Organisational Change Policy**

The Managing Organisation Change Policy was agreed by Council in March 2007. The Council's policy on the payment of redundancy payments is set out in this policy. The redundancy payment is based on the length of continuous local government service which is used to determine a multiplier which is then applied to actual pay.

The policy provides discretion to enhance the redundancy and pension contribution of the individual and each case would be considered taking into account individual circumstances. Copies of the policy agreed by Council in March 2007 are available on the Council's website.

**Payments on termination**

The Council does not provide any further payment to employees leaving the Council's employment other than in respect of accrued leave which by agreement is untaken at the date of leaving or payments that are agreed or negotiated in line with current employment law practices.

**Publication of information relating to remuneration of Senior Officers**

The Pay Policy Statement will be published annually on the Council's website following its approval by full Council each year.



## REPORT OF THE HEAD OF CORPORATE SERVICES

### Summary

The Council's current Corporate Strategy 2007-2011 and the interim Corporate Strategy Refresh 2009 are both due to expire on 31 March 2012. The Corporate Strategy 2012-2016 has been drafted and is attached at **Appendix One** for consideration. The Strategy was considered by Cabinet at its meeting on 14 February 2012 and recommended to Council for approval.

### Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that Council agrees the Corporate Strategy 2012-2016 and recommends its publication.

### Details

1. The current Corporate Strategy was published in March 2007 and was refreshed in the summer of 2009 to ensure the priorities and strategic tasks contained within it were still relevant. The Strategy contained 13 strategic tasks based upon six corporate priorities for improvement. The refreshed Strategy of 2009 consolidated these tasks to reflect the significant progress made.
2. The 2007-2011 Strategy has come to a conclusion and as such a new Strategy has been developed to reflect the Council's key priorities over the next four years. The process of developing these new key priorities reflects the significant progress made against delivery of previous objectives. Work to ensure the legacy of these achievements continues is central to the way the Council delivers its services.
3. The Corporate Strategy 2012-2016 initially focused on the three key themes of our economy, our residents and our Council. At its meeting on 14 February Cabinet requested that these themes be revised in order to enable better understanding of how they aim to develop the Borough over the next four years. The revised three key themes are set out below:
  - *Supporting economic growth to ensure a prosperous and thriving local economy*
  - *Maintaining and enhancing our residents' quality of life*
  - *Transforming the Council to enable the delivery of efficient high quality services*

4. Each of these three themes encompasses three strategic tasks, the delivery of which will achieve the community outcomes stated in the Strategy. These nine strategic tasks are also supported by measures and targets to monitor progress towards our goals.
5. A draft of the Corporate Strategy was circulated to Members in late 2011 with an invitation to comment on the format, structure, style and content of the Strategy. All comments received are attached at **Appendix Two**.
6. The Corporate Strategy is monitored quarterly by the Performance Management Board. Members of the Board will scrutinise progress towards completing the nine strategic tasks and monitor performance through a basket of corporate performance indicators which include those contained within the Corporate Strategy. They have the opportunity to request further information or investigation where progress or performance does not appear to be sufficient to reach the targets set or deliver the community outcomes desired.

### **Financial Comments**

The Corporate Strategy 2012- 2016 has been developed alongside the Council's Budget setting process in order to align resources to the delivery of key priorities. Furthermore its development is set against the backdrop of the Council's Four Year Plan, which sets out its proposals to address the financial challenges facing the Council based upon business cost reduction, service redesign and income maximisation.

### **Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act**

Development and delivery of a successful Corporate Strategy is integral to the Council fulfilling its roles and duties under Section 17. The previous Strategy 2007-2011 contained a specific priority for improvement regarding reducing levels of crime and anti-social behaviour and this is reflected in the significant achievements made on the issue across the Borough. Whilst this previous priority has not been carried into the revised Strategy 2012-2016 it remains an area of strategic importance for the Council to ensure Rushcliffe remains a place where people feel safe.

### **Diversity**

Development and delivery of a Corporate Strategy which is reflective of the Council's key priorities ensures its services are delivered in a way that meets the needs and aspirations of the diverse make up of its residents.

### **Background Papers Available for Inspection:**

Rushcliffe Borough Council Corporate Strategy 2007 – 2011

Rushcliffe Borough Corporate Strategy Refresh 2009 - 2011

# Proactively Preparing for the Future

## Rushcliffe Borough Council

### Corporate Strategy – 2012-2016

#### **Welcome to Rushcliffe – Great place, Great lifestyle and Great sport**

Rushcliffe is a fantastic place to live and work. We feel very privileged to play such an important role in providing essential public services to residents of the Borough. We couldn't do this without the people who work for the Council – they are its life-source; they provide the dynamism which drives service performance and improvement and without their professionalism and commitment the Council would be unable to provide essential services to residents. There is a collective sense of responsibility between Councillors and staff to deliver 'what's right for Rushcliffe' and all decisions are made in accordance with our guiding principles – providing community leadership, delivering focused quality services which meet our customers' expectations, and recognising and promoting diversity.

We have been working hard over the last eight years to develop those services residents find most useful and those which are highly visible – we have an award winning recycling2go service, an excellent customer services centre, a very efficient council tax and benefits system getting support to those in need, excellent partnerships with sporting venues and other public service providers, attractive and desirable affordable housing, and a responsive Streetwise service focusing on keeping the Borough clean. Whilst this level of excellence is demanded by Rushcliffe residents, it all comes at a cost. We work hard to manage the money we have to continue delivering services our residents need, without increasing the Council Tax excessively. Over the last few years this has become an increasingly difficult task. We are proud of the way our staff and your Councillors have approached this task, working together to find £2m of savings in the three years to 2010. Our work in this area will continue over the next few years, making sure we make good use of technology and target our efforts where they will make the most significant differences to the lives of our residents.

Allen Graham, Chief Executive, and Neil Clarke, Leader of the Council, Rushcliffe Borough Council

#### **Key Achievements 2007-2011**

- Top for resident satisfaction [2008 Place Survey results]
  - 93% of residents satisfied with Rushcliffe as a place to live – 4th nationally
  - 66% of residents satisfied with the way the Council runs things –1st nationally
  - 52% of residents feel the Council provides value for money –1st nationally
- Awarded 'Excellent' in both Comprehensive Performance Assessment 2008 and Comprehensive Area Assessment 2009
- Achieved a number of awards and accolades for ground breaking services and consistently excellent service provision

## Proactively Preparing for the Future – Draft Corporate Strategy 2012/16

- Gross annual income of £39 million; efficiency savings in the last three years of £2.03m
- Annual staff survey shows 96% of Rushcliffe staff are happy to ‘go the extra mile’

Between 2007-2011, we focused our attention and resources on six priority areas:

1. Help to deliver a sustainable environment
2. Pursue effective partnership working to deliver improved and accessible public services within Rushcliffe and the East Midlands region
3. Reduce levels of crime and anti-social behaviour to make people feel safe
4. Increase community involvement in decision making
5. Help children and young people to achieve their potential and make a positive contribution to society
6. Deliver efficient and effective high quality services

Actions undertaken by the Council helped to deliver real change for our residents in these areas. Here are some of our successes:

In 2009, we published our Climate Change Action Plan which focuses on how the Council and its residents can help tackle climate change. One of our successful projects is being run in partnership with Warmstreets who provide subsidised loft and cavity wall insulation for all residents. People over 70 or on certain benefits may get it free. Residents can save money on fuel bills with the result being that less fossil fuels are consumed and less people will live in fuel poverty. We have adopted a new Carbon Management Plan with a target of reducing carbon emissions by 15% by 2015.

In April 2011, in partnership with the Police, we opened a brand new Community Contact Centre in the heart of our busiest shopping and residential area. The Rushcliffe Community Contact Centre, which sits within West Bridgford Police Headquarters, provides telephone, face-to-face and online support to residents across a broad range of Council and Police services. This partnership has been so successful we are now looking for ways to expand this principle and deliver customer services on behalf of other public services in the Borough. Since the Centre opened in April 2011, 15,485 customers have been served (3,476 of these enquiries were taken on behalf of the police) this compares to 8,305 customers visiting the Civic Centre over the same period last year. One happy customer said, “I was able to reclaim my lost property and get some advice on my planning application all in one visit”.

Our successful ‘weeks of action’ bring together partners to focus on issues of concern to the community. In key areas across the Borough we have asked the community what matters to them, what needs attention and what would make living in that area more pleasant. In the last few years we have held several events providing increased dog fouling clear-up and enforcement patrols, tackling graffiti and fly-tipping with help from the community, increased police patrols and crime safety advice, and more recently health advice for young people. Since 2007 the

crime rate has fallen by 43% as a result of Rushcliffe's pro-active approach to tackling crime, as part of the South Nottinghamshire Community Safety Partnership. We also set out to increase safety in borough-owned car parks with more security patrols, better lighting and the removal of hedges which obstruct clear lines of visibility. Crime in our car parks has gone down and we have won several national car park safety awards.

With partners, we have helped 18 communities to draw up a parish plan for their village. A parish plan is a holistic vision and programme of action based on consultation, research and survey followed by community action planning. Communities are given assistance to bring together likeminded people to discuss issues of concern to local residents and decide upon actions that are appropriate and relevant to that specific community – a perfect example of local people influencing decisions that directly affect their communities. In Cotgrave, we have taken this one step further and undertaken a complete master-planning exercise with the local community that has resulted in a large scale regeneration project to revitalise the community including new housing and employment on the colliery site, and a complete redevelopment of the town centre.

The Rushcliffe Play Strategy focussed over £500,000 of funding to improve children's play parks in the Borough. Seven new play facilities have been built and a further 14 existing sites have been significantly improved. These play areas provide children of all ages with somewhere safe and stimulating to play in their local area. We have also been working with partners from Nottingham Rugby to tackle childhood obesity through our joint Try-It - A Conversion for Life programme, which looks to enhance the lives of young people through sport.

Still on-going is the successful Positive Futures project in Cotgrave. This is a social inclusion project which aims to help young people engage in positive activities. During the lifespan of Positive Futures and the "Make Cotgrave Smile" community safety programme, crime in Cotgrave has reduced by over 20%. Rushcliffe has a management role in Positive Futures, which is co-ordinated by Nottinghamshire County Cricket Club.

In 2008, we introduced our Express Delivery service for benefit claims. To get vulnerable people the money they need as quickly as possible we made a pledge to make a decision on benefits cases within 24hrs of all the necessary documentation being provided by the claimant. This has helped to bring our performance for processing claims down to an average of 14 days. We have processed 238 claims through this initiative this year. Our customers are very complimentary about this service, "...low waiting time...compared to other councils, Rushcliffe is excellent".

### **Proactively Preparing for the Future**

Rushcliffe is a very prudent authority and weathered the financial storms of 2009/10 well. However, the national financial situation worsened and a radical rethink was required in 2010/11 to save the £2.8m needed over the following 4 years to make the

budgets balance again. We refocused and drew up a four year plan with three elements at the heart – income generation, income maximisation and service redesign. We have made great progress during 2011/12 and the continual delivery of this plan forms a major part of this Corporate Strategy.

Finances aside, we are still very focused on delivering services to residents at a time that suits them and in a way they find acceptable. Our service delivery is based around customer need rather than council convenience. Putting customers first and new legislation in the form of the Localism Act 2011 present us with both opportunities and challenges. Rushcliffe is eager to capitalise on its new responsibilities, especially where this puts residents at the centre of service design and delivery.

This document presents our Strategy for the next four years. It is the Council's fifth Corporate Strategy and in many ways will be the most difficult to deliver. We will be focusing on three key themes over the next four years. These are:

- *Supporting economic growth to ensure a prosperous and thriving local economy*
- *Maintaining and enhancing our residents' quality of life*
- *Transforming the Council to enable the delivery of efficient high quality services*

We have identified nine strategic tasks under these three key themes, the delivery of which will help the Council towards its long-term goals set out in the 2020 Vision for the Borough (the 2020 Vision can be viewed at – <http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/>). The Action Plan on the following page details these tasks, their desired outcomes and how we are going to measure progress toward achieving them.

### **Review and Monitoring**

The Corporate Strategy is reviewed by the Council's Performance Management Board on a quarterly basis. Progress towards achieving the objectives and targets set out under the strategic tasks is reported and monitoring of strategic performance indicators takes place. This enables Councillors to see where the Council is performing well and where further attention is needed if the Council is to reach its stated goals. In line with the Localism Act 2011 the Council will also be experimenting with communicating progress against the Corporate Strategy directly to residents to enable them to hold the Council to account.

| Supporting economic growth to ensure a prosperous and thriving local economy       |   |   |  |
|--|---|---|--|
| Strategic Tasks  | Adopt the Rushcliffe Local Plan   | Support the regeneration of Cotgrave including new housing, employment opportunities and a vibrant town centre  | Undertake an economic assessment of the Borough's potential for business growth  |
| Community Outcomes   | Appropriate housing and supporting infrastructure is built following the adoption of the Rushcliffe Local Plan  | Quality of life for residents in Cotgrave is improved through increased local employment opportunities, an enhanced local environment and excellent local shopping and social facilities  | The Borough is a more prosperous area with improved employment opportunities and thriving local businesses   |
|  | Head of Community Shaping   | Head of Partnerships and Performance  | Head of Community Shaping  |
|  | December 2011 – March 2013  | January 2008 – March 2020   | April 2012 – March 2016  |
| Measures and Targets   | Rushcliffe Local Plan adopted by March 2013 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission of Draft Core Strategy by July 2012</li> <li>Inspector's report received January 2013</li> </ul>                                  | Cotgrave Master Plan delivered by 2020 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appoint a developer partner for the project by December 2012</li> <li>Undertake public consultation on town centre regeneration proposals in June 2013</li> <li>Planning application submitted for the town centre regeneration scheme by April 2014</li> </ul>   | Economic assessment of the Borough's potential for business growth completed by 2013 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase in rateable value</li> <li>Percentage of RBC-owned business units occupied</li> <li>Percentage of privately-owned business units occupied</li> </ul>  |
| Maintaining and enhancing our residents' quality of life                           |   |   |  |
| Strategic Tasks  | Implement Welfare Reform, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>developing a local Council Tax Support scheme</li> <li>transferring housing benefit customers to the national Universal Credit system</li> </ul>    | Activate the Leisure Strategy to best provide leisure facilities and activities as the conditions prescribed in the Strategy arise  | Facilitate activities for Children and Young People to enable them to reach their potential  |
| Community Outcomes   | Vulnerable residents feel supported and are able to access advice and financial assistance which is administered transparently and fairly to those in need  | Rushcliffe residents continue to be able to access a wide range of leisure facilities and activities helping them to maintain healthy and active lifestyles   | Young people living in the Borough are healthy, active, confident and engaged in the communities they live in  |
|  | Head of Revenues and ICT  | Head of Partnerships and Performance  | Head of Community Shaping  |
|  | April 2012 – March 2017   | April 2012 – March 2016   | April 2012 – March 2016  |
| Measures and Targets   | Local Council Tax Support scheme adopted by January 2013 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of council tax support customers satisfied with the service received</li> </ul>                                      | Percentage of users satisfied with sports and leisure centres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of residents who regularly participate in sport and active recreation</li> </ul>  | Rushcliffe Children and Young People Plan delivered by March 2013 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of Rushcliffe Young Ambassadors Group by May 2012</li> <li>Delivery of Rushcliffe Young Ambassadors Group project plan by September 2013</li> <li>Percentage of young people satisfied with the Borough as a place to live</li> <li>Percentage of young people actively participating in sports or organised social activities outside of school</li> </ul> |
| Transforming the Council to enable the delivery of efficient high quality services |   |   |  |
| Strategic Tasks  | Deliver the Council's Four Year Plan to reduce costs, generate income and adopt more effective delivery models  | Develop the use of technology to improve customer access and reduce costs by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introducing self-serve options on the website</li> <li>Making better use of social media</li> <li>Working in partnership to share staff, applications and best practice</li> <li>Supporting the implementation of rural broadband across the Borough</li> <li>Continuing the development of remote access points for customer services across the Borough</li> </ul> | Examine the future viability of all Council owned property to maximise the potential of the Council's property portfolio   |
| Community Outcomes   | Residents of the Borough continue to receive the council services they require. The Council provides these services in a variety of different ways keeping Council Tax as low as possible                                       | Residents are able to readily access Council services and information using a method that suits them  | Property owned by the Council is utilised to its full potential or used to generate income for the Council enabling it to keep Council Tax as low as possible  |
|  | Head of Partnerships and Performance  | Head of Revenues and ICT  | Head of Revenues and ICT   |
|  | April 2012 – March 2015   | April 2012 – March 2016   | April 2012 – March 2016  |
| Measures and Targets   | Four Year Plan delivered by March 2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of residents satisfied with the services the Council provides</li> <li>Value of savings achieved through the Four Year Plan</li> </ul> | Percentage of transactions done through self-serve <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of residents satisfied with the variety of ways they can contact the Council</li> <li>Percentage of households with access to at least 2mbps broadband in the home</li> </ul>  | Assessment of key property assets within the portfolio undertaken by 2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Future use of The Hall and Park Lodge, West Bridgford considered by March 2013</li> <li>Level of income generated through letting property owned by but not occupied by the Council</li> </ul>  |

## Comments from Councillors in response to the draft Corporate Strategy consultation

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| Councillor One:   | <p>Comments about what was missing from the Corporate Strategy, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• planning applications and planning enforcement</li> <li>• the Country Park and Local Nature Reserves / woodland</li> <li>• development of more low cost / affordable / housing</li> <li>• provisions of good available sports fields</li> <li>• reduction in carbon emissions.</li> </ul>  |
| Councillor Two:   | <p>Questioned the focus of the tasks, for example using technology to improve customer access would appear to be decommitting from the hub and spoke model.</p>  |
| Councillor Three: | <p>Please consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• including words of support for rural businesses and rural diversification, particularly where this is of benefit to a village community under the economic growth task</li> <li>• changing planning rules to give special consideration to schemes that would benefit the local community – for example a village shop within a larger development for a community where there are no local shopping facilities</li> <li>• including support for rural broadband under the use of technology to improve customer access task</li> </ul> |
| Councillor Four:  | <p>Comments about affordable housing which this Councillor felt was noticeable in the Corporate Strategy by its absence. This Councillor also wanted the Council to consider the inclusion of tasks relating to setting up additional town and parish councils within the Borough and a review of scrutiny.</p>  |
| Councillor Five:  | <p>Question regarding one of the proposed measures which has since been removed from the indicator set.</p>  |
| Councillor Six:   | <p>A few suggested changes to the text of the Corporate Strategy; a comment about a proposed indicator which has since been removed; and identification of items this councillor expected to see in the Corporate Strategy including future housing development (especially Sharp Hill and East Leake) and the extension to the Gypsum Mine.</p>   |