

# The Council Meeting

Council Chamber, Town Hall  
17 February 2010 at 6.00pm

# Information for Members of the Public

## Access to information and meetings

You have the right to attend all meetings of the Council, its Committees and Cabinet. You also have the right to see the agenda, which is usually published 5 working days before the meeting, and minutes once they are published. Dates of the meetings are available at [www.colchester.gov.uk](http://www.colchester.gov.uk) or from Democratic Services.

## Have Your Say!

The Council values contributions from members of the public. Under the Council's Have Your Say! policy you can ask questions or express a view to meetings, with the exception of Standards Committee meetings. If you wish to speak at a meeting or wish to find out more, please pick up the leaflet called "Have Your Say" at Council offices and at [www.colchester.gov.uk](http://www.colchester.gov.uk)

## Private Sessions

Occasionally meetings will need to discuss issues in private. This can only happen on a limited range of issues, which are set by law. When a committee does so, you will be asked to leave the meeting.

## Mobile phones, pagers, cameras, audio recorders

Please ensure that all mobile phones and pagers are turned off before the meeting begins and note that photography or audio recording is not permitted.

## Access

There is wheelchair access to the Town Hall from St Runwald Street. There is an induction loop in all the meeting rooms. If you need help with reading or understanding this document please take it to Angel Court Council offices, High Street, Colchester or telephone (01206) 282222 or textphone 18001 followed by the full number that you wish to call and we will try to provide a reading service, translation or other formats you may need.

## Facilities

Toilets with lift access, if required, are located on each floor of the Town Hall. A vending machine selling hot and cold drinks is located on the first floor and ground floor.

## Evacuation Procedures

Evacuate the building using the nearest available exit. Make your way to the assembly area in the car park in St Runwald Street behind the Town Hall. Do not re-enter the building until the Town Hall staff advise you that it is safe to do so.

Colchester Borough Council, Angel Court, High Street, Colchester  
telephone (01206) 282222 or textphone 18001 followed by the full number you wish  
to call

e-mail: [democratic.services@colchester.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@colchester.gov.uk)

[www.colchester.gov.uk](http://www.colchester.gov.uk)

# COLCHESTER BOROUGH COUNCIL

**TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL**

19 February 2010

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of the Council to be held at the Council Chamber, Town Hall on **17 February 2010 at 6:00pm** for the transaction of the business stated below.



**Chief Executive**

## AGENDA

### **Pages**

#### **1. Welcome and Announcements**

(a) The Mayor to welcome members of the public and Councillors and to invite the Chaplain to address the meeting. The Mayor to remind all speakers of the requirement for microphones to be used at all times.

(b) At the Mayor's discretion, to announce information on:

- action in the event of an emergency;
- mobile phones switched to off or to silent;
- location of toilets;
- introduction of members of the meeting.

#### **2. Have Your Say!**

(a) The Mayor to ask members of the public to indicate if they wish to ask a question, make a statement or present a petition on any matter relating to the business of the Council – either on an item on the agenda for this meeting or on a general matter not on this agenda (Council Procedure Rule 6(2)).

(b) The Mayor to invite contributions from members of the public who wish to address the Council on a general matter not on this agenda.

(Note: A period of up to 15 minutes is available for general statements and questions under 'Have Your Say!').

**3. Minutes** **1 - 11**

Motion that the Minutes of the meeting held on 10 December 2009 be confirmed as a correct record.

**4. Mayor's Announcements**

Mayor's Announcements (if any) and matters arising pursuant to Council Procedure Rule 8(3).

**5. Personal Interests of Members**

Disclosures by Members under Council Procedure Rule 9(3) to 9(9) (if any).

**6. Prejudicial Interests of Members**

Disclosures by Members under Council Procedure Rules 9(10) and 9(11) (if any).

(Note: Members should only declare personal and/or prejudicial interests on items that are to be considered at the meeting).

**7. Items (if any) referred under the Call-in Procedure**

To consider any items referred by the Strategic Overview and Scrutiny Panel or the Finance and Audit Scrutiny Panel under the Call-In Procedure because they are considered to be contrary to the policy framework of the Council or contrary to, or not wholly in accordance with the budget.

**8. Appointment of Cabinet Member and Consequential Amendments to the Membership of Panels** **12 - 13**

B... Motion that the recommendations contained in the Head of Corporate Management's report be approved

**9. Recommendations of the Cabinet, Panels and Committees**

i. 2010/2011 Revenue Budget and Medium Term Financial Forecast **14 - 27**

C... Motion that the recommendations contained in minute 58 of the Cabinet meeting of 27 January 2010 and the recommendations contained in the Head of Resource Management's report entitled Precept and Council Tax Levels 2010/2011 be approved and adopted.

- ii. Single Equality Scheme **28**
- D... Motion that the recommendation contained in minute 60 of the Cabinet meeting of 27 January 2010 be approved and adopted.
- iii. Councillor Development **29 - 30**
- E... Motion that the recommendations contained in minute 63 of the Cabinet meeting of 27 January 2010 be approved and adopted.
- iv. Colchester Borough Council Safeguarding Children Policy and Procedures **31 - 32**
- F... Motion that the recommendatins contained in minute 64 of the Cabinet meeting of 27 January 2010 be approved and adopted.

#### **10. Questions to Cabinet Members and Chairmen pursuant to Council Procedure Rule 10**

To receive and answer pre-notified questions in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 10(1) followed by any oral questions (ie not submitted in advance) in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 10 (3).

(Note: A period of up to 90 minutes is available for pre-notified questions and oral questions by Members of the Council to Cabinet Members and Chairmen (or in their absence, Deputy Chairmen)).

##### **Questioner: Councillor Bouckley**

To the Portfolio Holder for Communication, Customers and Leisure

After praising the facilities at Charter Hall to residents after attending the formal opening, I have frequently been told it is too expensive to hire and organisations are forced to go elsewhere. On reading page 77 of the current Summons the position appears to be exactly the same, so may I ask if a solution has ever been sought by examining the problem in depth?

##### **Questioner: Councillor Chillingworth**

To the Portfolio Holder for Communication, Customers and Leisure

At the December Council Meeting I raised the question of the apparent failure to distribute the November issue of the Courier to

most residents in my Ward. Subsequently, I have had further complaints from members of my five Parish Councils, particularly with regard to their participation in the Waste and Recycling survey, which I had highlighted at their November meetings.

What assurances can he give my residences that there will be 100% delivery to all households for the March issue?

#### **11. Notices of Motion pursuant to Council Procedure Rule 11**

None received

#### **12. Schedules of Decisions taken by Portfolio Holders**

**33 - 42**

To note schedules covering the period 28 November 2009 - 5 February 2010

#### **13. Reports Referred to in Recommendations**

**43 - 105**

The reports specified below are submitted for information and are referred to in the recommendations specified in item 9 on the agenda:

Report to Cabinet 27 January 2010: 20102/011 Revenue Budget and Medium Term Financial Forecast

Report to Cabinet 27 January 2010: Single Equality Scheme

Report to Cabinet 27 January 2010: Councillor Development

Report to Cabinet 27 January 2010: Colchester Borough Council Safeguarding Children Policy and Procedures

#### **14. Urgent items**

To consider any business not specified in this summons which by reason of special circumstances the Mayor determines should be considered at the meeting as a matter of urgency.

#### **15. Exclusion of the Public**

In accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to exclude the public, including the press, from the meeting so that any items containing exempt information (for example confidential personal, financial or legal advice), in Part B of this agenda (printed on yellow paper) can be decided. (Exempt

information is defined in Section 100I and Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972).





# COUNCIL

## 10 DECEMBER 2009

*Present :-* Councillor Henry Spyvee (Mayor)  
Councillor Sonia Lewis (Deputy Mayor)  
Councillors Christopher Arnold, Nick Barlow,  
Lyn Barton, Kevin Bentley, Mary Blandon,  
Elizabeth Blundell, John Bouckley, Nigel Chapman,  
Peter Chillingworth, Helen Chuah, Barrie Cook,  
Nick Cope, Mark Cory, Robert Davidson,  
Beverly Davies, Tina Dopson, John Elliott,  
Andrew Ellis, Margaret Fairley-Crowe,  
Margaret Fisher, Stephen Ford, Wyn Foster,  
Ray Gamble, Christopher Garnett, Martin Goss,  
Chris Hall, Mike Hardy, Dave Harris,  
Pauline Hazell, Peter Higgins, Theresa Higgins,  
Mike Hogg, Martin Hunt, John Jowers,  
Margaret Kimberley, Justin Knight, Michael Lilley,  
Sue Lissimore, Jackie Maclean, Jon Manning,  
Richard Martin, Kim Naish, Nigel Offen,  
Beverley Oxford, Gerard Oxford, Philip Oxford,  
Gaye Pyman, Ann Quarrie, Lesley Scott-Boutell,  
Paul Smith, Terry Sutton, Laura Sykes,  
Nick Taylor, Jill Tod, Anne Turrell, Dennis Willetts  
and Tim Young

The meeting was opened with prayers by the Mayor's Chaplain, The Reverend David Harper.

### **31. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting on 14 October 2009 were confirmed as a correct record subject to the record of Councillor Hogg's comments in Appendix A being amended so that the reference to St John's ward was replaced with St Anne's ward.

### **32. Have Your Say!**

Norman Bailey addressed the Council pursuant to the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 6(2) to express his concern about the felling of trees in Crouch Street. The loss of trees was of particular concern given the issues of deforestation and its role in climate change. Whilst the work had been undertaken by Essex County Council, Colchester Borough Council had not

sought to prevent the removal of the trees despite the Council's tree officer being advised in advance that the trees would be removed. The Borough Council's tree officer had been aware that the report on which the decision to remove the trees was taken did not highlight any problem serious enough to warrant removal. The Planning Services Manager had put a system in place to ensure that councillors would be notified if a similar situation were to arise in the future. However, the borough councillors for Castle ward attended a meeting in September at which the reasons for the removal of the trees and plans for their replacement were agreed. Why had these plans been agreed to when the removal of the trees was unnecessary and why was the Leader of the Council not informed?

Councillor Turrell, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, responded that she shared Mr Bailey's anger about the loss of the trees and would respond fully once she had completed her enquiries into this matter.

Roy Ward addressed the Council pursuant to the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 6(2) to express his concern that the sloping stairway had been removed from the pool at Leisure World. This had been well used, particularly by the elderly, and had been in place for twenty five years. The Council should demonstrate some compassionate understanding and reinstate the stairway. He understood that the stairway had been removed for spurious health and safety reasons and because it was alleged the stairway was damaging the tiles. There had been no consultation on the decision to remove the stairway and it should be restored or replaced with something similar in the interests of the elderly who deserved to be treated with more respect.

Councillor Hunt, Portfolio for Communication, Customers and Leisure responded. The stairway had been removed because the Council had been advised by its Health and Safety Manager that it was potentially dangerous to customers and staff. In the circumstances, there would be no point consulting on the removal as the Council had no choice but to comply with the advice of its Health and Safety Manager. The difficulty this caused some customers was appreciated. The Council hoped to purchase an alternative solution shortly.

### **33. Mayor's Announcements**

The Mayor announced that Castle Park had been awarded the prestigious accolade of the best park in the UK 2009, in Britain's Best Park competition and the Castle Park cricket ground had come out top in the PDQ North Essex cricket league pitch ratings. The Mayor also drew attention to the new exhibition at the Castle museum entitled "The Medieval Mind".

The Mayor thanked Councillors for the excellent attendance at Remembrance Day service. Details of forthcoming events had been circulated and the Mayor drew particular attention to the forthcoming "Just a Minute" event on 12 December 2009.

#### **34. Items (if any) referred under the Call-in Procedure**

**Councillor Theresa Higgins (in respect of her membership of Essex County Council and the East of England Regional Assembly) declared a personal interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(3)**

**Councillor John Jowers (in respect of his membership of Essex County Council and the East of England Planning Panel) declared a personal interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(3)**

**Councillor Tim Young (in respect of his spouse being a member of Essex County Council) declared a personal interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(3)**

**Councillor Lyn Barton, Councillor Kevin Bentley and Councillor Anne Turrell (in respect of membership of Essex County Council) declared a personal interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(3)**

#### **35. East of England Plan Review to 2031 Consultation - Colchester Borough Council Response**

*RESOLVED* that the recommendation contained in minute 16 of the Local Development Framework Committee meeting of 12 November 2009 be approved and adopted.

A named vote having been requested pursuant to the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 15(2), the voting was as follows:-

Those who voted FOR were:-

Councillors Arnold, Barlow, Barton, Bentley, Blandon, Blundell, Bouckley, Chapman, Chillingworth, Chuah, Cook, Cope, Davidson, Davies, Dopson, Elliott, Ellis, Farley-Crowe, Fisher, Ford, Foster, Gamble, Garnett, Hall, Hardy, Harris, Hazell, P. Higgins, T. Higgins, Hogg, Hunt, Jowers, Kimberley, Knight,

Lilley, Lissimore, Maclean, Martin, Naish, Offen, B. Oxford, G. Oxford, P. Oxford, Pyman, Quarrie, Smith, Sutton, Tod, Willetts and T. Young.

No Councillors voted AGAINST

Those who ABSTAINED from VOTING were:-

Councillors Cory, Goss, Manning, Scott-Boutell, Sykes, Taylor, Turrell, the Deputy Mayor (Councillor Lewis) and the Mayor (Councillor Spyvee).

### **36. Approval of Statement of Gambling Policy**

*RESOLVED* that the recommendation contained in minute 17 of the Licensing Committee meeting of 25 November 2009 be approved and adopted (MAJORITY voted in favour).

### **37. Revised Anti-Fraud and Corruption Policy**

*RESOLVED* that the recommendation contained in minute 17 of the Standards Committee meeting of 27 November 2009 be approved and adopted (MAJORITY voted in favour).

**Councillor Theresa Higgins (in respect of her membership of Essex County Council and the East of England Regional Assembly) declared a personal interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(3)**

**Councillor John Jowers (in respect of his membership of Essex County Council and the East of England Planning Panel) declared a personal interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(3)**

**Councillor Tim Young (in respect of his spouse being a member of Essex County Council) declared a personal interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(3)**

**Councillor Lyn Barton, Councillor Kevin Bentley and Councillor Anne Turrell (in respect of membership of Essex County Council) declared a personal interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(3)**

**Councillor Chris Hall (in respect of his spouse's membership of the Board of the Mercury Theatre) declared a personal interest in the following item which is also a prejudicial interest pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(10) and left the meeting during its consideration and determination.**

### **38. 2010/2011 Revenue Budget, Financial Reserves and Capital Programme**

*RESOLVED* that the recommendation contained in minute 45 of the Cabinet meeting of 2 December 2009 be approved and adopted (MAJORITY voted in favour).

### **39. Appointment of Deputy Mayor 2010/2011**

It was PROPOSED by Councillor Turrell and supported by Councillors Bentley, T. Young and G. Oxford that Councillor Helen Chuah be appointed as Deputy Mayor for the Borough of Colchester for the municipal year 2010-11.

*RESOLVED* that Councillor Helen Chuah be appointed Deputy Mayor for the 2010-2011 Municipal Year (UNANIMOUS).

### **40. City Status**

Councillor Turrell introduced a debate on city status. A report from the Monitoring Officer providing background information on city status had been circulated to councillors in advance of the meeting.

At the end of the debate a straw poll would be held on the question of whether the Council should seek city status if a further competition should be held. It was stressed that this was not a formal vote and was not binding in any way, but was a device to allow an assessment of the Council's view on the question.

In the debate the following arguments were made in favour of city status:-

- City status would reflect Colchester's status as a major influence and "big player" in the region. Colchester was a larger town than other places in the region which were already cities, such as Peterborough and Norwich. City status would be consistent with membership of Regional Cities East and would reflect Colchester's ambition to be the capital city of the Haven

Gateway Sub-Region.

- Colchester had the attributes of a city: it had a rich and important history, a garrison, university, an industrial and commercial base and a cultural and sporting tradition. It was forward thinking and ambitious. City status would simply be an acknowledgement of the reality of what Colchester was.
- City status could help Colchester compete for valuable tourist trade, particularly with other historic cities such as Chester and York. There could be benefits in promoting Colchester as Britain's oldest and newest city.
- City status might help Colchester compete for resources and funding from central government and Europe.
- The award of city status would raise Colchester's prestige and be a morale boost to Colchester.

The following arguments were made against applying for city status:

- Colchester should be proud of its existing status as an important historic town and its status as Britain's oldest recorded town. Colchester should not worry about seeking to change this status but instead concentrate on maintaining its historic character and tradition.
- There was little interest among the residents of the borough in the issue of city status.
- Applying for city status would be a waste of valuable resources, particularly in the current economic climate.
- City status was awarded to the whole borough and not just to the town of Colchester. It would not make sense for the rural communities and villages within the borough to be part of a city. This would impinge on their identity as separate settlements and there was no desire within these rural communities, and in some of the urban areas, for city status.
- The benefits of being granted city status were uncertain and had not been quantified.
- People's views of places were not changed by changes of status and therefore there was little point in devoting resources to city status.

The following relevant comments were also made in the course of the debate:-

- Officers should be asked to investigate what benefits city status had brought to other cities that had recently been awarded city status. This work should be done quickly so that a quick decision could be made if a competition for city status were to be held in the Queen's Diamond Jubilee Year.
- Once a decision was made whether or not to apply, all Councillors should respect that decision so that Council could speak with a consistent voice.

A summary of the comments made by individual councillors is at Appendix A.

An informal vote and non-binding vote was taken on whether the Council should apply for city status should a further competition be held, the result of which was ELEVEN voted FOR, and the MAJORITY voted AGAINST.

#### **41. Questions to Cabinet Members and Chairmen pursuant to Council Procedure Rule 10**

<b>Questioner</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>Oral Questions</b>		
Councillor Naish	The impact of the day of action in Berechurch on levels of crime and anti-social behaviour.	Direct oral answer provided by the Portfolio Holder for Street and Waste Services.
Councillor Chillingworth	Why were several areas of the borough not receiving their copies of the Courier, which was particularly important as the current edition contained details of the consultation on the options for future waste collection and recycling options.	Direct oral answer provided by the Portfolio Holder for Customers, Communication and Leisure.
Councillor Hardy	What measures would the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Sustainability and Environmental take to prevent the misuse of information about planning applications for political purposes	Direct oral answer provided by the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Sustainability and Environmental.
Councillor Blundell	In view of recent difficulties getting through to the Customer Service Centre, were levels of staffing in the CSC due to increase and what arrangements were in place to deal with calls to officers who were working at home.	Direct oral answer provided by the Portfolio Holder for Customers, Communication and Leisure.
Councillor Harris	What did the area assessment published on 9 December 2009 say about Colchester.	Direct oral answer given by the Portfolio Holder for Performance

Councillor Davies	Whether it was sensible to ask the company delivering the Courier to undertake the survey on where it was delivered.	and Partnerships. Direct oral answer provided by the Portfolio Holder for Customers, Communication and Leisure
Councillor Ellis	Whether the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Sustainability and Environmental investigate the misuse of a planning application for political purposes and ensure a retraction was published.	Direct oral answer provided by the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Sustainability and Environmental.
Councillor Cory	Could the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Regeneration and Sustainability explain why Colchester was awarded such a generous Housing and Planning Delivery Grant	Direct oral answer provided by the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Sustainability and Environmental.
Councillor Bentley	What work was being done to attract Olympic teams to Colchester and would the Portfolio Holder ensure a more proactive approach was taken.	Direct oral answer provided by the Portfolio Holder for Customers, Communication and Leisure.
Councillor Hunt	Which was the worst performing Council in Essex and who was it run by.	Direct oral answer given by the Portfolio Holder for Performance and Partnerships.
Councillor Cook	Would the Leader of the Council agree that it would be better if questions at Council were pre-notified.	Direct oral answer provided by the Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy.

#### **42. Schedules of Decisions taken by Portfolio Holders**

*RESOLVED* that the schedule of Portfolio Holder decisions for the period 3 October 2009 – 27 November 2009 be noted.



## 43. Appendix A

Councillor Naish expressed the view that the title of Britain's oldest recorded town was preferable to Britain's youngest city.

Councillor Bentley queried what Colchester had to gain from city status. He felt Colchester should preserve and promote its Roman heritage better and wondered whether city status would help with this.

Councillor Lissimore felt that applying for city status would be waste of Council resources. She was proud of Colchester's status as Britain's oldest recorded town.

Councillor Arnold argued that Colchester was a city in Roman times and therefore if it obtained city status, could claim to be Britain's oldest recorded city. As Colchester grew, city status might help Colchester compete with other historic cities such as York for valuable tourism trade. It also might help Colchester compete for resources from central government.

Councillor Hunt expressed the view that Colchester was the best town in Essex with a long and rich history. He could not see what benefits city status would bring.

Councillor Barlow felt there could be benefits in promoting Colchester as Britain's oldest and newest city. He would consider supporting a bid for city status if the benefit could be quantified and the expense was not too great. These issues need to be looked at now so that a quick decision could be made if a competition for city status were held in the Diamond Jubilee year.

Councillor Blundell considered that Colchester should apply for city status if the opportunity presented itself. It would be a morale booster for the town and it would be consistent with membership of Regional Cities East.

Councillor T. Higgins argued that a successful application for city status would enable Colchester to return to what it had previously been and therefore would not be fundamentally changing Colchester.

Councillor Chillingworth urged Councillors to look at the criteria for city status. Colchester was a big player in the region and city status would reflect that. Colchester was significantly bigger than other cities in the region such as Peterborough and Norwich. It was an important historic city, with a garrison, university, an industrial and commercial base and a cultural and sporting tradition. As was demonstrated by the four regeneration areas, it was forward thinking and ambitious. Colchester had grown and developed from being a market town and this needed to be accepted.

Councillor P. Higgins argued that whatever decision was reached on applying for city status, all Councillors should respect and support that decision so that the Council could speak with a consistent voice.

Councillor Jowers explained that whilst he voted for Colchester to apply for city status before, his views had shifted. He drew comparisons with Tiptree, which was proud of what it was and didn't feel the need to pursue change. Colchester had something precious and should not waste time and resources on pursuing city status unless there was a tangible benefit. It should also be borne in mind that Colchester was a borough and not just a town.

Councillor Hogg supported the views expressed by Councillor Chillingworth. He believed city status would bring great benefits to the town. It already punched above its weight. Visitors from abroad believed that Colchester was a city. In particular there may be particular benefits from the Europe of being designated a city.

Councillor Ford suggested that officers should investigate the benefits that city status had brought to other cities that had recently been awarded city status.

Councillor T. Young stated that this was not an issue that generated much interest in the ward he represented and felt this was not the right time to pursue city status. The report submitted by the Monitoring Officer did not address the issue of what benefits city status would bring to Colchester.

Councillor Chapman explained that if Colchester was granted city status, it would be granted to the whole borough, including the rural hinterland. It would not make sense for the rural communities and villages within the borough to be part of a city and there was no desire among those communities for city status.

Councillor Foster felt that the status quo should be maintained. Colchester did not need to be a city and should strive to maintain its existing character.

Councillor Cook noted that in the fifteenth century, Colchester was the tenth largest town in England. Colchester should not worry about its status but concentrate on maintaining its character and should promote its heritage.

Councillor Gamble supported an application for city status. He considered that Colchester should aim to be the capital of the Haven Gateway Sub-Region and that if Ipswich or Chelmsford were to gain status without Colchester applying, this may harm this ambition.

Councillor Offen considered the most compelling argument made was that city status was awarded to entire borough and that this would be inappropriate for

the rural areas.

Councillor Manning did not support a bid for city status on the grounds he felt that the towns and villages in the borough should be able to keep their existing identity.

The Deputy Mayor explained that residents in Lexden were seeking to develop a village identity for Lexden and this would be incompatible with city status.

Councillor Hall felt that the pendulum had swung against applying for city status. He did not consider that people changed their opinion of places just because they were awarded city status.



## Council

17 February 2010

Item  
**8(i)**

<b>Report of</b>	<b>Head of Corporate Management</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Richard Clifford</b>
<b>Title</b>	<b>Appointment of Cabinet Member and Consequential Amendments to Membership of Panels</b>		
<b>Wards affected</b>	Not Applicable		

**This report concerns the appointment of Councillor Nick Barlow to the Cabinet and proposes consequential changes to the membership of the Strategic Overview and Scrutiny Panel and Policy Review and Development Panel**

### 1. Decision(s) Required

- 1.1 To approve the appointment of Councillor Nick Barlow to the Cabinet.
- 1.2 To note the allocation of the Business and Tourism Portfolio to Councillor Barlow.
- 1.3 To approve the appointment of Councillor Manning to the Strategic Overview and Scrutiny Panel and Councillor Scott-Boutell to the Policy Review and Development Panel.

### 2. Reasons for Decision(s)

- 2.1 The approval of appointments to Cabinet and the approval of the membership of Committees and Panels are Council functions.
- 2.2 These proposals will maintain the political balance of the Cabinet and relevant Panels.

### 3. Alternative Options

- 3.1 No alternative options are proposed.

### 4. Supporting Information

- 4.1 Following the resignation of Councillor Offen from the Cabinet, the Leader of the Council has proposed the appointment of Councillor Barlow to the Cabinet.
- 4.2 The Leader of the Council has amended the Scheme of Delegation to Cabinet members as follows:
  - The former Resources and Business portfolio has been renamed Business and Tourism.
  - Responsibility for financial resources has been transferred to the former Culture and Diversity portfolio which has been renamed Resources, Diversity, Culture and the Arts.
  - Responsibility for human resources has been transferred to the Communication, Customers and Leisure portfolio.

The revised scheme of delegation to Cabinet members is attached at Appendix 1.

- 4.3 The Business and Tourism portfolio will be allocated to Councillor Barlow by the Leader of the Council, should Council appoint Councillor Barlow to the Cabinet.
- 4.4 Councillor Barlow is a member of the Strategic Overview and Scrutiny Panel and the Policy Review and Development Panel. Membership of the Cabinet is incompatible with membership of the Strategic Overview and Scrutiny Panel and the Liberal Democrat Group has indicated that Councillor Barlow's membership of these Panels will cease and that the following members be appointed to fill the resulting vacancies:

Strategic Overview and Scrutiny Panel: Councillor Manning  
Policy Review and Development Panel: Councillor Scott-Boutell

The Liberal Democrat Group has also indicated that Councillor Cory will be the Group Spokesperson on the Strategic Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

## **5. Standard References**

- 5.1 There are no particular references to the Strategic Plan; publicity or consultation considerations; or financial; equality, diversity and human rights; community safety; health and safety or risk management implications.

**Extract from the Minutes of the Cabinet meeting of 27 January 2010**

**Councillors Turrell, (in respect of her membership of Essex County Council) Barton (in respect of her membership of Essex County Council) and T. Young (in respect of his spouse's membership of Essex County Council) declared their personal interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(3).**

**58. 2010/2011 Revenue Budget and Medium Term Financial Forecast**

The Head of Resource Management submitted a report a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix A to these minutes in the Minute Book together with minute 42 of the Finance and Audit Scrutiny Panel meeting of 26 January 2010 and the notes of the NNDR Ratepayers meeting on 20 January 2010.

Nick Chilvers addressed the Cabinet pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 5(2). He noted the proposed rise in Council tax, but stressed that this needed to be seen in the context of frozen pension payments and low interest rates. Concern was expressed about the shrinking numbers of the population who paid Council tax. There were measures in the budget that he supported, such as the contracting out of the management of the market and he praised the performance of Street Services. Mr Chilvers queried why the Council had not implemented the proposed cut in funding to the major arts organisations, and he also considered that the proposed business hub at St James House would be a "white elephant". He asked whether there would be funding available for generous flower planting in the town centre.

Councillor Hunt, Portfolio Holder for Customers, Communication and Leisure responded that flowers would be planted in the town centre in the planting season, and that planting on the Albert Roundabout would be completed in April.

Mr Treloar addressed the Cabinet pursuant to the provisions of Cabinet Procedure Rule 5(2). He explained that he was the owner of a graffiti removal company. Whilst he welcomed the new policy and funding in the budget for graffiti removal, he was concerned that if the Council were to outsource this work to one company, this may lead to his company losing all its work. Businesses and the garrison should continue to be responsible for the payment for the removal of graffiti on their premises and boundaries. It was important that strategies were in place to prevent graffiti in the first place.

Councillor T. Young, Portfolio Holder for Street and Waste Services, explained that the Council had not decided on its approach for graffiti cleaning and whether it would outsource the service. It would be premature to do so before the budget was approved by Council. If the Council did outsource the service, then it would be done through a competitive tendering process which

would have to follow established procedures. However, no company had been excluded at this stage.

Councillor Bentley attended and addressed the Cabinet. He considered that the Council needed to take bold steps in relation to the budget. Visionary thinking and a different way of working was required. Concern was expressed about the reliance on reserves which were getting down to dangerous levels. The proposed rise in Council tax was not modest, as claimed in the Head of Resource Management's report, and should be reduced further. In respect of the losses from the Icelandic banks, whilst it was appreciated that the Council was following Local Government Association guidelines the Council should be doing more to ensure the return of these funds. Further service reviews were required. The Council also needed to review the budget timetable, as there was too little time between Finance and Audit Scrutiny Panel scrutinising the budget and its consideration by Cabinet. If the scrutiny revealed serious issues there was not enough time for these to be resolved before the Cabinet meeting.

Councillor Willetts attended and addressed the Cabinet in his capacity as Deputy Leader of the Conservative Group. He believed the budget was insipid, uninspiring and did not address the needs of Colchester. The ratio of growth items to cuts suggested that the administration had not reassessed the priorities and needs of Colchester and a full alternative budget would be presented to Council in February. The budget relied heavily on reserves, which were now down to a minimum. In respect of the loss from the Icelandic banks, whilst it was welcomed that part of these had now been written off, the reality was that these funds would not be repaid and the administration should budget on that basis.

In response to the speakers Councillor Smith, Portfolio Holder for Resources, Culture, Diversity and the Arts explained the budget proposed the lowest ever rise in Council tax and allowed funding to be directed towards growing the Council's services despite the challenging economic climate. The funding of the arts organisations had been restored as additional funding had been secured. This funding was about supporting jobs and the local economy, rather than high culture. The Council would continue with Fundamental Service Reviews to look for more efficient and new ways of working. In terms of the reserves, the administration had restored these to a prudent level and there had been a net increase in the reserves. The Council was following government and Audit Commission advice in respect of the Icelandic banks. If Essex County Council had contributed towards expenditure on the legal costs arising from the Visual Arts Facility, the Council tax rise could have been capped at 1.25%.

Councillor Turrell, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy and Councillor T. Young, Portfolio Holder for Street and Waste Services, expressed their support for the budget proposals, which matched the Council's strategic priorities and protected frontline services.

*RESOLVED* that:-

(a) The forecast outturn for the current financial year of an underspend of £699,000 be noted (see paragraph 3.4 of the Head of Resource Management's report).

(b) The cost pressures, growth items and savings / increased income options identified during the budget forecast process as set out at Appendices B, C and D of the Head of Resource Management's report be approved.

(c) It be agreed and *RECOMMENDED* to Council that the 2010/11 Revenue Budget requirement be set at £25,670,000 (see paragraph 7.1 of the Head of Resource Management's report) supported by the underlying detailed budgets set out in the Background Papers to the Head of Resource Management's report.

(d) Revenue Balances for the financial year 2010/11 be set at a minimum of £1,500,000 and that £671,000 of balances be applied to finance items in the 2010/11 revenue budget.

(e) The following releases be agreed (see paragraph 11.9 of the Head of Resource Management's report):-

- £1,210,000 from the Capital Expenditure Reserve in 2010/11 to meet costs including the community stadium, Icelandic Investment impairment and legal costs in respect of the VAF.
- £1,184,000 to be financed from the Renewals and Repairs Fund for specific projects.
- £70,000 from the Section 106 Monitoring Reserve.
- £166,000 from the Regeneration Reserve.

(f) It be agreed and *RECOMMENDED* to Council that £100,000 of Revenue Balances be earmarked for potential unplanned expenditure within the guidelines set out at paragraph 12.3 of the Head of Resource Management's report.

(g) It be agreed and *RECOMMENDED* to Council that Colchester's element of the Council Tax for 2010/11 be set at £175.23 for Band D properties which is an increase of £4.23 per annum (2.47%) (see paragraph 13.2 of the Head of Resource Management's report).

(h) It be noted that the formal resolution from Cabinet to Council will include the Parish, Police, Fire and County Council elements and any change arising from the formal Revenue Support Grant Settlement announcement in early February 2010. This will be prepared in consultation with the Leader of the Council.

(i) The Medium Term Financial Forecast for the financial years 2011/12 and 2012/13 be noted (see paragraph 14.13 of the Head of Resource Management's report).



(j) The changes in the capital programme to agree the capital programme releases set out at paragraph 15.6 of the Head of Resource Management's report be *RECOMMENDED* to Council

(k) The comments made on the robustness of budget estimates at paragraph 16 of the Head of Resource Management's report be noted.

(l) The Prudential Indicators, Treasury Management Strategy and Annual Investment Strategy be agreed and *RECOMMENDED* to Council (see paragraph 13.2 of the Head of Resource Management's report).

#### *REASONS*

The reasons for the decisions were set out in detail in the Head of Financial Services' report.

#### *ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS*

Various options were investigated at every stage of the budget setting process, due consideration of which was taken in order to meet the objectives of the Council's Strategic Plan.



## Council

Item  
**9(i)**

Colchester 17 February 2010

<b>Report of</b>	<b>Head of Resource Management</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Laura Skinner</b> ☎ 508769
<b>Title</b>	<b>Precept and Council Tax Levels 2010/11</b>		
<b>Wards affected</b>	Not Applicable		

**The purpose of this report is to set out the statutory resolutions the Council is required to approve in order to set the Council Tax for each band for the financial year 2010/11**

### 1. Decision Required

- 1.1 To approve the statutory resolutions as set out at Appendix 1 which are in accordance with the Local Government Finance Act 1992 in respect of the Council Tax for each band for the financial year 2010/11.

### 2. Reasons for Decision

- 2.1 The Council is required, in accordance with the Local Government Finance Act 1992, to set formally the Council Tax for each band, which will include precepting authorities.

### 3. Alternative Options

- 3.1 The resolutions are a statutory requirement.

### 4. Colchester Borough Council's Council Tax Requirement

- 4.1 Cabinet on 27 January 2010 approved and recommended to Council that the 2010/11 revenue budget requirement should be £25,670,000. The final grant settlement notification confirmed the earlier provisional figures so no adjustment is required. Cabinet also recommended Colchester Borough Council's element of the Council Tax for 2010/11 be agreed at £175.23 for Band D properties, which represents an increase of £4.23 per annum (2.47%).

- 4.2 In approving Colchester's element of the Council Tax, account has to be taken of:

- Revenue Support Grant
- National Non-Domestic Rate Grant
- Any surplus or deficit arising from the Collection Fund

Colchester's Council Tax requirement also has to reflect Parish Council spending and the following table sets out the position:

	£'000	£'000
Colchester's Budget Requirement	25,670	24,483
<b>Less:</b> Use of Balances	2,117	
	23,553	
Parish Councils' Requirement (Appendix 2)	930	
<b>Less:</b>		
Revenue Support Grant	11,274	12,911
Non-Domestic Business Rate Grant	1,637	
<b>Less:</b> Surplus on Collection Fund		49
<b>Council Tax Requirement</b>		<b>11,523</b>

4.3 Colchester's Council Tax at Band D for 2010/11 is £175.23 and is determined as follows:

Council Tax Requirement (as detailed at paragraph 4.2 above)	£11,523,265
Divided by Council Tax Base	60,451.7
Council Tax at Band D (including Parishes)	£190.62
Deduct Parish Element	£15.39
<b>Council Tax at Band D for Colchester Borough Council</b>	<b>£175.23</b>

## 5. Essex County Council, Essex Police Authority and Essex Fire Authority

5.1 In order to determine formally the overall level of Council Tax, account has to be taken of the precept requirements of Essex County Council, Essex Police Authority and Essex Fire Authority. The following table sets out the overall position based on information received at the date of writing this report. The County Council met on 9 February, the Essex Fire Authority on 10 February and Police Authority on 15 February, to approve formally their budgets and precept requirements. Any change to the information set out in this report will be reported to this meeting.

	Council Tax at Band D			
	2009/10 £	2010/11 £	% Increase	£ Increase
Colchester Borough Council	171.00	175.23	2.47	4.23
Essex County Council	1,066.50	1,086.75	1.90	20.25
Essex Police Authority	128.25	132.12	3.02	3.87
Essex Fire Authority	64.62	66.42	2.79	1.80
	<b>1,430.37</b>	<b>1,460.52</b>	<b>2.11</b>	<b>30.15</b>

5.2 The overall position (excluding Parishes) for each band is as follows:

<b>Band</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>H</b>
	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>
<b>Borough</b>	116.82	136.29	155.76	175.23	214.17	253.11	292.05	350.46
<b>County</b>	724.50	845.25	966.00	1086.75	1328.25	1569.75	1811.25	2173.50
<b>Police</b>	88.08	102.76	117.44	132.12	161.48	190.84	220.20	264.24
<b>Fire</b>	44.28	51.66	59.04	66.42	81.18	95.94	110.70	132.84
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>973.68</b>	<b>1135.96</b>	<b>1298.24</b>	<b>1460.52</b>	<b>1785.08</b>	<b>2109.64</b>	<b>2434.20</b>	<b>2921.04</b>

The appropriate Parish elements are added to these figures. Full details of the tax rates are given in Appendix 1. (Details of the individual Parish Precepts are set out in Appendix 2).

## **6. Special Expenses**

6.1 Special expenses are defined as those expenses incurred by the Council in performing, in part of the borough, a function performed elsewhere in the borough by a Parish Council. The Local Government Act 1992 allows the Council to treat any special expenses as general expenses, i.e. as part of its own budget requirement for Council Tax purposes, provided the Council resolved accordingly.

6.2 It is reasonable for the Council to continue to treat special expenses as general expenses, and for clarity it is considered sensible to reaffirm this position on an annual basis. A resolution to this effect, therefore, is included within Appendix 1.

## **7. Strategic Plan References**

7.1 The Strategic Plan objectives have informed all stages of the Council's budget setting process.

## **8. Publicity Considerations**

8.1 The usual arrangements will be made to publish the approved tax levels in the local press and to produce the Council Tax Information Leaflet for distribution with the Council Tax bills. These will be in accordance with the legal requirements.

## **9. Financial Implications**

9.1 As set out above.

## **10. Standard References**

10.1 Having considered consultation, equality, diversity and human rights, community safety, health and safety and risk management implications, there are none that are significant to the matters in this report.

## RESOLUTIONS

1. It be noted that the Tax Base has been approved and the following amounts were calculated for the year 2010/2011 in accordance with regulations made under Section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:

- (a) 60,451.7 equivalent band D properties being the amount calculated by the Council, in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992, as its Council Tax base for the year.
- (b) Part of the Council's area for the parish of:

<b>Parish</b>	<b>Parish Tax Base</b>
Abberton & Langenhoe	432.9
Aldham	213.8
Birch	329.6
Boxted	599.7
Chappel	220.5
Copford	675.9
Dedham	910.9
East Donyland	669.6
East Mersea	115.5
Eight Ash Green	656.5
Fingringhoe	344.2
Fordham	333.2
Great Horkesley	935.5
Great Tey	382.2
Langham	494.9
Layer Breton	130.2
Layer de la Haye	712.5
Layer Marney	86.0
Little Horkesley	93.0
Marks Tey	942.3
Messing cum Inworth	169.8
Mount Bures	101.3
Myland	3,822.0
Stanway	3,173.0
Tiptree	3,512.5
Wakes Colne	234.5
West Bergholt	1,363.8
West Mersea	3,242.0
Winstred Hundred	487.6
Wivenhoe	2,830.3
Wormingford	200.2

Being the amounts calculated by the Council, in accordance with Regulation 6 of the Regulations, as the amounts of its Council Tax base for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.

2. The following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2010/2011 in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:
- (a) £143,536,300 Being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(2) (a) to (e) of the Act. [Gross Expenditure]
  - (b) £119,052,700 Being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(3) (a) to (c) of the Act. [Gross Income]
  - (c) £24,483,600 Being the amount by which the aggregate at 2(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 2(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 32(4) of the Act, as its budget requirement for the year. [Net Expenditure]
  - (d) £12,960,335 Being the aggregate of the sums which the Council estimates will be payable for the year into its General Fund in respect of redistributed non-domestic rates and revenue support grant, increased by the amount of the sums which the Council estimates will be transferred in the year from its Collection Fund to its General Fund in accordance with Sections 97(3) and 98(4) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988. [Government Grants and Collection Fund adjustments]
  - (e) £190.62 Being the amount at 2(c) above, less the amount at 2(d) above, all divided by the amount at 1(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 33(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year. [Council Tax, including parishes]
  - (f) £930,576 Being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act. [Parish Precepts]
  - (g) £175.23 Being the amount at 2(e) above, less the result given by dividing the amount at 2(f) above by the amount at 1(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no special item relates. [Council Tax]

(h) Part of the Council's area

Abberton & Langenhoe	195.01
Aldham	207.93
Birch	197.06
Boxted	202.76
Chappel	224.23
Copford	203.30
Dedham	198.90
East Donyland	233.00
East Mersea	244.16
Eight Ash Green	209.38
Fingringhoe	202.04
Fordham	221.82
Great Horkesley	184.96
Great Tey	202.70
Langham	208.16
Layer Breton	175.23
Layer de la Haye	190.92
Layer Marney	175.23
Little Horkesley	191.36
Marks Tey	205.33
Messing cum Inworth	226.25
Mount Bures	187.73
Myland	190.00
Stanway	208.21
Tiptree	210.18
Wakes Colne	224.59
West Bergholt	200.98
West Mersea	226.32
Winstred Hundred	193.48
Wivenhoe	228.66
Wormingford	190.13
All other parts of the Council's area	175.23

Being the amounts given by adding to the amount at 2(g) above the amounts of the special item or items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area mentioned above divided in each case by the amount at 1(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act, as the basis amounts of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.

## (i) Parts of the Council's Area

Parish	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Abberton & Langenhoe	130.01	151.67	173.34	195.01	238.35	281.68	325.02	390.02
Aldham	138.62	161.72	184.83	207.93	254.14	300.34	346.55	415.86
Birch	131.37	153.27	175.16	197.06	240.85	284.64	328.43	394.12
Boxted	135.17	157.70	180.23	202.76	247.82	292.88	337.93	405.52
Chappel	149.49	174.40	199.32	224.23	274.06	323.89	373.72	448.46
Copford	135.53	158.12	180.71	203.30	248.48	293.66	338.83	406.60
Dedham	132.60	154.70	176.80	198.90	243.10	287.30	331.50	397.80
East Donyland	155.33	181.22	207.11	233.00	284.78	336.56	388.33	466.00
East Mersea	162.77	189.90	217.03	244.16	298.42	352.68	406.93	488.32
Eight Ash Green	139.59	162.85	186.12	209.38	255.91	302.44	348.97	418.76
Fingringhoe	134.69	157.14	179.59	202.04	246.94	291.84	336.73	404.08
Fordham	147.88	172.53	197.17	221.82	271.11	320.41	369.70	443.64
Great Horkesley	123.31	143.86	164.41	184.96	226.06	267.16	308.27	369.92
Great Tey	135.13	157.66	180.18	202.70	247.74	292.79	337.83	405.40
Langham	138.77	161.90	185.03	208.16	254.42	300.68	346.93	416.32
Layer Breton	116.82	136.29	155.76	175.23	214.17	253.11	292.05	350.46
Layer de la Haye	127.28	148.49	169.71	190.92	233.35	275.77	318.20	381.84
Layer Marney	116.82	136.29	155.76	175.23	214.17	253.11	292.05	350.46
Little Horkesley	127.57	148.84	170.10	191.36	233.88	276.41	318.93	382.72
Marks Tey	136.89	159.70	182.52	205.33	250.96	296.59	342.22	410.66
Messing cum Inworth	150.83	175.97	201.11	226.25	276.53	326.81	377.08	452.50
Mount Bures	125.15	146.01	166.87	187.73	229.45	271.17	312.88	375.46
Myland	126.67	147.78	168.89	190.00	232.22	274.44	316.67	380.00
Stanway	138.81	161.94	185.08	208.21	254.48	300.75	347.02	416.42
Tiptree	140.12	163.47	186.83	210.18	256.89	303.59	350.30	420.36
Wakes Colne	149.73	174.68	199.64	224.59	274.50	324.41	374.32	449.18
West Bergholt	133.99	156.32	178.65	200.98	245.64	290.30	334.97	401.96
West Mersea	150.88	176.03	201.17	226.32	276.61	326.91	377.20	452.64
Winstred Hundred	128.99	150.48	171.98	193.48	236.48	279.47	322.47	386.96
Wivenhoe	152.44	177.85	203.25	228.66	279.47	330.29	381.10	457.32
Wormingford	126.75	147.88	169.00	190.13	232.38	274.63	316.88	380.26
All other parts of Council's area	116.82	136.29	155.76	175.23	214.17	253.11	292.05	350.46

Being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at (g) and (h) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands.



3. It be noted that for the year 2010/2011 Essex County Council, Essex Police Authority and Essex Fire Authority have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:

**Valuation Bands**

<b>Precepting Authority</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>H</b>
Essex County Council	724.50	845.25	966.00	1086.75	1328.25	1569.75	1811.25	2173.50
Essex Police Authority	88.08	102.76	117.44	132.12	161.48	190.84	220.20	264.24
Essex Fire Authority	44.28	51.66	59.04	66.42	81.18	95.94	110.70	132.84

4. Having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 2(i) and 3 above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2010/2011 for each of the categories of dwellings shown overleaf:
5. For the purposes of Section 35 of the Local Government Act 1992, any expenses incurred by the Council in performing in part of its area a function performed elsewhere in its area by a parish council or chairman of a parish meeting shall not be treated as special expenses.

## 6. Parts of the Council's Area

Parish	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Abberton & Langenhoe	986.87	1,151.34	1,315.82	1,480.30	1,809.26	2,138.21	2,467.17	2,960.60
Aldham	995.48	1,161.39	1,327.31	1,493.22	1,825.05	2,156.87	2,488.70	2,986.44
Birch	988.23	1,152.94	1,317.64	1,482.35	1,811.76	2,141.17	2,470.58	2,964.70
Boxted	992.03	1,157.37	1,322.71	1,488.05	1,818.73	2,149.41	2,480.08	2,976.10
Chappel	1,006.35	1,174.07	1,341.80	1,509.52	1,844.97	2,180.42	2,515.87	3,019.04
Copford	992.39	1,157.79	1,323.19	1,488.59	1,819.39	2,150.19	2,480.98	2,977.18
Dedham	989.46	1,154.37	1,319.28	1,484.19	1,814.01	2,143.83	2,473.65	2,968.38
East Donyland	1,012.19	1,180.89	1,349.59	1,518.29	1,855.69	2,193.09	2,530.48	3,036.58
East Mersea	1,019.63	1,189.57	1,359.51	1,529.45	1,869.33	2,209.21	2,549.08	3,058.90
Eight Ash Green	996.45	1,162.52	1,328.60	1,494.67	1,826.82	2,158.97	2,491.12	2,989.34
Fingringhoe	991.55	1,156.81	1,322.07	1,487.33	1,817.85	2,148.37	2,478.88	2,974.66
Fordham	1,004.74	1,172.20	1,339.65	1,507.11	1,842.02	2,176.94	2,511.85	3,014.22
Great Horkesley	980.17	1,143.53	1,306.89	1,470.25	1,796.97	2,123.69	2,450.42	2,940.50
Great Tey	991.99	1,157.33	1,322.66	1,487.99	1,818.65	2,149.32	2,479.98	2,975.98
Langham	995.63	1,161.57	1,327.51	1,493.45	1,825.33	2,157.21	2,489.08	2,986.90
Layer Breton	973.68	1,135.96	1,298.24	1,460.52	1,785.08	2,109.64	2,434.20	2,921.04
Layer de la Haye	984.14	1,148.16	1,312.19	1,476.21	1,804.26	2,132.30	2,460.35	2,952.42
Layer Marney	973.68	1,135.96	1,298.24	1,460.52	1,785.08	2,109.64	2,434.20	2,921.04
Little Horkesley	984.43	1,148.51	1,312.58	1,476.65	1,804.79	2,132.94	2,461.08	2,953.30
Marks Tey	993.75	1,159.37	1,325.00	1,490.62	1,821.87	2,153.12	2,484.37	2,981.24
Messing cum Inworth	1,007.69	1,175.64	1,343.59	1,511.54	1,847.44	2,183.34	2,519.23	3,023.08
Mount Bures	982.01	1,145.68	1,309.35	1,473.02	1,800.36	2,127.70	2,455.03	2,946.04
Myland	983.53	1,147.45	1,311.37	1,475.29	1,803.13	2,130.97	2,458.82	2,950.58
Stanway	995.67	1,161.61	1,327.56	1,493.50	1,825.39	2,157.28	2,489.17	2,987.00
Tiptree	996.98	1,163.14	1,329.31	1,495.47	1,827.80	2,160.12	2,492.45	2,990.94
Wakes Colne	1,006.59	1,174.35	1,342.12	1,509.88	1,845.41	2,180.94	2,516.47	3,019.76
West Bergholt	990.85	1,155.99	1,321.13	1,486.27	1,816.55	2,146.83	2,477.12	2,972.54
West Mersea	1,007.74	1,175.70	1,343.65	1,511.61	1,847.52	2,183.44	2,519.35	3,023.22
Winstred Hundred	985.85	1,150.15	1,314.46	1,478.77	1,807.39	2,136.00	2,464.62	2,957.54
Wivenhoe	1,009.30	1,177.52	1,345.73	1,513.95	1,850.38	2,186.82	2,523.25	3,027.90
Wormingford	983.61	1,147.55	1,311.48	1,475.42	1,803.29	2,131.16	2,459.03	2,950.84
All other parts of <b>Council's area</b>	973.68	1,135.96	1,298.24	1,460.52	1,785.08	2,109.64	2,434.20	2,921.04

## Parish Council Precepts 2010/11

Parish	Precept 2009/10 £	Precept 2010/11 £	Increase/ (Reduction) £	Increase/ (Reduction) %
Abberton & Langenhoe	7,131	8,563	1,432	20
Aldham	6,492	6,992	500	8
Birch	7,196	7,196	0	0
Boxted	16,648	16,512	(136)	(1)
Chappel	8,305	10,804	2,499	30
Copford	18,526	18,971	445	2
Dedham	21,061	21,561	500	2
East Donyland	39,595	38,685	(910)	(2)
East Mersea	7,961	7,961	0	0
Eight Ash Green	22,059	22,421	362	2
Fingringhoe	10,038	9,228	(810)	(8)
Fordham	15,256	15,524	268	2
Great Horkesley	8,835	9,104	269	3
Great Tey	10,150	10,500	350	3
Langham	16,274	16,299	25	0
Layer Breton	-	-	0	n/a
Layer de la Haye	11,177	11,177	0	0
Layer Marney	-	-	0	n/a
Little Horkesley	1,500	1,500	0	0
Marks Tey	26,382	28,361	1,979	8
Messing cum Inworth	7,233	8,663	1,430	20
Mount Bures	1,147	1,266	119	10
Myland	48,436	56,451	8,015	17
Stanway	90,374	104,642	14,268	16
Tiptree	84,258	122,751	38,493	46
Wakes Colne	8,504	11,574	3,070	36
West Bergholt	33,268	35,118	1,850	6
West Mersea	162,041	165,647	3,606	2
Winstred Hundred	8,900	8,900	0	0
Wivenhoe	145,980	151,223	5,243	4
Wormingford	1,353	2,982	1,629	120
Totals	846,080	930,576	84,496	10

**Extract from the Minutes of the Cabinet meeting of 27 January 2010**

**60. Single Equality Scheme**

The Executive Director submitted a report a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix C to these minutes in the Minute Book together with minute 22 of the Policy Review and Development Panel meeting of 11 January 2010.

*RESOLVED* that the Single Equality Scheme be approved.

*RECOMMENDED* to Full Council that the Single Equality Scheme be adopted and added to the Council's Policy Framework.

*REASONS*

The Council achieved Level Three of the Equality Standard for Local Government in March 2009. The Equality Standard has since changed to the Equality Framework for Local Government and the Council has migrated across to the Achieving Level of the framework. One of the recommendations of the review was that the Council considered moving to a Single Equality Scheme.

The Council has developed a Single Equality Scheme, because of the strategic, operational and financial benefits to amalgamating the Council's existing equality schemes for race, gender and disability, and having one scheme for all equality groups.

*ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS*

The alternative option is that the Council continues to have three separate equality schemes for race, gender and disability, each of which is required to be reviewed annually and a new scheme written every three years. Current dates for existing schemes are: Disability Equality Scheme 2006-2009; Gender Equality Scheme 2007-2010 and Race Equality Scheme 2008-2011.

**Extract from the Minutes of the Cabinet meeting of 27 January 2010**

**63. Councillor Development**

The Head of Corporate Management submitted a report a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix F to these minutes in the Minute Book.

Councillor Hunt, Portfolio Holder for Communication, Customers and Leisure endorsed the proposals in the Head of Corporate Management's report but also proposed that the Leader of the Council be given delegated authority to make minor amendments to the role profiles.

*RESOLVED* that:-

- (a) The Councillor Development Policy at Appendix 1 of the Head of Corporate Management's report be approved.
- (b) The Councillor Roles at Appendix 2 of the Head of Corporate Management's report be approved subject to minor amendments to be agreed by the Leader of the Council.
- (c) The introduction of a Councillor self assessment process as proposed at paragraphs 4.9 – 4.12 of the Head of Corporate Management's report be agreed.

*RECOMMENDED* to Council that the Councillor Development Policy and Councillor Roles be adopted.

*REASONS*

- (a) The proposals in this report are aimed at improving the Council's Councillor learning and development procedures so that Councillor development is delivered in a more consistent and coherent way and so that the opportunities provided meet the requirements of Councillors.
- (b) The Council is committed to obtaining Member Charter status. Each of the political groups has indicated its support to the principle of seeking Charter status. The proposals in this report are consistent with good practice elsewhere and are in line with the requirements for Charter Status. Charter Status is externally validated recognition of good practice in member development issues and as such would be a significant asset to the Council in external assessments of the Council.

*ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS*

Not to agree a Councillor Development Policy and Councillor Roles and not to agree a Councillor Self Assessment process. However, this would mean that it would be unlikely that the Council would achieve Member Charter Status.

**Extract from the Minutes of the Cabinet meeting of 27 January 2010**

**64. Colchester Borough Council Safeguarding Children Policy and Procedures**

The Head of Life Opportunities submitted a report a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix G to these minutes in the Minute Book.

It was proposed that the Portfolio Holder for Performance and Partnerships be given delegated authority to agree minor amendments to the policy before it was referred to Council for adoption.

*RESOLVED* that the Safeguarding Children Policy and Procedures at appendix 1 of the Head of Life Opportunities report be approved, subject to minor amendments to be agreed by the Portfolio Holder for Performance and Partnerships.

*RECOMMENDED* to Full Council the adoption of the Safeguarding Children Policy and Procedures and its inclusion in the Council's Policy Framework.

*REASONS*

(a) Section 11 of The Children Act 2004 places duties on organisations and individuals to ensure that their functions are discharged with regard to the need to safeguard and promote the welfare of children. Colchester Borough Council, as a district local authority, is one of the organisations specified in Section 11 of the Act.

(b) The Essex Safeguarding Children Board (ESCB) is the body responsible under the provisions in the Children Act 2004 for improving outcomes for children by coordinating the work of local agencies to safeguard and promote the welfare of children and ensuring the effectiveness of that work.

(c) The ESCB has asked all relevant agencies in Essex to audit their safeguarding practices and procedures, and as part of the work to complete this audit for the Council, this revised Safeguarding Children Policy has been developed to reflect the current legislative environment and to ensure the Council is demonstrating best practice in this field.

(d) The audit process requires the Council to demonstrate:

- senior management commitment to the importance of safeguarding and promoting children's welfare
- a clear statement of the council's responsibilities towards children, available for all staff
- a clear line of accountability within the organisation for work on safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children

- service development that takes account of the need to safeguard and promote welfare – and is informed by the views of children and families
- safe recruitment procedures
- training on safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children for all staff working with, or in contact with, children and families, including work on case studies
- effective inter-agency working to safeguard and promote the welfare of children
- effective information sharing.

(e) The Safeguarding Policy and Procedures seek to set out the policy framework to comply with these requirements and a programme of work is in place, led by the Council's senior named officer for safeguarding (Head of Life Opportunities), to work towards best practice in this field.

#### *ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS*

To not approve the Policy. This would prevent the Council from having up to date and compliant policy and procedures and put at risk the authority's ability to comply with the provisions of the Children Act 2004 and to respond to scrutiny from the ESCB.

To request amendments to the Policy. The Policy has been developed by the Council's senior named officer for safeguarding (Head of Life Opportunities) and safeguarding co-ordinator, and is believed to reflect current best practice in this field.



**Record of Decisions taken under Scheme of Delegation to Cabinet Members  
28 November 2009 - 5 February 2010**

**New from 26 January 2010**

<b>Portfolio – Business and Tourism</b>					
<b>Date</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Report Title</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Result</b>
1/2/10	BUS-001-09	Disposal of land at 63 Gosbecks Road, Colchester	Michael Timmins	Approval to the disposal of the land on terms as reported	Due 9/2/10

**Record of Decisions taken under Scheme of Delegation to Cabinet Members  
28 November 2009 - 5 February 2010**

<b>Portfolio – Communication, Customers and Leisure</b>						
<b>Date</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Report Title</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Result</b>	
15/12/09	COM-004-09	Approval to lease part of Lexden King George V Pavilion for use as a Sure Start Children's Centre	Bob Penny	To approve the lease part of the Lexden King George V pavilion to Essex County Council for 25 years for use as a Sure Start Children's Centre for the local community	Agreed 4/1/10	
22/1/10	COM-005-09	Fees and charges for Sports and Leisure and Parks and Recreation Services for 2010/11	Simon Grady Bob Penny	To approve fees and charges for Sports and Leisure and Parks and Recreation Services for 2010/11	Due 5/2/10	
22/1/10	COM-006-09	Colchester Tree Policy	Bob Penny	To adopt the Colchester Tree Policy	Due 9/2/10	

**Record of Decisions taken under Scheme of Delegation to Cabinet Members  
28 November 2009 - 5 February 2010**

<b>Portfolio – Culture and Diversity</b>					
<b>Date</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Report Title</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Result</b>
16/12/09	CUL-006-09	Visual Arts Facility – Funding Variation Agreements	Ian Vipond	To agree that the Council enters into a Variation Agreement with The Arts Council England to secure a further Arts Council capital investment of £2m in the Visual Arts Facility Project	Agreed 4/1/10
11/1/10	NEI-005-09/ CUL-007-09	Amendments to Service Charge Policy	Paul Clarke/ Rachel Eley	To approve the proposed amendments to Colchester's Service Charge Policy for tenants and leaseholders	Agreed 21/1/10
19/1/10	NEI-006-09/ CUL-008-09	Housing Revenue Account Fees and Charges 2010-11	Paul Clarke/ Rachel Eley	To approve fees and charges as set out in report	Due 5/2/10
29/1/10	CUL-009-09	Revenues Fees and Charges	Peter Evans	To set recoverable court costs for local taxation and mortgage fees for the year commencing 1 April 2010	Due 5/2/10

**Record of Decisions taken under Scheme of Delegation to Cabinet Members  
28 November 2009 - 5 February 2010**

<b>Portfolio - Neighbourhoods</b>					
<b>Date</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Report Title</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Result</b>
19/11/09	NEI-004-09	Updating the Enforcement Policy for Private Sector Housing	Jo Tawell	To approve the revised Enforcement Policy for Private Sector Housing (PSH) to take account of the Housing Act 2004 and other procedural matters	Agreed 17/12/09
11/1/10	NEI-005-09/ CUL-007-09	Amendments to Service Charge Policy	Paul Clarke/ Rachel Eley	To approve the proposed amendments to Colchester's Service Charge Policy for tenants and leaseholders	Agreed 21/1/10
19/1/10	NEI-006-09/ CUL-008-09	Housing Revenue Account Fees and Charges 2010-11	Paul Clarke/ Rachel Eley	To approve fees and charges as set out in report	Due 5/2/10

**Record of Decisions taken under Scheme of Delegation to Cabinet Members  
28 November 2009 - 5 February 2010**

<b>Portfolio - Performance and Partnerships</b>						
<b>Date</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Report Title</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Result</b>	
06/1/10	PER-002-09	Fees and Charges for Helpline	Cassandra Fallows	To agree fees and charges for Helpline 2010/2011	Due 5/2/10	
19/1/10	PER-003-09	Grants to Parish Councils 2010/11	Steve Heath	To approve the distribution of grants to Parish Councils 2010/11	Due 9/2/10	

**Record of Decisions taken under Scheme of Delegation to Cabinet Members  
28 November 2009 - 5 February 2010**

<b>Portfolio – Planning, Sustainability and Environmental</b>						
<b>Date</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Report Title</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Result</b>	
2/12/09	PLA-002-09	Colchester's Annual Monitoring Report, December 2009	Cathryn-Ann Cansdale	To agree the content of Colchester's Annual Monitoring Report (AMR)	Agreed 17/12/09	
21/12/09	PLA-003-09	Proposed Supplementary Planning Document – North Growth Area Urban Extension (NGAUE)	Karen Syrett	To approve the draft Supplementary Planning Document and a public consultation exercise	Agreed 5/1/10	
22/1/10	PLA-004-09	Better Rail Stations Consultation	Jane Thompson	To respond to the Government's consultation and promote Colchester stations for future investment as indicated	Agreed 29/1/10	
25/1/10	PLA-005-09/ STS-011-09	Environmental and Protective Services Fees and Charges 2010-11	Beverley Jones	To approve the scale of fees and charges for Environmental and Protective Services	Due 5/2/10	

**Record of Decisions taken under Scheme of Delegation to Cabinet Members  
28 November 2009 - 5 February 2010**

<b>Portfolio – Resources and Business</b>						
<b>Date</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Report Title</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Result</b>	
4/12/09	RES-012-09	Disposal of Land at the rear of Bailey Cottages, Water Lane, Little Horkesley	Paul Clarke	Disposal of land at the rear of Baileys Cottages, Little Horkesley, formerly occupied by a Sewage Treatment Works	Agreed 17/12/09	
4/12/09	RES-013-09	Sale of HRA Land adjacent to 147 Magnolia Drive	Suzanne Norton/ Tina Hinson	To approve the sale of HRA land adjacent to 147 Magnolia Drive	Agreed 17/12/09	
31/12/09	RES-014-09	Irrecoverable Debts over £5,000	Peter Evans	To approve writing off of debts over £5,000 which have proved irrecoverable	Agreed 13/1/10	
12/1/10	RES-015-09	External Stone Repairs, Refurbishment of Moot Hall and Rewiring of Council Chamber Town Hall	Lee Spalding	To agree to place an order with Bakers of Danbury to undertake external stone repairs, the refurbishment of the Moot Hall and the rewiring of the Council Chamber at Colchester Town Hall	Agreed 19/1/10	
Not issued	RES-016-09					
Not issued	RES-017-09					
29/1/10	RES-018-09	Corporate Management Fees and Charges 2010-11	Lucie Breadman	To approve fees and charges as set out in report	Due 5/2/10	

**Record of Decisions taken under Scheme of Delegation to Cabinet Members  
28 November 2009 - 5 February 2010**

**New from 26 January 2010**

<b>Portfolio - Resources, Diversity, Culture and the Arts</b>					
<b>Date</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Report Title</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Result</b>



**Record of Decisions taken under Scheme of Delegation to Cabinet Members  
28 November 2009 - 5 February 2010**

<b>Portfolio - Strategy</b>					
<b>Date</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Report Title</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Result</b>

**Record of Decisions taken under Scheme of Delegation to Cabinet Members  
28 November 2009 - 5 February 2010**

<b>Portfolio - Street and Waste Services</b>						
<b>Date</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Report Title</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Result</b>	
15/10/09	STS-007-09	Publication of Parking Annual Report	Richard Walker	To approve the Annual Report for Parking	Agreed 6/1/09	
24/11/10	STS-008-09	Fees and charges for Recycling, Workshops, Market and Street Trading	Dave McManus	To approve fees and charges for Street Services for 2010/11	Due 5/2/10	
Not issued	STS-009-09					
6/1/10	STS-010-09	Fees and charges for Parking Services	Richard Walker	To approve the fees and charges for Parking Services	Due 4/2/10	
25/1/10	PLA-005-09/ STS-011-09	Environmental and Protective Services Fees and Charges 2010-11	Beverley Jones	To approve the scale of fees and charges for Environmental and Protective Services	Due 5/2/10	
29/1/10	STS-012-09	Travel Concession Scheme	Peter Evans	To set fees and charges for the year 2010/11 for the concessionary travel scheme for the year starting 1 April 2010	Due 5/2/10	
29/1/10	STS-013-09	Street Naming and Numbering Charges	Sarah Taylor	To implement the option to charge for reworking Street Naming and Numbering that has already been registered	Due 5/2/10	



## Cabinet

Item  
**7(i)**

27 January 2010

<b>Report of</b>	<b>Head of Resource Management</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Charles Warboys</b> <b>Sean Plummer</b> ☎ 282350 ☎ 282347
<b>Title</b>	<b>2010/11 Revenue Budget and Medium Term Financial Forecast</b>		
<b>Wards affected</b>	n/a		

**This report requests Cabinet to recommend to Council:**

- **The 2010/11 Revenue Budget**
- **Colchester's element of the Council Tax for 2010/11**
- **Changes to the Capital Programme**
- **The Medium Term Financial Forecast**
- **The Prudential Indicators and Treasury Management Strategy and Annual Investment Strategy**

### 1. Decisions Required

- 1.1 To note that the outturn for the current financial year is forecast to be underspent by £699k (paragraph 3.4.).
- 1.2 To approve the cost pressures, growth items and savings / increased income options identified during the budget forecast process as set out at Appendices B, C and D.
- 1.3 To consider and recommend to Council the 2010/11 Revenue Budget requirement of £25,670k (paragraph 7.1) and the underlying detailed budgets set out in the Background Papers.
- 1.4 To agree that Revenue Balances for the financial year 2010/11 be set at a minimum of £1,500k and that £671k of balances be applied to finance items in the 2010/11 revenue budget.
- 1.5 To agree the following releases (paragraph 11.9):-
  - £1,210k from the Capital Expenditure Reserve in 2010/11 to meet costs including the community stadium. Icelandic Investment impairment and legal costs in respect of the VAF.
  - £1,184k to be financed from the Renewals and Repairs Fund for specific projects
  - £70k from the S106 monitoring reserve
  - £166k from the Regeneration Reserve
- 1.6 To agree and recommend to Council that £100k of Revenue Balances be earmarked for potential unplanned expenditure within the guidelines set out at paragraph 12.3.
- 1.7 To agree and recommend to Council that Colchester's element of the Council Tax for 2010/11 be set at £175.23 for Band D properties which is an increase of £4.23 per annum (2.47%) (paragraph 13.2).

- 1.8 To note that the formal resolution from Cabinet to Council will include the Parish, Police, Fire and County Council elements and any change arising from the formal Revenue Support Grant Settlement announcement in early February. This will be prepared in consultation with the Leader of the Council.
- 1.9 To note the Medium Term Financial Forecast for the financial years 2011/12 and 2012/13 (paragraph 14.13).
- 1.10 To agree and recommend to Council the changes in the capital programme to agree the capital programme releases set out at paragraph 15.6.
- 1.12 To note the comments made on the robustness of budget estimates at section 16.
- 1.13. To agree and recommend to Council the Prudential Indicators, Treasury Management Strategy and Annual Investment Strategy (paragraph 17.7).

## **2. Background Information and Summary**

- 2.1 The 2010/11 Revenue Budget and the Capital Programme have been prepared in accordance with a process and timetable agreed at Cabinet and endorsed by the Strategic Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Appendix A).

### ***Delivering a Balanced Budget for 2010/11***

- 2.2. The Revenue Budget for 2010/11 has been prepared against a background of meeting the Council's Strategic Plan objectives whilst facing significant financial pressures from the difficult economic background. Every effort has been made to produce a budget that not only funds the delivery of high quality services and shifts resources for investment in priority areas but keeps the increase in Council Tax as low as possible. This has been very difficult, however, a high level of savings has been found and includes areas such as:

- Delivery of savings through the fundamental service review process
- Making efficiencies through reviewing assets and taking advantage of new technologies such as the accommodation changes and ICT strategy
- Using reserves in a managed and prudent way
- Making reasonable assumptions on the level of Government grant funding

### ***Council Tax***

- 2.3. It is proposed to increase the Council's element of the Council Tax by 2.47% in 2010/11. This is below the increase in state pensions (2.5%). The Government has stated that it expects authorities to increase Council Tax by less than 5%. Colchester's increase is therefore well within this level and is the lowest increase in 16 years in line with the expectations stated by Government.
- 2.4. A 2.47% increase in Colchester's element of the Council Tax equates to 8p per week for a Band D property. This is a modest increase when considered alongside £2.7m of cost pressures and areas of growth/investment set out in Appendices B & C respectively.
- 2.5. Further information on the budget is provided in the following paragraphs.

## **3. Current Year's Financial Position**

- 3.1 In order to inform the 2010/11 budget process and forecast level of reserves it is useful to first review the current year's financial position. Revenue budgets are monitored on a monthly basis with regular reports to Senior Management Team and the Finance and Audit Scrutiny Panel (FASP). A considerable amount of work has been undertaken to determine a reasonable forecast of the year-end position.
- 3.2 The current position is showing that the forecast outturn is expected to be an underspend of £0.7m. This forecast reflects a number of variances the most significant being:-
- Shortfall in interest earnings as a result of the low level of interest rates
  - Shortfall in achieving corporate targets such as salary savings due in part to the lower turnover levels
  - Receipt of HPDG (Housing and Planning Delivery Grant) which was significantly more than budgeted
- 3.3. There remain some outstanding risks to the forecast and the position continues to be monitored and FASP on 23 February 2010 will receive a report setting out a detailed position.

3.4 **Cabinet is asked to note that the forecast outturn position for the current year is anticipated to be an underspend of £0.7m and that the position will continue to be monitored.**

#### **4. 2010/11 Revenue Cost Pressures**

- 4.1 Appendix B sets out revenue cost pressures, over the 2009/10 base, of £2,677k which have been identified during the budget process. This includes an inflation allowance, impact of the economic downturn on investment income and the one off costs in respect of the VAF legal costs and Icelandic investment impairment.
- 4.2 The cost pressures have mostly been previously considered by Cabinet, however, provision has now been included to reflect changes to assumptions including a reduction in income in respect of licensing and cemetery and crematorium and the impact of the lower than expected level of housing benefit admin grant.

4.3 **Cabinet is asked to approve inclusion within the 2010/11 Revenue Budget of the cost pressures set out at Appendix B.**

#### **5. 2010/11 Revenue Growth**

- 5.1. Appendix C sets out growth items totalling £125k which have been identified during the budget process. These items will assist in enabling the Council to deliver its Strategic Plan objectives and include costs funded through Government grants and the use of Council reserves.

5.2. **Cabinet is asked to approve inclusion within the 2010/11 Revenue Budget of the growth items as set out at Appendix C.**

#### **6. 2010/11 Revenue Saving/Increased Income**

- 6.1 Appendix D sets out savings / increased income totalling £1,234k. The appendix provides an analysis of the risks to delivering the savings and steps taken or planned to mitigate these risks.

6.2. There are some changes to the report since Cabinet met on 2 December 2009. These include an assumption regarding potential savings through the Fundamental Service Review Process, additional planning income, revised assumption for HPDG for 10/11 and various savings across all service areas.

6.3. There will be some one-off costs required to deliver all the budget savings. A sum of £150k has therefore been included within the budget.

6.4. **Cabinet is asked to approve inclusion of the savings / increased income items set out at Appendix D within the 2010/11 Revenue Budget.**

## 7. Summary Total Expenditure Requirement

7.1 Should Cabinet approve the items detailed above, the total expenditure requirement for 2010/11 is as follows:

	<b>£'000</b>
2009/10 Budget	<b>24,432</b>
Less: 2009/10 one-off items	(330)
Cost Pressures (as per Appendix B)	2,677
Revenue Growth (as per Appendix C)	125
Savings/Increased Income (net of one off costs) (as per Appendix D)	(1,234)
<b>Forecast Budget 10/11</b>	<b>25,670</b>

### Note:

Detailed service group expenditure is available in the Background Papers. A summary of service group expenditure is attached at Appendix E.

7.2. **Cabinet is asked to agree and recommend to Council the net revenue expenditure requirement for 2010/11 and the underlying detailed budgets set out in the Background Papers.**

## 8. Revenue Support Grant

8.1 The provisional Revenue Support Grant Settlement was announced in Parliament in November 2009. Our provisional grant settlement is £12,911k, which is in line with the announcement of the 3 year figures provided as part of the Comprehensive Spending Review 2007 (CSR 07).

8.2 The settlement represents an increase of £230k (1.8%) in cash terms on 2009/10

8.3. The Settlement is provisional and subject to consultation. Traditionally, there has been very little change between the provisional and actual Settlement. Any marginal change to the Council's grant entitlement will be reflected in the final budget recommendation to Council.

8.4. Looking ahead the outcome of the next comprehensive spending review is unlikely to be known until Autumn 2010. What is evident is that the pressures facing public finances will mean that resources to support Local Government will be reduced and as such this will place increased pressures on the Council's finances. This is considered as part of the Medium Term Financial Forecast.

## 9. Council Tax

- 9.1 As part of the formal budget setting process, the Council is required to determine each year, as at 15 January, the estimated surplus or deficit arising from the Council Tax Collection Fund as at 31 March.
- 9.2 The collection rate continues to be close to our target and a higher surplus was made in the prior year than was originally estimated. As a result a surplus is anticipated at the 2009/10 year end of £49k. The MTFF had previously assumed that Colchester's share of the any surplus would be nil and therefore this has improved the overall budget position.

## 10. Revenue Balances

- 10.1 The Local Government Act 2003 places a specific duty on the Chief Financial Officer to report on the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves of an Authority when the budget is being considered. This section and section 11 address this requirement.
- 10.2. Cabinet, at its meeting on 2 December 2009, considered a report setting out the outcome of a risk analysis in respect of the Council's Revenue Balances. Cabinet agreed with the analysis conclusion that Revenue Balances should be maintained at a minimum of £1.5m and that the situation would be reviewed based on the implications and details of items such as the grant settlement, budget savings and other variables. Based on the assumptions built into the budget it is considered prudent to maintain the recommended minimum level at £1.5m.
- 10.3. The cost pressures and growth items set out in the following table and included within the appendices to this report include a number of one-off costs which are recommended to be funded from general balances in additional to general support of the budget.

	<i>Cost in 10/11 £'000</i>	<i>Note</i>
Potential one-off costs to deliver budget options	150	See para 6.3
Child Poverty Initiative	15	See Growth items (Appendix C)
One-off costs for census	15	See Growth items (Appendix C)
One of costs for 20mph	15	See Growth items (Appendix C)
Place surveys	15	See Cost pressures (appendix B)
Benefits staff – Reduction in grant	70	See Cost pressures (appendix B)
General support of the budget	391	
<b>Total</b>	<b>671</b>	

- 10.4 In considering the level at which Revenue Balances should be set for 2010/11, Cabinet should note the financial position the Council is likely to face in the medium term both through the levels of future Government funding and the incremental pension burden highlighted in the Medium Term Financial Forecast (MTFF).
- 10.5 The forecast position in respect of Revenue Balances as at 31 March 2010 is set out at Appendix F and shows balances at £1,500k the recommended minimum balance as set out in the agreed Risk Analysis. Taking account of the medium term position detailed above, Cabinet is recommended to approve that balances are retained at a minimum level of £1,500k and release £671k to assist in funding the 2010/11 Revenue Budget.

- 10.6 **Cabinet is recommended to approve Revenue Balances for the financial year 2010/11 at a minimum of £1,500k and that £671k of balances is applied to finance items in the 2010/11 Revenue Budget.**

## 11. Reserves and Provisions

- 11.1. Cabinet at its meeting on 2 December 2009 considered the Council's earmarked reserves. As part of the budget process a review was undertaken into the level and appropriateness of earmarked reserves and provisions for 2010/11. The review concluded that the reserves and provisions detailed were broadly appropriate and at an adequate level, however, it was stated that a further review would be done as part of this final report. The proposed budget includes a number of releases from reserves, including some changes to those already proposed.

*Capital Expenditure Reserve (CER) – release of £1,210k:-  
Community Stadium - £300k*

- 11.2. The Council agreed that an approach to minimise the revenue pressure is to fund the annual MRP cost by identifying new capital receipts in the period of the borrowing. This then allows a release of revenue funds within the capital expenditure reserve. For 2010/11 the use of the reserve remains at £300k.

*Icelandic Investment Impairment- £615k*

- 11.3. As reported to Cabinet in December we are required to recognise the assessed financial impairment in respect of the Council's investment in Landsbanki. This has been calculated to be £615k based on guidance received of a recovery of 88%, phased repayments and status as a preferred creditor.

*VAF Legal Costs - £250k*

- 11.4. The proposal to budget for these costs was agreed by Cabinet. Using the CER is considered appropriate given this is a one-off cost and is linked to the capital programme.

*Corporate Scanning - £45k*

- 11.5. As part of the accommodation strategy a corporate scanning team has been set up. This has been financed through savings in service areas through scanning. However, in the first year it is estimated that there will be a cost of £45k. Funding through the CER will enable an assessment of the running costs of the scanning team to be made and to consider how, if necessary, this will be funded in the future.

*Renewals and Repairs Fund – release of £1,184k*

- 11.6. Cabinet noted on 2 December that the estimated balance at 31 March 2010 on the Renewals and Repairs Fund stood at £2,600k and that the 2010/11 expenditure programme would be considered at this meeting. Appendix G sets out the recommended programme totalling £1,154k. The releases include £760k in respect of the 5-year building maintenance programme. The programme has been based on in-depth condition surveys of all Council building assets. The programme will continue to be developed over the coming year and will again be considered as part of the budget strategy for 2011/12.

*Regeneration Reserve – release of £166k*

- 11.7. As with previous years it is proposed to use £166k from the Regeneration Reserve in respect of resources to maintain the role of this team. This will fully use this reserve and will mean that for 2011/12 the cost of the team will need to be met as part of the general budget or alternative resources will need to be met the costs. The MTFF takes account of this potential pressure.

*S106 Monitoring Reserve – release of £70k*

- 11.8. This reserve was set up to provide funds to support the future monitoring of Section 106 agreements. Within the last budget report to Cabinet it was proposed to use £60k to



support the 2009/10 budget. However, given that the costs involved in monitoring are higher than this a contribution of £70k is now proposed. This reserve will still last for at least the next 3 years if used in a similar way.

- 11.9 **Cabinet is recommended to agree release of**
- £1,210k from the Capital Expenditure Reserve in 2010/11
  - £1,154k from the Renewals and Repairs Fund as set out at Appendix G
  - £166k from the Regeneration Reserve.
  - £70k is released from S106 monitoring reserve towards the costs of carrying out this function

## 12. Contingency Provision

12.1 The Council's Constitution requires that any spending from Revenue Balances not specifically approved at the time the annual budget is set, must be considered and approved by full Council. This procedure could prove restrictive particularly if additional spending is urgent.

12.2 It is recommended that £100k of Revenue Balances be specifically earmarked for potential items of unplanned expenditure. It should be noted that if this sum was used during the year it would take revenue balances below the recommended level of £1,500k and the Council would need to consider steps to reinstate balances at a later date.

- 12.3 **Cabinet is asked to agree and recommend to Council that £100k of Revenue Balances be specifically earmarked for potential items of unplanned expenditure which are:**
- The result of new statutory requirements or
  - An opportunity purchase which meets an objective of the Strategic Plan or
  - Is considered urgent, cannot await the next budget cycle and cannot be funded from existing budgets
  - Authorisation being delegated to the Leader of the Council.

## 13. Summary of Position

13.1 Summary of the Revenue Budget position is as follows:

	<b>£'000</b>
Revenue expenditure requirement for 2010/11 (para 7.1).	25,670
Release from Capital Expenditure Reserve (para 11.2 to 11.5)	(1,210)
Release of General Reserve (para 10.3)	(671)
Release of Regeneration Reserve (para 11.7)	(166)
Release of S106 monitoring reserve (para 11.8)	(70)
<b>Budget Requirement</b>	<b>23,553</b>
Funded by:	
Revenue Support Grant (para 8.1)	12,911
Collection Fund Surplus (para 9.2)	49
Council Tax Payers requirement (before Parish element) see below*	10,593
<b>Total Funding</b>	<b>23,553</b>

<b>Council Tax*</b>	
Council Tax Payers requirement (before Parish element)	10,593
Council Tax Base – Band D Properties	60,451.7
<b>Council Tax at Band D</b>	<b>£175.23</b>

- 13.2 **Cabinet is asked to agree and recommend to Council Colchester's element of the Council Tax for 2010/11 at £175.23 per Band D property, which is an annual increase of £4.23 (2.47%), noting that the formal resolution to Council will include Parish, Police, Fire and County Council precepts and any minor change arising from the formal Revenue Support Grant announcement.**

#### **14. Medium Term Financial Forecast – 2010/11 to 2013/14**

- 14.1. This Council, in common with most other local authorities, faces an ongoing difficult position in the medium term due to a range of pressures including increased statutory pension payments and potential revenue implications of strategic priorities. However, the most significant factor that will impact on budget will be the level of grant support.
- 14.2. The Government three-year grant settlement has provided some certainty over future grant levels and aids longer term planning. However, 2010/11 is the last year of the previously announced Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR07) and therefore making assumptions for 2011/12 and beyond is difficult and can only be indicative at this stage. What is clear is that the widely reported deficit within public finances needs to be addressed and funding to local authorities will come under pressure. The CSR10 is expected to be announced during the latter half of 2010 and irrespective of the outcome of the General Election reductions in grant support for public services are anticipated.
- 14.3. The Medium Term Financial Forecast (MTFF) is attached at Appendix H showing that the Council will face the need to bridge a budget gap of circa £3m over the three years from April 2011 with the 2011/12 gap likely to be in the region of £1.9m. To formulate the MTFF it is necessary to make a number of assumptions. Generally, these do not represent decisions but are designed to show the impact of a set of options for planning purposes. The key assumptions and savings required are set out at the Appendix and summarised below:-

##### *Government Grants – RSG, HPDG and LABGI*

- 14.4. An assumption is made of a 5% reduction in core Government Grant (Revenue Support Grant - RSG) equivalent to £650k pa. This assumption, whilst realistic, is by no means a worst case forecast with some other authorities predicting reductions up to 20%.
- 14.5. In considering the reduction in Government funding it is also necessary to assess the impact of discontinuing the LABGI and HPDG schemes, as has been indicated, which based on the assumptions made in the 10/11 equates to a further reduction of £748k.
- 14.6. When added to our forecast reduction in RSG this equates to a cash reduction of £1.4m in 2011/12 (10.3% reduction of these current budgeted grants).

##### *Pay, Inflation and costs*

- 14.7. The 2010/11 includes a 1% pay award which has been agreed as part of a 2 year settlement for 09/10 and 10/11. For the following 3 years a planning assumption of a nil pay award has been shown. For other price inflation a range of 1% to 1.5% has been used although it will be necessary to review forecasts for specific areas in due course.
- 14.8. An allowance of £250k pa has been included for the outcome of the next actuarial review of the pension fund. It is unlikely that we will know the actual figure until the Autumn, however, it should set out the pressure for the coming three years.

### *Economic Downturn*

14.9. It is difficult to fully assess the impact on Council budgets, however it is evident that there has been a reduction in some income budgets such as planning and net interest earnings as well as increased demands for services such as benefits. The MTFF assumes a broadly neutral position over the next three years which is likely to represent a prudent forecast.

### *Council Tax*

14.10. In line with the approach taken in recent years, a planning assumption has been used of an increase in Council Tax of the same as the coming year's budget proposal, in this case, 2.47%. This is shown to set out the MTFF position and does not represent a proposal.

### *Summary*

14.11. In the 2010/11 budget savings of £1.2m have been found which is similar to previous years. Whilst we will continue to look for other areas of savings and efficiencies it will be increasingly hard to balance budgets without considering variations to current services.

14.12. This year's budget process includes assumptions in respect of savings anticipated through the fundamental service review process and these reviews will continue during 2010/11. The Budget Group has also noted a number of areas where savings in 2011/12 may be possible. This group is continuing to meet and has started considering steps necessary to deliver balanced budgets for future years.

14.13. **Cabinet is asked to note the medium term financial position forecast for the Council.**

## **15. Capital Programme**

15.1. The capital programme has been reviewed and as a result changes are proposed to remove certain schemes and include a number of new items. This review also includes the necessary changes to enable the release of the capital expenditure reserve.

15.2. Appendix I sets out proposed schemes to remove from the capital programme totalling £1.8m which includes £1m set aside for ICT purposes which is no longer required given the approach taken to using new technologies. Other items include projects that were previously put "on hold" by Cabinet.

15.3. The capital programme proposals include the following new bids:-

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>Amount £'000</b>	<b>Description</b>
Private Sector Renewals	585.0	Including £200k additional resources for 2009/10 and £350k additional for 2010/11.
Town Hall DDA Sensory Access	75.0	Principal benefit will be to have a hearing loop system available in all meeting rooms at all times. Quality sound and visual display accessible to everyone attending council meetings. Members and the public feel included and are able to fully participate in Council meetings.
Disabled Facilities Grants	200.0	Additional resources required.
Public Realm Works	175.0	Funding anticipated from the capital receipt for 15 Queen Street

Scheme	Amount £'000	Description
Customer Service Centre Redesign	100.0	Work required following the completion of the flexible working project and sale of Angel Court
Repairs to walls of closed churchyards following survey	75.0	There are concerns regarding the condition of the walls surrounding closed churchyards as there has not been an ongoing maintenance programme to deal with these in the past. This has resulted in a backlog of work being required that is beyond the means of the current revenue budget. The amount of £75k relates to all the works with health & safety concerns.
	<b>1,210.0</b>	

15.4. The full proposed new capital programme reflecting all changes is set out at Appendix J. In total there is a forecast surplus of resources of £1m, however, this reflects some capital receipts expected later in 2010/11 meaning that not all capital projects can be started immediately. The forecast surplus also assumes that the net underspend of £202k against capital schemes that was reported to the Finance and Audit Scrutiny Panel on 17 November 2009 has been made available for allocation to other schemes.

15.5. It is proposed that funding for the projects set out at paragraph 15.3 are released subject to the agreement of including these items in the programme by Council.

15.6. **Cabinet is asked to recommend to Council that the changes to the capital programme set out Appendix I and paragraph 15.1 be agreed and that subject to this funding be released for projects set out at paragraph 15.3.**

## 16. Robustness of Estimates

16.1 The Local Government Act 2003 placed a specific duty on the Chief Financial Officer to report on the robustness of estimates in the budget proposals of an Authority when the budget is being considered. This section addresses this requirement.

16.2 As set out in this paper a rigorous process and timetable has been followed throughout the budget setting activity this year involving the Cabinet, Leadership Team, Finance and Audit Scrutiny Panel, Senior Management Team, the Budget Group and budget holders. All key assumptions used have been reviewed and scrutinised as part of this process. The result of this process has been a budget which is, in my view, challenging but deliverable.

16.3. The continuing impact of the economic climate on the Council is significant. This includes pressures on income from areas such as planning and car parks, although there has been some recovery in some of these areas during the last 12 months. Falling interest rates have had a major effect on investment returns and it has been necessary to significantly adjust budget assumptions in this area.

16.4. Steps have been taken to revise corporate targets such as salary savings, procurement and income in light of the current climate.

16.5. By taking appropriate action within the proposed 2010/11 budget, exposure to further downgrading of assumptions has been reduced and to that extent some of the risk has been mitigated. However, the need to draw heavily on reserves to support the budget, albeit largely in respect of one-off items, is a concern and considerable financial discipline will be required to achieve balanced budgets over the medium term.

- 16.6. Whilst I consider that reasonable assumptions have been made to account for the pressures being faced there remains a degree of risk with the key areas being:-
- Uncertainty over how long the impact of the economic downturn will be felt.
  - The combined impact of falling interest rates and negative cashflow factors such as reduced levels or delays to securing capital receipts on the net interest budget.
  - The ability to deliver all savings included within the budget, including the assumptions in respect of fundamental service reviews.
  - Actual levels of grants received from Government, specifically Housing and Planning Delivery Grant (HPDG) and the LABGI (Local Authority Business Growth Incentive Scheme)
  - Meeting income levels in particular in respect of planning, leisure and car parking.
- 16.7. These risks will be managed during 2010/11 by regular targeted monitoring and review at Senior Management Team and Finance and Audit Scrutiny Panel. The Revenue Balance Risk Analysis considered these areas in establishing a minimum level of required balance of £1.5m.
- 16.8. Delivery of the budget will continue to require financial discipline led by SMT in terms of the corporate budget initiatives and by budget holders, ensuring expenditure is not incurred without adequate available budget. Budget managers will continue to be supported through training and advice to enable them to do this.
- 16.9. Regular updates on forecast expenditure will also be important to ensure the budget is managed within the expenditure constraints set out.
- 16.10. **Cabinet is asked to note the comments on the robustness of budget estimates.**

## **17. Prudential Code Indicators**

- 17.1. The aims of the Prudential Code are to assist local authorities to ensure that:
- Capital expenditure plans are affordable
  - All external borrowing is at a prudent and sustainable level
  - Treasury management decisions are taken in accordance with good practice
  - The authority is accountable in taking decisions by providing a clear and transparent framework.
  - The framework is consistent with and supports local strategic and asset management planning and proper option appraisal.
- 17.2. The prudential indicators are designed to support and record decision making in relation to capital expenditure plans, external debt and treasury management. Estimating capital expenditure for the forthcoming financial year and the following two financial years is the starting point of the calculation of prudential indicators. The Council has made reasonable estimates of both HRA and non-HRA total capital expenditure.
- 17.3. In agreeing the Council's revenue budget and capital programme there is a requirement to approve the prudential indicators for the coming year.
- 17.4. The recommended Prudential Indicators for 2010/11 are set out in the background paper with relevant commentary.
- 17.5. One of the key requirements of the Code is that the Council agrees a number of prudential indicators which set out the limits to which the Council may borrow and the

implications of borrowing. The main assumptions used in setting these indicators are that:

- Capital expenditure to be financed through prudential borrowing has been agreed as part of the 09/10 budget by Council in respect of the Firstsite:newsite project (£2m), the replacement of a cremator (£0.5m), the Business Incubation Centre (£0.9m), and the upgrading of the communal aerial system in the Council's housing stock (£0.4m). These projects have been previously agreed by Cabinet / Council.
  - The revenue and capital budget proposals set out in this report will be agreed.
  - That treasury management decisions will be carried out in line with the Treasury Management Strategy.
- 17.6. Council is required to annually approve the Treasury Management Strategy and Annual Investment Strategy that underpins the setting of some of the prudential indicators, the Council's capital programme and the revenue budget for net interest earnings. The 2010/11 strategy reflects the revised CIPFA Treasury Management in the Public Services Code of Practice as well as other guidance issued following the credit crunch and Icelandic banking collapse, particularly in relation to the criteria used for investing with banks and building societies, and the reporting of treasury management activities to members. The strategy also states that the Council will continue to 'borrow internally' for the foreseeable future to reduce exposure to interest rate and credit risk, as well as providing forecasts on interest rates and setting the policy for calculating the Minimum Revenue Provision.

- 17.7 **Cabinet is asked to agree and recommend to Council:**
- **The revised CIPFA Treasury Management in the Public Services Code of Practice, including the four amended clauses**
  - **The revised Treasury Management Policy Statement**
  - **The Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy**
  - **The Prudential Indicators for 2010/11**
  - **The Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Statement**
- All of the above are set out in Appendix K**

## **18. Strategic Plan References**

- 18.1. The budget forecasting process has been underpinned by the Strategic Plan. The objectives of the Strategic Plan have informed all stages of the budget setting process. The proposed budget will enable the Council to deliver the services and priorities set out in the Strategic Plan which is subject to a separate report on this agenda.
- 18.2. Looking specifically at the revenue budget and capital programme proposals these include changes with direct links to the Strategic Plan such as:-
- The introduction of graffiti clean up team
  - Maintaining staff resources to help process benefits claims despite reduction in Government grant.
  - Providing resources to support a child poverty initiative
  - Considering in detail proposals for 20mph speed limits
  - Providing additional capital funding for disabled facilities grants and private sector renewal schemes.
- 18.3. To achieve the budget growth proposals resources have been shifted through efficiencies such as savings in accommodation running costs and use of new IT reducing

the need for large scale IT replacement. The system of carrying out fundamental service reviews is helping to improve service delivery whilst also reducing costs.

- 18.4. In addition to these items the budget includes examples where funds have been shifted within service areas to ensure that priorities are met at no net additional costs. An example includes funding for air quality monitoring stations and for the detailed assessment.

## **19. Financial Implications**

- 19.1 As set out in the report.

## **20. Publicity Considerations**

- 20.1 Arrangements will be made to publish the approved tax levels in the local press and to produce the Council Tax Information Leaflet for distribution with the Council Tax bills. These will be in accordance with the legal requirements.

## **21. Human Rights Implications**

- 21.1 None

## **22. Equality and Diversity**

- 22.1. Consideration has been given to equality and diversity issues in respect of budget changes proposed as part of the budget process. This has been done in line with agreed policies and procedures including production of Equality Impact Assessments where appropriate.

## **23. Community Safety Implications**

- 23.1 None

## **24. Health and Safety Implications**

- 24.1 None

## **25. Risk Management Implications**

- 25.1 Risk management has been used throughout the budget process and specific consideration has been given to the Council's current risk profile when allocating resources. This will be reflected in the corporate risk register.

## **26. Consultation**

- 26.1. The budget will be scrutinised by Finance and Audit Scrutiny Panel on 26 January 2010. The statutory consultation with NNDR ratepayers takes place on 20 January 2010 and notes of the meeting will be provided at Cabinet.

- 26.2. The budget proposals have been underpinned by the Strategic Plan which was subject to consultation.

### **Background Papers**

Detailed Service Group Expenditure Papers

Budget reports to Cabinet – 2 December 2009

<b>2010/11 Budget Timetable</b>	
<b>Budget Strategy March 09 – July 2009</b>	
<b>March – June (SMT)</b>	Budget Group established Update MTFF /Budget Strategy Review cost pressures, growth and risks Consider approach to budget Externally facilitated Budget Workshop held
<b>Cabinet – 13 July 09</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report on updated budget strategy / MTFF</li> <li>• Timetable approved</li> </ul>
<b>SOSP – 14 July 09</b>	Review Cabinet report
<b>Budget Group / Leadership Team - July</b>	Consider review of capital programme Consider approach to consultation
<b>Detailed Budget preparation and Budget Setting Consultation</b>	
<b>Budget Group / Leadership Team regular sessions on progress / budget options July - September</b>	Review budget tasks Consider Fundamental Service Reviews
<b>Cabinet – 9 September 09</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget Update</li> <li>• Proposals for consultation</li> <li>• Review of capital resources / programme</li> </ul>
<b>Cabinet – 21 October 09</b>	Budget Update (if required)
<b>Cabinet – 2 December 09</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget update</li> <li>• Reserves and balances</li> <li>• Grant settlement</li> <li>• Consultation results (provisional date)</li> </ul>
<b>FASP – 26 January 10</b>	Review consultation / Budget position
<b>Cabinet – 27 January 10</b>	Revenue and Capital budgets recommended to Council
<b>Council – 17 February 10</b>	Budget agreed / capital programme agreed / Council Tax set



### 2010/11 Revenue Cost pressures

Heads of Service / Portfolio Holders have been asked to contain cost pressures within existing budget allocations wherever possible. The following are specific areas where budget allocations have been increased. Changes since the report to Cabinet on 2 December 2009 are highlighted.

	Previous estimate	Updated estimate	
	£'000	£'000	Comment
Inflationary pressure	(67)	(67)	Net inflation impact, including the allowance for the agreed pay award and assumed increase in prices and an increase in fees and charges. This allowance has been reviewed with the main change being the inclusion of savings in energy prices which have taken effect from October.
Incremental pension contributions	154	154	The triennial review of the pension fund has shown a significant deficit due to market conditions and increased life expectancy. This financial pressure is one being felt by all local authorities and other organisations. The impact of next triennial review will need to be considered as part of the 2011/12 budget.
Minimum Revenue Provision (Commutation adjustment)	13	13	Increase in calculated figure based on statutory criteria.
Place Survey – Statutory requirement (one off for 10/11)	15	15	The cost of the statutory place survey is needed every 2 years.
Local Development Framework (LDF) Examinations. (One off)	150	150	Following the submission of two LDF documents to the Secretary of State the process of examination then starts in 2010, including 2 in public. The estimated cost includes the fee for the inspector, legal and consultant fees and a temporary programme officer.
Net Interest earnings	900	900	The net interest budget for this year is currently forecast to have a shortfall due to the low level of interest rates available. The outlook for interest rates remains uncertain, however, it is evident that there will continue to be a considerable cost pressure next year. The allowance of £900k reflects this.
Impact of foregone Layer Road receipt	60	60	At the July Cabinet it was agreed in principal to dispose of land at Layer Road at nil value for an extra-care housing scheme. As reported this will result in a revenue budget impact due to the ongoing costs of borrowing in respect of the community stadium.

	<b>Previous estimate</b>	<b>Updated estimate</b>	
	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Corporate Safeguarding Co-ordinator	10	10	We have statutory responsibilities under section 11 of the Children Act 2004 regarding safeguarding the welfare of children – our task this financial year is to complete a self-assessment against these responsibilities, and we then need to use the results of this self-assessment to develop an action plan in the next financial year to ensure we are fully compliant, and this staff resource will drive this process and support Services with tasks they need to complete. We then need to report our progress back to the Essex Safeguarding Children Board late in 2010.
2 Planning Officers (Strategic Policy and Regeneration)	75	75	These are permanent posts in the establishment but have to date been funded through an annual approval process of using HPDG (Housing Planning and Delivery Grant). It is proposed that the cost of these posts be included in the base budget with an assumed increase in the level of HPDG as agreed by Cabinet.
Revised Corporate targets	260	260	The report sets out that it is necessary to review the level of salary targets due to the economic climate and the resulting impact on staff turnover. In addition, the income target has also been reviewed.
Housing Benefits – reduction in admin grant	0	70	The recently announced benefit admin grant has reduced from the level received in 2009/10. In order to maintain current staffing levels to deal with the continued high level of claims it is recommended that this pressure be funded as a one-off with the assumption that the FSR will identify savings through more efficient processes from 2011/12.
Reduction in cemetery and crematorium income	0	64	We are facing a large income pressure in year for 09/10 for a number of reasons: A reduction in the number of burials and cremations carried out (anecdotal evidence from surrounding crematoriums seems to suggest a current decline in death-rate); a reduction in the number and value of memorials purchased and the opening of a new crematorium in Braintree
Reduction in Licensing income	0	15	The introduction of the EU Services Directive (in force from 28 December 09) requires that we do not charge any more for licences than it costs us to administer the licence. This impacts on licences such as Sex Shop Licences which are very low resource input but high income.
Audit Fees		23	Forecast increase in external audit costs due to methodology for calculating base fee imposed unilaterally by the Audit Commission.

	<b>Previous estimate</b>	<b>Updated estimate</b>	
	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Technical Items / General Fund / HRA adjustments		25	Estimated impact of budget change on allocation of costs between General Fund and HRA and other technical items.
Scanning		45	Additional costs associated with running central scanning team. In 2010/11 this will be funded through the ICT Strategy capital budget via the Capital Expenditure Reserve.
VAF Legal Fees	250	250	Additional provision for external legal costs as reported to Cabinet on 2 December 2009
Icelandic Investment impairment	614	615	Estimated impact of 'impairment' costs associated with investment in Landsbanki. Cost includes cashflow impact based on specified repayment profile and preferred creditor status.
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,434</b>	<b>2,677</b>	

## 2010/11 Revenue Growth items

The following growth items have been included within the current budget allocations which are all additions since the report to Cabinet on 2 December 2009.

<b>Area</b>	<b>New Items / Changes £'000</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Graffiti Clean Up	55	Introduction of a specialist Graffiti cleaning team in order to improve clearance response times, extend areas of removal and meet the Councils Strategic aims.
Child Poverty Initiative	15	The project involves training 2 staff members in every Colchester Children's Centre on the most common Welfare Rights and Benefits matters. Then staff will proactively identify families who would gain the most from extra benefit checks as publicising this new service in the Centres and responding to those families seek support.
Census preparation (one-off)	15	<p>The £15k proposal is to fund a Census Community Developer post. This person would be responsible for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Networking with external partners,</li> <li>• Bringing our community/voluntary groups together,</li> <li>• Organising and taking part in low level community events</li> <li>• Coordinating the data for our Census Area Profile (CAP)</li> <li>• Communications support.</li> </ul> <p>The Census will take place on 27 March 2011. Increased emphasis is being given to local authority involvement in its success. Our focus should be on low level engagement with our customers and reaching all sectors of the community to encourage people to complete their Census form.</p>
20mph consultation (one off)	15	Following the findings of the 20mph Task and Finish Group and approval of the recommendations by Cabinet that funding is required to develop and undertake structured, meaningful and relevant consultation with residents and organisations on the implementation of 20 mph policy across Colchester.
Green Infrastructure Study (one off) funded through HPDG).	25	Green infrastructure is a connected system of protected sites, nature reserves, greenspaces and greenway linkages. By providing for multi-functional uses, e.g. wildlife, recreation, and cultural experience, green infrastructure contributes to quality of life whilst also delivering landscape, historic and ecological benefits. A local study will provide more detail and help inform master plans that are being prepared for North Colchester and Stanway as well as the regeneration of East Colchester.
	<b>125</b>	

## Summary of Savings / Increased Income

	Total	Reallocations	Total by Service
	£	£	£
<b>Service specific savings</b>			
Executive Management Team	14,000		14,000
Corporate Management	216,000	(16,000)	200,000
Customer Service Centre	60,000		60,000
Environmental & Protective Services	199,000	8,300	207,300
Life Opportunities	70,000	77,900	147,900
Resource Management	40,000	60,900	100,900
Strategic Policy and Regeneration	59,000	600	59,600
Street Services	117,000	3,500	120,500
<b>Total Service Savings</b>	<b>775,000</b>	<b>135,200</b>	<b>910,200</b>
Housing and Planning Delivery Grant	398,000		398,000
LABGI	50,000		50,000
Fundamental Service Reviews (FSR)	100,000	(100,000)	0
Invest to Save	34,000	(8,000)	26,000
NNDR Costs Across service areas	27,200	(27,200)	0
Less: Provision for one-off costs	(150,000)		(150,000)
<b>Total Service Savings</b>	<b>1,234,200</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,234,200</b>

*Notes:*

*The budget also includes the continuation of corporate savings targets in respect of salaries of £315k.*

*The table shows reallocations for savings across more than one service such as legal costs and NNDR savings as well as FSR savings.*

*Housing FSR savings are shown all within Life Opportunities, however, some saving will be within SP&R*

*The following pages set out detailed delivery plans for all specific proposals.*

<b>Work Area: EMT</b>					
<b>Who: Ann Wain</b>					
<b>Saving (£): £14,300</b>					
<i>Outline of work</i>	<i>Specific Tasks and Timetable</i>	<i>Risks to delivery</i>	<i>Mitigating action</i>	<i>Monitoring arrangements</i>	
External printing (£1.8k)	Majority used for Xmas cards. Have gone to electronic cards so no longer need budget.	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Conferences (£2k)	Reduction in costs for SMT awaydays.				
Marketing (£10.5k)	Budget reduced.	Reduced speed and impact of work and in particular training and development; removes flexibility to respond to opportunities as they emerge.	Take as a one off saving and review impact in future years.		

**Work Area: Corporate Management**

**Who: Lucie Breadman**

**Saving (£): £216k (includes £16k savings across other service areas)**

<i>Outline of work</i>	<i>Specific Tasks and Timetable</i>	<i>Risks to delivery</i>	<i>Mitigating action</i>	<i>Monitoring arrangements</i>
Rowan House Service Charge (£30k)	Reduced Service Charge already agreed	Should not be any risk	n/a	Ongoing monitoring of service charge
Town Hall – Lettings income (£13k)	New business plan active from 1.4.10	Ongoing works to Town Hall, economic climate	Limit Disturbance and marketing plan	Ongoing monitoring of BP against income
Angel Court – Savings in respect of disposal of Angel Court (£140k)	Should be effective from 1.4.10	No foreseeable risk	n/a	Ongoing monitoring against predicted cost
Legal Services – staffing reduction and reduced legal costs across CBC through use of Essex Legal Services Partnership. (£29k)	Finalisation of staff redundancy and payment details and agreement by Strategic Housing to take on a small element of additional work.	1) Non-use of Essex Legal Services by Services who still procure external legal advice from current sources – no saving achieved. 2) Use of Essex legal services does not provide the quality of service required.	1) Savings to be taken out of service budgets up front to ensure use of the partnership. 2) Close monitoring and communications with Legal Services from those using the partnership to feedback & monitor on service levels.	Regular monitoring and liaison.
Mayoral reception The annual reception hosted by the Mayor for the Mayor's and Mayoress' of the various neighbouring local authorities (£1.7k)	Has been agreed with current Mayor not to hold this event in 09/10. NB NOT agreed with new Mayor for 10/11 as yet, awaiting a decision.	None	Not relevant	Not relevant.
Small savings across group (£2k)				

<b>Work Area: CSC</b>				
<b>Who: Leonie Rathbone / Pam Donnelly</b>				
<b>Saving (£): £60,000</b>				
<i>Outline of work</i>	<i>Specific Tasks and Timetable</i>	<i>Risks to delivery</i>	<i>Mitigating action</i>	<i>Monitoring arrangements</i>
Income from partners in support of infopoint@colchester (£60k)	Commitment now agreed from partners	Contributions change or are not ongoing.	Ongoing communication with partners and consideration of securing ongoing commitment.	Regular review of arrangements with partners.



<b>Work Area: Environmental and Protective Services</b>					
<b>Who: Beverly Jones</b>					
<b>Saving (£): £199k</b>					
<i>Outline of work</i>	<i>Specific Tasks and Timetable</i>	<i>Risks to delivery</i>	<i>Mitigating action</i>	<i>Monitoring arrangements</i>	
Environmental and Protective Services Review – Forecast increase in income (£15k)	Review income projections for 2010/11. Agree budget for year.	Based on current levels this increased income is achievable.		Monthly monitoring of income and caseloads	
Museums. Saving on administration / IT (£15k). Target for savings from review of service (£30k)	Savings on Administration/IT are secured by renegotiation of IT charge and by decision to cut staff post.	No risk to delivery			
	Review due to start March/April 2010 and due to report August/September.	Review fails to identify efficiencies or changes to service levels that are acceptable.  One-off costs are prohibitive.	The FSR process has been shown to be effective at identifying opportunities for making changes and delivering efficiencies.  Ensure consultation and scrutiny throughout process.	Final report to be submitted in New Year and monitoring of action plan.	
Planning Income. Additional forecast income reflecting improved number of applications. The	Planning Officers continue to work with Developers and Agents to ensure that process does not discourage	Recession impacts on quantity or scale of development and therefore impacts on numbers of applications.	Planning Officers continue to offer pre-application advice and maintain discussions with	Regular monitoring	financial

<b>Work Area: Environmental and Protective Services</b>					
<b>Who: Beverly Jones</b>					
<b>Saving (£): £199k</b>					
<i>Outline of work</i>	<i>Specific Tasks and Timetable</i>	<i>Risks to delivery</i>	<i>Mitigating action</i>	<i>Monitoring arrangements</i>	
increased income needs to be offset by the cost of staff returning from temporary secondments to deal with the current workload (net saving of £138k)	applications.		developers and agents to ensure that development opportunities continue to be considered.		
Small savings across group (£1.2k)	Budget Group 14 Dec	No risk to delivery	N/A	Regular monitoring	financial

<b>Work Area: Life Opportunities</b>			
<b>Who: Gareth Mitchell</b>			
<b>Saving (£): £145k (including £75k in respect of Housing FSR)</b>			
<i>Outline of work</i>	<i>Specific Tasks and Timetable</i>	<i>Risks to delivery</i>	<i>Mitigating action</i>
		<i>Monitoring arrangements</i>	
Sport and Leisure – Additional net income in respect of:- Bar and catering (£10k)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>manage vending contracts in-house rather than through contractors</li> <li>Review prices of stock against other comparable local outlets</li> <li>Enter agreement with Zoggs to supply swimming equipment</li> <li>Build retail outlet off the reception area at Leisure World</li> </ul>	The recession results in decreased sales	Regular financial monitoring
Retails sales of swimming equipment (£6k)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide additional grass pitch at Tiptree Sports Centre in conjunction with Thurstable school</li> </ul>	<p>The recession results in decreased sales</p> <p>A delay in building retail outlet leads to lower sales</p>	Regular financial monitoring and liaison with supplier
Tiptree Sports Centre income (£5k)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider financial risk on an event by</li> </ul>	<p>The recession results in decreased pitch use</p> <p>Additional pitch provision in Tiptree could affect potential income</p> <p>The recession results in decreased ticket sales</p>	Regular financial monitoring
Charter Hall Events (£6k)		Monitor competitors Improve quality of customer experience	Regular financial monitoring

<b>Work Area: Life Opportunities</b>			
<b>Who: Gareth Mitchell</b>			
<b>Saving (£): £145k (including £75k in respect of Housing FSR)</b>			
<i>Outline of work</i>	<i>Specific Tasks and Timetable</i>	<i>Risks to delivery</i>	<i>Mitigating action</i>
			<i>Monitoring arrangements</i>
Aqua Springs (£3k)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>event basis</li> <li>Pursue private hire bookings</li> </ul>	<p>Cost of hiring Charter Hall leads to hirers using other venues</p> <p>The recession results in decreased sales</p> <p>Competitive market</p>	<p>and value for money</p> <p>Pricing and promotional campaigns, identify customer demands</p> <p>Regular financial monitoring</p>
Lifestyles memberships (£15k)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure all staff aware of importance of up-selling centre passes where appropriate</li> </ul>	<p>The recession results in decreased sales in a competitive market</p>	<p>Regular financial monitoring and capturing customer feedback</p>
Invest to Save project. Savings accruing from Invest to Save projects carried out in 2009. (£15k)	<p>Projects agreed and implemented.</p>	<p>Savings being delivered now therefore minimal risk.</p>	<p>Regular budget monitoring.</p>
Car parking charges at High Woods Country Park (£10k)	<p>Produce business case for introduction of car parking charges</p> <p>Implement car parking charges</p>	<p>Business case does not demonstrate opportunity for sufficient additional income.</p> <p>Project will not deliver full year income opportunity due to timescales</p>	<p>Portfolio Holder will consider business case.</p> <p>Regular financial monitoring</p>

<b>Work Area: Life Opportunities</b>				
<b>Who: Gareth Mitchell</b>				
<b>Saving (£): £145k (including £75k in respect of Housing FSR)</b>				
<i>Outline of work</i>	<i>Specific Tasks and Timetable</i>	<i>Risks to delivery</i>	<i>Mitigating action</i>	<i>Monitoring arrangements</i>
Housing Fundamental Service Review (£75k) Estimated General Fund saving through changes proposed as part of the review of housing. The saving comprises savings across this service area and Strategic Policy and Regeneration.	Housing Review detailed business case agreed by Cabinet on 2 Dec 2009. Implementation commenced in Jan 2010.	Savings are apportioned across HRA/General Fund and may not achieve full budgeted GF saving. Implementation is delayed so full year saving is not achieved. Any potential one off costs could reduce the savings potential in year one	Performance Management Framework to be developed for implementation phase of review. Realise all opportunities to redeploy staff to minimise any one off costs.	Portfolio Holders and Cabinet informed of progress throughout review through Implementation Plan updates. Implementation Team in place to manage and monitor implementation.

<b>Work Area: Resource Management</b>				
<b>Who: Charles Warboys</b>				
<b>Saving (£): £73k (includes £25k in respect of FSR to be allocated)</b>				
<i>Outline of work</i>	<i>Specific Tasks and Timetable</i>	<i>Risks to delivery</i>	<i>Mitigating action</i>	<i>Monitoring arrangements</i>
Indicative target for Fundamental Service Review of revenues and benefits. (£48K) <i>Includes saving of £23k in respect of benefits assessment officer post not replaced.</i>	Review started and due to report early in new year.	Review fails to identify further efficiencies.  One-off costs are prohibitive.  Economic situation increases workload resulting in limited scope to deliver net savings.	The FSR process has been shown to be effective at identifying opportunities for making changes and delivering efficiencies.  Ensure consultation and scrutiny throughout process.	Final report to be submitted in New Year and monitoring of action plan.
Invest to Save – Remote printing proposal (£8k)	Meetings scheduled with Serco and supplier. Project due to start for revenues and benefits in mid-March with a completion date by end of July.	Saving dependant on level of postage / use of electronic communication methods.	Monitoring usage / volumes.	Monitoring of project plan.
Non-renewal of DCAL software licence (£6.5k)	Decision to not renew system agreed and supplier notified Alternative system arrangements put in place.	New procedures result in greater administration costs	Process considered and will be reviewed to ensure it is cost effective.	Review arrangements during year.
Miscellaneous rental changes, principally Culver Square (£6.6k)	Budget amended	Economic climate is such that rental income is not delivered as expected.	Continue to monitor and review rental income. Work with partners to	Monthly monitoring of rental income forecasts

<b>Work Area: Resource Management</b>			
<b>Who: Charles Warboys</b>			
<b>Saving (£): £73k (includes £25k in respect of FSR to be allocated)</b>			
	promote CBC		
Treasury Management brokerage fees (£4k)	Savings included in current forecast 09/10. Reduced fees likely to be incurred in 10/11 due to policy of internal borrowing so less new borrowing	At risk if required to borrow to finance capital programme / incur temporary borrowing.	Regular review of cashflow forecasts.
			Review of cashflow and treasury management strategy

**Work Area: Strategic Policy and Regeneration**

**Who:** Lindsay Barker

**Saving (£): £59k (+ savings included under Life Opportunities in respect of Housing Review )**

<i>Outline of work</i>	<i>Specific Tasks and Timetable</i>	<i>Risks to delivery</i>	<i>Mitigating action</i>	<i>Monitoring arrangements</i>
Reduction in Cultural Services Management budget (£30k)	Budget removed	Main risk will be reduced capacity for project support.	Continue to work with partner organisations.	Cultural Services Manager
Spatial Policy – Reduction in staffing by 0.5fte following review (£19k)	Opportunity to amalgamate two posts following the end of a joint arrangement with Tending (TDC decision)	Already in place from Jan 2010	Clear workload management in place for the team to manage the reduction in staffing	Spatial policy manager
Initiative Funding Subscriptions (£10k)	Grantfinder / Grant net is a tool for identifying grant funding opportunities within the UK. Annual subscription expires in March 2010.	Potential to miss funding opportunities	ECC have the tool so will seek to work more closely where necessary	Enterprise team



<b>Work Area: Street Services</b>					
<b>Who: Matthew Young</b>					
<b>Saving (£): £117,000</b>					
<i>Outline of work</i>	<i>Specific Tasks and Timetable</i>	<i>Risks to delivery</i>	<i>Mitigating action</i>	<i>Monitoring arrangements</i>	
Trade Waste expenditure (£7k)	ECC have reduced landfill charges from 1 April resulting in £7k saving	No risk to delivery. The only circumstance where saving is not met would result in additional income for customers	n/a	Monthly monitoring by Street Care and Recycling Manager	budget by Street Recycling
Trade Waste service (£25k)	Consideration of additional recycling opportunities for businesses. Additional marketing and promotion of commercial waste service	Risk that marketing and promotion does not result in additional market share and income	Promotional campaigns, identify customer demands Improve service delivery and develop SLA for customers Start process as soon as possible	Monthly monitoring by Street Care and Recycling Manager	budget by Street Recycling
Street Fundamental Review (£25k)	The savings will be delivered as part of the project work approach of a FSR	That no 'in year' savings are identified through the process. That the corporate support to the project is delayed	From the experience of other FSR it is probable that savings will be identified some of which could be realised immediately	Regular reviews into FSR process	built
Markets (£60k)	Investigate and develop action plan to introduce new and/or improved	Risk that additional markets are unable to attract sufficient traders	Promotional campaigns, identify customer and trader demands	Monthly monitoring by Street Care and Recycling	budget by Street Recycling

<b>Work Area: Street Services</b>			
<b>Who: Matthew Young</b>			
<b>Saving (£): £117,000</b>			
	markets. Consideration of additional Thursday street market or themed Thursday or Sunday markets Investigate outsourcing of market management Consider redesign of market layout	Aim to commence 1 April although timescales may be difficult to meet	Manager
		Improve service delivery and develop SLA for traders and customers Start process as soon as possible	

<b>Work Area: Technical Items / Non-Service Specific areas</b>					
<b>Who: Charles Warboys and Senior Management Team</b>					
<b>Saving (£): £501k</b>					
<i>Outline of work</i>	<i>Specific Tasks and Timetable</i>	<i>Risks to delivery</i>	<i>Mitigating action</i>	<i>Monitoring arrangements</i>	
Changes to Government Grants:- LABGI (extra £50k, i.e. total of £100k) HPDG (extra £398k, i.e. total of £648k)	Await announcement of grants	Grants are lower than budgeted.	LABGI estimate based on indications provided within consultation paper and amount received in 09/10.  HPDG grant in 09/10 was over £1.4m. The consultation paper set out that the overall funding pot in the third year (10/11) will be larger. Based on current forecasts the budget figure should be achievable	Grants will be notified during 2010/11 and will be reported as part of normal budget monitoring reports to FASP.	
NNDR savings across services (£27k)	Following the revaluation of properties and extension of empty property relief there is a net saving across CBC properties	N/a	n/a	Budget monitoring	
Invest to Save (residual balance £26k)	Proposed to release this sum to support the budget	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

## Budget Analysis – Appendix E

	Adjusted Base Budget	One-Off Items	Cost Pressures	Growth	Total Savings	Detailed 10/11 Budgets
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Corporate & Democratic Core	330		26			356
Executive Management Team	759		7		(14)	752
Corporate Management	6,714	59	68		(200)	6,641
Customer Services	1,157	(9)	11		(60)	1,099
Env. & Protective Services	2,555	(20)	55		(207)	2,383
Life Opportunities	5,965		(72)	15	(73)	5,835
Resource Management	2,095		138		(68)	2,165
Strategic Policy & Regen.	2,658	(120)	492	55	(60)	3,025
Street Services	2,823	(40)	(44)	55	(120)	2,674
<b>Total Services</b>	<b>25,056</b>	<b>(130)</b>	<b>681</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>(802)</b>	<b>24,930</b>
<b>Technical Items</b>						
Pay Savings	(515)		200			(315)
Procurement	0		0			0
Income target	(60)		60			0
LABGI	(50)		0		(50)	(100)
HPDG	(250)		0		(398)	(648)
Area Based Grant (ABG)	(23)		0			(23)
Grants to Parish councils	202		0			202
CLIA (net interest)	(322)		960			638
Min Revenue Provision	549		13			562
Pensions	2,198		154			2,352
Redundancy Provision	120	(120)	0		150	150
ECC Second Homes	(144)		0			(144)
Heritage Reserve	12		0			12
Contribution to capital	80	(80)	0			0
I2Save			0		(34)	(34)
FSR	0		0		(100)	(100)
Icelandic Investment Impairment			615			615
GF/HRA adjustments	(2,421)		(6)			(2,427)
Total Below the Line	(624)	(200)	1,996	0	(432)	740
<b>Total incl Below the line</b>	<b>24,432</b>	<b>(330)</b>	<b>2,677</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>(1,234)</b>	<b>25,670</b>
<b>Funded by:-</b>						
General Reserve	(484)	484	(671)			(671)
Capital Expenditure Reserve	(661)	361	(910)			(1,210)
Regeneration Reserve	(221)	55	0			(166)
Other Reserves - S.106	(60)		0		(10)	(70)
Insurance	(100)	100	0			0
Government Grant (RSG / NNDR)	(12,681)		0		(230)	(12,911)
Council Tax	(10,225)		0		(368)	(10,593)
Collection fund Transfer	0		0		(49)	(49)
<b>Total</b>	<b>(24,432)</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>(1,581)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(657)</b>	<b>(25,670)</b>

**General Fund Balances  
Current Position**

	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>
Balance as at 31 March 2009 (As per Statement of Accounts)		2,891
<b>Movement on balances during 2009/10:</b>		
• Financing carry forwards		(222)
• Funds released in previous years to carry forward to 09/10 (includes invest to save projects)		(178)
• Supporting 2009/10 budget:-		
Items included in 2009/10 budget	(484)	
Emerging pressures agreed	(285)	
Further pressures identified	(250)	
		(1,019)
Forecast outturn 2009/10 - underspend		(699)
<b>Projected Balances as at 31 March 2010</b>		<b>2,171</b>
Less anticipated support to 2010/11 budget		671
		<b>1,500</b>
 Proposed minimum balance		 <b>1,500</b>

**Note:**

- This forecast is on the basis that there are no further calls on balances during the remainder of the year and that the current year's outturn is delivered on budget.
- A proposal is made within the main report (paragraph 10.6) to use £671k from balances to support the 2010/11 budget.

## Renewals and Repairs 2010/11 Releases

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>Requested Value of Release</b>
<b>Various</b>	
Building Maintenance Programme	760,000
<b>Environmental and Protective Services</b>	
Environmental Control - Noise Equipment	18,800
Cemetery - Memorial Repairs	10,000
Crematorium – Cremators (part of capital project), floors, carpets & curtains.	241,000
<b>Life Opportunities (All Colchester Leisure World)</b>	
Leisure Pool Change Refurbishment	10,000
Teaching Pool and Thermal Pool Filters	40,000
Aqua Springs Feature Refurbishment (money from a scheme previously released but no longer needed)	20,000
CLW Miscellaneous (including swimming retail outlet agreed)	35,000
<b>Street Services</b>	
Bus Station - maintenance	19,500
Car Park – equipment (hand held computers etc)	30,000
Total	<b>1,184,300</b>

<b>Medium Term Financial Forecast</b>				
<b>2011/12 to 2013/14</b>				
	<b>2010/11</b>	<b>2011/12</b>	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>2013/14</b>
	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>
<b>Base Budget</b>	24,432	25,670	25,462	25,792
Remove one-off items	(330)			
Cost Pressures	2,677	(745)	405	375
Growth Items	125	(70)	0	0
Savings	(786)	(163)	(75)	0
Changes to Gov't grants (LABGI, HPDG etc)	(448)	770	0	0
<b>Forecast Base Budget</b>	<b>25,670</b>	<b>25,462</b>	<b>25,792</b>	<b>26,167</b>
Government Grant	(12,911)	(12,265)	(11,652)	(11,070)
Council Tax	(10,593)	(10,963)	(11,346)	(11,743)
Collection Fund Surplus	(49)	0	0	0
Use of Reserves	(2,117)	(370)	(370)	(370)
<b>Total Funding</b>	<b>(25,670)</b>	<b>(23,598)</b>	<b>(23,368)</b>	<b>(23,183)</b>
<b>Budget (surplus) / gap before changes (cumulative)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,864</b>	<b>2,424</b>	<b>2,984</b>
<b>Annual increase</b>		<b>1,864</b>	<b>560</b>	<b>561</b>

**Key Assumptions**

Inflation - Pay assumed at 0%, other cost and income circa 1 / 1.5%

Gov't Grant – The grant for 2011/12 and beyond is assumed to reduce in cash terms by 5% p.a.

Council Tax – 2.47% increase + 1% increase in tax base assumed for 10/11 and beyond.

No general recovery in income from planning, car parks, interest earnings etc.

Next pensions actuarial review will impact in 11/12 and a planning assumption of £250k has been assumed for all years

<b>Cost Pressures</b>				
General Inflation	140	140	140	140
Net Inflationary changes (e.g. energy)	(207)			
Corporate safeguarding co-ordinator (new)	10			
Impact of foregoing Layer Rd Capital Receipt	60			
General impact on net interest earnings	900			
Pensions	154	250	250	250
MRP (Minimum Revenue Provision)	13	10		
Core Strategy Examination (one off)	150	(150)		
Place Surveys	15	(15)	15	(15)
Shortfall in income targets	60			
Shortfall in salary targets	200			
Iceland (one off)	615	(615)		
VAF (one off)	250	(250)		
Cemetery and Crematorium income	64			
Licensing Income	15			
Planning Policy staff	75			
Benefits Staff / Reduction in grant (one off)	70	(70)		

<b>Medium Term Financial Forecast</b>				
<b>2011/12 to 2013/14</b>				
	<b>2010/11</b>	<b>2011/12</b>	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>2013/14</b>
	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>
Cost of scanning (funded through CER)	45	(45)		
Audit costs	23			
General Fund / Housing Revenue Account impact	23			
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,677</b>	<b>(745)</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>375</b>
<b>Growth Items</b>				
Green Infrastructure Study (one off HPDG funded)	25	(25)		
Graffiti	55			
Census (one off)	15	(15)		
20mph	15	(15)		
Child Poverty	15	(15)		
<b>Total</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>(70)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Savings / additional Income</b>				
Corporate Management	4	(2)		
Executive Management Team	14	(10)		
Resource Management	17	(4)		
Environmental & Protective Services	16			
Strategic Policy and Regeneration	10			
Street Services (including market and trade waste)	92			
Angel Court (net savings)	200			
Sport and Leisure	45			
Museum Service - Back office functions	15			
Facilities Management	43			
Cultural Services	30			
Invest to Save (Sport & Leisure)	15			
Spatial Policy	19			
Planning income (less costs)	138			
Legal Services	13			
Legal costs across service areas	16			
Invest to Save (remote printing)	8	7		
Invest to Save (balance)	26	(26)		
High Woods Car Park	10			
NNDR Savings	27	(27)		
less provision for one-off costs	(150)	150		
<b>Fundamental Service Reviews</b>				
Housing	75	75	75	
Revenues and Benefits	48			
Museums	30			
Street	25			
<b>Total</b>	<b>786</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Decrease in Government Grants</b>				
LABGI	(50)	100		
Housing and Planning Delivery Grant	(398)	648		
Area Based Grant		22		
<b>Total</b>	<b>(448)</b>	<b>770</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>



<b>Medium Term Financial Forecast</b>				
<b>2011/12 to 2013/14</b>				
	<b>2010/11</b>	<b>2011/12</b>	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>2013/14</b>
	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>
<b>Use of Reserves</b>				
Balances (General)	671			
S106 monitoring reserve	70	70	70	70
Regeneration Reserve	166			
Capital Expenditure Reserve:-				
Community Stadium	300	300	300	300
Iceland and VAF	865			
Other	45			
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,117</b>	<b>370</b>	<b>370</b>	<b>370</b>

## Addressing the Budget Gap

The MTFF shows a budget gap of circa £3m over the three years from 2011/12. This is an increase on the previous situation reflecting the increased pressures on the Council's budgets and some of the one-off savings used to balance the budget.

There is no doubt that the current economic climate has impacted on the Council's budget proposals for 10/11 and is likely to continue having an impact during next year and beyond.

## Risk Areas / Comments

The key risk areas to the forecast are:-

Ref	Risk / Area of uncertainty	
1	<i>Government Grant and the Comprehensive Spending Review 10 (CSR10)</i>	What the CSR10 will provide is difficult to predict, however, it is clear that public finances are continuing to come under increasing pressures. The MTFF assumes a reduction in grant of cash reduction of 5%pa for the next three years. For illustrative purposes a 1% change in the level of grant equates to £130k.
2	<i>Government grants and partnership funding</i>	The Council's budget has changed over recent years with a greater emphasis on funding from both partner organisations and Government bodies. These funding streams can rarely be guaranteed and can therefore add to our cost pressures. The 2010/11 budget includes funding in respect of HPDG and the LABGI scheme. 2010/11 sees the end of the funding period for these grants. Given the uncertainty over public finances the MTFF assumes these grants will cease.
3	<i>Pensions</i>	An allowance has been built in for increases in pensions costs based on the results of the recent actuarial review and therefore are fixed for 2010/11. However, an updated review will be undertaken that will inform the cost for 2011/12 onwards. The recent and ongoing economic downturn is highly likely to impact on the pension fund and therefore whilst an increased allowance of £250k each year from 11/12 has been made for this it will need to be reviewed when more reliable estimates are available.
4	<i>Concessionary Fares</i>	CLG and DoT consulted on the future administration of the concessionary fares scheme. The favoured option being a transfer of responsibility to upper tier authorities (e.g. Essex County Council). In many ways this would mirror existing locally negotiated arrangements. There is a second consultation on the amounts of funding to be transferred. The method of assessing costs is not yet known so this represents a risk to the Council which could be positive or negative.
5	<i>Fees and charges</i>	As has been seen in the past few years we have experienced pressures arising from changes in income levels. In 2008/09 we experienced significant shortfalls in income in respect of planning and building control fees and car park revenue (on and off street). Looking ahead to 2010/11 and beyond it is difficult to estimate how income

Ref	Risk / Area of uncertainty	
		levels may continue to be affected, however, the 10/11 budget assumes some increase in revenue from planning which has recovered to an extent during the last 12 months. At this stage no allowance has been built in for any further changes to income levels.
6	<i>Inflation</i>	An allowance for general inflation has been built into the 10/11 forecast and MTF, and specific increases allowed for items such as pay (which has been agreed for 09/10 and 10/11) The current (November 2009) CPI is 1.9% and RPI is 0.3%. The economic forecasts published by HM Treasury point to inflation figures for 2010 of 1.9% and 2.9% for CPI and RPI respectively. Not all the Council's costs are directly linked to RPI and therefore we will continue to monitor the impact of inflation on all Council costs with particular attention on energy costs for which an overall reduction has been included in the 10/11 budget figures reflecting agreed prices for the period October 09 – October 10.
7	<i>Use of reserves</i>	The budget position for 10/11 includes proposals to use certain reserves and also reflects the impact of reserves used in 09/10. The forecast position on general balances shows that they remain at our recommended level with no headroom.
8	<i>Legislation</i>	There may be new legislation over the life of the MTF for which any available funding may not cover costs.
9	<i>Impact of renaissance programme e.g. car park closure and staff resources</i>	As the renaissance programme progresses there will be an impact on income from car parks due to temporary and permanent closure of certain car parks and also the introduction of park and ride. We are currently using the Regeneration Reserve to meet some staffing costs to provide increased capacity to deliver the renaissance programme. The budget forecast includes funding for 2010/11 to ensure that the team can continue work. However, this will exhaust the Reserve and therefore any future costs will need to be considered as part of the budget.
10	<i>ICT strategy – change programme</i>	The ICT strategy was updated in 2007 there have been a number of financial implications arising from changes. This has resulted in some costs in the short-term leading to longer term savings. This has been examined as part of detailed budget proposals and as part of the implementation of accommodation and flexible working changes and will be monitored to assess in ongoing financial issues.
11	<i>Property review</i>	A review of our assets was carried out and a 5-year Building Repairs and Maintenance Plan produced. There will continue to be financial implications arising from this for both the revenue budget and capital programme and these will be continue to be considered in detail by the council's Property Forum and included in the on-going updates of the MTF.
12	<i>Impact of growth in the Borough and</i>	A number of Local Authority services are directly impacted by the increase of population in the Borough, such as waste

Ref	Risk / Area of uncertainty	
	<i>demand for services</i>	<p>services, planning, benefits etc.</p> <p>As part of the budget it will be necessary to consider whether there is a need for additional resources in these or other areas in order to maintain levels of service.</p> <p>A further area of risk is any increase in the demands for Council services arising from the impact on residents of the economic environment.</p> <p>At this stage no allowance for these areas has been provided within the MTF. Fundamental Service Reviews (FSR) have been carried out or are being undertaken on some of the key areas affected by growth and /or also the economic climate such as benefits, housing and street services. The financial assumption made is that these reviews will assist in identifying efficiencies to cope with changes in demand.</p>
13	<i>Delivery of budget savings</i>	<p>The 2010/11 budget continues to set some challenging targets for savings although for 10/11 these have been reduced to reflect the current economic climate such as the salaries target. The MTF assumes these targets will be delivered at these amended levels.</p>
14	<i>Net earnings Interest</i>	<p>The budget is influenced by a number of factors including interest rates and cashflow movements. The treasury management strategy highlights the outlook for interest rates in the medium-term which points to continuation of unprecedented low levels into 2010/11.</p> <p>The 2010/11 budget as proposed shows a significant reduction in interest earnings and the MTF currently assumes no further recovery in this area. This will be monitored and considered again as part of the 2011/12 budget.</p>

All these issues will remain as risks to be managed over the course of the MTF.

## Schemes Recommended for Removal

Scheme	Funded £'000	Unfunded £'000	Total £'000	Description	Reason for removal / implications
Backlog Repairs	0.0	150.0	150.0	Required maintenance to civic buildings.	The budget provision for the buildings maintenance programme is currently being reviewed. Condition surveys are expected to be completed by the end of 2009 and then turned into a programme of works for 2011/12 and beyond.
Public Conveniences	139.0	0.0	139.0	Toilet refurbishment works.	The rest of the public conveniences programme has now been reviewed by the Portfolio Holder in line with the Cabinet's wishes and no further refurbishments are planned.
Maritime Projects	0.0	150.0	150.0	Provision for maritime project works.	Projects not started - funding could be withdrawn.
Opportunity Purchases	53.0	0.0	53.0	Fund for purchase of opportunity purchases	Small balance does not represent the cost of any likely purchases.
Castle Park Improvements	2.3	0.0	2.3	Design work to create plans showing overall improvements to the park in a coordinated approach.	Work complete. Balance is an underspend.
ICT Strategy Development	0.0	200.0	200.0	New capital investment	Projected outturn shows £200k underspend.
Computer Upgrade	0.0	800.0	800.0	Personal Computer Upgrade (including Councillors Computers). To keep personal computer stock updated	No longer required due to the adoption of VDI technology as part of the ICT strategy scheme.
East Colchester, Hythe Regeneration	222.1	0.0	222.1	A general provision for the cost of progressing elements of the regeneration of the area from master planning to matchfunding individual projects such as B-Sure.	Alternative funds for delivery currently being accessed.
Town Centre Signs (Phase 2)	90.0	0.0	90.0	Extension of Town Centre signage scheme.	Reconsider funding when St Botolphs regeneration takes place as new street signage will be required at that time.
<b>Total</b>	<b>506.40</b>	<b>1,300.00</b>	<b>1,806.40</b>		

Service / Scheme	Total Funded Prog. £'000	Funded		Unreleased Total £'000
		09/10	10/11	
		£'000	£'000	
<b>SUMMARY</b>				
Corporate Management	2,168.9	2,067.4	101.5	0.0
EMT	236.7	236.7	0.0	0.0
Resource Management	629.0	489.5	139.5	0.0
Street Services	453.2	453.2	0.0	96.0
Environmental & Protective Serv.	1,027.4	637.4	390.0	300.0
Strategic Policy & Regeneration	15,859.3	10,264.4	5,594.9	545.0
Life Opportunities	4,543.4	3,239.7	1,303.7	55.0
Completed Schemes	98.0	98.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Total (General Fund)</b>	<b>25,015.9</b>	<b>17,486.3</b>	<b>7,529.6</b>	<b>996.0</b>
<b>CORPORATE MANAGEMENT</b>				
Town Hall	106.8	105.3	1.5	0.0
E-Government	43.8	43.8	0.0	0.0
GIS/Gazetteer	11.3	11.3	0.0	0.0
Electronic Service Delivery	190.0	190.0	0.0	0.0
ICT Strategy Development	1,717.0	1,717.0	0.0	0.0
Customer Service Centre Redesign	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
<b>TOTAL - CORPORATE MANAGEMENT</b>	<b>2,168.9</b>	<b>2,067.4</b>	<b>101.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>EMT</b>				
Support for Parish Councils and Community Groups	236.7	236.7	0.0	0.0
<b>TOTAL - EMT</b>	<b>236.7</b>	<b>236.7</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>RESOURCE MANAGEMENT</b>				
Financial Systems Migration	3.1	0.0	3.1	0.0
DDA Measures	522.9	427.9	95.0	0.0
Site Disposal Costs	61.6	61.6	0.0	0.0
Moler Works Site	41.4	0.0	41.4	0.0
<b>TOTAL - RESOURCE MANAGEMENT</b>	<b>629.0</b>	<b>489.5</b>	<b>139.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>STREET SERVICES</b>				
Public Conveniences	71.8	71.8	0.0	0.0
PowerPerceptor Voltage Optimisation Equipment	132.9	132.9	0.0	0.0
Shrub End Waste Transfer Plant	89.7	89.7	0.0	0.0
Flat Recycling Extension	106.5	106.5	0.0	0.0
Upgrade of CCTV Equipment	52.3	52.3	0.0	96.0
<b>TOTAL- STREET SERVICES</b>	<b>453.2</b>	<b>453.2</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>96.0</b>

Service / Scheme	Total Funded Prog. £'000	Funded		Unreleased
		09/10	10/11	Total
		£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL &amp; PROTECTIVE SERVICES</b>				
Heritage Fund - incl. Roman Walls	139.4	139.4	0.0	200.0
Heritage Fund - Castle Park Interpretation	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
Heritage Fund - St Nicholas Square	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
Cemetery Extension	125.0	0.0	125.0	0.0
Replacement of Cremators	350.0	350.0	0.0	0.0
Roman Circus	78.0	78.0	0.0	0.0
Redevelopment of Castle Museum	265.0	0.0	265.0	100.0
<b>TOTAL - ENV &amp; PROT SERVICES</b>	<b>1,027.4</b>	<b>637.4</b>	<b>390.0</b>	<b>300.0</b>
<b>STRATEGIC POLICY &amp; REGENERATION</b>				
Park & Ride	124.4	124.4	0.0	0.0
Community Stadium Pre-development	71.3	71.3	0.0	0.0
Community Stadium - Build	56.1	56.1	0.0	0.0
B I C North	2,360.2	2,360.2	0.0	0.0
Hythe Station Environmental Improvements	737.7	737.7	0.0	0.0
King Edward Quay	117.2	117.2	0.0	0.0
St Botolphs Regeneration	946.0	473.0	473.0	545.0
St Botolphs Public Realm Phase 1	387.2	387.2	0.0	0.0
St Botolphs Public Realm Phase 2	180.0	180.0	0.0	0.0
Historic Town Centre Improvements	160.0	160.0	0.0	0.0
Town Centre Improvements Phase 1	50.8	50.8	0.0	0.0
Town Centre Improvements Phase 2	150.0	150.0	0.0	0.0
A12 Junction Facilitation	350.0	350.0	0.0	0.0
Creative Business Hub	125.0	125.0	0.0	0.0
Visual Arts Facility (VAF) Main Scheme	2,429.5	2,429.5	0.0	0.0
Visual Arts Facility (VAF) Fit-out	6,750.0	2,000.0	4,750.0	0.0
Assistance to Registered Social Landlords	688.9	492.0	196.9	0.0
Public Realm Works	175.0	0.0	175.0	0.0
<b>TOTAL - STRAT POLICY &amp; REGEN</b>	<b>15,859.3</b>	<b>10,264.4</b>	<b>5,594.9</b>	<b>545.0</b>
<b>LIFE OPPORTUNITIES</b>				
Community Development - St Annes	29.3	29.3	0.0	0.0
Improving Life Opportunities	40.4	40.4	0.0	55.0
Hythe Community Centre	10.8	10.8	0.0	0.0
Mandatory Disabled Facilities Grants	1,811.6	1,011.6	800.0	0.0
Private Sector Renewals - Loans and Grants	1,069.4	684.4	385.0	0.0
Highwoods Community Facilities	19.0	19.0	0.0	0.0
St Annes MUGA	2.7	2.7	0.0	0.0
Colchester Leisure World - Fitness Pool LACM and Modernisation	776.5	769.0	7.5	0.0
Old Heath MUGA Installation & Landscape Improvements	75.0	75.0	0.0	0.0
Castle Park - Playground Refurbishment	118.7	118.7	0.0	0.0
Messing Village Hall Refurbishment S106	28.2	28.2	0.0	0.0
St Leonard's Church Wall	95.0	95.0	0.0	0.0

Service / Scheme	Total Funded Prog. £'000	Funded		Unreleased
		09/10	10/11	Total
		£'000	£'000	£'000
Resource Centre - Highwoods Country Park	181.0	178.2	2.8	0.0
Highwoods Country Park Improvements	33.4	0.0	33.4	0.0
Boada Skatebowl	102.4	102.4	0.0	0.0
Monkwick MUGA	75.0	75.0	0.0	0.0
Repairs to walls of closed church yards	75.0	0.0	75.0	0.0
<b>TOTAL - LIFE OPPORTUNITIES</b>	<b>4,543.4</b>	<b>3,239.7</b>	<b>1,303.7</b>	<b>55.0</b>
<b>COMPLETED SCHEMES (OR WHERE RETENTION ONLY OUTSTANDING)</b>				
Angel Court Atrium Roof	4.8	4.8	0.0	0.0
SOS Bus	3.5	3.5	0.0	0.0
Public Art - Section 106	1.3	1.3	0.0	0.0
Mersea Pontoon	1.5	1.5	0.0	0.0
Groundsmen's Building Castle Park	10.5	10.5	0.0	0.0
Mill Road	4.4	4.4	0.0	0.0
Westlands Country Park Playground	70.0	70.0	0.0	0.0
West Mersea	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
<b>TOTAL - COMPLETED SCHEMES</b>	<b>98.0</b>	<b>98.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Note: The above programme excludes housing schemes which form part of the Housing Investment Programme (HIP).</b>				





27 January 2010

<b>Report of</b>	<b>Pam Donnelly, Executive Director</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Claire Holland</b>
<b>Title</b>	<b>Single Equality Scheme</b>		<b>☎ 506452</b>
<b>Wards affected</b>	Not applicable		

**This report seeks approval for the Council's Single Equality Scheme**

**1. Decision(s) Required**

- 1.1 To approve the Single Equality Scheme.
- 1.2 To recommend to Full Council the adoption of the Single Equality Scheme and its addition to the Council's Policy Framework.

**2. Reasons for Decision(s)**

- 2.1 The Council achieved Level Three of the Equality Standard for Local Government in March 2009. The Equality Standard has since changed to the Equality Framework for Local Government and we have migrated across to the Achieving Level of the framework. One of the recommendations of the review was that the Council considered moving to a Single Equality Scheme.
- 2.2 Once in post the new Equality and Diversity Officer began developing a Single Equality Scheme, because of the strategic, operational and financial benefits to amalgamating our existing equality schemes for race, gender and disability, and having one scheme for all equality groups.

**3. Alternative Options**

- 3.1 The alternative option is that we continue to have three separate equality schemes for race, gender and disability, each of which is required to be reviewed annually and a new scheme written every three years. Current dates for existing schemes are: Disability Equality Scheme 2006-2009; Gender Equality Scheme 2007-2010 and Race Equality Scheme 2008-2011.

**4. Supporting Information**

**Current Race Equality Scheme**

- 4.1 The Council's Race Equality Scheme was refreshed in 2008. This scheme outlines our commitment and our intentions to meeting the requirements of the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000. It replaces the previous scheme published in 2002 and details how we intend to respond to the needs of all people in our increasingly diverse communities and promote race equality across the borough.

- 4.2 Our intentions remain to provide excellent examples of good practice in developing policies, working with our communities and improving service delivery. In addition, under this new scheme we commit to work in partnership with the community to ensure that all sections of the community have equal access to services regardless of other factors but particularly ethnicity.
- 4.3 These experimental mid-2007 ethnic group estimates show that 92.1% of Colchester's resident population categorise themselves as 'White' (161,600 people). This is a slight decrease from 92.9% in the previous year (mid-2006 ethnic group estimates).
- 4.4 The statistics indicate that ethnic minority groups, (excluding 'other white') account for 7.9% of the total population, an increase from 3.8% on Census Day 2001. This is also higher than the Essex proportion of 6.5%, although some of this could be attributed to the University being situated in Colchester Borough.
- 4.5 AT the end of year 2008/09 2.8% of Colchester Borough Council's employees identified themselves as being from a Black Minority Ethnic (BME) group.
- 4.6 Colchester has the fourth largest proportion of ethnic minority groups in Essex County behind Epping Forest (10.1%), Harlow (8.8%) and Brentwood (8.2%) which have all increased in the last year.
- 4.7 Colchester Borough Council's website includes 'Babelfish' and 'Google Translate' – both can be used to translate content of our website from English into other languages.
- 4.8 Colchester Borough Council and Colchester Borough Homes are active participants in the Hate Crime Panel which seeks to monitor and prevent the level of hate crimes and harassment which take place in the borough. We work in partnership with the Police and TaCMEP (Tendring and Colchester Minority Ethnic Partnership) to identify areas where hate crimes occur and take action to prevent them.

### **Current Disability Equality Scheme**

- 4.9 In December 2006 Colchester Borough Council adopted a Disability Equality Scheme. Its key aims are promote equal opportunities regardless of disability in the delivery of its services and employment of staff. This Scheme also seeks to ensure that people are not discriminated against, directly or indirectly, as a result of their disability.
- 4.10 The Disability Equality Scheme set in motion a number of initiatives to ensure people with disabilities in the borough and Colchester Borough Council staff were not discriminated against. A key achievement of this scheme has been the way in which the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act have been met. This includes making sure premises more accessible and inclusive, and that services have been delivered differently to ensure disabled people can benefit from them equally.
- 4.11 The Disability Equality Scheme recognised that approximately 12.5% of the population has some form of disability or impairment, and they can experience barriers to accessing services and employment. Through the actions in this scheme and conducting a series of Equality Impact Assessments, the Council has made significant progress in removing or minimising these barriers. An example is the Town Hall where the installation of a lift was completed in July 2009 and the renovation of the Old Library, due to be completed early 2010, will greatly improve community access to this Grade 1 listed building. This is a complex project because of the particular challenges of making such an historic building accessible, both in terms of the design of the building itself and the number of parties that need to be brought together in agreement to achieve the desired outcomes.

- 4.12 The website has been developed to enhance its ease of access for all visitors, ensuring it meets the needs of disabled users, and offers individual choice by being viewable in the widest possible range of web-browsing technology. This includes software like Browsealoud which enables people with visual, learning or literacy difficulties the option to have the information on the website read out loud to them. We ensure that all information meets accessibility standards set out by organisations such as the Royal National Institute for the Blind (RNIB), and ‘tag’ pdf documents to enable people who use screenreaders to access the information they contain more easily.
- 4.13 The Council also aims to reflect the diversity of the borough’s population in its workforce. As at June 2009, 4% of the Council’s staff had a declared disability.
- 4.14 The Disability Reference Group of staff meets quarterly to discuss issues around disability including accessibility, communications, EqlAs and feedback from service areas, and acts as a support group to its members. In addition, the group acts as a consultation resource. An example of this is their input into the Council’s flexible working practices and the proposals for Rowan House as staff move there from Angel Court.

### **Current Gender Equality Scheme**

- 4.15 In August 2007 Colchester Borough Council adopted a Gender Equality Scheme. Its aims are to overcome potential discrimination that may be experienced because of gender, either in service delivery or in employment. It recognised that the significant issues facing women are around equal pay and occupational segmentation, their increased caring responsibilities and domestic violence.
- 4.16 A wide range of organisations were consulted and involved in the creation of the Gender Equality Scheme to identify and understand the barriers women face as customers and employees and the scheme sets out plans to overcome and minimise these barriers. Achievements since its publication include the provision of private areas available for breast feeding in the Customer Service Centre as well as child-friendly areas while customers are waiting.
- 4.17 The Council works closely with a number of local organisations who assist the victims of domestic violence and their families, including the Colchester Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership and the Colchester Domestic Abuse Forum. Colchester Borough Council provide revenue funding for the Women’s Refuge and in 2008 gave additional funding through the Life Opportunities Capital Fund to purchase new premises
- 4.18 Examples of initiatives and actions from working together with our partners and stakeholders include: the production of a directory of services and supporting leaflet for Colchester, containing useful contacts, advice and guidance for both those agencies dealing with victims of domestic abuse and the actual victims of domestic abuse; provided one refuge place per 10,000 population in Colchester; produced a multi-agency strategy to tackle domestic abuse in Colchester.
- 4.19 Future projects include the launch of Sanctuary Scheme for Colchester – a scheme which enables victims of domestic abuse and their children to remain in their own home, should they choose to do so.
- 4.20 Legislation gives certain employees the legal right to request to work in a flexible way, giving them with the opportunity to balance work and family life/personal responsibilities whilst being compatible with and beneficial to the efficiency of Council services. The Council’s ‘Way We Work’ programme is taking this further, and helping us to “embrace

flexibility in our thinking and behaviours to make best use of technology and new ways of working." Across the Council there are many services already being delivered outside the familiar 9-5 working pattern in order to best meet the needs of our customers, and this can offer flexibility in working patterns to the staff concerned – both female and male.

- 4.21 One of the borough's senior civic roles is currently held by a woman –the Leader of the Council. The council also has an equal female/male split of cabinet Members. At the year end 2007/08 28.4% of senior managers were women.

## **5. Proposals**

- 5.1 The Equality Bill was introduced in the House of Commons and published on Monday 27 April 2009, and seeks to streamline and consolidate more than 100 pieces of legislation that relate to equality and diversity in the UK. The Bill will also introduce a new Public Sector Duty on local authorities and public bodies. In response to this Colchester Borough Council have decided to draft and introduce a Single Equality Scheme, which will replace the existing schemes for race, gender and disability, as well as including religion or belief, age and sexual orientation duties in the scheme. The Scheme will also detail how we intend to meet the new Public Sector Duty under the Equality Bill.
- 5.2 The draft scheme brings together the three existing schemes for race, gender and disability and extends to cover age, religion or belief, sexual orientation and transgender. The scheme includes information about each equality group in the borough where information is available; examples of work the council has been doing with the equality groups and a three year action plan which includes equality objectives.
- 5.3 The scheme will be reviewed annually, with progress against the equality objectives and action plan being reported to the Policy Review and Development Panel, and the scheme will be refreshed, with a new action plan being drafted every three years.

## **6. Strategic Plan References**

- 6.1 The vision set out in the Council's Strategic Plan 2009-12 is "Colchester: a place where people want to live, work and visit." The Plan makes a strong commitment to ensuring that all the residents of Colchester can expect a good quality of life and wherever possible receive services that suit them and their circumstances. It also highlights this commitment to tackling discrimination and providing equality of opportunity as one of the core values of the organisation, which are integral to the way it works.
- 6.2 The Strategic Plan is also underpinned by the Council's statement on access and participation, which states that:

*"We are committed to promoting equity and equal opportunities for access and participation for everyone, whatever their personal circumstances. This includes the use of all the services and facilities which we provide. We are committed to ensuring that everyone is treated with dignity and respect, and to eliminating all forms of harassment.*

*We will allocate and spend money on services as fairly as possible according to the needs of local people."*

## **7. Consultation**

- 7.1 The draft scheme had a six week consultation period. An executive summary of the scheme, draft equality objectives and action plan were sent out to more than 100 partners, stakeholders, voluntary and community groups, and the 29 Parish and Town Councils in the borough by email and post. A press release was issued and copies of the draft scheme, executive summary, equality objectives and action plan were sent to all libraries in the borough, to be made available for public viewing.
- 7.2 The draft scheme was published on the council's website, with an electronic survey form to complete to feedback comments on the scheme. Five responses were received via this method. Those who wanted to comment on the scheme were also able to email the Equality and Diversity Officer directly by post, email or telephone, with seven responses being received via these methods.
- 7.3 The council has three internal equality groups, the Diversity Steering Group, the Disability Reference Group and the Member Liaison Group. All three internal groups were asked to review and comment on the scheme.
- 7.4 In addition, the draft scheme was also sent to the East of England Regional Assembly Equality and Diversity Network Members and the Essex Equality and Diversity Network Members.

## **8. Publicity Considerations**

- 8.1 The Council's website has a section on Diversity and Equality where all related documents are published, with an opportunity provided for feedback and comments.

## **9. Financial implications**

- 9.1 Colchester Borough Council will be in a stronger position to lever in resources from external funders as an organisation that has embedded diversity throughout its practices. Credibility would be improved and it would enable the organisation to take advantage of opportunities for funding, building capacity and organisational growth.
- 9.2 The East of England Regional Assembly, in conjunction with Improvement East, the Regional Improvement and Efficiency Partnership (RIEP) for the East of England, has identified equality and diversity as one of the areas where performance needs to improve across the region's 60 authorities. Support is being offered in the form of subsidised network events where Equality and Diversity issues are discussed and training given, for example, Equality Impact Assessments and the forthcoming Equality Bill. The network events also give authorities the chance to share best practice and encourage partnership working.
- 9.3 The new post of Equality and Diversity Officer commenced in March 2009 as a joint post with Colchester Borough Homes, following a reconfiguration of existing resources. This is an effective way to create synergy by sharing knowledge, learning and best practice, as well in the new resource which this officer and their co-ordination role will bring to both organisations. This role has been key in taking forward the new requirements of the Equality Framework, the Council's Single Equality Scheme and the Equality Bill as these develop.

## **10. Equality, Diversity and Human Rights implications**

- 10.1 The entirety of this report is about the equality and diversity implications of the Council's activities.
- 10.2 A summary of completed Equality Impact Assessment is attached and published on [www.colchester.gov.uk/diversity](http://www.colchester.gov.uk/diversity)

## **11. Community Safety Implications**

- 11.1 Tackling hate crimes and harassment in the borough, whether based on race, sexuality or disability, is integral to tackling inequality and valuing diversity. The work undertaken in the Hate Crimes Panel will help to not only make the borough a safer place to live but will help to improve community cohesion. This work also extends into Neighbourhood Action Panels (NAPs) and to the extensive work of the Domestic Violence Forum.

## **12. Health and Safety Implications**

- 12.1 There are no specific Health and Safety Implications to this report.

## **13. Risk Management Implications**

- 13.1 If Colchester Borough Council is unsuccessful in embedding diversity principles throughout its practices a number of risks need to be faced. The most significant of these is the risk of not achieving our corporate aims that "we will make sure all our residents have the opportunities they need", and "we will support a range of sustainable employment choices that match the aspirations of our residents". There are numerous examples of links between groups who are deprived or disadvantaged and those who face discrimination. Probably the clearest example of this is the link between facing discriminatory barriers in employment and living in poverty. There are numerous other examples, and the Council needs to acknowledge the effects of discrimination on individuals and communities and take appropriate action.
- 13.2 As an employer and provider of public services, the Council may face legal challenges from individuals who have been discriminated against because of discriminatory practices, however unintended. The work undertaken by services to review their functions and conduct EQIAs will have reduced this risk significantly. Legal cases brought on grounds of discrimination do not have upper limits like those brought through employment tribunals so it imperative that the Council meets its responsibilities to ensure it does not discriminate in order to avoid the potential for significant financial claims.
- 13.3 There are risks to the Council's reputation and profile as an excellent organisation and an employer of choice if the organisation does not show that it has understood and met its responsibilities under the equalities legislation currently in place. Strong evidence of embedded equality and diversity is a cornerstone of the Comprehensive Area Assessment which, from April 2009, will be the "*new approach that will provide the first independent assessment of the prospects for local areas and the quality of life for people living there. It will assess and report how well public money is spent and will ensure that local public bodies are accountable for their quality and impact.*"

## **Background Papers**

The following documents have been published, are in the public domain and are available on Colchester Borough Council's website:

- Diversity Policy and Plan
- Race Equality Scheme

- Disability Equality Scheme
- Gender Equality Scheme
- Equality Impact Assessment on adopting a Single Equality Scheme



## **12. Health and Safety Implications**

- 12.1 In completing this section you should consider whether as a result of the decision there would be any harm to the health and safety of the general public and ensure that the actions taken as a result of the decision are as safe as is reasonably practicable. For help contact Mike Thurston 2396.

## **13. Risk Management Implications**

- 13.1 In completing this section you should keep the details to the implications of the decision made i.e. the effect of agreeing or disagreeing with the recommendation, not necessarily the risks of the report item. Identify the risks and opportunities. If there are strong risks or opportunities associated with the item these should be made clear in the main body of the report. This section is a summary of the potential effect of the decision. Any implications for other items or projects should be outlined with further details in the main body if applicable. For help contact the Risk and Insurance section ext. 2387

*If your report does not impact on any of the standard references, please consider using the following paragraph as an alternative to the separate paragraphs above.*

## **6. Standard References**

- 6.1 There are no particular references to the Strategic Plan; publicity or consultation considerations; or financial; equality, diversity and human rights; community safety; health and safety or risk management implications.

## **Background Papers**


Provide a list of documents here that you have relied upon to formulate the report but you do not need to list any document already in the public domain. Please be aware that any document listed must be shown to anyone who asks to see it. You should take this into consideration before listing any confidential documents.



## Cabinet

27 January 2010

Item  
**10(i)**

<b>Report of</b>	<b>Head of Corporate Management</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Richard Clifford</b>
<b>Title</b>	<b>Councillor Development</b>		 <b>507832</b>
<b>Wards affected</b>	Not applicable		

**This report concerns the introduction of a Councillor Development Policy, Councillor roles and a Councillor Self Assessment process**

### 1. Decision(s) Required

- 1.1 To approve the Councillor Development Policy at Appendix 1.
- 1.2 To approve the Councillor Roles at Appendix 2.
- 1.3 To agree the introduction of a Councillor self assessment process as proposed at paragraph's 4.9 – 4.12.
- 1.4. To recommend to Council the adoption of the Councillor Development Policy and Councillor Roles.

### 2. Reasons for Decision(s)

- 2.1 The proposals in this report are aimed at improving the Council's Councillor learning and development procedures so that Councillor development is delivered in a more consistent and coherent way and so that the opportunities provided meet the requirements of Councillors.
- 2.2 The Council is committed to obtaining Member Charter status. Each of the political groups has indicated its support to the principle of seeking Charter status. The proposals in this report are consistent with good practice elsewhere and are in line with the requirements for Charter Status. Charter status is externally validated recognition of good practice in member development issues and as such would be a significant asset to the Council in external assessments of the Council.

### 3. Alternative Options

- 3.1 Not to agree a Councillor Development Policy and Councillor Roles and not to agree a Councillor Self Assessment process. However, this would mean that it would be unlikely that the Council would achieve Member Charter Status.

### 4. Supporting Information

- 4.1 The role of a local councillor is a complex one. In order to support councillors in this role, the Council provides training on relevant knowledge and skills. Training and development is provided in-house on a range of core subjects such as planning and licensing, scrutiny and the Code of Conduct. Skills based training is also offered. In addition to the training

and development offered in house, each political group has a budget which can be used to fund external training and development.

- 4.2 The Council is seeking to improve its processes and procedures in respect of Councillor training and development. This is to ensure the relevance of the training and development opportunities provided to Councillors and to ensure that the training and development provided meets the needs of Councillors and contributes to the Council's strategic objectives. It will also help ensure that best value is obtained from the Councillor Development budget.

### **Councillor Development Policy**

- 4.3 The introduction of a Councillor Development policy is intended to establish a clearer, consistent and more structured approach to Councillor development. The draft Councillor Development policy is at appendix 1. The aim of the policy is to articulate the Council's commitment to councillor development, to set out the general principles that apply to councillor development and to define the roles and responsibilities of councillors and officers.
- 4.4 The key element of the Councillor Development policy is the introduction of a learning and development plan. This will identify the key development priorities for Councillors, based on the assessment of individual, group and corporate requirements. It will link to the Council's strategic priorities and will provide the foundation for the training and development events funded by the Councillor training budget.
- 4.5 The Councillor Development policy also sets out the Council's policy for attendance at the IDEA's Leadership Academy. The policy encourages the attendance at Leadership Academy of cabinet members and Group Leaders. In view of the cost of places at Leadership Academy only one place per year can be guaranteed funding from the Council's core training budget and it is proposed that this place be nominated by the Leader of the Council.

### **Councillor Role Profiles**

- 4.6 The Council has not previously sought to define the roles and responsibilities of Councillors and the various positions Councillors may hold. However, given the emphasis on the role of the Councillor as community champion in recent government legislation, it seems appropriate to seek formally set out the roles and responsibilities.
- 4.7 Councillor role profiles set out the roles and responsibilities of the various positions held by Councillors and identify the skills needed for the role. They are intended as a guide, rather than being prescriptive. Role profiles will be of particular value in helping Councillors assess their training and development needs, especially when they have taken on a new role. They will also have a wider use, for instance in the recruitment of candidates for election. Profiles for the following roles are at Appendix 2:-
- Ward Councillor;
  - Cabinet Member;
  - Leader of the Council;
  - Deputy Leader of the Council;
  - Leader of Opposition Group;
  - Shadow Cabinet member;
  - Chairman of Strategic Overview and Scrutiny Panel;
  - Chairman of Finance and Audit Scrutiny Panel

- Chairman of Policy Review and Development Panel;;
- Chairman of Planning Committee;
- Chairman of Licensing Committee.

4.8 It is intended that the role profiles be kept under review and be adapted as roles and responsibilities change.

### **Assessment of Councillor Learning and Development Needs**

4.9 In order to ensure that the Council provides learning and development opportunities that meet Councillors needs, a system of assessment of Councillor training and development needs is proposed.

4.10 It is proposed that Councillors be invited to complete an assessment form. The form builds upon that developed in the Councillor Development Centre project, but also offers more scope for open comment rather than simply ticking boxes. A copy of the form is at Appendix 3. The form is made up of three elements.

- Part A: A review of the past twelve months identifying successes and areas for development, using the IDEA's political skills framework as a guide;
- Part B: Identifying ambitions and future work plans in the role as a Councillor;
- Part C: Identifying training and developments to address the needs identified in the Parts A and B of the form.

The form can be completed either as a self assessment or in discussion with a colleague. There is no obligation to disclose the first two parts of the form. The third part of the form would be forwarded to either the relevant development representative or Democratic Services. The results from this process would be fed into the development of the annual learning and development plan. Whilst there is no guarantee that all needs identified from this process will be met, it will enable the Council to ensure that the opportunities it provides are relevant to councillors needs.

4.11 A slightly different form will be used for Cabinet members (appendix 4) due to the fact that the political skills framework on which the form is built contains additional skill competencies for Cabinet members.

4.12 It is proposed that Councillors be invited to complete the assessment form on an annual basis, early in the municipal year.

## **5. Proposals**

5.1 It is proposed that Cabinet-

- Approve and adopt the Councillor Development Policy at appendix 1;
- Approve and adopt the Councillor role profiles to Cabinet at appendix 2;
- Approve the Councillor Self Assessment process outlined above.

## **6. Strategic Plan References**

6.1 There are no direct references to the Strategic Plan but the introduction of an improved system of identifying councillors learning and development needs should help the Council meet the objectives in the Strategic Plan.

## **7. Financial Implications**

- 7.1 There are no financial implications. No additional expenditure is proposed. The proposals outlined in this report are designed to ensure the best value is obtained from the existing councillor training budget and from the officer resource supporting Councillor development. The costs of administering the self assessment process will be met from existing budgets.

## **8 Equality, Diversity and Human Rights Implications**

8. The Councillor Development Policy has been subject to an Equality Impact Assessment, which can be accessed via the link below.

[http://www.colchester.gov.uk/servedoc.asp?filename=member\\_development\\_policy\\_EIA\\_2.doc](http://www.colchester.gov.uk/servedoc.asp?filename=member_development_policy_EIA_2.doc)

## **9. Other Standard References**

- 91 There are no particular references to publicity or consultation considerations; or community safety; health and safety or risk management implications.

27 January 2010

<b>Report of</b>	<b>Head of Life Opportunities</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Gareth Mitchell</b>
<b>Title</b>	<b>Colchester Borough Council Safeguarding Children Policy and Procedures</b>		
<b>Wards affected</b>	All Wards		

**This report seeks approval for the Council's Safeguarding Children Policy and Procedures**

**1. Decisions Required**

- 1.1 To approve the Safeguarding Children Policy and Procedures at appendix 1.
- 1.2 To recommend to Full Council the adoption of the Safeguarding Children Policy and Procedures and its addition to the Council's Policy Framework.

**2. Reasons for Decisions**

- 2.1 Section 11 of The Children Act 2004 places duties on organisations and individuals to ensure that their functions are discharged with regard to the need to safeguard and promote the welfare of children. Colchester Borough Council, as a district local authority, is one of the organisations specified in Section 11 of the Act.
- 2.3 The Essex Safeguarding Children Board (ESCB) is the body responsible under the provisions in the Children Act 2004 for improving outcomes for children by coordinating the work of local agencies to safeguard and promote the welfare of children and ensuring the effectiveness of that work.
- 2.4 The ESCB has asked all relevant agencies in Essex to audit their safeguarding practices and procedures, and as part of the work to complete this audit for the Council, this revised Safeguarding Children Policy has been developed to reflect the current legislative environment and to ensure the Council is demonstrating best practice in this field.
- 2.5 The audit process requires the Council to demonstrate:
  - senior management commitment to the importance of safeguarding and promoting children's welfare
  - a clear statement of the council's responsibilities towards children, available for all staff
  - a clear line of accountability within the organisation for work on safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children
  - service development that takes account of the need to safeguard and promote welfare – and is informed by the views of children and families
  - safe recruitment procedures
  - training on safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children for all staff working with, or in contact with, children and families, including work on case studies
  - effective inter-agency working to safeguard and promote the welfare of children
  - effective information sharing.

2.6 The Safeguarding Policy and Procedures seek to set out the policy framework to comply with these requirements and a programme of work is in place, led by the Council's senior named officer for safeguarding (Head of Life Opportunities), to work towards best practice in this field.

### **3. Alternative Options**

3.1 To not approve the Policy. This would prevent the Council from having up to date and compliant policy and procedures and put at risk the authority's ability to comply with the provisions of the Children Act 2004 and to respond to scrutiny from the ESCB.

3.2 To request amendments to the Policy. The Policy has been developed by the Council's senior named officer for safeguarding (Head of Life Opportunities) and safeguarding co-ordinator, and is believed to reflect current best practice in this field.

### **4. Supporting Information**

4.1 The government has defined 'safeguarding children' as:

"The process of protecting children from abuse or neglect, preventing impairment of their health and development, and ensuring they are growing up in circumstances consistent with the provision of safe and effective care that enables children to have optimum life chances and enter adulthood successfully."

Lord Laming in the Victoria Climbié Inquiry Report said:

"The support and protection of children cannot be achieved by a single agency... every service has to play its part. All staff must have placed upon them the clear expectation that their primary responsibility is to the child and his or her family."

4.2 'Every Child Matters' – the government's vision for children's services – sets out five key outcomes. They are to:

- be healthy
- stay safe
- enjoy and achieve
- make a positive contribution
- achieve economic wellbeing.

District councils contribute to these outcomes in several ways:

- housing – preventing homelessness, providing supported accommodation for young people
- planning – providing appropriate play facilities in new housing developments
- culture, leisure and learning opportunities – for example: provision of local leisure centres and museums
- environmental health services – for example: promoting the health of children, particularly in relation to food hygiene and nutrition.
- work on community safety and as a licensing authority
- delivering benefits
- local employment.

4.3 The scope of this policy includes the Colchester and Ipswich Museums Service and discussions are underway with Colchester Borough Homes to audit the provisions for safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children of the Council's tenants.

## **5. Proposals**

- 5.1 That Cabinet approve the Safeguarding Children Policy and Procedures attached at Appendix 1
- 5.2 That Cabinet recommend to Full Council the adoption of the Safeguarding Children Policy and Procedures and its addition to the Council's Policy Framework.

## **6. Strategic Plan References**

- 6.1 "Addressing younger people's needs" is one of the nine priorities for action identified in the Council's Strategic Plan 2009-12.

## **7. Consultation**

- 7.1 No formal consultation has been conducted in the development of this Policy as it concerns compliance with statutory requirements.

## **8. Publicity Considerations**

- 8.1 The adoption of the Safeguarding Policy and Procedures can provide reassurance to residents and customers that the Council takes the welfare of children seriously.

## **9. Financial implications**

- 9.1 There are no additional financial implications from the adoption of this Policy.

## **10. Equality, Diversity and Human Rights implications**

- 10.1 The Equality, Diversity and Human Rights aspects of safeguarding children are a fundamental principle underlying this Policy and are reflected in the content of the document.
- 10.2 An Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) has been completed for this Policy and can be found by clicking on the link below:-

[http://www.colchester.gov.uk/Info\\_page\\_two\\_pic\\_2\\_det.asp?art\\_id=8001&sec\\_id=1988](http://www.colchester.gov.uk/Info_page_two_pic_2_det.asp?art_id=8001&sec_id=1988)

## **11. Community Safety Implications**

- 11.1 The links between the Safeguarding Children agenda and Community Safety are strong and are reflected in the multi-agency protocols and practices outlined in the Policy.

## **12. Health and Safety Implications**

- 12.1 There are strong links between the Safeguarding Children agenda and the Council's Health and Safety responsibilities and these are reflected in the Policy.

## **13. Risk Management Implications**

- 13.1 The welfare of children using and interacting with the Council's services is an area of potentially significant risk, and the principle purpose of this Policy is to manage and mitigate these risks.



## **Background Papers**

Appendix 1 - Colchester Borough Council Safeguarding Children Policy and Procedures

