



METROPOLITAN BOROUGH OF SEFTON

## COUNCIL SUMMONS

To Members of the Metropolitan Borough Council

Dear Councillor

You are requested to attend a Meeting of the Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council to be held on **Thursday 2nd September, 2010 at 6.30 pm at the Town Hall, Bootle** to transact the business set out on the agenda overleaf.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "M. Carney".

Chief Executive

Town Hall,  
Southport

24 August 2010

Please contact Steve Pearce, Head of Committee and Member Services  
on 0151 934 2046 or e-mail [steve.pearce@legal.sefton.gov.uk](mailto:steve.pearce@legal.sefton.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank.

# AGENDA

**1. Apologies for Absence**

**2. Declarations of Interest**

Members and Officers are requested to give notice of any personal or prejudicial interest and the nature of that interest, relating to any item on the agenda in accordance with the relevant Code of Conduct.

**3. Minutes**

(Pages 5 - 16)

Minutes of the meeting held on 8 July 2010

**4. Mayor's Communications**

**Public Session**

**5. Matters Raised by the Public**

To deal with matters raised by members of the public within the Borough, in accordance with the procedures relating to Petitions, Public Questions and Motions set out in Rule 11 of the Council and Committee Procedure Rules.

(Details of any further Petitions notified or Questions submitted to the Legal Director by members of the public in accordance with Rule 11 will be circulated at the meeting).

**Council Business Session**

**6. Questions Raised by Members of the Council**

To receive and consider questions to Cabinet Members, Chairs of Committees or Spokespersons for any of the Joint Authorities upon any matter within their portfolio/area of responsibility, of which notice has been given in accordance with Rule 12 of the Council and Committee Procedure Rules.

**7. Prioritisation and Strategic Budget Review**

(Pages 17 -  
22)

Report of the Chief Executive

**8. Capital Programme Review**

(Pages 23 -  
74)

Report of the Strategic Director - Communities

**9. Proper Officer and Monitoring Officer Functions**

(Pages 75 -  
78)

Report of the Chief Executive

**10. Members' Allowances**

(Pages 79 -  
88)

Joint report of the Director of Corporate Services and the Assistant Chief Executive

**11. Membership of Committees 2010/11**

To consider any changes to the Membership of any Committees etc.

**12. Notice of Motion by Councillor Webster**

To consider the following Motion submitted by Councillor Webster:

"This Council calls upon the Government to recognise that Sefton Council has a significantly higher proportion of older people within its population compared to the national average. With this in mind, the Council requests the Chancellor of the Exchequer to increase the Council's Central Government Grant to allow the Council to meet the needs of this ever increasing section of the community and to ensure that all Senior Citizens in Sefton are able to enjoy a reasonable quality of life. The Grant should more accurately and adequately reflect the additional cost incurred in caring for such a large elderly population."

(This is a Cross Party Motion supported by the Members of the Dementia Working Group, comprising of Councillors McGuire, Pearson and Webster)

**THIS SET OF MINUTES IS NOT SUBJECT TO "CALL-IN"**

## COUNCIL

### MEETING HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, SOUTHPORT ON THURSDAY 8TH JULY, 2010

**PRESENT:**                   The Mayor (Councillor M Fearn) (in the Chair)  
The Deputy Mayor (Councillor Cummins) (Vice Chair)

Councillors Barber, Blackburn, Booth, Bradshaw, Brady, Brennan, Brodie - Browne, Byrne, Byrom, Carr, K. Cluskey, L. Cluskey, Cuthbertson, Dodd, Doran, Dorgan, M. Dowd, P. Dowd, Dutton, Fairclough, Lord Fearn, Friel, Gibson, Glover, Griffiths, Gustafson, Hands, Hardy, Hill, Hough, Howe, Ibbs, Jones, Kelly, Kerrigan, Maher, C Mainey, S Mainey, McGinnity, McIvor, Moncur, Papworth, Parry, Pearson, Preece, Preston, D Rimmer, Robertson, Shaw, Tattersall, Tweed, Veidman, Sir Ron Watson, Weavers and Webster

#### **9.       APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Fenton, Hubbard, Larkin, Mahon, McGuire, Porter, B. Rimmer, Sumner and Tonkiss.

#### **10.     DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The following declaration of interest was received:

Member	Minute	Reason	Action
Councillor Moncur	23 and 25 - Strategic Budget Review and Budget 2010/11	Personal - He and his spouse are employed by one of the organisations referred to in the report	Took part in the consideration of the item and voted thereon.

#### **11.     MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

**RESOLVED:**

That the Minutes of the Special Council meeting held on 13 May 2010, the Annual Council meeting held on 20 May 2010 and the Extraordinary Council meeting held on 24 June 2010 be approved as a correct record.

# Agenda Item 3

COUNCIL- THURSDAY 8TH JULY, 2010

## **12. MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS**

### Civic Service

The Mayor reported that her Civic Service had been held at The Church of St. Francis of Assisi in Southport on 4 July 2010, and she expressed her thanks to those Members who had attended the Service.

### Launch of Mayoral Theme - Music and 'Heroes Welcome in Sefton'

The Mayor reported that on 25 June 2010, she had launched the Principal Theme for her Mayoral Year as Music and indicated that in addition to this she would continue the initiative: 'Heroes Welcome in Sefton' introduced by her predecessor.

The Mayor expressed thanks to the Sefton Music Services Brass Ensemble who provided an excellent display of the musical talent we have in our Borough at the launch event.

### Visit of Children's Orchestra from Pafos Cyprus

The Mayor reported that during the period 15-18 July 2010, Sefton would play host to a number of children from Pafos in Cyprus, a town that Sefton had very strong cultural links with. During their visit the children's orchestra would perform on 16 July 2010 at St. Faith's Church, Great Crosby from 6.00 p.m. to 7.00 p.m.; and on 17 July 2010 at the Bandstand on Lord Street, Southport between 11.00 a.m. and 12.00 noon.

The Mayor indicated that the visit had been arranged in liaison with Sefton Music Services and requested Members to take up the opportunity of attending and promoting the events.

### Interim Head of Corporate Legal Services

The Mayor reported that the Interim Head of Corporate Legal Services, Dave Mackey, would be retiring on 6 August 2010 after 22 years service at Sefton and a total of 45 years in Local Government. On behalf of the Council, the Mayor thanked Mr. Mackey for his service to Sefton Council and extended best wishes to him for a happy and healthy retirement.

## PUBLIC SESSION

## **13. MATTERS RAISED BY THE PUBLIC**

The Mayor reported that members of the public had not submitted any petitions or questions.

COUNCIL- THURSDAY 8TH JULY, 2010

## COUNCIL BUSINESS SESSION

### **14. QUESTIONS RAISED BY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL**

The Council considered a written question from Councillor Papworth to the Cabinet Member - Regeneration relating to the proposed redevelopment in Crosby together with a written response to the question - one supplementary question was put and responded to.

### **15. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT 2009/10**

The Council considered the Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report for 2009/10 and Councillors Byrom, Hands, Hill and Papworth highlighted the key areas of work undertaken by their respective Committees and thanked Members and Officers for their support and assistance during 2009/10.

It was moved by Councillor Hands and seconded by Councillor Papworth and

RESOLVED:

That the Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report 2009/10 be noted.

### **16. HOUSING CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2010/11**

Further to Minute No. 30 of the Cabinet meeting held on 10 June 2010, the Council considered the report of the Neighbourhoods and Investment Programmes Director seeking approval to the Housing Capital Programme for 2010/11.

This was a Key Decision and was included in the Council's Forward Plan of Key Decisions.

It was moved by Councillor Robertson, seconded by Councillors Brodie-Browne and

RESOLVED:

That the Housing Capital Programme detailed at Annex A of the report, which requires the utilisation of £2.225m One Vision Housing capital receipts as a funding resource together with other capital funding, be approved.

### **17. CARBON REDUCTION COMMITMENT SCHEME**

Further to Minute No. 62 of the Cabinet meeting held on 8 July 2010, the Council considered the joint report of the Neighbourhoods and Investment Programmes Director and the Interim Head of Corporate Finance and ICT Strategy on the proposed operation of the Carbon Reduction Commitment (CRC) Scheme which became a statutory requirement with effect from 1 April 2010.

# Agenda Item 3

COUNCIL- THURSDAY 8TH JULY, 2010

It was moved by Councillor Robertson, seconded by Councillors Brodie-Browne and

RESOLVED:

That Part 3 of the Council Constitution (Responsibility for Functions) be amended to enable the Head of Corporate Finance and ICT Strategy or, the Section 151 Officer to have delegated powers to act as the CRC Responsible person, to enable trading of Carbon Allowances using General Fund resources, and to sign off all future Carbon declarations and claims made through the Scheme to the Department for Energy and Climate Change.

## **18. SEX ESTABLISHMENT LICENCE - SEXUAL ENTERTAINMENT VENUE**

Further to Minute No. 39 of the Cabinet meeting held on 10 June 2010, the Council considered the joint report of the Environmental and Technical Services Director and the Interim Head of Corporate Legal Services seeking approval to the adoption of the statutory provisions with regard to the licensing of sexual entertainment venues within the Borough.

It was moved by Councillor Robertson, seconded by Councillor Brodie-Browne and

RESOLVED: That

- (1) approval be given to the adoption of Schedule 3 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, 1982, as amended by Section 27 of the Policing and Crime Act 2009;
- (2) approval be given to the establishment of a Licensing (Sexual Entertainment Venues) Sub-Committee;
- (3) the Licensing and Regulatory Committee be authorised to delegate its functions under Schedule 3 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, 1982, as amended by Section 27 of the Policing and Crime Act 2009 to Licensing (Sexual Entertainment Venues) Sub-Committees each consisting of three members of the Licensing and Regulatory Committee;
- (4) the Assistant Chief Executive be authorised to determine the composition (i.e. membership) of any Licensing (Sexual Entertainment Venues) Sub-Committees from within the membership of the Licensing and Regulatory Committee for the purposes of convening meetings of the Licensing (Sexual Entertainment Venues) Sub-Committees; and



COUNCIL- THURSDAY 8TH JULY, 2010

- (5) Part 3 of the Council Constitution - Responsibility for Functions (Delegations to Regulatory and Non-Executive Committees) be amended to take account of resolutions (2), (3) and (4) above.

(In accordance with Rule 18.5 of the Council and Committee Procedure Rules, Councillor Gibson requested that his vote against the above resolutions, be recorded)

## **19. MOOR PARK CONSERVATION AREA ARTICLE 4(2) DIRECTION**

Further to Minute No. 72 of the Council meeting held on 14 January 2010, and Minute No. 44 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 10 June 2010, the Council considered the report of the Planning and Economic Development Director which sought approval to the confirmation without modification of the Moor Park Article 4(2) Direction following the recent public consultation exercise.

It was moved by Councillor Robertson, seconded by Councillors Brodie-Browne and

RESOLVED:

That the Moor Park Article 4(2) Direction be confirmed without modification.

## **20. DOG FOULING AND ENFORCEMENT**

Further to Minute No. 64 of the Cabinet meeting held on 8 July 2010, the Council considered the report of the Leisure and Tourism Director on the draft Leisure and Tourism Enforcement Policy for Coast, Countryside, Paths and Open Spaces. The report also sought the delegation of powers to the Leisure and Tourism Director in respect of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005.

This was a Key Decision and was included in the Council's Forward Plan of Key Decisions.

It was moved by Councillor Robertson, seconded by Councillors Brodie-Browne and

RESOLVED:

That Part 3 of the Council Constitution (Responsibility for Functions) be amended by the inclusion of the following text:

“Environmental

Cabinet Member  
Delegations

# Agenda Item 3

COUNCIL- THURSDAY 8TH JULY, 2010

E. Leisure and Tourism Director

‘Power to appoint authorised officers under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005’

## **21. MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES 2010/11**

Councillor Ibbs proposed the following changes:

### Licensing and Regulatory Committee

- Councillor Pearson to replace Councillor Sir Ron Watson as a Member of the Committee

### Planning Committee

- Councillor Dorgan to replace Councillor Barber as a Member of the Committee and Councillor Ibbs be appointed as a substitute for Councillor Dorgan on the Committee

Councillor Blackburn proposed the following changes:

### Planning Committee

- Councillor Hough to replace Councillor Shaw as a Member of the Committee
- Councillor Tonkiss to replace Councillor Hough as the Substitute Member for Councillor Hands on the Committee
- Councillor Shaw to replace Councillor McGuire as a substitute for Councillor Preston on the Committee

### Licensing & Regulatory Committee

- Councillor Blackburn to replace Councillor Larkin as a Member of the Committee
- Councillor Byrne to replace Councillor Fenton as a Member of the Committee

### Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Children’s Services)

- Councillor Larkin to be appointed as a Member of the Committee in place of Councillor Hough and also appointed as the Vice-Chair of the Committee

### Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Performance & Corporate Services)

- Councillor Shaw to replace Councillor Fenton as a Member of the Committee

COUNCIL- THURSDAY 8TH JULY, 2010

## Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Regeneration & Environmental Services)

- Councillor Fenton to replace Councillor Larkin as a Member of the Committee
- Councillor Larkin to replace Councillor Fenton as a substitute for Councillor C. Mainey on the Committee

Councillor Moncur proposed the following changes:

## Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Health and Social Care)

- Councillor Carr to replace Councillor Brennan as the Substitute for Councillor Veidman on the Committee

RESOLVED:

That the proposed changes detailed above be approved.

### **22. MATTERS DEALT WITH IN ACCORDANCE WITH RULE 17 OF THE SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULES (CALL-IN AND URGENCY) OF THE CONSTITUTION**

The Council received a report of the Interim Head of Corporate Legal Services setting out details of those matters dealt with in accordance with Rule 17 of the Scrutiny Procedure Rules (Call-In and Urgency).

### **23. STRATEGIC BUDGET REVIEW AND BUDGET 2010/11 - PART 1**

The Council considered the report of the Chief Executive which provided details of the proposed response to Minute 8 of the Extraordinary Council Meeting held on 24 June 2010, the impact of the recent announcement by the Government for a reduction of grants to Local Authorities and proposals for the management of the budget reductions for the Council.

The Cabinet had considered the report at its meeting held earlier that day (Minute No. 65 refers) and a revised Appendix A to the report was circulated to Members, together with the confidential Appendix B (see Minute No. 25 below).

The Chief Executive also circulated an addendum to the report on the equality impact assessment of the proposals to reduce/cease some activity funded through Area Based Grant.

This was a Key Decision and was included in the Council's Forward Plan of Key Decisions.

# Agenda Item 3

COUNCIL- THURSDAY 8TH JULY, 2010

It was then moved by Councillor Robertson and seconded by Councillor Brodie-Browne that:

- (1) approval be given to the cessation of the specific Area Based Grant projects and activities totalling £2,549,850 in 2010/11 as identified in Appendix A and the confidential Appendix B of the report (see Minute No. 25 below);
- (2) it be noted that this will involve a reduction in staff, to be achieved through the Council's normal personnel procedures and if necessary through compulsory redundancies;
- (3) the finalisation of these arrangements be delegated to the Chief Executive in consultation with Party Leaders;
- (4) the response to the resolution of the Extraordinary Council Meeting on 24 June 2010 as set out in paragraph 5 of the report be noted;
- (5) approval be given to the use of £1.5m one-off funding previously allocated to support the 2009/10 outturn position to compensate for the reduction in grant;
- (6) approval be given to the use of the 2010/11 contribution to balances of £500k towards the required savings;
- (7) approval be given to the re-phasing of £720k of the transport capital programme;
- (8) approval be given to the reallocation of 2009/10 reserve contributions outlined in Appendix 3 of the report and totalling £745k;
- (9) the ongoing work outlined in paragraph 3.9 of the report to identify the balance of savings required be endorsed and a report be submitted to the next Cabinet meeting.

It was moved by Councillor P. Dowd, seconded by Councillor Maher that the motion be amended by the addition of the following text:

*"The Council notes:*

*that the increase in VAT from 17.5% to 20% announced in the Government's June Emergency Budget will fall hardest on those least able to afford it;*

*that the increase in VAT will lead to higher prices for goods and services; will have a disproportionate impact on pensioners and other low income groups; and will have a severe impact on businesses, charities and community groups in Sefton;*

COUNCIL- THURSDAY 8TH JULY, 2010

*that the effect of the increase in VAT, when taken with other measures in the Budget, will be unfair to pensioners, who have not had a compensatory increase in other benefits and allowances;*

*that the way the VAT increase will affect pensioners and other low income groups runs counter to the Government's Coalition Agreement statement on 20 May 2010 that it would "ensure that fairness is at the heart of those decisions so that all those most in need are protected"; and*

*that the Institute of Fiscal Studies has stated the VAT increase was not "unavoidable", as the Chancellor of the Exchequer said in his Budget speech.*

*The Council resolves:*

*To write directly to the Chancellor of the Exchequer raising concerns about the impact of the proposed VAT increase on pensioners, other vulnerable groups and businesses in Sefton.*

*To call on the Members of Parliament representing the Metropolitan Borough of Sefton to stand up for Sefton's pensioners, businesses and wider community, to voice their opposition to this unfair increase in VAT and to vote against it in Parliament."*

The requisite number of Members having signified their wish that the voting on the amendment should be recorded in accordance with Rule 18.4 of the Council and Committee Procedure Rules, the voting was duly recorded and the Members of the Council present at the time, voted as follows:-

FOR THE AMENDMENT:

Councillors Bradshaw, Brady, Brennan, Byrom, Carr, K. Cluskey, L. Cluskey, Cummins, M. Dowd, P. Dowd, Fairclough, Gustafson, Hardy, Kelly, Kerrigan, Maher, McGinnity, Moncur, Tweed, Veidman and Webster.

AGAINST THE AMENDMENT:

Councillors Barber, Blackburn, Booth, Brodie-Browne, Byrne, Cuthbertson, Dodd, Doran, Dorgan, Dutton, Lord Fearn, Gibson, Glover, Griffiths, Hands, Hill, Hough, Howe, Ibbs, Jones, C. Mainey, S. Mainey, McIvor, Papworth, Parry, Pearson, Preece, Preston, D. Rimmer, Robertson, Shaw, Tattersall, Sir Ron Watson and Weavers.

ABSTENTION:

Councillor M. Fearn.

The amendment was lost by 34 votes to 21 with one abstention.

# Agenda Item 3

COUNCIL- THURSDAY 8TH JULY, 2010

A further amendment was moved by Councillor P. Dowd, seconded by Councillor Maher that resolution (1) of the Motion be amended by the addition of the following text:

*"excluding the staffing implications set out in the confidential Appendix B".*

The requisite number of Members having signified their wish that the voting on the amendment should be recorded in accordance with Rule 18.4 of the Council and Committee Procedure Rules, the voting was duly recorded and the Members of the Council present at the time, voted as follows:-

## FOR THE AMENDMENT:

Councillors Bradshaw, Brady, Brennan, Byrom, Carr, K. Cluskey, L. Cluskey, Cummins, M. Dowd, P. Dowd, Fairclough, Gustafson, Hardy, Kelly, Kerrigan, Maher, McGinnity, Moncur, Tweed, Veidman and Webster.

## AGAINST THE AMENDMENT:

Councillors Barber, Blackburn, Booth, Brodie-Browne, Byrne, Cuthbertson, Doran, Dorgan, Dutton, Lord Fearn, Gibson, Glover, Griffiths, Hands, Hill, Hough, Howe, Ibbs, Jones, C. Mainey, S. Mainey, Mclvor, Papworth, Parry, Pearson, Preece, Preston, D. Rimmer, Robertson, Shaw, Tattersall, Sir Ron Watson and Weavers.

## ABSTENTION:

Councillor M. Fearn.

The amendment was lost by 33 votes to 21 with one abstention.

Following further debate, the requisite number of Members having signified their wish that the voting on the Substantive Motion should be recorded in accordance with Rule 18.4 of the Council and Committee Procedure Rules, the voting was duly recorded and the Members of the Council present at the time, voted as follows:

## FOR THE SUBSTANTIVE MOTION:

Councillors Barber, Blackburn, Booth, Brodie-Browne, Byrne, Cuthbertson, Doran, Dorgan, Dutton, Lord Fearn, Gibson, Glover, Griffiths, Hands, Hill, Hough, Howe, Ibbs, Jones, C. Mainey, S. Mainey, Mclvor, Papworth, Parry, Pearson, Preece, Preston, D. Rimmer, Robertson, Shaw, Tattersall, Sir Ron Watson and Weavers.

## AGAINST THE SUBSTANTIVE MOTION:

Councillors Bradshaw, Brady, Brennan, Byrom, Carr, K. Cluskey, L. Cluskey, Cummins, M. Dowd, P. Dowd, Fairclough, Gustafson, Hardy, Kelly, Kerrigan, Maher, McGinnity, Moncur, Tweed, Veidman and Webster.

COUNCIL- THURSDAY 8TH JULY, 2010

ABSTENTION:

Councillor M. Fearn.

The Substantive Motion was carried by 33 votes to 21 with one abstention and it was

RESOLVED: That

- (1) approval be given to the cessation of the specific Area Based Grant projects and activities totalling £2,549,850 in 2010/11 as identified in Appendix A and the confidential Appendix B of the report (see Minute No. 25 below);
- (2) it be noted that this will involve a reduction in staff, to be achieved through the Council's normal personnel procedures and if necessary through compulsory redundancies;
- (3) the finalisation of these arrangements be delegated to the Chief Executive in consultation with Party Leaders;
- (4) the response to the resolution of the Extraordinary Council Meeting on 24 June 2010 as set out in paragraph 5 of the report be noted;
- (5) approval be given to the use of £1.5m one-off funding previously allocated to support the 2009/10 outturn position to compensate for the reduction in grant;
- (6) approval be given to the use of the 2010/11 contribution to balances of £500k towards the required savings;
- (7) approval be given to the re-phasing of £720k of the transport capital programme;
- (8) approval be given to the reallocation of 2009./10 reserve contributions outlined in Appendix 3 of the report and totalling £745k; and
- (9) the ongoing work outlined in paragraph 3.9 of the report to identify the balance of savings required be endorsed and a report be submitted to the next Cabinet meeting.

## **24. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

In view of the content of Minute No. 23 above, the press and public were not excluded from the meeting.

# Agenda Item 3

COUNCIL- THURSDAY 8TH JULY, 2010

## **25. STRATEGIC BUDGET REVIEW AND BUDGET 2010/11 - PART 2**

In view of the content of Minute No. 23 above, the confidential Appendix B to the Chief Executive's report, which provided details of the assessment of the proposals to reduce/cease activity on projects funded through Area Based Grant, was not discussed under this agenda item.



# Agenda Item 7

**REPORT TO:** Cabinet  
Council

**DATE:** 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2010  
2<sup>nd</sup> September 2010

**SUBJECT:** Prioritisation And Strategic Budget Review

**WARDS AFFECTED:** All

**REPORT OF:** Margaret Carney  
Chief Executive

**CONTACT OFFICER:** Bill Milburn  
0151 934 4191

**EXEMPT/CONFIDENTIAL:** No

**PURPOSE/SUMMARY:**

To progress the development of the Council's prioritisation process and identify actions that can be taken now to help reduce the 2011/12 – 2013/14 budget gap.

**REASON WHY DECISION REQUIRED:**

To support timely decision making and allow early actions to be taken to help reduce the 2011/12 – 2013/14 budget gap.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Cabinet is requested to:-

- i) note the report,
- ii) approve the establishment of the identified Strategic / Organisation Design project work-streams, together with the Lead Officer support and Elected Member Overseeing Groups,
- iii) note the intention to present further tactical/operational budget savings options to future meetings of Cabinet, as the prioritisation process develops, which will work towards the closure of the 2011/12 – 2013/14 budget gap,
- iv) recommend to Council that the savings options identified in paragraph 8, to achieve full year budget savings of £2.4m in 2011/12 be progressed.

Council is requested to

- i) agree that the savings options identified in paragraph 8 to achieve full year savings of £2.4m in 2011/12 be progressed.

# Agenda Item 7

**KEY DECISION:** No.

**FORWARD PLAN:** No.

**IMPLEMENTATION DATE:** Immediately following the expiry of the “call-in” period for this meeting.

**ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS:**

Not to agree the issues identified will increase budgetary pressures on the Council.

**IMPLICATIONS:**

**Budget/Policy Framework:**

**Financial:** The options and actions proposed in this report will support the Council’s budget setting process for 2011/12 and seek to reduce the currently predicted MTFP budget gap of ~£53m over the period 2011/12 – 2013/14.

	2008/9 £	2009/10 £	2010/11 £	2011/12 £
<b>CAPITAL EXPENDITURE</b>				
Gross Increase in Capital Expenditure				
Funded by:				
Sefton Capital Resources				
Specific Capital Resources				
<b>REVENUE IMPLICATIONS</b>				
Gross Increase in Revenue Expenditure				
Funded by:				
Sefton funded Resources				
Funded from External Resources				
Does the External Funding have an expiry date? Y/N				
How will the service be funded post expiry?				

**Legal:** Formal budgetary decisions must be made at full Council.

**Risk Assessment:** Early decision making in relation to budget issues will help to mitigate the impact of the consequential changes by giving sufficient time to undertaken the required formal consultation / notification processes.

**Asset Management:** N/A

**CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN/VIEWS**

Finance department FD Nos 491

**CORPORATE OBJECTIVE MONITORING:**

<u>Corporate Objective</u>		<u>Positive Impact</u>	<u>Neutral Impact</u>	<u>Negative Impact</u>
1	Creating a Learning Community			√
2	Creating Safe Communities			√
3	Jobs and Prosperity			√
4	Improving Health and Well-Being			√
5	Environmental Sustainability			√
6	Creating Inclusive Communities			√
7	Improving the Quality of Council Services and Strengthening local Democracy			√
8	Children and Young People			√

**LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS RELIED UPON IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT**

Report to Cabinet 8 July 2010 *“Strategic Budget Review and Budget 2010/11”*

# Agenda Item 7

## Background

1. At their 8<sup>th</sup> July 2010 meeting Cabinet received a report entitled “*Strategic Budget Review and Budget 2010/11*” that outlined the impact of recent Government announcements, which resulted in a £7.145m reduction of grants for Sefton in the current financial year, 2010/11. The report also updated the Council’s Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) to take account of the measures included in the Government’s Emergency Budget, particularly the announcements of a 2 year freeze in Council Tax and the Government’s intention to reduce public expenditure by an average 25% over the next 3 years. The overall impact of these measures was to increase the predicted 3 year MTFP budget gap from ~£30m to ~£53m.
2. Subsequently, a review of the uncommitted Capital Programme was reported to Cabinet on 5<sup>th</sup> August 2010 and that report is updated elsewhere on this agenda.
3. Informal briefing sessions have also been undertaken with Cabinet and individual Party groups to further develop the prioritisation and budget review process related to the MTFP and the 2011/12 budget.

## Next Steps

4. As part of the MTFP / budget development process Directorates & Departments have been asked to review the Strategic Budget Review (SBR) savings options identified, but not taken, for 2010/11 and to consider what other strategic or tactical/operational changes can be proposed in order to close the overall savings gap identified, i.e. currently ~£53m over 3 years (2011/12 – 2013/14) including ~£20m for 2011/12.
5. As an initial result 6 Strategic / Organisational Design project work-streams have been identified across the Council, each project has a senior management Lead Officer and it is proposed that an overseeing Elected Member group comprising a Lead Cabinet Member, a second Cabinet Member (or nominee) and a Scrutiny Chair/Labour Spokesperson is established to support the project development. Each 3 Member overseeing group will be constructed to ensure 3 Party representation.
6. The 6 Strategic / Organisation design project work-streams are:-
  - Customer Access – Lead Officer Bill Milburn
  - Integration of Adults & Children’s Services – Lead Officer Peter Morgan
  - Early Intervention & Vulnerable Person Support – Lead Officer Charlie Barker
  - Procurement & Commissioning – Lead Officer John Farrell
  - Community, Voluntary & Faith Sector – Lead Officer Samantha Tunney
  - Integration and Shared Services – Lead Officer Mike Fogg/Samantha Tunney

It is currently estimated that financial savings of over £8m could be achieved upon the completion of these work-streams; however it may take more than one financial year to achieve that target.

7. Cabinet is asked to endorse the establishment of the Elected Member Overseeing Groups and the development the Strategic work-streams.

8. As a consequence of the initial review of the outstanding SBR options and the identification of other potential savings Cabinet are asked to recommend to Council progression of the following options for immediate action. It is expected that the full year savings identified for each option will be achieved in 2011/12, thus reducing the overall budget gap for that year. It is possible that some part-year savings may be achievable for some options during 2010/11.

<b>Savings Option</b>	<b>£</b>
Full year impacts of Area Based Grant (ABG) funding changes within Children's Services (CSF)	935,000
Removal of severance pay support to schools	700,000
Realise full year Working Neighbourhood Fund/ABG savings (not CSF)	272,000
Communities Directorate Senior Management Restructure	250,000
Managed print services via Avarto	100,000
Removal of Centrex Analogue Telephone Lines	50,000
Downgrade quality of print paper	40,000
Rationalisation of Point of Sale & Bookings Software	30,000
Charge schools for health & safety training course	18,000
Reduction of mobile phones	9,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,404,000</b>

9. Early agreement of these options will allow the necessary time to formally progress the options to achieve full year savings in 2011/12.
10. A further range of tactical/operational saving options, made up from the SBR options not taken in 2010/11 and additional options is being compiled. It is intended that these options will be presented to future meetings of Cabinet, as the prioritisation process develops, to work towards the closure of the 2011/12 – 2013/14 budget gap.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 8

**REPORT TO:** Cabinet  
Council

**DATE:** 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2010  
2<sup>nd</sup> September 2010

**SUBJECT:** Capital Programme Review

**WARDS AFFECTED:** All

**REPORT OF:** Bill Milburn  
Strategic Director – Communities

**CONTACT OFFICER:** Bill Milburn  
0151 934 4191

**EXEMPT/CONFIDENTIAL:** No

**PURPOSE/SUMMARY:**

To provide Members with further details of the uncommitted Capital Programme to allow Cabinet to determine which of the uncommitted capital schemes identified in Annex 1 - 46 should be approved or abandoned.

**REASON WHY DECISION REQUIRED:**

To allow Members to consider the potential impact of the uncommitted capital schemes on the Council's overall budget position for 2011/12.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Cabinet is requested to:-

- i) note the report,
- ii) recommend to Council which uncommitted capital schemes identified in Annex 1 - 46 should now be approved for completion or abandoned to support the Council's overall budget position for 2011/12.

Council is requested to agree which uncommitted capital schemes identified in Annex 1 - 46 should now be approved for completion or abandoned to support the Council's overall budget position for 2011/12.

# Agenda Item 8

- KEY DECISION:** Yes.
- FORWARD PLAN:** Yes. Individual Capital Programme reports have been identified within the Forward Plan.
- IMPLEMENTATION DATE:** Immediately following the expiry of the “call-in” period for this meeting.

**ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS:**

To continue with all uncommitted schemes. Should all uncommitted schemes progress there will be no resultant revenue savings.

**IMPLICATIONS:**

**Budget/Policy Framework:** Financial impacts are identified within Annex 1 - 46

**Financial:**

	2008/9 £	2009/10 £	2010/11 £	2011/12 £
<b>CAPITAL EXPENDITURE</b>				
Gross Increase in Capital Expenditure				
Funded by:				
Sefton Capital Resources				
Specific Capital Resources				
<b>REVENUE IMPLICATIONS</b>				
Gross Increase in Revenue Expenditure				
Funded by:				
Sefton funded Resources				
Funded from External Resources				
Does the External Funding have an expiry date? Y/N				
How will the service be funded post expiry?				

**Legal:** The Capital Programme schemes identified are not contractually committed. However, costs have been incurred in bringing these schemes to their current state of preparation, both by Sefton Council and others, for which the Council may be liable.

**Risk Assessment:** A number of Capital Programme schemes relate to statutory or other responsibilities which if unfulfilled may present liabilities for the Council.



**Asset Management:**

A number of the Capital Programme schemes have direct, or indirect, impacts upon the future use or disposal of the Council's assets.

**CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN/VIEWS**

All Departments have been consulted.  
Detailed consultation has taken place with the Finance department's Capital Group  
FD Number - 490

**CORPORATE OBJECTIVE MONITORING:**

<u>Corporate Objective</u>		<u>Positive Impact</u>	<u>Neutral Impact</u>	<u>Negative Impact</u>
1	Creating a Learning Community		√	
2	Creating Safe Communities		√	
3	Jobs and Prosperity		√	
4	Improving Health and Well-Being		√	
5	Environmental Sustainability		√	
6	Creating Inclusive Communities		√	
7	Improving the Quality of Council Services and Strengthening local Democracy		√	
8	Children and Young People		√	

**LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS RELIED UPON IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT**

Report to Cabinet 5 August 2010 *"Transformation Programme - Review Of The Capital Programme"*

# Agenda Item 8

1. At the meeting held on 4 August 2010, Cabinet considered a report entitled "*Transformation Programme - Review of the Capital Programme*" and resolved:

That

- (1) the Chesterfield High School 14 to 19 Diploma Scheme (£135k) to be funded from specific resources be included in the Children, Schools and Families Capital Programme 2010/11;
  - (2) the sum of £2m in respect of the Targeted Capital Fund – Special Educational Needs Scheme, to be funded from specific resources be included in the Children, Schools and Families Capital Programme 2010/11 and the Strategic Director - Children, Schools and Families be requested to submit a report to a future Cabinet meeting on the revenue savings to be achieved from the inclusion of this scheme in the Capital Programme;
  - (3) the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Performance and Corporate Services) be requested to undertake a review of the Asset Management Plan and in particular the revenue savings made from capital investment in schemes and a report on the review be submitted to a future Cabinet meeting;
  - (4) officers continue to progress the remaining uncommitted capital schemes in the Annexe to the report which will receive ring-fenced grant monies;
  - (5) **the remaining uncommitted capital schemes in the Annexe to the report which do not have ring-fenced grant monies be reviewed at the next Cabinet meeting.**
2. At the same meeting Cabinet also approved 6 individual Capital Programme reports to go forward for contractual commitment, i.e.:

Southport Indoor Market  
Southport Cycle Town Work Programme 2010/11  
Youth Capital Fund - Proposed Schemes 2010/11  
Proposed Demolition of Balliol House, Bootle  
Kew Woods School, Southport - Proposed Two Storey Classroom Extension  
Proposed Replacement Netherton Activity - Tenders

and agreed that the Merseyside Sub Regional Choice Based Lettings Scheme one-off set-up costs be met from existing provision in the Housing Capital Programme approved by the Council on 8 July 2010.

3. Since the production of the last report further consideration has been given to the Disabled Facilities Grant (DFG) / Specified Capital Grant (SCG) and this is now considered to be "Ring-fenced" and has therefore been removed from the remaining uncommitted Capital Programme.
4. Members will also recall that after approving £2m from the Targeted Capital Fund - SEN scheme (resolution (2) in paragraph 1 above) there was an implied balance of £0.54m of non-ringfenced capital grant remaining. Unfortunately, the original figure given for TCF SEN did not reflect that this grant had been reduced, by £0.658m, as part of the announcements following the Government's Emergency Budget. The resulting £0.118m difference in funding can be accommodated by rephrasing the planned expenditure on smaller, approved schemes into 2011/12. This proposal will not be detrimental to the schemes concerned.

5. The remaining uncommitted Capital Programme schemes are attached as Annex 1 - 46 and Cabinet are requested to determine which of these schemes should now be approved for completion or abandoned to support the Council's overall budget position for 2011/12.
6. Each Annex outlines the scope of the scheme, its funding source and the impacts of abandoning the scheme. Members have already agreed that Ring Fenced schemes should go forward to formal contract and completion. In relation to other funding streams Members are advised that the financial impacts of abandoning each scheme would be:

**Non-ring fenced grant** - Deletion of these schemes should not require the return of Grant to Government. However, Government normally require a report in relation to the Grant which would include an explanation as to why the Grant had not been utilised for the purpose intended. The capital works currently specified against the Grant would not be completed and Sefton Council could use the one-off funding to support expenditure elsewhere, this could result in revenue savings to the Council. However, Government have recently attempted a number of "*claw-backs*" of non-ringfenced grants, these "*claw-backs*" may be subject to challenge and this may impact upon our ability to utilise these grants for other purposes.

**Prudential Borrowing** - Deletion of these schemes would result in revenue savings equal to ~8.5% of the total prudential borrowing required to fund the identified capital scheme.

**Unringfenced supported borrowing** - Deletion of these schemes would result in revenue savings equal to ~8.5% of the total supported borrowing required to fund the identified capital scheme.

Members should also be aware that abandoning any particular capital scheme may result in abortive costs, either directly to the Council or to 3<sup>rd</sup> parties who may seek to recover those costs from the Council.

This page is intentionally left blank

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Children's Services**  
**Scheme Name: Primary Capital Strategy External Consultancy**

Total Cost £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
65	54	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Prudential Borrowing**

<b>Financial consequences of scheme progression:</b>				
	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	1	5	5	5
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**  
 This funding was made available to support the development of the Primary Capital Strategy which is now complete.  
 This balance of funding is no longer required by CSF.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**  
 This funding is no longer required by CSF.

**Completed by:** Christine Dalziel  
**Date:** 12/08/2010

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Children's Services**  
**Scheme Name: Framework Contracting – External Consulting**

<b>Total Cost £'000</b>	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
60	60	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Prudential Borrowing**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	1	5	5	5
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

This funding was set aside in order that a Framework, for the procurement of capital schemes, could be explored. This has not been progressed and CSF does not require this funding.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

This funding is not required by CSF.

**Completed by:** Christine Dalziel

**Date:** 06/08/2010

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Children’s Services**  
**Scheme Name: Fair Play Playbuilder Programme**

Total Cost £’000	2010/11 £’000	2011/12 £’000	2012/13 £’000	2013/14 £’000
1127	440	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Non ringfenced grant**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	2010/11 £’000	2011/12 £’000	2012/13 £’000	2013/14 £’000
<b>Borrowing costs</b>				
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>				
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

The grant, originally ringfenced, was earmarked to develop 8 further play schemes throughout Sefton with particular emphasis on older children in the 8-13 age group.

The ringfence was removed on 10 June and on 15 July the DfE informed authorities that ‘With immediate effect and until further notice, all of these local authorities should avoid incurring any new contractual liabilities in relation to their play capital grants.’ Sefton had not entered into any contractual agreements at this stage and the DfE were informed accordingly. These schemes are therefore deferred pending further consideration in the context of other resources that the Council has available.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

Non development of these schemes will mean that children in the 8-13 age group in particular will have few opportunities for safe but challenging outdoor play with consequent health/obesity issues.

**Completed by: Christine Dalziel**

**Date: 12/08/2010**

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Children's Services**  
**Scheme Name: Extended Schools**

Total Cost £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
1022	108 *	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Non ringfenced grant**

### Financial consequences of scheme progression:

	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Funded from:</b>				

### The Scheme aims to achieve:

A contribution towards 3 major schemes at English Martyrs, Summerhill and Bedford Primary Schools. At English Martyrs new Foundation Stage accommodation is being funded from LCVAP which will release space for the relocation of the PVI nursery from unsuitable accommodation. This is funded from the ring-fenced Early Years Grant, mainly for PVI schemes. The Extended Schools element will replace a multifunctional room for the school's use. At Summerhill the PVI nursery will be relocated releasing much needed accommodation within the main school. The majority of funding is from the Early Years Grant. Bedford Primary School has raised over £200k and the Extended Schools funding is a contribution to the development of a Family Room. A £20K Extended Schools contribution to a play area at Farnborough Rd will now be funded from DFC.

### Consequences of non progression of scheme:

\* This is the balance of the grant following a cut of £128,815 as a result of the new government's emergency budget. However, with some adjustments to the schemes and careful management it is anticipated that the 3 schemes could still be progressed. The major schemes at English Martyrs and Summerhill both have a large element of ring-fenced, EY funding (£151,139 and £302,981 respectively) and if the Extended Schools contribution is not available then the schemes cannot be progressed and the ring-fenced EY funding will be lost. Bedford Primary School is in an area of severe deprivation and the school urgently need a room in which to work with families as part of the extended schools programme. Savings on other EY schemes may release more funding for English Martyrs and Summerhill so that the extended schools budget can be used for the Bedford scheme.

**Completed by:** Christine Dalziel

**Date:** 12/08/2010



## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Children’s Services**  
**Scheme Name: CS IT (Single Child Record)**

<b>Total Cost £’000</b>	<b>2010/11 £’000</b>	<b>2011/12 £’000</b>	<b>2012/13 £’000</b>	<b>2013/14 £’000</b>
540	409	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Prudential Borrowing**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	<b>2010/11 £’000</b>	<b>2011/12 £’000</b>	<b>2012/13 £’000</b>	<b>2013/14 £’000</b>
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	9	35	35	35
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>				
A. Document Management Licensing costs of approx £8k p.a. from 20011/12		8	8	8
B. Approximate revenue cost of £25k to support the solution p.a. from 2011/12		12.5	12.5	12.5
<b>Funded from:</b>				
A. from CSF IT budget.				
B. from establishment budget transfer of resource to arvato (shared with Social Care & Well Being Directorate).				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

(1) Migration of the Capita ONE product from Version.3 to Version.4. (2) Upgrade of Business Object reporting platforms across core management information systems. (3) Implementation of Electronic Social Care Record (ESCR) document management system. (4) Integration of core management information systems to share common basic data sets. (5) Development of core management information systems to support information sharing across partner agencies.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

The department will lose the ability to (a) maintain children’s records effectively, (b) share information with key partner agencies involved in the delivery of services to children, young people and their families and (c) comply with statutory reporting requirements.

CSF requires this funding to develop its core IT based systems to manage children’s records, supporting the local authority in its statutory obligation to safeguard and provide education to young people. The IT based systems provide authority staff with direct, real-time access to data, helping them see any child, by having access to the information on every child, with which they can then make more informed decisions

**Completed by:** Christine Dalziel

**Date:** 12/08/2010

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Children's Services**  
**Scheme Name: Modernisation schemes**

<b>Total Cost £'000</b>	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
376	376	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Non ringfenced supported borrowing**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	8	32	32	32
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

A contribution towards phase 2 of the Aintree Davenhill Primary Capital Programme Scheme to rebuild/Refurbish the school. Phase 1 is well underway and due for completion by December 2010. Funding for phase 2 has not been identified but this will be a priority for capital funding released following the Government's spending review. The estimated cost for phase 2 is approximately £2 million and a proportion of this year's funding has been purposely held back to contribute to phase 2.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

Phase 2 must be implemented due to the nature of the existing building and non-completion of the scheme is not an option as only part of the existing building will be demolished at the end of phase 1. The new building will be more compact and energy efficient thus reducing the school's long-term revenue costs. If this funding is not available as a contribution towards phase 2 then a larger proportion of funding in future years will have to be taken to make up the balance.

**Completed by:** Christine Dalziel

**Date:** 12/08/2010

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Children’s Services**  
**Scheme Name: Schools Access Initiative schemes**

Total Cost £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
172	172	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Non ringfenced supported borrowing**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	4	15	15	15
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

This is the balance of the SAI Grant 2010/11. It is proposed to spend approximately £80,000 on improving access to the Merefield Special School site. The balance of £92,000 would be held in reserve to address DDA issues that crop up during the school year as pupils, with special needs, move to different schools or move into the area.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

Merefield -The large Sefton minibuses cause major problems at start and end of the school day as they have to enter and leave by the same gate. Pupils at Merefield and adjacent Shoreside are put at risk. The intention is to develop a one way system and to segregate the entrances to the 2 schools.

Balance of fund – This will provide DDA improvements in any mainstream school where a child is admitted but where some reasonable adjustments need to be made to accommodate the child. E.g. disabled toilet, changing facilities, hygiene areas and hoists, ramps, lift (exceptionally) etc. Some pupils may also require specialised computers to allow them to have fuller access to the curriculum. All support the inclusion agenda. These problems crop up through out the year and without the funding we would not be able to comply with DDA legislation. This is an LA duty – schools are not expected under legislation to make physical (capital) adjustments to buildings.

**Completed by:** Christine Dalziel

**Date:** 12/08/2010

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Children's Services**  
**Scheme Name: New Pupil Places schemes**

<b>Total Cost £'000</b>	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
300	300	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Non ringfenced supported borrowing**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	7	26	26	26
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

A new secure entrance, office and staffroom at Shoreside Primary School, Southport, with refurbishment to other areas of the school. The Head and Governors have been fully involved in the proposed scheme which is being developed by Capita.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

The lack of a secure entrance is a safeguarding issue and the relocation of the entrance and reconfiguration of other spaces will greatly improve the management of the school.

**Completed by:** Christine Dalziel

**Date:** 12/08/2010

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Corporate Services**

**Scheme Name: DDA – Disabled adaptations to Council premises**

Total Cost £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
500	130	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Prudential Borrowing**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	3	11	11	11
<b>Running costs (specify)</b> Minimal				
<b>Funded from:</b> Existing departmental budgets				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

The Council does not currently comply fully with the statutory DDA and this funding is to ultimately meet the Acts requirements in full.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

Until all necessary works are carried out the Council could be said to be in contravention of the DDA, however the DDA requirements within properties with the most significant public access requirements, and where there are disabled members of staff, have already been addressed.

The works proposed in the current year and categorised as being the next highest priority are:

- a) Improvements to access and disabled facilities at Leisure Services and Tourism establishment – predominantly libraries (approximately £90,000).
- b) Installation of a lift at Hudson Road, a Heath and Social Care establishment (approximately £40,000).

The deficiencies within the various Leisure buildings are long standing and have not presented an obvious barrier to use of the facilities, nor have they attracted adverse comment from the public. The existing lift at Hudson Road is broken and beyond repair. The facility has therefore operated without a lift for a number of years but Sefton New Directions believe that it remains a necessity for a new lift to be provided. I quote:

*“Not having a lift in-situ for residents with severe and complex mobility difficulties, as well as learning difficulties, impacts on their quality of life, they are disadvantaged. Their ability to move freely around the home is restricted. Stairs presents them with unnecessary risks. Not having a suitable lift fails to comply with CQC Essential Standards of Quality and Care”*

**Completed by: David Kay – Technical Services Client Manager**

**Date: 8<sup>th</sup> August 2010**

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Corporate Services**  
**Scheme Name: Health & Safety Programme**

<b>Total Cost £'000</b>	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
250	60	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Prudential Borrowing**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	1	5	5	5
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>				
None				
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

Address urgent priority asbestos removal at 209 Linacre Lane for which there is no current identified funding.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

The asbestos within the roof space at 209 Linacre Lane has been disturbed and does not allow access to the area for essential plant maintenance. Failure to address the issue will mean that the facility will become unsuitable for occupation.

There is no specific allocation for this work and, in similar previous circumstances, the cost of such works has been met from this, Corporate Health and Safety, budget.

This Civic Buildings Repair and Maintenance budget is not capable of meeting the cost of works at Linacre Lane without severe impact upon other commitments including essential statutory Health and Safety testing and inspection works.

**Completed by: David Kay - Technical Services Client Manager**

**Date: 9<sup>th</sup> August 2010**

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

<b>Cabinet Portfolio: Corporate Services</b>
<b>Scheme Name: Energy Efficiency Measures</b>

Total Cost £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
250	200	0	0	0

<b>Funding sources: Prudential Borrowing</b>
--

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	4	17	17	17
<b>Reduced Running costs (specify)</b> 10/11 Savings assume capital installation from November.	<b>-15.8 (saving)</b>	<b>-67.9 (saving)</b>	<b>-72.7 (saving)</b>	<b>-77.7 (saving)</b>
<b>Funded from:</b> Reduced existing revenue running cost budgets of council buildings				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

Firstly, to bring measurable financial savings of up to £77K per annum for the Council from installation of already identified energy technologies/schemes within core buildings. Savings are sufficient, not only to easily offset the cost of Prudential Borrowing, but also actually pay-back the Capital investment within 5 years –

Secondly, to bring measurable carbon savings for the Council to:

- a) Improve the annual statutory measured building performance ratings and
- b) Savings to the annual cost of CRC (Carbon reduction commitment) trading cost liability at £12 per tonne = £4,528, rising to £20/plus per tonne = £7,540 in 2 years (i.e. further reduce fiscal risk).

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

If the identified efficiency schemes were not expedited the Council would not achieve the £77K utility cost reductions and would face risks from continued poor asset performance and potential legal/finance penalties under CRC and corporate risk under future performance measures from NI 185 and NI186. It is intended to prove the copper bottomed fiscal value to Sefton's Transformation for continued programmes of prudent investment in energy/water savings already identified beyond initial Capital to harvest increased financial efficiency savings going forward.

<b>Completed by: Ian Weller – Energy Manager</b>
--

<b>Date: 12 August</b> Page 39
--------------------------------

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Corporate Services**  
**Scheme Name: Legal Dept ICT Programme**

Total Cost £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
95	0	55	0	0

**Funding sources: Prudential Borrowing**

### Financial consequences of scheme progression:

	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	0	1	5	5
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>				
<b>Funded from:</b>				

### The Scheme aims to achieve:

The modernisation of video conferencing equipment in Bootle and Southport.

### Consequences of non progression of scheme:

The existing video conferencing facilities between Bootle and Southport and equipment may become increasingly unreliable.

**Completed by: Andrea Grant**

**Date: 19 August 2010**



## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Corporate Services**  
**Scheme Name: IT Equipment Server Replacement**

Total Cost £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
90	48	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Prudential Borrowing**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	1	4	4	4
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>				
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

Network separation is required under Government Code of Connection. The servers that will be acquired will provide extra security and will strictly control and prevent unauthorised access to our network from the outlying sites.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

Sefton will not conform with the Government Code of Connection and this will severely impact on the way we communicate with Central Government. The main service that would be affected would be Revenue and Benefits, removing access to DWP data that is essential to calculate Council Tax and Housing Benefits.

The requirement for additional firewall servers needs to be linked to the accommodation strategy and the priority occupancy of council buildings. This needs to be done to prevent the waste of the authority's funds.

**Completed by: Phil Breen (Principal Contract Monitoring Officer,  
Finance & IS Dept)**

**Date: 16<sup>th</sup> August 2010**

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Corporate Services**  
**Scheme Name: E Govt Geographical Info Service**

<b>Total Cost £'000</b>	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
165	27	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Prudential Borrowing**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	1	2	2	2
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>				
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

This scheme is no longer required. Should any funding be required in the future a new bid for funding will be submitted.

**Completed by: Linda Price**

**Date: 17/08/10**

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Corporate Services**  
**Scheme Name: IT Members ICT & Mobile Technology**

Total Cost £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
120	63	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Prudential Borrowing**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	1	5	5	5
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>				
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

The current equipment was refreshed in May 2007; the estimated life expectancy is 4 years. The equipment is now beginning to fail due to age, capacity and compatibility.

To refresh the equipment provided to Members to ensure compliance with the Government Code of Connection and to enable Members to have access to ICT facilities that are fit for purpose.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

Lack of equipment available to Members when equipment reaches the end of its life. The equipment not capable of taking the latest upgrades, patches and software. Members unable to gain access to emails and paperwork.

**Completed by: A M Grant (Assistant Director, Democratic Services)**

**Date: 11<sup>th</sup> August 2010**

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Environmental**  
**Scheme Name: Pathfinder Fund Programme**

Total Cost £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
145	64	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Govt. Grant (100%)- not ringfenced**

### Financial consequences of scheme progression:

	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:** DEFRA granted the money to enable Local Authorities to undertake work in relation to Adaptation to Coastal Change, these were intended to be innovative solutions that would then inform the development of their policy in relation to this topic.

The capital element of this grant was specific to two projects on the Sefton Coast; one was the restoration and creation of dune slacks (£40k) – an important habitat at both a national and international level. The second was the rebuilding of the boardwalk (£105k) at Lifeboat Road, Formby, in such a way that it provided an all abilities access point to the beach (the only one between Hall Road Crosby and Shore Road Ainsdale) that would be resilient to the changing coast (erosion).

### Consequences of non progression of scheme:

The consequence of non-progression of the dune slack work would be to limit our ability to manage the site adequately and achieve favourable condition over the next 20 to 50 years. As a Council we have a statutory duty to maintain in favourable condition the habitats under our ownership and management (Wildlife and Countryside Act).

The majority of the timber has already been purchased for the Boardwalk and the principal cost to be incurred in completing this element would be staff costs. This element can be completed for £10k. Failure to progress this element of the scheme would result in:

1. the non-provision of an all-ability access route to the beach at Lifeboat Road
2. impacts on staff due to loss of funding
3. ongoing maintenance costs for the existing structure and the need to remove it in the near future for safety reasons as it is approaching the end of its life.

The consequence in relation to non-delivery of the project to DEFRA will be loss of reputation and detriment to future opportunities to gain grant-aid.

Officers can minimise this through the continuation of the committed elements and reporting back on all adaptation work being undertaken on the coast regardless of whether or not it is being funded by DEFRA.

**Completed by: Graham Lymbery**

**Date: 12 August 2010** Page 44

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Environmental**  
**Scheme Name: Public Conveniences**

Total Cost £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
900	73	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Prudential Borrowing**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	2	6	6	6
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>				
Maintenance		3	3	3
Cleaning		5	5	6
Utilities		2	3	3
<b>Funded from:</b> All of the above costs can be funded from within the existing Public Convenience revenue budget .No provision has been made for possible vandalism costs. <b>NB The revised Capital cost of this new facility is estimated to be £96k therefore to progress this scheme would require an additional £23k from Prudential Borrowing. The additional annual borrowing costs in a full year (£2k) would be contained within the existing PC revenue budget and would be offset by any 'pay to use' income received.</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

To provide a new pay-to-use public convenience facility for local residents and visitors within the central/main shopping area of Formby.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

Whilst there is no statutory duty to provide public conveniences it has previously been agreed by Members that the Council would replace the former public convenience facility in Formby which is now closed.

Not proceeding with this scheme is likely to be criticised by local residents and elected representatives and will not resolve land title issues in relation to the existing building/former public convenience facility, which was not built on Council owned land.

**Completed by: Jim Black**

**Date: 10<sup>th</sup> August 2010**

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Environmental**  
**Scheme Name: Gypsy & Traveller Site**

<b>Total Cost £'000</b>	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
220	17	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Prudential Borrowing**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	1	2	2	2
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>				
<b>Funded From:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

Maintain standards on the Broad Lane Gypsy and Traveller Site, including obligations in terms of health and safety

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

Without this resource it will not be possible to keep the site properly maintained and to ensure that any remediation issues are investigated and remedied. This will potentially lead to claims against the council for failing to take reasonable care to ensure that there is no danger to human health

**Completed by:** Jim Ohren

**Date:** 13/08/10

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Environmental**  
**Scheme Name: Waste Infrastructure Grant**

Total Cost £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
1160	300	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Non Ring fenced Capital Grant**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Running costs (specify)</b> N/A	0	0	0	0
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

To provide Sefton with sustainable waste management arrangements.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

The capital grant that remains has been identified to be used to offset the increase in cost that is anticipated via a tendering exercise to establish a new kerbside-sort dry-recycling collection contract or an alternative (commingled) dry-recycling collection service. Use of the grant would reduce the leasing/borrowing costs (circa £25k p.a.) of procuring vehicles and/or equipment associated with recycling collection services and would be in line with the purpose for which it was provided. Information regarding the use of this funding is requested by central government at the end of the financial year.

The additional revenue likely to be required, to fund a new recycling contract/service, has already been identified in the Medium Term Financial Plan for 2011/12.

**Completed by: Jim Black**

**Date: 6<sup>th</sup> August 2010**

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Health & Social Care**  
**Scheme Name: IT Strategy**

<b>Total Cost £'000</b>	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
488	195	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Prudential Borrowing**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	4	17	17	17
<b>Running costs (specify)</b> No revenue cost increase is anticipated for the schemes identified.				
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

1. NHS N3 interconnection
2. ICT infrastructure to support New Directions
3. ICT infrastructure to support mobile and flexible working
4. Upgrade of MS reporting platform
5. Information governance/programme management

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

The intention is to use this capital in conjunction with Adult Social Care infrastructure grant to support the implementation of a new client database system. The electronic social care record solution, mobile technology to support flexible working for social care practitioners, IT infrastructure for commissioned services and the IT connection between the Local Authority and NHS.

The Adult Social Care IT strategy details the IT plans to support the reform of Adult Social Care provision from a holistic perspective, if the anticipated business benefits of improved information management and sharing and potential efficiencies of improved performance and resulting financial savings are to be realised the capital funds are mutually dependant and the overall objectives are inextricably linked.

**Completed by: Robina Critchley**

**Date: 12<sup>th</sup> August 2010**



## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Health & Social Care**  
**Scheme Name: Mental Health SCE ( C ) 2008/09-10/11**

Total Cost £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
150	150	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Non ring fenced Capital Grant**

<b>Financial consequences of scheme progression:</b>				
	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
<b>Borrowing costs</b>				
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>				
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

No schemes identified.

**Completed by: Robina Critchley**

**Date: 12<sup>th</sup> August 2010**

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Health & Social Care**  
**Scheme Name: Social Care SCE ( C ) 2008/09-10/11**

<b>Total Cost £'000</b>	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
130	130	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Non ring fenced Capital Grant**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
<b>Borrowing costs</b>				
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>				
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

No schemes identified.

**Completed by: Robina Critchley**

**Date: 12<sup>th</sup> August 2010**

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Health & Social Care**  
**Scheme Name: Adult Social Care IT Infrastructure 08/09-10/11**

Total Cost £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
317	317	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Non ring fenced Capital Grant**

Local Authority Circular LAC (DH) (2008) 6, states the Local Authority shall use this grant monies only for capital expenditure to continue to develop their IT infrastructure to support effective information sharing between health and social services.

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>				
C. Document Management Licensing costs (approx)		8	8	8
D. Support costs (approx)		12.5	12.5	12.5
<b>Funded from:</b>				
Departmental IT budget.				
<b>Efficiency Savings</b>			-200	-200

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

1. Upgrade or replacement of adult social care case management system (CMS) including associated infrastructure and reporting platform.
2. Implementation of electronic social care record document management solution.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

Both of these projects are considered 'invest to save' schemes that should result in business benefits and potential efficiencies. The Social Care and Well Being Directorate intends to implement an electronic document management solution by aligning its ICT strategy and associated capital investment with the Children's Schools and Families Directorate. The anticipated business benefits are improved information management and information sharing. The anticipated efficiencies are increased productivity across Adult Social Care workforce and reduced administration activities, which will result in approximately £200,000 pa savings to be achieved from 2012/2013 onwards. If these schemes are not approved the department will not implement a solution for producing electronic assessments and care plans, will not improve data quality, will not achieve safe and accurate information sharing with NHS and will not enable the developing of IT literacy and informatics skills and good practise in recording and use of information on electronic care record systems across the social care workforce.

**Completed by: Robina Critchley**

**Date: 12<sup>th</sup> August 2010**

**Page 51**

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Health & Social Care**  
**Scheme Name: Capital Investment for Transformation on Adult Social Care**

<b>Total Cost £'000</b>	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
197	197	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Non ring fenced Capital Grant**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
<b>Borrowing costs</b>				
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>				
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

1. Business process remodelling/re-engineering
2. Raise skills of the workforce and remodelling the social care workforce
3. Personalisation services.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

This funding is predominately aimed at transformation and is specifically aligned to business process re-engineering capability, and capacity building activities. Aligned to the ICT strategy and associated capital investment, the social care reform grant monies will support a change in social care, with a shift in resources and culture, remodelling systems and processes and raising the skills of the workforce. The change management activities funded through this grant are associated with the ICT capital schemes and are critical for ensuring anticipated benefits and potential efficiencies.

**Completed by: Robina Critchley**

**Date: 12<sup>th</sup> August 2010**

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Leisure & Tourism**  
**Scheme Name: Derby Park Refurbishment**

<b>Total Cost £'000</b>	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
930	47	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Prudential Borrowing**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	1	4	4	4
<b>Running costs (specify)</b> Will be accommodated within existing budget	0	0	0	0
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

Final part of Derby Park refurbishment scheme. This phase seeks to repair the bandstand and improve its immediate vicinity.

(Note. Earlier phases concentrated on H&S issues and the more historic features of the park)

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

Will detract from the effect of the major refurbishment to the park undertaken to date. As this part of the park will remain an eyesore.

Disappointment from the 'Friends of Derby Park' group and local ward members who have always wanted the bandstand restored.

**Completed by: Rajan Paul**

**Date: 19<sup>th</sup> August 2010 v2**

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Leisure & Tourism**  
**Scheme Name: Repairs to Park Lodges**

<b>Total Cost £'000</b>	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
125	42	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Prudential Borrowing**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	1	4	4	4
<b>Running costs (specify)</b> Will be accommodated from existing budgets.	0	0	0	0
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

Preliminary work towards 'decent homes standard' for occupied park lodges.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

The council may be accused of providing poor quality rented accommodation. This could be mitigated by undertaking some work (approx£18k) to improve heating and bathrooms

Remaining work could be shelved and dealt with on an 'as and when' basis.

Should any major issue/expenditure arise, then this will need to be considered by SAMG.

**Completed by: Rajan Paul**

**Date: 19<sup>th</sup> August 2010 v2**

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

<b>Cabinet Portfolio: Leisure &amp; Tourism</b> <b>Scheme Name: Hesketh Park Office/Visitor Centre</b>
---

Total Cost £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
50	50	0	0	0

<b>Funding sources : Prudential Borrowing</b>
---

<b>Financial consequences of scheme progression:</b>				
--	--	--	--	--

	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	1	4	4	4
<b>Running costs (specify)</b> Will be accommodated within existing budget.	0	0	0	0
<b>Funded From:</b>				

<b>The Scheme aims to achieve:</b>
------------------------------------

Meet the expectations of the HLF, who are funding the overall improvement to Hesketh Park, that a visitor centre/local park office will be provided.

<b>Consequences of non progression of scheme:</b>
---

May affect the HLF Board's view on current and future applications for HLF funding.

Needs to stay in the capital programme, but could be deferred into 2011/12/13

<b>Completed by: Rajan Paul</b>
---------------------------------

<b>Date: 10<sup>th</sup> August 2010</b>
--

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Leisure & Tourism**  
**Scheme Name: Southport Sports Park Contribution**

<b>Total Cost £'000</b>	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
382	382	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Prudential Borrowing**

### Financial consequences of scheme progression:

	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	9	32	32	32
<b>Running costs (specify)</b> None – will be met by KGV College	0	0	0	0
<b>Funded from:</b>				

### The Scheme aims to achieve:

This is a contribution to KGV College towards providing sports (football) facilities for use by the college, Meols Cop High School, southport FC and the community. And is match funding for a bid to the Football Foundation by KGV for a £1m scheme.

The proposal will provide a 3<sup>rd</sup> generation all weather pitch along with changing facilities, which will also be used by the local football league.

### Consequences of non progression of scheme:

The overall £1m scheme will become unviable.

Expenditure could be substantially deferred into 2011/12

**Completed by: Rajan Paul**

**Date: 19<sup>th</sup> August 2010**



## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Leisure & Tourism**  
**Scheme Name: Botanic Gardens Museum roof /lift**

Total Cost £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
375	375	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Prudential Borrowing**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	8	32	32	32
<b>Running costs (specify)</b> Difficult to quantify at this stage, as will depend on future proposals for the building which can now be progressed in a different direction in view of the Council's decision to progress the Southport Cultural Centre project.  The running costs will be reported when the proposals are presented to CMLT/Cabinet for approval <b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

The scheme now aims to achieve an end use for a grade 2 listed building and discharge the Council's responsibility to safeguard such buildings.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

Some funding will be necessary to mothball the building. (approx£25k)  
 Should any major issue/expenditure arise in the future then this will need to be considered by SAMG.

May affect the HLF Board's view on current and future applications for HLF funding.

Needs to stay in the capital programme, but could be substantially deferred into 2011/12/13 (pending consideration of the final use of the building).  
 But mothballing costs must be made available to secure the building in a sympathetic way given that it is a listed building in a conservation area.

**Completed by: Rajan Paul**

**Date: 19<sup>th</sup> August 2010**

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Leisure and Tourism, Regeneration**  
**Scheme Name: Kings Gardens**

(i) Development Stage				(ii) Delivery Stage (subject to HLF Stage 2 award)			
	Total Cost £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	Total Cost £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000	Other years
HLF	240	120	120	4079	1889.5	1889.5	300
S106	240	120	120	1360	630	630	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>480</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>5439</b>	<b>2519.5</b>	<b>2519.5</b>	<b>400</b>

**Funding sources: HLF ringfenced to the project and S106 contributions ringfenced to greenspace for Southport and agreed by SAC.**

Cabinet (15.04.10) agreed to underwrite any shortfall in S106 contributions until sufficient S106 contributions are generated.

(i) Development Stage: The Council have recently accepted the 50% HLF grant for the development stage. There is £240,000 in S106 contributions available. Therefore no borrowing requirement.

(ii) Delivery Stage: A report to Cabinet will be presented for approval, prior to a Stage 2 submission to the HLF (around Sept 2011). This will include any financial implications for scheme progression.

### Financial consequences of scheme progression:

	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
<b>Borrowing costs</b>				
(i) Development Stage	0	0		
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>				
<b>Funded from:</b>				

### The Scheme aims to achieve:

This is a key scheme for the Southport Visitor Economy as it helps facilitate the release of the regeneration benefits of Marine Park, through improved infrastructure and connectivity. It is also important in its own right, since this is a Grade II heritage asset and part of Southport's existing visitor offer.

### Consequences of non progression of scheme:

The council would forego what would be the biggest grant of its type in the Northwest, to restore this strategically important open space.

The long-term deteriorating infrastructure of the buildings, lighting, Venetian bridge and lake edge, will require significant investment over the next few years, independently of whether the Marine Park development comes forward. The Council has a legal responsibility for the maintenance of this open space which includes shelters requiring protection under the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990.

Completed by: *Awallia*

Date: 16<sup>th</sup> August 2010 Page 58

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Leisure & Tourism**  
**Scheme Name: Southport Tourist Information Centre Relocation**

Total Cost £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
59	0	54	0	0

**Funding sources :** Originally £21,600 from NWDA and £32,400 from the Performance Improvement and Development fund. The recently announced abolition of NWDA removes the potential for funding from them. Efforts will be made to draw down alternative funding but in the absence of that it is proposed that PIDF underwrite the costs, which are scheduled to be paid back in entirety by rental income within three years of completion.

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
<b>Borrowing costs</b>				
<b>Running costs (specify)</b> None Likely to generate a potential annual income of circa £28k from 2013/14	0	0	0	0
<b>Funded From:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

Relocate existing TIC as part of the Southport Cultural Centre project.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

Loss of potential rental income generated by leasing the existing TIC building to a potential operator.

**Completed by: Rajan Paul**

**Date: 10<sup>th</sup> August 2010**

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Regeneration**  
**Scheme Name: Leeds Liverpool Canal**

<b>Total Cost £'000</b>	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
1,020	87	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Non ring fenced Government Grant**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Running costs (specify)</b> Not known				
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

The scheme has completed its aims and objectives and all contractual obligations to funders met. However, as a result of changes in match funding during the scheme, £87,000 remains uncommitted. A number of projects, some of which were part of the original scheme and some developed more recently, have been identified that could benefit from the funding.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

The Transform Sefton Access to Nature scheme is hoping to use up to £80,000 of the above as part match funding for a bid to Natural England for a grant of £324k. The scheme is currently under appraisal by Natural England and it is understood that a certain degree of match funding is required for the scheme to be successful.

Various other improvements to the canal that could use the funding have been suggested, such as further development of an arts project or CCTV, but these have not been developed to any detail and no commitment made to them.

**Completed by: Will Moody/Dominique Tilley**

**Date: 9<sup>th</sup> August 2010**

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Regeneration**

**Scheme Name: Southport Commerce Park- 3<sup>rd</sup> Phase development**

<b>Total Cost £'000</b>	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
884	884	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Prudential Borrowing**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	20	75	75	75
<b>Running costs (specify) (None at this stage)</b>				
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:** The scheme provides Council funds to support the continued development of the Southport Business Park. The Business Park is Southport's only significant strategic employment site but because of its previous use as a landfill site, is contaminated. The funds are intended to be used as match against other resources potentially available from European/National programmes. The range of projects that may be able to attract external funding include land preparation, traffic and landscape improvements at the entrance to the Business Park which will complement both the exiting development site/sites and the proposed expanded business park, plans of which are being developed by the Councils development partners David Wilson Homes and Wilson Bowden Developments. There are some parts of the site that are contaminated from the sites previous uses and it is intended that the resource included in this project will be used to secure external financial support to carry out land remediation.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:** Failure to undertake remediation and the infrastructure works using public sector funds will mean that future private sector investment, which is desperately needed will only be brought forward at a much slower rate and possibly even not at all. In the past and with only limited public sector contributions of £5,108,012 (Sefton Council £325,000, English Partnerships £1,092,794, NWDA £449,000, and ERDF £3,241,218) it has been possible to lever in some £20 million of private sector investment, which has led to approximately 750 local jobs being created.

In the absence of any funding from the NWDA, and possibly ERDF grant there is a clear need for a contribution from Sefton Council to influence private sector investment, and where possible to explore potential opportunities that may be forthcoming from such programmes as JESSICA (which is an ERDF supported borrowing fund), the Regional Growth Fund, and some of the newly announced Energy related initiatives.

**Phasing of Capital Spend:** Based on current progress by above developers and available funding opportunities, it is anticipated that there will be no call on Sefton's capital resources this financial year (2010/112), but will require £300,000 in 2011/12 and £584,000 in 2012/13.

**Completed by: Mo Kundi**

**Date: 12/8/10**

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Regeneration**

**Scheme Name: Home Improvement Grants 2010/11 Approvals**

<b>Total Cost £'000</b>	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
600	395	90	19	0

**Funding sources: Housing Capital Allocation**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
<b>Borrowing costs</b>				
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>				
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

Funding for loans (up to £5k.) to home owners to rectify housing defects. Eligibility is restricted to those on qualifying benefits. Plus funding for some older renovation grants approved (hence committed) but not yet spent.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

Approximately £200k. is committed to applications already in the system. The Home Repairs Assistance (HRA) loan is part of our advertised home repairs assistance policy. It is expected that demand will fall off somewhat this year for HRA Loans as there is some evidence that because they are loans, not grants, they are less popular. The loans are equity based, charged against the property concerned and repaid when the property is sold, so the resource is recouped eventually. If the funding is removed then some people on benefits may not be able to undertake essential repairs if they are unable to access funding elsewhere.

**Completed by:** Jim Ohren

**Date:** 13/08/10

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Regeneration**  
**Scheme Name: Landlord Accreditation/HMO's**

<b>Total Cost £'000</b>	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
35	5	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Housing Capital Allocation**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
<b>Borrowing costs</b>				
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>				
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

The maintenance of proper standards in private rented accommodation, particularly HMOs.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

This relatively small budget line is a longstanding one and historically has been used to grant aid works to HMO properties where standards are lacking and where the landlord requires some support to bring the property to a reasonable standard. In so doing, it can, in certain circumstances, avoid the necessity for a closing order and the need to re-house tenants and also remove significant hazards to human health such as fire safety.

**Completed by:** Jim Ohren

**Date:** 13/08/10

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Regeneration**  
**Scheme Name: Housing Act Works in Default**

<b>Total Cost £'000</b>	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
35	9	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Housing Capital Grant**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
<b>Borrowing costs</b>				
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>				
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

Default works to properties in order to remove hazards

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

The Council has powers to do works in emergency default, where hazards are identified under the Housing Health and Safety legislation. Default works are not necessarily dictated by statute and other options are available, such as taking owners to court. However, these other options do not always result in the hazards being remedied. Default works would only be undertaken where third parties (e.g. tenants or adjacent occupiers) are adversely affected. As an example, water ingress affecting an adjacent occupier where the owner of the property requiring repair is unknown or refuses to undertake essential repairs. Expenditure on default works is recoverable from the owners as a sundry debt or via a legal charge on the properties, but this can take some time to recover. Removing the budget will not remove the necessity for the Council to fund works if the circumstances arise. This budget is usually fully committed in year and is on target to be committed during 2010-11

**Completed by:** Jim Ohren

**Date:** 13/08/10



## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Regeneration**

**Scheme Name: Older Persons Housing Strategy- extra care provision**

<b>Total Cost £'000</b>	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
2890	0	2690	0	0

**Funding sources: Prudential borrowing**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	0	61	229	229
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>	None	None	None	None
<b>Funded from: N/A</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

Increased extra care housing provision in Sefton by funding housing associations to develop via new build or refurbishment.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

One of the key recommendations arising from studies of the housing needs of older people in the Borough is to develop three 'core and cluster' extra care housing schemes in geographically dispersed areas as an interim model for extra care housing. This fits in with Government policy and the Council's strategic aim to improve health and well being, prevent hospital admissions and facilitate early discharge. Such schemes are typically worked up in partnership with the local health authority, and other partners such as charitable trusts and housing associations. The Council as a key partner is expected to bring funding to the table and this budget line is therefore flagging up the need to plan and budget for this as part of the Council's medium term capital strategy.

Extra care housing has been evidenced to reduce calls upon hard pressed social care budgets and health budgets. The opportunity to do this will therefore be missed by not investing in extra care housing. Older people with specific housing needs will become more vulnerable if appropriate accommodation is not available for their needs.

**Completed by:** Jim Ohren

**Date:** 13/08/10

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Regeneration**  
**Scheme Name: Contribution to HMRI**

<b>Total Cost £'000</b>	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
2,600	2,600	0	0	0

**Funding sources:** Housing Pot Capital Grant plus capital receipts ring fenced to support housing regeneration.

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	None	None	None	None
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>	None	None	None	None
<b>Funded from: N/A</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

This is the Council's contribution to the HMRI Strategic Programme set up to build sustainable communities in the most deprived housing areas in South Sefton. It is used to match Government HMRI funding in progressing key programmes in the priority areas, acquiring earmarked older properties, demolishing, remediating and assembling development sites for a mixed provision of new build housing with some limited number of commercial units.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

The whole £2.6m is committed given the need to continue to voluntarily acquire properties of those people in the Bedford/Queens Area and Klondyke whom we have pro actively approached to sell, and to support ongoing demolition and site investigatory work, remediation costs in the two main areas and to gap fund two flagship schemes already approved by Cabinet (both relating to the last successful CPO in Bedford/Queens). Any reduction in the £2.6m would prejudice the two CPO enquiries to be held in November 2010 and any future necessary CPOs. Sefton have committed £2.6m to the 2010/11 "Deed of Variation" funding agreement of which we will be held accountable for providing this amount of Local Authority leverage. Failure to abide by this risks clawback of a commensurate amount of HMR Grant by DCLG for failing to meet with our promised match funding target. This would significantly de-rail the whole Programme.

**Completed by:** Jim Ohren and Tony Birrell

**Date:** 13/08/10

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Regeneration**  
**Scheme Name: Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation**

Total Cost £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
12	12	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Housing Capital Allocation**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>				
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

Funding consultations on future site provision together with fees for land surveys and valuation.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

If Sefton is to fulfil the requirements of the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment to provide increased pitch provision there is a need to appraise sites for suitability. Consultation is inevitably allied to this process and if a suitable site is identified it will be necessary also to survey and value the land, and draw up plans. Recent changes to national planning rules state that we have some flexibility to decide our needs locally, but the Government recommends we have regard to the existing policy framework and assessed needs, and they signal a review of the guidance. Meanwhile, the availability of site grant funding has been removed for this year at least. The consequences of removing this budget line this year means not being able to progress the site appraisals in any meaningful way, although given the unavailability of nationally provided site grant this is arguably of no practical consequence. We need to be mindful, though, that the assessed needs still remain and that we will need to take into account the results of the Government review when it is known. The timescale for this is not known.

**Completed by:** Jim Ohren

**Date:** 13/08/10

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Safer Stronger Communities Fund**  
**Scheme Name: Safer Stronger Communities Fund**

Total Cost £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
40	25	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Govt. Grant – non ringfenced**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to:** Reduce repeat victimisation, serious harm, and homicide through our public protection work in relation to highly vulnerable victims of Domestic and Sexual abuse, Hate crime and repeat victimisation. The scheme provides the 'physical' equipment and protection assessed as required under our risk assessment process to enable victims to remain in their home (rather than flee and declare homeless) and/or provide an adequate level of reassurance. It is intrinsically related to the work of the Domestic and Sexual Violence, and Hate Crime Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conferences, the Sanctuary Scheme and the Anti Social Behaviour Unit.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:** It should be noted that the Home Office has already reduced this funding by 50% in 2010 and service provision has been adapted to manage this reduction. The inability to comply with the recommendation of the risk assessment for very high/high risk victims of Domestic and Sexual abuse, Hate crime and repeat victimisation that will leave them vulnerable to become victims of serious harm.

Legal advice also suggests that an officer of the Authority could be liable in relation to a charge of corporate manslaughter. When we have established a duty of care for a person's safety but the way in which we discharge our responsibility falls well below that which is deemed to be reasonable then in the case where the client is murdered our negligence will amount to a gross breach of duty.

In addition the service has significantly reduced the requirement of our homelessness services. It is estimated that the cost of a victim of violence and abuse needing to access temporary accommodation is on average £16,744 (Shelter and Home Office data). In 2009 140 Sanctuary schemes were installed resulting in a projected net saving to Sefton of £2,252,160.

Part of a post involved in the assessment of need will not be required. (revenue cost circa £9k , fully funded from Core & Supporting People grant )

**Completed by: Amanda Langan**

**Date: 13<sup>th</sup> August 2010**

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Technical Services**  
**Scheme Name: Thornton Switch Island Link Road**

Total Cost £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
5,912	250	1,949	2,015	0

**Funding sources: Prudential Borrowing**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	6	65	232	358
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>				
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

The proposed Thornton to Switch Island Link scheme will provide a new single carriageway highway link between the A565 in Thornton and the Switch Island motorway junction, bypassing the local communities of Netherton and Thornton. The objectives of the scheme are to :

- Relieve traffic congestion on the local highway network and improve environmental quality for local communities;
- Improve local access, safety, public transport, walking and cycling;
- Improve access to Southport from the northwest's motorway system;
- Improve access to the Atlantic Gateway development sites in Netherton;
- Improve access to the Port of Liverpool by providing more reliable journey times on the A5036.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

The scheme is subject to the Government's review of all major transport schemes, which will determine whether it receives future Government funding. If the scheme is not delivered, traffic congestion and associated noise, pollution emissions and traffic accidents will continue to increase on the existing highway network between Thornton and Switch Island. Strategic access to Southport, Atlantic Park and the Port of Liverpool will not be improved which may adversely affect their economic performance, especially in terms of visitors to Southport. Local access and conditions for public transport, walking and cycling would remain difficult. The scheme has very strong support from local communities in the area and there would be significant disappointment if the scheme was not delivered.

**Completed by:** Stephen Birch (Team Leader STPU)

**Date:** 11/08/10

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Technical Services**  
**Scheme Name: Local Safety Schemes**

<b>Total Cost £'000</b>	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
450	350	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Non ring fenced Grant**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
<b>Borrowing costs</b>				
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>				
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

The schemes address three areas of the Borough which are exhibiting the highest level of injury collisions. The schemes will reduce collisions and therefore contribute to our national target in reducing the number of Killed and Seriously Injured (KSI) on Seftons roads. The schemes for Lambshear Lane (150K) and Cemetery Road (£100K) have received Area Committee approval and the scheme for Portland Street (£100k) has received Cabinet Member approval.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

Collision numbers will not be reduced and consequently the KSI target may not be met. The public expectation of improvements to the highway will not be met.

The Lambshear Lane scheme is now on site and committed.

In addition the proposal for Portland Street (£100k) is matched by funds from Cycling England (£310k) to deliver an East – West cycle route along the Street. If the LTP funds are lost the scheme may not progress and the funds from Cycling England would also be lost.

**Completed by: Dave Marrin**

**Date: 12.8.10**

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Technical Services**  
**Scheme Name: Cycling Programme**

<b>Total Cost £'000</b>	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
200	190	0	0	0

**Funding sources: Non ring fenced Grant**

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
<b>Borrowing costs</b>				
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>				
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

**Dunnings Bridge Road Environmental Improvements** - The cycling element of the scheme is for the upgrading of a footpath to cycleway between the allotments and Switch Island Leisure Park. In addition junction improvements will improve accessibility for both pedestrians and cyclists onto some of the existing network of cycle routes which link to the key employment sites on Dunning's Bridge Road.

**Wennington Road** – Continuation of the cycling link from the North of Southport to the development, health and education sites in the east

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

**Dunnings Bridge Road** - The £90k from the cycle programme is to be matched with £450k out of a specific Employment Section 106 Fund agreed with Tesco's. This fund is to be used to support employment related development proposals including the link to the key employment sites on Dunnings Bridge. The combined resource is then to be matched with an equal amount of ERDF resource which is currently set aside for the Dunning's Bridge Road Project. Failure to agree the Cycle programme funding will result in the Council not being able to secure the match funds as with the Tesco funds alone the project is of only limited benefit to the whole corridor.

**Wennington Road** – The scheme is a key element of and is matched by £100k funding from the Cycle Town Work Programme. Failure to deliver will result in the link not being provided and the match funding from cycling England not being claimed.

**Completed by: Dave Marrin**

**Date: 12.8.10**

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Technical Services**  
**Scheme Name: Carriageway Maintenance**

<b>Total Cost £'000</b>	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
<b>1,381</b>	<b>1,200</b>			

**Funding sources:**  
 Unringfenced Supported Borrowing

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	27	102	102	102
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>				
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

In common with most of Merseyside, Sefton's carriageways require considerable investment simply to maintain their existing condition. The annual LTP maintenance programme is a three year rolling programme prioritised to address those areas of carriageway most in need of repair or replacement. In 2010/11, the LTP programme was supplemented by an additional revenue sum agreed by Cabinet to respond to the high levels of carriageway deterioration resulting from the severe winter weather early in 2010.

A substantial proportion of the LTP programme has been committed, and delivery of the programme has been continuing, so additional commitments have been made since the uncommitted total was identified previously.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

The existing levels of investment in highway maintenance are not sufficient to even maintain a steady-state in the condition of the carriageways. Combined with the effects of the winter weather, this has placed considerable pressure on Sefton's highway network. If the programme is not delivered, it will significantly compromise Sefton's abilities to fulfil its statutory highway management duties under the terms of the Highways Act.

Delaying or deferring highway maintenance schemes now will also mean that the carriageways continue to deteriorate, leading to potentially increased costs for repairs or replacements in the future.

**Completed by:** Stephen Birch, Team Leader, STPU

**Date:** 13/08/10



## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Technical Services**  
**Scheme Name: St. Luke's Bridge**

Total Cost £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
1,311	148			

**Funding sources:**  
 Unringfenced Supported Borrowing

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	3	12	12	12
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>				
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

St Lukes Road Bridge has had major structural problems for a number of years. An assessment of the bridge identified serious weaknesses of the structure associated with the pavement areas and parapet beams. Detailed surveys and more rigorous structural analysis identified that there were additional problems involving more areas of the bridge structure. As a result, Network Rail requested that a major strengthening scheme was carried out on the bridge. The scheme was designed and developed in conjunction with Network Rail and was completed in 2010, with the spend being spread across 2009/10 and 2010/11. The potential saving resulted from the works being completed for less than the original scheme estimate.

However, health and safety risks have been identified for another bridge within the Council's capital programme (Ledson's Canal Bridge) resulting in additional works being required on that bridge. Technical Services Cabinet Member on 11<sup>th</sup> August approved a revision of the Bridges Capital Programme to use the saving from St Luke's Bridge to undertake the works on Ledsons Bridge.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

If the funds are not made available for the additional works on Ledson's bridge, the structure will continue to deteriorate. This could lead to a risk of concrete falling from the bridge on to the towpath or the canal. In addition, if a vehicle was to strike the parapet rail, the whole parapet could collapse, including the service bay, which carries a gas main, water main and electricity and telecommunications cables. Given these risks, it has been recommended that the works are completed as a matter of urgency.

**Completed by:** Stephen Birch, Team Leader, STPU

**Date:** 13/08/10

## CAPITAL PROGRAMME – UNCOMMITTED SCHEME DETAILS

**Cabinet Portfolio: Technical Services**  
**Scheme Name: Millers Bridge**

<b>Total Cost £'000</b>	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
1,311	100			

**Funding sources:**  
 Unringfenced Supported Borrowing

**Financial consequences of scheme progression:**

	<b>2010/11 £'000</b>	<b>2011/12 £'000</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>	<b>2013/14 £'000</b>
<b>Borrowing costs</b>	2	8	8	8
<b>Running costs (specify)</b>				
<b>Funded from:</b>				

**The Scheme aims to achieve:**

The A5058 Miller's Bridge includes four separate structures crossing the Leeds Liverpool Canal. The structure crossing the Bootle Junction to Aintree Line and the Hunts Cross to Southport Line has been assessed by Network Rail. This assessment shows that the structure fails to meet the required safety and structural standards. Strengthening of this structure is, therefore, required. However, the resources are not available for a full strengthening scheme because a bid to the DfT has not been successful. The current scheme is a mitigation proposal that will temporarily address the problem and keep the bridge fully open for use.

**Consequences of non progression of scheme:**

The A5058 Miller's Bridge forms part of the Principal Route Network within Sefton and provides a major link between the Port of Liverpool and the north west's motorway network. It is also part of the abnormal load route network within Sefton. If the required works are not undertaken, the combination of structural condition and safety risks would require restrictions on vehicles to be introduced over the bridge. It may result in reducing the existing dual carriageway to a single carriageway with consequent impacts on the strategic freight route and the risk of significant traffic congestion along the route.

Delaying the required works would also create a risk of significantly increased costs for future remedial works because the scale of works may be much greater if the problems are not addressed now.

**Completed by:** Stephen Birch, Team Leader, STPU

**Date:** 13/08/10

# Agenda Item 9

<b>REPORT TO</b>	Cabinet Council
<b>DATE</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> September 2010 2 <sup>nd</sup> September 2010
<b>SUBJECT</b>	Proper Officer and Monitoring Officer Functions
<b>WARDS AFFECTED</b>	All
<b>REPORT OF</b>	Chief Executive
<b>CONTACT OFFICER</b>	Assistant Chief Executive (Contact: Andrea Grant Ext 2030)
<b>EXEMPT/ CONFIDENTIAL</b>	No

**PURPOSE/SUMMARY:**

To propose that the Assistant Director (Strategic Development & Management), Leisure Services shall be appointed as Proper Officer in relation to the registration of Births, Marriages and Deaths with effect from 3<sup>rd</sup> September, 2010.

To Propose that the Acting Head of Corporate Legal Services shall assume the role of Monitoring Officer for the Council with effect from 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2010 whilst the Head of Corporate Legal Services is on maternity leave.

**REASON WHY DECISION REQUIRED:**

The Council must have an officer responsible for all functions in relation to the registration of Births, Marriages and Deaths.

The Council must have a Monitoring Officer pursuant to s.5 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989.

**RECOMMENDATION(S):**

That the Cabinet recommend to the Council that:

(1) the Assistant Director (Strategic Development & Management), Leisure Services be appointed as the Proper Officer for the registration of Births, Marriages and Deaths under the provisions of the Local Government Act 1972 and Registration Services Act 1953 and the regulations made thereunder;

(2) the Acting Head of Corporate Legal Services be appointed as the Monitoring Officer pursuant to s.5 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 with effect from 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2010 until such time as the Head of Corporate Legal Services

# Agenda Item 9

returns to work following a period of maternity leave.

**KEY DECISION:** No

**FORWARD PLAN:** Not appropriate

**IMPLEMENTATION DATE:** Following consideration by Full Council

**ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS:**

That other appropriate persons be designated.

**IMPLICATIONS:**

**Budget/Policy Framework:** No additional financial implications.

**Financial:** There are no direct financial implications associated with the appointment of the Monitoring Officer or the Proper Officer for Births, Marriages and Deaths, as it is assumed this responsibility is within their current grade.

<b><u>CAPITAL EXPENDITURE</u></b>	<b>2006/ 2007 £</b>	<b>2007/ 2008 £</b>	<b>2008/ 2009 £</b>	<b>2009/ 2010 £</b>
Gross Increase in Capital Expenditure				
Funded by:				
Sefton Capital Resources				
Specific Capital Resources				
<b><u>REVENUE IMPLICATIONS</u></b>				
Gross Increase in Revenue Expenditure				
Funded by:				
Sefton funded Resources				
Funded from External Resources				
Does the External Funding have an expiry date? Y/N	When?			
How will the service be funded post expiry?				

**Legal:** The Council must have a Proper Officer for Births, Marriages and Deaths and must have a Monitoring Officer.

**Risk Assessment:**

**Asset Management:** Not applicable

## CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN / VIEWS

Chief Executive, Director of Corporate Services, Head of Corporate Legal Services, Assistant Chief Executive and Leisure and Tourism Director.

## CORPORATE OBJECTIVE MONITORING:

<u>Corporate Objective</u>		<u>Positive Impact</u>	<u>Neutral Impact</u>	<u>Negative Impact</u>
1	Creating a Learning Community		√	
2	Creating Safe Communities		√	
3	Jobs and Prosperity		√	
4	Improving Health and Well-Being		√	
5	Environmental Sustainability		√	
6	Creating Inclusive Communities		√	
7	Improving the Quality of Council Services and Strengthening local Democracy	√		
8	Children and Young People		√	

## LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS RELIED UPON IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT

None

## BACKGROUND:

### 1.0

- 1.1 The Assistant Director (Democratic Services) is currently the Proper Officer for the registration of Births, Marriages and Deaths under the provisions of S112 of the Local Government Act 1972 and the Registration Services Act 1953 and appropriate regulations. It is proposed that the Assistant Director (Strategic Development and Management), Leisure Services be appointed the Proper Officer following the transfer of the related services to the Leisure Services Department.
- 1.2 The Head of Corporate Legal Services is currently the Monitoring Officer under the provisions of s.5 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 and she is due to commence a period of maternity leave with effect from 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2010. For the duration of the maternity leave the Principal Solicitor (Children and Social Care Team) will take the position of Acting Head of Corporate Legal Services and it is proposed that he undertake the role of the Monitoring Officer whilst he holds the post of Acting Head of Corporate Legal

# Agenda Item 9

Services. The Assistant Director (Democratic Services) will remain as the Deputy Monitoring Officer for the Council.

# Agenda Item 10

<b>REPORT TO</b>	Cabinet Council
<b>DATE</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> September 2010
<b>SUBJECT</b>	Members' Allowances
<b>WARDS AFFECTED</b>	All
<b>REPORT OF</b>	Director of Corporate Services/Assistant Chief Executive
<b>CONTACT OFFICER</b>	Andrea Grant, Assistant Director (Democratic Services) 0151 934 2030
<b>EXEMPT/ CONFIDENTIAL</b>	No

**PURPOSE/SUMMARY:**

To request that proposed reductions in the Scheme of Members' Allowances be approved.

**REASON WHY DECISION REQUIRED:**

In order to achieve savings on the Members' Allowances budget.

**RECOMMENDATION(S):** That the Cabinet recommend to Council that

- (1) the views of the Independent Remuneration Panel on the proposal be noted;
- (2) the recommendations made by the Cabinet on 5<sup>th</sup> August 2010 be accepted;
- (3) the changes be implemented with effect from 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2010; and
- (4) any increases from 2011/12 continue to be linked to any National Joint Council (NJC) for Local Government employees pay awards.

<b>KEY DECISION:</b>	No
<b>FORWARD PLAN:</b>	Not appropriate
<b>IMPLEMENTATION DATE:</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> September 2010

# Agenda Item 10

## ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS:

The alternative is to continue with the existing scheme.

## IMPLICATIONS:

**Budget/Policy Framework:** The proposals represent an annual saving in the order of £25,400 (inc on costs) pa.

## Financial:

<b><u>CAPITAL EXPENDITURE</u></b>	<b>2008/ 2009 £</b>	<b>2009/ 2010 £</b>	<b>2010/ 2011 £</b>	<b>2011/ 2012 £</b>
Gross Increase in Capital Expenditure				
Funded by:				
Sefton Capital Resources				
Specific Capital Resources				
<b><u>REVENUE IMPLICATIONS</u></b>				
<b>Gross saving</b> in Revenue Expenditure			14,800	25,400
Funded by:				
Sefton funded Resources				
Funded from External Resources				
Does the External Funding have an expiry date? Y/N	When?			
How will the service be funded post expiry?				

## Legal:

**Risk Assessment:** No specific risk assessment has been carried out, but the risks associated with the report are already being addressed as part of the Council's approach to risk management.

## Asset Management:

**CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN / VIEWS**



Leaders

**CORPORATE OBJECTIVE MONITORING:**

<u>Corporate Objective</u>		<u>Positive Impact</u>	<u>Neutral Impact</u>	<u>Negative Impact</u>
1	Creating a Learning Community		√	
2	Creating Safe Communities		√	
3	Jobs and Prosperity		√	
4	Improving Health and Well-Being		√	
5	Environmental Sustainability		√	
6	Creating Inclusive Communities		√	
7	Improving the Quality of Council Services and Strengthening local Democracy	√		
8	Children and Young People		√	

**LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS RELIED UPON IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT**

Report of the findings of the Independent Remuneration Panel 2007.

# Agenda Item 10

## 1.0 **BACKGROUND:**

1.1 At its meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> August 2010, the Cabinet considered a report on the recommendations of the three Political Group Leaders for reductions to be made to the Scheme of Members' Allowances (Minute 74 refers).

1.2 It was resolved that

(1) the recommendations made by the Political Group Leaders in Section 2.3 of the report be referred to the Independent Remuneration Panel for consideration; and

(2) the Independent Remuneration Panel's response to the recommendations be reported to the Cabinet and the Council on 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2010, or as soon as possible.

1.3 Under the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003, the Council has a duty to have regard to recommendations made to it by the Independent Remuneration Panel, prior to making or amending a Members' Allowances Scheme.

1.4 The following proposals were considered by the Panel:

- Basic Allowance for Members to remain unchanged;
- Weighting on Special Responsibility Allowances (SRA's) to remain unchanged;
- Payment of daily Special Responsibility Allowances to cease;
- The rates of all Special Responsibility Allowances be reduced by 5%.

1.5 Due to the short timescales involved it proved impossible to convene a formal meeting of the Panel. However an e-mail consultation with Panel members has taken place. Panel members raised a number of issues which have been responded to by Officers (see Appendix A).

1.6 The final responses from Members of the Panel are as follows:

Mrs Susan Lowe - The papers you enclose clarify the issue to some extent. Bearing in mind the very short timescale and the fact that we have been unable to meet to discuss the matter, I can only state that the reductions seem reasonable as a short term expedient.

Any further responses received will be circulated at the meeting.

Q. Some of the daily Special Responsibility Allowances were given to Members to fulfil statutory functions e.g. visits to Children's Homes, and noting that before allowances were given not many Members undertook them - should there be confirmation that Members will still be doing these duties after September 1st?

A. The Panel last met on 16th November 2009 at which meeting it was resolved that the request to pay traveling expenses to those Members who undertake statutory Regulation 33 visits to Children's Homes be declined. Members attending such visits have never been entitled to a daily SRA.

The reference in the Cabinet report to the ceasing of payments of daily Special Responsibility Allowances refers to the following parts of the scheme:

Members of Licensing Sub Committee	£35.00 Daily rate
Members of Planning Visiting Panel	£35.00 Daily rate
Members of Adoption Panel	£35.00 Daily rate
Members of Fostering Panel	£35.00 Daily rate

The requirement to convene these meetings will not cease although it is fair to point out that meetings of the Licensing Sub-Committee will now be at a somewhat reduced rate from when the Sub-Committee was first established.

Q. A clear date and timetable be drawn up by Legal Services to instigate a review - probably before the end of the current Municipal Year.

A. A timetable for the review of the Scheme of Members' Allowances will be submitted for approval and subsequently a calendar of meetings for the Panel will be drawn up (in full consultation with Panel members).

Q. What is the position of the Committee as to when it is convened and meets, and who decides when we meet?

A. The Panel is required to meet at least annually to recommend a Scheme of Members' Allowances for the following Municipal Year to the Standards Committee and on to full Council. The Panel is also consulted each time the Council amends its Members' Allowances Scheme. However, the Panel does not need to approve a Scheme annually if the Scheme includes provision for adjustments to the level of allowances to be determined according to a specified index - the Scheme would also need to specify how long that index should apply (subject to a maximum of four years).

Q. Could a paper still be drawn up for us that spells out what the above proposals actually mean i.e. : The list of current weightings for Special Responsibility Allowances?

Q. How many daily Special Responsibility Allowances were actually paid in 2009/2010 and for what functions/duties?

# Agenda Item 10

- Q. What a 5% reduction actual means in financial terms for all the holders of Special Responsibility, e.g. current allowance and propose allowance with 5% reduction?
- Q. I would like to understand the savings of £25,400 as a percentage of the Members Budget.
- Q. It would also be useful to understand the percentage reductions being sought by the Council across its various budget heads.  
See attached paper

## REPORT CIRCULATED FOR CONSULTATION

**Report to:** Independent Remuneration Panel

**Title of Report:** Scheme of Members' Allowances

**Report of:** John Farrell – Interim Head of Corporate Finance & Information Services

**Contact Officer:** John Farrell - 0151 934 4339

### 1. Introduction and Background

- 1.1 The Council has 66 Members all of whom receive a Basic Allowance, which is £8,970 for 2010/11. In addition certain Members receive a Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA) which is calculated based upon a multiplier of the Basic Allowance.
- 1.2 The Panel last met on 16<sup>th</sup> November 2009 because the Council had asked them to review their previous recommendations which had included an increase to the SRA for the Chairs of Overview & Scrutiny Committees (costing an additional £20,000).
- 1.3 At the meeting the Panel recognised the Council's budgetary concerns regarding their proposals but had received no further information which would cause them to revise their original recommendations
- 1.4 The Council deferred any decisions on the proposals and also decided that in view of the current financial climate, they wished to defer the planned review of the full Scheme.

### 2 Matters for consideration

- 2.1 The Leaders of the political groups met to discuss the Scheme of Members' Allowances with a view to contributing towards the savings required by the Council, and made the following recommendations:
  - that the current rate of Basic Allowance remains unchanged for 2010/11
  - that the weightings for the Special Responsibility Allowances remain unchanged for 2010/11.
  - that payment of the daily Special Responsibility Allowances should cease
  - that the rates of all Special Responsibility Allowances (including the Mayoral) be reduced by 5%The effects of the changes are attached at Annex A
- 2.2 The Leaders also recommended that the changes should be implemented with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> September 2010 saving £14,800, and that any increases from 2011/12 continue to be linked to any National Joint Council (NJC) for Local Government employees pay awards.

# Agenda Item 10

- 2.3 Cabinet on 5th August 2010 approved the recommendations subject to consultation with the Independent Remuneration Panel.
- 2.4 The Independent Remuneration Panel are therefore requested to consider the proposals above.

## Information on Members Allowances 2010/11

## Annex A

**Basic Allowance** - £8,970 paid to all Members of the Council

### Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA)

Paid to the following Members in addition to their Basic Allowance

	<b>Current</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Leader of the Council	£26,910	£25,560
Party Leaders (with Cabinet position)	£22,425	£21,300
Other Members of the Cabinet	£17,940	£17,040
Chair of Planning Committee	£8,970	£8,520
Chairs of Overview and Scrutiny Committees	£4,485	£4,260
Chair of Licensing and Regulatory Committee	£8,970	£8,520
Chair of Audit and Governance Committee	£4,485	£4,260
Party Spokespersons for all Cabinet & Planning	£4,485	£4,260
Waste Disposal Authority - Chair	£8,970	£8,520
Members of Licensing Sub Committee	£35.00 per day	Nil
Members of Planning Visiting Panel	£35.00 per day	Nil
Members of Adoption Panel	£35.00 per day	Nil
Members of Fostering Panel	£35.00 per day	Nil

Cost of Current Scheme including on costs - £1,162,200

Cost of proposed Scheme including on costs - £1,136,800

Savings by reducing SRA by 5% (inc on costs) - £25,400

Overall reduction – 2.1% reduction

### Daily SRA information 2009/10

103 claims were paid – costing £3,448 including on costs

### The Council's saving

The current estimate of savings required by the Council is £53m over the next 3 years, (with £20m being required to balance the budget for 2011/12), but Departments have not been issued with target percentages.

The Council's gross budget is approximately £600m+ but within this figure are contractual commitments, repayments of debt, and other items that reduce the amount from which savings can realistically be found to about £227m.

In simplistic terms it can be argued that savings of approximately 9% need to be achieved (£20m out of £227m) for 2011/12 which increases to 23% (£53m out of £227m) by 2013/14.

Departments have put forward proposals in parallel with the Members' exercise of prioritising services. They are conscious that there may be elements of double counting between the two exercises and this is being examined very carefully by the Strategic Leadership Team, Transformation team and Financial Management.

# Agenda Item 10

It should be noted that senior managers have had a pay freeze in 2009/10 and 2010/11 with every possibility that the freeze will continue into 2011/12 and 2012/13. Based upon the RPI increases between April 2009 and June 2010 this is the equivalent of approximately 6% reduction in real terms.