

# CABINET

13 February 2013

# REPORT SUPPLEMENTARY

**Subject Heading:**

**THE COUNCIL'S BUDGET  
2013/14**

**This report supplements the main report to this meeting on the Council's Budget 2013/14.**

## 1. Introduction

The report to Cabinet on the Council's budget includes a number of areas where further information has been obtained subsequent to the completion and publication of the report. To enable Cabinet to make an informed decision, this information is set out in this Supplementary paper. The principle areas covered below are:

- Final Local Government Financial Settlement (LGFS)
- Final East London Waste Authority (ELWA) budget proposals
- Updated position for other levies
- Joint Overview & Scrutiny Committee minutes
- Consultation results.

Each of these is covered below.

## 2. Final Settlement

The final LGFS was issued on the afternoon of 4<sup>th</sup> February, without any prior notification, which given information provided previously to local authorities was somewhat of a surprise. The settlement only contains some minor changes to the overall settlement, which are highlighted in the table below, but in very broad terms, these changes are immaterial, and therefore have no marked impact on the proposals before Cabinet.

### LGFS – Comparison of Provisional and Final

	Provisional	Final	Change
Change in Spending Power 2013/14:			
National Average	-1.7%	-1.3%	+0.4%
London Average	-1.2%	-0.8%	+0.4%
Havering	-1.6%	-1.1%	+0.5%

	Provisional	Final	Change
Note : these “increases” are due almost entirely to the inclusion of the new Public Health grant in the calculation, as this was not included previously. The respective figures excluding Public Health are -1.7%, -1.1% and -1.6%, barely different to the original figures			
Change in Start Up Funding:			
Havering 2012/13	£79.713m	£79.225m	-£0.488
Havering 2013/14	£75.569m	£75.568m	-£0.001
Havering 2014/15	£69.311m	£69.309m	-£0.002
Note : the final settlement shows only a miniscule change in Havering’s funding, with a very small reduction in both years. The adjusted figure for 2012/13 shows a slightly larger reduction, which in theory lessens the actual funding in 2013/14, from £4.144m to £3.657m. Several elements on this calculation have changed and these are currently being looked into, to determine whether there is any actual impact on the 2013/14 budget, although the “cash” position is effectively unchanged			

The original briefing paper on the provisional settlement was included in the January Cabinet report, as Appendix B to that report, including a number of tables. A more detailed analysis of the settlement has been included in the February report, including the Council’s response to the consultation process. The January briefing paper has been updated to reflect the final settlement position, but also includes more information on the 2014/15 position, as there is now greater clarity on these figures. Given the minor nature of the changes, the tables included in the January report have not been updated. The revised Appendix is attached to provide as full a picture as possible of the final outcome.

In broad terms, the impact of the final settlement on the Council’s budget is immaterial, with only a very small reduction in funding from the provisional settlement. As that is the case, the Council Tax statement, Appendix E, has been left unchanged, but will be updated as necessary for the formal report to Council.

### 3. ELWA

The final ELWA budget report is covered in the report to Cabinet, however, the meeting of the Authority took place as the report was being finalised.

The Authority meeting took place on 4<sup>th</sup> February and the budget as presented was approved. The figures set out in the report to Cabinet can therefore be confirmed as final.

### 4. Other Levies

Information on the other levies is extremely late this year, due in part to the changes caused by the new calculation for the Council Tax base. As there is a minor change arising from the final settlement, the levies position will be updated as part of the report to Council.

### 5. Joint Overview & Scrutiny Committee Minutes

The draft minutes of the Joint meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> January are attached, this is headed as Appendix K.

## 6. Consultation Results

### Public consultation

Between Thursday 24th January and Monday 4th February, the public were invited to comment on the budget proposals and priorities and answer four questions:

1. Do you agree that Council Tax should be frozen next year, by making the sorts of changes outlined above?
2. Do you agree with these priorities? If not what would you change?
3. Can you think of any ways we can be working more closely with local people to improve services and reduce costs?
4. Do you have any other comments about our budget proposals?

Owing to the tight timescale, the consultation was web-based. (A full survey on local priorities and satisfaction with services, called 'Your Council, Your Say' will be undertaken in March, allowing local people to respond through online or paper questionnaires.)

The Council received 161 responses to the consultation.

In answer to question 1, 139 respondents answered 'yes', 22 answered 'no'.

Of 108 responses received to question 2, 88 indicated broad support of the priorities as set out in the consultation, with the most specific support shown for road and pavement repairs, initiatives to make Havering cleaner, crime reduction and parks.

In response to question 3, 21 respondents called for more/improved consultation, 7 respondents suggested that local people could get involved in tackling litter and 7 suggested other uses for volunteers.

Among general comments made in response to question 4, 10 respondents offered their appreciation for the Council's efforts.

## 7. Summary

As indicated, the impact of the final LGFS announcement is that there has been no real change in the position. There is also, similarly, no change in the ELWA levy.

A revised version of the levies summary, Appendix D, and the Council Tax statement, Appendix E from the main report, will be included in the report to Council.

## 8. Implications and Risks

The financial, legal and other implications and risks remain as stated in the main report.

**APPENDIX B JANUARY CABINET REPORT  
UPDATED FOR FINAL SETTLEMENT**

**(APPENDICES FROM THAT REPORT NOT UPDATED OWING TO MINIMAL  
CHANGES SO NOT INCLUDED WITH THIS TEXT)**

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE SETTLEMENT 2013/14 INCLUDING 2014/15  
PROVISIONAL ALLOCATION.**

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1. On the 4<sup>th</sup> of February 2013, the Parliamentary Under Secretary of the State for Communities and Local Government (CLG), Brandon Lewis, released a written statement concerning the final local government finance settlements 2013/14 and the provisional 2014/15 allocations. This briefing note highlights key issues of note and some comparative information.
- 1.2. The settlement provides local authorities with their funding allocations for the next two years (2013/14 and 2014/15) only. This settlement brings about major changes to the settlement process with the introduction of the localisation of business rates alongside the formula grant calculation.

**2. Headlines**

- 2.1. The written statement announced that councils will face an average reduction in spending power of 1.3%; and that no authority would experience a decrease of more than 8.8%. In a similar manner to the previous two years, the government's headlines focus on comparative figures concerning a local authority's "revenue spending power"
- 2.2. The initial statement releasing the settlement was released on the afternoon of the 19<sup>th</sup> of December however the information released only included a high level summary. Further details were released over the Christmas period and into the new year. With this in mind the deadline for comment on the provisional settlement was the 15<sup>th</sup> of January 2013.
- 2.3. From the introduction of localisation of business rates, the method of calculating RSG has also changed. Previously the RSG was calculated using the numerous deprivation / population indicators however this now forms part of a "start-up funding allocation" which include Havering business rate baseline. This Baseline is used to provide a notional figure (or target business rate yield) which in theory would be equivalent to the amount of business rates we would collect
- 2.4. As originally announced in the Autumn Statement, local government was exempt from the 1% reduction in funding in 2013/14 however a 2%

reduction has been reflected in the 2014/15 figures.

- 2.5. The estimated business rate aggregate has been calculated at £21.8bn lower than anticipated due to the inclusion of appeals into the calculation. This figure is used to determine an authority's business rate baseline via the use of proportionate share calculation.

### 3. National Control Total and Spending powers

- 3.1. The average spending power reduction nationally has been stated as 1.3% (1.7% in the provisional allocations), however Havering's reduction in 2013/14 is 1.1% and 2.2% in 2014/15. Appendix A shows the 2012/13, 2013/14 and 20-14/15 calculations. The change from the provisional allocation in December is due to the introduction of the Public Health reform grant as well as the double counting of the Council Tax support grant within the spending powers calculation.
- 3.2. Appendix A shows a reduction in spending of £8m from 12/13 allocation, however this does not include the additional new burden placed on local authorities. For example the Council Tax Support grant of £13.5m which has been included in the start-up allocation has been used in arriving at the spending power reduction. This does not include the £1.5m reduction in funding being placed on Local Authorities therefore not reflecting in the headline reductions.
- 3.3. The table below shows the changes in spending control total since the 2010 Spending Review. The further breakdown can be found in Appendix B.

<b>Announcements</b>	<b>2013/14 (£m's)</b>
<b>SR2010 Formula grant</b>	<b>23,196</b>
<b>2011 Autumn Statement</b>	(260)
<b>Business Rate Retention</b>	
Grants being Rolled in	7,959
Transfers Out	(4,106)
Other Adjustments including NHB	(717)
<b>Revised Spending Control Total</b>	<b>26,072</b>

- 3.4. The spending control total has increased significantly due to the large amount of grants being rolled into the formula. This is not an increase in funding but a movement in funding stream or additional burdens placed on local authorities.

### 4. The Formula Funding – Havering

- 4.1. The settlement calculation is normally a series of complex and interlinking calculations using various demographics and deprivation indicators. The 2013/14 calculation has not only had this aspect but also £31m of rolled in grants as well as the introduction of the business rate

retention funding. 2013/14 has been the biggest change in funding for 20 years and the lateness of the release of information has hindered the budget setting process and the full understand of the changes affecting Havering.

- 4.2. Havering's provisional start-up funding allocation is used to determine both Havering's RSG and business rate baseline. This comprises of the current four-block formula grant model as well as incorporating £31.2m of rolled in grants. This equate to a provisional start-up funding allocation for 2013/14 of £75.568m (£69.309m for 2014/15) compared to a 2012/13 equivalent of £79.225m. As part of the revised calculation to determine Havering's business rate baseline and RSG allocation a ratio is applied the start-up funding allocation. As the localised element of the business rates only amount to £10.096bn against the spend control totals of £26.2bn this creates a 60.1:39.9 split. This creates an RSG figure for Havering of £45.4m and a business rate baseline or business rate target of £30.1m.
- 4.3. From the introduction of the new funding regime, no authority was said to be worse off under this arrangement however due to the method of calculating the retained element of funding formula and the four block model Havering will be facing a reduction in funding.
- 4.4. The four block element of this funding can be shown in more detail in appendix C, however on the face of the calculation in 2013/14, there is a £2.0m reduction. This is due to numerous changes including
  - Updating of indicators
  - Removal of New Homes Bonus Funding (£500m nationally) and
  - the impact of the floor / damping
  - Reduction in Early Intervention Grant (EIG).
- 4.5. Havering in 2014/15 will face further reduction of £6.2m (appendix F) as a result of the following:
  - The reduction in spending from the 2010 emergency budget,
  - The 2% departmental reductions announced in the Autumn Statement
  - The unique treatment of Council Tax Support grant within the formula resulting in the grant facing reductions due spending reductions
  - Further reduction in the EIG allocation.
- 4.6. Havering's grant per head is still considerably lower than that the outer London average, as well its neighbouring boroughs. Figure 1 below compares Havering's grant per head against the outer London average and neighbouring boroughs.

Figure 1

	2013/14 Formula Grant	Projected 2013 Population	Grant per head	Grant per head Ranked	2014/15 Formula Grant	* Projected 2013 Population	Grant per head	Grant per head Ranked
<b>Havering</b>	75,568,000	243,676	310.12	5	69,309,000	243,676	284.43	5
<b>Newham</b>	243,753,000	318,369	765.63	1	220,134,000	318,369	691.44	1
<b>Redbridge</b>	116,858,000	293,541	398.10	3	105,727,000	293,541	360.18	3
<b>Barking &amp; Dagenham</b>	126,170,000	196,094	643.42	2	114,363,000	196,094	583.20	2
<b>Bromley</b>	84,130,000	318,378	264.25	6	77,122,000	318,378	242.23	6
<b>Bexley</b>	80,147,000	237,794	337.04	4	73,048,000	237,794	307.19	4
<b>Outer London</b>	2,427,282,000	5,435,100	446.59		2,206,155,000	5,435,100	405.91	

\* 2014/15 population uses the 2013 projected as details on project population for 14/15 have yet to be released.

- 4.7. The formula grant has been updated to reflect the most recent data available including the population, council tax base, and various demographics / deprivation indicators. This also includes updating the grants rolled in 11/12 to provide a more reflective picture of the allocation of these grants.
- 4.8. From initial briefings from the Department of Communities and local government £2bn was to be moved from the formula in full to fund the New Homes Bonus however it has been decided to phase this gradually and in 13/14 £500m has been removed. This process will leave winners and losers as those who increase house building, bringing homes back into use and building affordable homes over and above the amount removed will benefit. The £500m is more than the actual amount paid out and as a result Havering will be returned £258k. However, this is solely for 2013/14, and the amount will be re-calculated for 2014/15; as such, this is not sufficiently reliable to be reflected in the Council's base budget, and these funds will therefore be treated as a one-off for 2013/14.
- 4.9. The cost of guaranteeing the minimum increase in grant continues to be paid for by scaling back the increase in grant for authorities above the floor. As in previous years, the floor damping system is self-financing within each group of authorities i.e. authorities in one group will not cross-subsidise the floor for authorities in another group

Floor band	Social Services authorities	Shire district councils	Fire & rescue authorities	No. of London boroughs
<b>Band 1 (most dependent)</b>	-2.70%	-5.40%	-8.70%	17
<b>Band 2</b>	-4.70%	-7.40%	-9.20%	3
<b>Band 3</b>	-6.70%	-9.40%	-11.70%	9
<b>Band 4 (least dependent)</b>	-8.70%	-11.40%		4

- 4.10. Funding formula will be subject to damping or smoothing as per previous settlement. Four bands have been set up according to an authority's level of grant dependency. Due to the fact Havering receives one of the lowest settlements in London and has a relatively large council tax base, it faces the highest level of reduction of 8.7%. Only four other authorities in London face this level of reduction. Below is a summary of the bands and number of borough in each band as per London Councils.
- 4.11. As part of the funding formula £31.2m of grants have been rolled into the formula. A full list can be found in appendix D. Of these grants the majority was as expected from previous announcements from DCLG however some changes have occurred in the Early Intervention Grant (EIG) and the Local Authority Central Spend Equivalent Grant (LACSEG) transfers.
- 4.12. The funding for the early intervention grant has now been separate between the core allocations, an apportion for two year olds and an £150m top-slice. It has been recently announced that this £150m top-slice will be returned to local authorities for adoption services.. As part of the EIG allocation,, a flooring mechanism has been incorporated which reduces the figure by £600k. The full effect of this reduction is a reduction of £1.7m.

## 5. Business Rate Baseline - Havering

- 5.1. As stated above, Havering's business rate baseline has been set at £30.1m however this is not the actual allocation which will be received, it's a notional amount or target to obtain an equivalent funding as set out in the start-up funding allocation. In addition a separate calculation is used to determine whether the amount of business rates by a local authority which are collected is over or under this baseline this used to calculate the Top-up or tariff for local authorities. The calculation is as followed:

National business Rate Aggregate \* Local share (30%) \* the proportionate Share. = individual business rate Baseline

$$21.797bn \times 30\% \times 0.0032354 = £21.157m$$

The proportionate share calculation has been calculated by using a two year average in business rate collection against the average national amount collected.

- 5.2. The individual business rate baseline is used as Havering target business rates. As this is only a notional amount there will be difference once compared to the actual / estimated business rate yield.
- 5.3. Havering's estimated business rate yield has been calculated at £20.741m thus resulting in a £416k shortfall against our target business rate. This shortfall is on top of the funding reductions stated above.



5.4. Those authorities who collect more business rates than their business rate baseline will pay a tariff whilst those who collect less will be paid a Top-up. Some authorities will collect significantly more than their start-up funding and as a result pay a tariff however Havering collects less than this therefore receiving a top-up of £9.03m. The Appendix E shows the calculation of the provisional RSG, business rate baseline and top-up. D

5.5. The business rate baseline will increase year on year and as part of the settlement an increase of 3.07% has been used. As a result Havering would need to increase their business rates by this percentage in order match the equivalent funding as set out in the start-up allocations.

## **6. Pooling**

6.1. Currently London boroughs have not decided to pool however work is being undertaken by London Councils to monitor and assess the impact if London had pooled.

6.2. Assuming London had pooled, London as a whole would be a tariff paying authority which would also be required to pay a levy of 10p in the pound.

# Public Document Pack

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
JOINT (ALL) OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
Town Hall  
24 January 2013 (7.30 pm – 9.10 pm)**

**Present:**

**COUNCILLORS**

**Conservative Group** Sandra Binion, Jeffrey Brace, Wendy Brice-Thompson, Dennis Bull, Osman Dervish, Roger Evans, Georgina Galpin, Pam Light, Robby Misir, Eric Munday+, Frederick Osborne, Garry Pain, Frederick Thompson, Linda Trew, Keith Wells and Damian White

+ Substituting for Rebecca Bennett

**Residents' Group** June Alexander, Clarence Barrett+, Nic Dodin, Gillian Ford, Linda Hawthorn, Barbara Matthews, Ray Morgon, Ron Ower and Linda Van den Hende

+ Substituting for John Mylod

**Labour Group** Keith Darvill+

+ substituting for Paul McGeary

**Independent Residents Group** Michael Deon Burton and David Durant

All decisions were taken with no votes against.

The Chairman reminded Members of the action to be taken in an emergency.

**1 CHAIRMAN OF MEETING**

With the agreement of all Overview & Scrutiny Committee Members, the Chair was taken at this special joint meeting by Councillor Sandra Binion.

**2 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman advised all present of action to be taken in the event of emergency evacuation of the Town Hall becoming necessary.

**3 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (IF ANY) - RECEIVE**

Apologies were received from the following Members:

Children & Learning Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Margaret Cameron (Co-opted Member – non-voting)

Crime & Disorder Committee:

Councillor Rebecca Bennett (substituted by Councillor Eric Munday)

Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Councillor John Mylod (substituted by Councillor Clarence Barrett)

Towns & Communities Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Councillor Paul McGeary (substituted by Councillor Keith Darvill)

Value Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Councillor Ted Eden

**4 DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

There were no disclosures of interests.

**5 THE COUNCIL'S FINANCIAL STRATEGY**

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Michael White explained that the budget proposals had been made in the context of continuing austerity measures by central Government. The priority for Havering had been to protect front line services and reviews had therefore been undertaken of the Council's back office functions. A joint agreement with Newham had saved £5-6 million and further savings had been achieved by the introduction of ISS software and a total of 78 restructures across the Council.

The level of Council Tax which was formerly residents' top priority was now only the fourth priority and this showed that Council Tax levels in Havering were under control. The Council's savings plans were currently on track and budgets were being managed sensibly. A further £1.5 million of savings would be needed but it was anticipated that these could be found without any denigration of services, providing budgets were kept under review.

It was expected that the austerity situation would now last until at least 2017 and a further Comprehensive Spending review would have an impact on

Havering from 2015/16. A 1% cut was required in 2013/14 and a 2% saving would have to be achieved in 2014/15. Public sector pay would increase by an average 1%.

Changes impacting on the budgetary position included the localisation of business rates (although the Government would keep 30% of this revenue) a 10% cut in funding as a result of Council Tax localisation and funding of £1.8 million from the New Homes Bonus although the Rate Support Grant had fallen. NHS funding for social care had risen to £3.6 million although the borough's large elderly population had to be taken into account. There was also a ring fenced amount of £8.6 million for the new public health duties transferring to the Council.

In conclusion, the Leader felt it was essential to protect front line services but this could only be done with less money by finding efficiencies. The Administration's strong financial planning had been praised in the recent Peer Review report. It was important to continue to deliver value for money through initiatives such as Shared Services and East London Solutions. A future funding group had been established to help the Council prepare for further budgetary challenges in the future.

The Leader agreed with a Member's suggestion that energy management was a good area for investment and favoured using the Council's pension fund for this if it offered a better return.

Answers to questions raised by Members on specific items of the budget are shown in the appendix to the minutes.

**Having received the presentation from the Leader of the Council, the Overview and Scrutiny Committees noted:**

1. The financial position of the Council.
2. That the report was formally consulting them on the proposed Corporate budget adjustments and that this was the opportunity to scrutinise the budget proposals.

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX: JOINT MEETING OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES, 24  
JANUARY 2013, ANSWERS TO MEMBER QUESTIONS ON THE COUNCIL'S  
FINANCIAL STRATEGY

Questions were asked by Members on the areas shown below and answers were given by officers or Cabinet Members as follows:

1. Details on Corporate Contingency Fund and service revenue underspends – It was not possible to give any figures on these at this stage.
2. Why Havering remained continued to be in the highest floor damping band – There had been no clarity received on this from central government and it could not be established how these figures had been arrived at.
3. Details of funding received via the Early Years Support Grant – While it had been confirmed what the level of the top slice would be, it was not known what level of funding would come back to the Council. Some information had recently been received re how much adoption funding would come back to the Council but there remained a lack of specific details.
4. How many primary schools were planning to convert to academy status – No other primary schools were planning to convert at this stage.
5. Public health supplementary paper – This would be included in the February Cabinet report.
6. Savings from review of adult social care – The savings proposed took account of any underspend in other areas of adult social care.
7. Main savings areas proposed for adult social care – These were still being worked through and would cover a variety of areas. Savings would however be in back office functions, not front line services.
8. Impact on children's placements – Provision would be made for the rising numbers of cases. Costs could also be reduced by undertaking more work with families in order to reduce the need for placements.
9. Amount of section 106 receipts – This was not known at this stage and details would be supplied to Councillor Hawthorn outside of the meeting.
10. Predicted underspends – The contingency did not include the forecast overall underspend of £1.2 million. Contingency totals would not be declared until closer to the year end. Officers were very pleased with the catering

underspend which would be used to offset against overspends elsewhere. This was a regular surplus but could not be written permanently into the underlying budget as there was a possibility that the service could lose catering contracts in the future. It was felt it may not be productive for the service to take on many further contracts in addition to those it currently held.

11. Underspend on Special Corporate Budget Provision – Some risk factors had not been applied as yet and so there had only been one-off calls on this provision thus far.
12. Shortfall in income from advertising hoardings – Some income was obtained from sites such as those at the top of North Street and roundabouts. The recession had meant it was not viable to introduce any more sites and there had not been any impact on this from the Olympic Games. Details of income from the existing hoardings would be supplied to Councillor Barrett outside of the meeting.
13. Transfer of outside catering company staff into Havering pension scheme – The legal requirements of an outsourced contract meant that any current staff in the Local Government Pension Scheme had to be admitted to the Havering scheme.
14. Details of the New Homes Bonus – All funds received for this would be spent on the local community on services that residents wished to be improved. This was reflected in the budget. The New Homes Bonus was unringfenced and all residents had been consulted on the proposals being taken forward.
15. Commissioning of specialist advisors – Advisors of this kind were not employed by the Council. The advisor working in connection with the New Homes Bonus was aiming to get empty properties back into use as soon as possible. This was a specialist resource to purely undertake this role and had been carried out effectively in other boroughs.
16. Savings in Members Allowances 2014/15 – The Leader felt that a realignment of Cabinet posts and Overview & Scrutiny Committees was required although the position after the 2014 election would be a matter for the Leader at that time. A Cabinet Member dealing solely with children's issues may not be required once the plans for academies and free schools had concluded.
17. Your Council Your Say survey – The main questions in the survey were the same in order to allow for benchmarking. Some new questions could also be added.

18. Use of recession funding grant – This was used to support payment of additional claims for Council Tax and Housing Benefit.
19. Removal of Learning Disability and Health Reform Grant – There were no specific plans to change spending on this area. The current service plan would continue. Services provided would be assessed by social workers and carers' groups would also be consulted. Services to support people with high level needs were also continuing to be planned for.
20. Social Fund Localisation – Scrutiny of this would fall under the Value Overview and Scrutiny Committee. It was hoped that voluntary or community groups would administer a scheme offering help in kind up to a level of £100. This was a very new area and it was hard to know the exact Social Fund amounts at present. As such, a contingency may be needed. A smaller scheme was in existence in Mawneys ward whereby vouchers for a voluntary food bank could be issued to people.
21. Youth Offending Team – This funding had been removed as some services were now administered by the Youth Justice Board.
22. Social Work Improvement Team – This funding, to cover training for staff, had been now been withdrawn by central Government. Training remained a priority for the directorate however.
23. Troubled Families – While this grant had now been withdrawn, some funding would come to the council as payment by results claims were submitted.
24. Culture & Leisure Savings – The predicted income increase from football pitches was due to the opening of more pitches rather than any plans to increase prices. Officers would confirm to Councillor Darvill the position as regards the pitches at the rear of the Albermarle Youth Centre. Income from Hornchurch Country Park was due to payments for cows being allowed to graze in the park. It was not expected that there would be complaints as a result of cow excrement due to the large size of the park. Officers would check re any current income from cows already grazing in the park. The reduction in cleaning costs would not result in dangerous glass etc being left in parks. There would be no impact of the removal of the car allowance for Parks Protection officers as staff would use Council vehicles.
25. Children's Services – Management & Administration Savings – These would result from restructures of the service following a series of reviews over the last six months.



26. Capital Expenditure – A Member welcomed the presentation of details of capital programme expenditure and requested that this format be followed to allow monitoring of savings throughout the year.

27. Corporate Plan Refresh – A Member requested that this be printed in a bigger typeface or in colour.