

AGENDA

General Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Date: **Wednesday 30 September 2015**

Time: **10.00 am**

Place: **Council Chamber, The Shire Hall, St Peter's Square,
Hereford, HR1 2HX**

Notes: Please note the time, date and venue of the meeting.

For any further information please contact:

Ben Baugh, Governance Services

Tel: 01432 261882

Email: bbaugh@herefordshire.gov.uk

If you would like help to understand this document, or would like it in another format, please call Ben Baugh, Governance Services on 01432 261882 or e-mail bbaugh@herefordshire.gov.uk in advance of the meeting.

Agenda for the Meeting of the General Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Membership

Chairman	Councillor WLS Bowen
Vice-Chairman	Councillor MJK Cooper
	Councillor JM Bartlett
	Councillor CA Gandy
	Councillor J Hardwick
	Councillor DG Harlow
	Councillor EPJ Harvey
	Councillor JF Johnson
	Councillor RL Mayo
	Councillor AJW Powers
	Councillor NE Shaw
	Councillor A Warmington
	Councillor SD Williams

Co-optees (education items)

Mr P Burbidge
Mrs A Fisher
Mr RJ Fuller
Mr P Sell

Roman Catholic Church
Parent Governor Representative: Primary Schools
Parent Governor Representative: Secondary Schools
Church of England

AGENDA

		Pages
1.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>To receive apologies for absence.</p>	
2.	<p>NAMED SUBSTITUTES</p> <p>To receive details of members nominated to attend the meeting in place of a member of the committee.</p>	
3.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>To receive any declarations of interest by members.</p>	
4.	<p>MINUTES</p> <p>To receive the minutes of the meeting held on 21 July 2015.</p>	7 - 16
5.	<p>SUGGESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC</p> <p>To consider suggestions from the public on issues the committee could scrutinise in the future.</p> <p>(There will be no discussion of the issue at the time when the matter is raised. Consideration will be given to whether it should form part of the committee's work programme when compared with other competing priorities.)</p>	
6.	<p>QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC</p> <p>To note questions received from the public and the items to which they relate.</p> <p>(Questions are welcomed for consideration at a scrutiny committee meeting subject to the question being directly relevant to an item listed on the agenda below. If you have a question you would like to ask then please submit it no later than 5.00 pm on Thursday 24 September 2015 to bbaugh@herefordshire.gov.uk)</p>	
7.	<p>THE DEVELOPMENT OF A SCHOOLS CAPITAL INVESTMENT STRATEGY</p> <p>To provide General overview and scrutiny committee with the opportunity to review and comment on the progress made in developing a schools capital investment strategy, including considering a presentation of evidence at the committee meeting.</p>	17 - 22
8.	<p>REVISIONS TO THE COUNCIL TAX REDUCTION SCHEME</p> <p>To seek the views of the General overview and scrutiny committee regarding the proposed revisions to the current council tax reduction (CTR) scheme ahead of Cabinet review in October and Council approval in December.</p>	23 - 72
9.	<p>WORK PROGRAMME</p> <p>To consider the committee's work programme.</p>	73 - 82
10.	<p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</p> <p>The next scheduled meeting is Tuesday 27 October 2015 at <u>1.00 pm</u>.</p>	

The public's rights to information and attendance at meetings

You have a right to: -

- Attend all Council, Cabinet, committee and sub-committee meetings unless the business to be transacted would disclose 'confidential' or 'exempt' information.
- Inspect agenda and public reports at least five clear days before the date of the meeting.
- Inspect minutes of the Council and all committees and sub-committees and written statements of decisions taken by the Cabinet or individual Cabinet Members for up to six years following a meeting.
- Inspect background papers used in the preparation of public reports for a period of up to four years from the date of the meeting. (A list of the background papers to a report is given at the end of each report). A background paper is a document on which the officer has relied in writing the report and which otherwise is not available to the public.
- Access to a public register stating the names, addresses and wards of all Councillors with details of the membership of Cabinet and of all committees and sub-committees.
- Have a reasonable number of copies of agenda and reports (relating to items to be considered in public) made available to the public attending meetings of the Council, Cabinet, committees and sub-committees.
- Have access to a list specifying those powers on which the Council have delegated decision making to their officers identifying the officers concerned by title.
- Copy any of the documents mentioned above to which you have a right of access, subject to a reasonable charge (20p per sheet subject to a maximum of £5.00 per agenda plus a nominal fee of £1.50 for postage).
- Access to this summary of your rights as members of the public to attend meetings of the Council, Cabinet, committees and sub-committees and to inspect and copy documents.

Public transport links

The Shire Hall is a few minutes walking distance from both bus stations located in the town centre of Hereford.

Recording of this meeting

Please note that filming, photography and recording of this meeting is permitted provided that it does not disrupt the business of the meeting.

Members of the public are advised that if you do not wish to be filmed or photographed you should let the governance services team know before the meeting starts so that anyone who intends filming or photographing the meeting can be made aware.

The reporting of meetings is subject to the law and it is the responsibility of those doing the reporting to ensure that they comply.

Fire and emergency evacuation procedure

In the event of a fire or emergency the alarm bell will ring continuously.

You should vacate the building in an orderly manner through the nearest available fire exit and make your way to the Fire Assembly Point in the Shire Hall car park.

Please do not allow any items of clothing, etc. to obstruct any of the exits.

Do not delay your vacation of the building by stopping or returning to collect coats or other personal belongings.

The Chairman or an attendee at the meeting must take the signing in sheet so it can be checked when everyone is at the assembly point.

HEREFORDSHIRE COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting of General Overview & Scrutiny Committee held at Council Chamber, Shire Hall, St. Peter's Square, Hereford, HR1 2HX on Tuesday 21 July 2015 at 10.00 am

Present: Councillor WLS Bowen (Chairman)
Councillor MJK Cooper (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors: J Hardwick, DG Harlow, EPJ Harvey, JF Johnson, MT McEvilly, FM Norman, AJW Powers, NE Shaw, LC Tawn and SD Williams

Co-opted members: Mr P Burbidge, Mrs A Fisher, Mr RJ Fuller and Mr P Sell

In attendance: Councillors H Bramer (Cabinet Member, Contract and Assets), BA Durkin (in his capacity as chairman of the task and finish group on development management), and GJ Powell (Cabinet Member, Economy and Corporate Services).

Officers: G Hughes (Director of Economy, Communities and Corporate), L Knight (Head of Additional Needs), B Norman (Assistant Director, Governance), M Willimont (Head of Development Management and Environmental Health), and K Vigus (Waste Disposal Team Leader)

In his introductory remarks, the Chairman welcomed Mrs A Fisher and Mr RJ Fuller to their first meeting as Parent Governor Representatives, for the primary and secondary sectors respectively.

11. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors JM Bartlett, CA Gandy and A Warmington. Apologies had also been received from Councillors JG Lester (Cabinet Member, Young People and Children's Wellbeing) and PD Price (Cabinet Member, Infrastructure).

12. NAMED SUBSTITUTES

Councillor FM Norman substituted for Councillor JM Bartlett; Councillor MT McEvilly substituted for Councillor CA Gandy; and Councillor LC Tawn substituted for Councillor A Warmington.

13. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

14. MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting were received.

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 10 June 2015 be approved as a correct record.

15. SUGGESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

It was reported that a suggestion had been received from Mr. Peter McKay in relation to Highway Dedication Codes and Deregulation Bill provisions and safeguards; details about the suggestion and a related question to Council were included in a supplement to the agenda.

The Chairman thanked Mr. McKay for his interest and suggestion. It was requested that committee members be provided with a briefing note on public rights of way, the definitive map and other matters raised by Mr. McKay. In addition, the Chairman said that arrangements were being made for a member seminar/workshop on transportation issues where these matters could be explored.

16. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No questions had been received.

17. EXECUTIVE RESPONSE TO COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCHOOL EXAMINATION PERFORMANCE

The Chairman reminded members that a report had been considered on school examination performance at the committee meeting on 10 March 2015 ([minute 63](#) refers) and a number of recommendations made. The Executive response to those recommendations was detailed within Appendix 1 to this item.

The discussion centred on the following recommendation that had not been accepted:

Recommendation 1: That officers reprise the actions within the Herefordshire Food Strategy in the context of food provision and education in schools and that the committee be updated with the current position in terms of the delivery of those actions.

A committee member questioned whether the Food Strategy was still a live document and, whilst acknowledging the autonomy of schools, whether further thought should be given to the authority's approach.

The Head of Additional Needs advised that the authority took the issue seriously, particularly in terms of nutrition, but responsibility for schools meals was delegated to individual schools.

Mr. Sell said that the discussion at the 10 March 2015 meeting had focussed on promoting the use of locally sourced produce but noted that this could not be imposed on schools. Nevertheless, many schools did use local suppliers, adding that some schools involved pupils in the preparation of food as an educational activity.

The Chairman requested that a briefing note be prepared on the Food Strategy, with input from children's wellbeing and public health directorates.

A committee member noted the strong causal link between nutrition, the ability of pupils to pay attention in class and examination performance. As the Food Strategy had linkages to schools, it was suggested that an indication was needed about the direction of travel at a strategic level.

Noting the wording in the response that 'there are recent examples of schools changing suppliers to achieve best value', a committee member said that schools should be encouraged to achieve best value in the broadest sense rather than just being price focussed. The Assistant Director Governance confirmed that price was only one aspect of best value.

Mr. Burbidge said that he was aware of one school that had recently replaced an underperforming supplier and, in appointing a new caterer, had focused on quality and service. He added that locally sourced produce should be promoted wherever possible but there was a need to give freedom to caterers to use their best judgement.

Mr. Knight commented that the attractiveness of the food offer to pupils needed to be factored into the way in which schools approached the issue.

The Chairman welcomed the update provided on looked after children activities.

RESOLVED: That

(a) the Executive response be noted; and

(b) a briefing note be prepared on the Herefordshire Food Strategy and its linkages to schools.

18. EXECUTIVE RESPONSE TO THE TASK AND FINISH GROUP REPORT ON DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT (PLANNING)

The report of the task and finish group on development management (planning) had been considered at the committee meeting on 10 June 2015 ([minute 9](#) refers). The Chairman drew attention to the draft Executive response to the group's recommendations detailed within Appendix A to this item.

Invited to express his views on the response, the group chairman noted that the majority of the recommendations had been accepted, demonstrating that the work had been worthwhile. However, he considered that clarification was needed on five of the recommendations that had been partially accepted.

Recommendation 2: Downloadable and/or online editable applications be developed for all planning related application forms to encourage electronic applications.

The group chairman said that the recommendation was not about duplicating systems, it was about enhancing the existing planning portal.

A committee member commented on the need to explore the use of file compression software, as many service users found it difficult to download large images, particularly in areas with slow internet connectivity.

In response, the Head of Development Management and Environmental Health (subsequently 'head of service') reassured the committee that officers would endeavour to improve upon the planning portal in conjunction with Hoople Ltd, the council's IT support provider.

Recommendation 3: That provision of a facility for subscription service to a given planning application giving updates is developed - this would enhance the service and reduce phone calls and planning officer time.

The group chairman said that the intention behind the recommendation was to provide alerts to interested parties about significant developments with planning applications.

The head of service said that, whilst many people followed the progress of planning applications closely, better ways of notifying applicants electronically would be considered. It was noted that, with up to 4,000 applications received a year, the service needed to be mindful of the way in which it deployed resources.

Recommendation 5: Alternative means of managing the planning committee work schedule be explored to ensure that efficient and consistent planning decisions are made.

The group chairman said that the issue was about the workload and duration of Planning Committee meetings, rather than about member training.

The head of service commented on the need for consistent and robust decisions and acknowledged the importance of the democratic decision making process. In terms of Planning Committee arrangements, it was noted that all day committee meetings had been split into morning and afternoon committee sessions, thereby providing greater flexibility in terms of substitutions. Apart from occasional additional meetings, it was not considered that the committee could meet more frequently than every three weeks given the cycle of report preparation, publication, site visits, and meetings.

A committee member commented that consistency also had to apply to officer advice, as he considered that there had been some recent examples where the degree of weight given to emerging Core Strategy policies had been interpreted differently.

Recommendation 11: That employees' well-being in terms of stress management should be monitored as part of the annual appraisal process.

The group chairman said that the recommendation should have highlighted the need for day to day management of employee wellbeing, not just through the annual appraisal process. The Chairman of the committee noted that increases in workload could place additional pressures on staff which could impact on the individuals concerned and the service provided.

The head of service emphasised his commitment to staff and recognised that there could be a lag phase between upturns in the numbers of planning applications received and the recruitment of additional staff to manage that workload. He commented on how managers sought to identify concerns and support staff; reference was made to health and wellbeing days that had been undertaken during the year.

Comments were made by committee members about the impact of sickness absences on other staff and departmental efficiency. The head of service explained some of the considerations and actions that were taken in response to both short term and long term sickness absences. He also outlined how, in such circumstances, the work of specialist officers was typically redistributed or temporary resources utilised.

Recommendation 25: That ward members be notified in all matters of planning applications to ward boundaries.

The group chairman emphasised the need for ward members to be at least as well informed as the parish councils in their areas.

The head of service said that, although it would be too resource intensive to communicate about every application, officers would notify members of all major or significant applications in adjacent wards. He encouraged members to contact managers if the dialogue with planning officers could be improved.

A committee member commented on the potential impact of developments on adjacent wards, particularly in market towns.

Returning to recommendation 23, a committee member noted that planning was one of the most visible service areas to the public and had clear statutory obligations.

Therefore, assurance was sought that proper risk analysis had been undertaken to ensure that planning activity was resourced properly given the potential legal implications and reputational damage that could arise if the service could not fulfil its functions.

In response, the head of service gave an overview of the income and expenditure of development control during 2014/15. He also advised members that the managers met weekly to monitor performance and, in doing so, could also gauge workloads if too high for a particular officer.

In response to a comment by a committee member about the need for proactive planning enforcement, the Chairman noted that planning enforcement had improved in both approach and outcomes in recent times. The head of service reported that the authority now had five planning enforcement officers (four full-time equivalent posts) and said that there was closer working between planning enforcement and environmental health teams. He advised that it would require significant further investment to investigate the delivery of every planning condition, so there had to be an expedient approach based on the professional acumen of officers and on the information received from the public. The need to publicise enforcement activity where appropriate to enhance public trust was acknowledged.

The group chairman commended planning and enforcement officers for their hard work, often under considerable pressure.

In response to a question from a committee member about income and how it was treated, the Director of Economy, Communities and Corporate said that the committee could be assured that budgets were managed appropriately, supported by quality accounting and audit processes. He said that a briefing note was in preparation and would be circulated to committee members about the distribution of resources to planning and associated services. In response to further comments, the Director said that the authority would continue to look at the range of needs but ring-fencing income to the planning service could not be guaranteed; he added that this could limit flexibility in terms of the resources available in less active periods.

RESOLVED: That

- (a) the draft Executive response be noted; and**
- (b) a briefing note on progress with the response be provided within six months.**

19. UPDATE ON WASTE PERFORMANCE (Verbal Report)

The Chairman said that, mindful of performance information reported to Cabinet on [10 June 2015](#), it would be helpful for the committee to receive an update on the Waste Management Service and the Waste Disposal Team Leader (subsequently 'team leader') was invited to give a presentation.

The principal points of the presentation (*in italics*) and discussion are provided below.

Waste Collection New Service

1. *In November 2014 the council commenced an alternate weekly refuse and recycling collection service (AWC)*
2. *Green wheeled bin for recycling and a black bin for general rubbish collected fortnightly on alternate weeks*

3. *Introduced to save £0.5 million per year, reduce general rubbish and increase recycling*

Performance Improvement

4. *Average monthly general waste: prior to AWC 3,838 tonnes; after AWC 3,545 tonnes; difference - 293 tonnes*
5. *Average monthly kerbside recycling: prior to AWC 1430 tonnes; after AWC 1,551 tonnes; difference + 121 tonnes*
6. *Dry recycling %: prior to AWC 28.26%; after AWC 33.60%; difference + 5.34%*
7. *Estimated recycling and composting rate: prior to AWC 40%; after AWC 42%; difference + 2% (estimated)*

Summary

8. *Move to Alternate Weekly Collection has done what we wanted it to do: save £0.5 million per annum; reduced amount of general (residual) waste; and increased recycling*

The team leader said that, although data was only available for a six month period, the performance indicators were encouraging and demonstrated that lower levels of general waste were being collected and higher levels of recycling were being achieved, from already good levels compared to other areas. It was noted that this had offset recent changes to the treatment of wood waste.

The team leader responded to a number of questions from committee members:

- i. It was likely that AWC had reduced the amount of trade waste entering the system and that households were reusing, donating and composting more materials than before. The Chairman noted that the simplicity of the AWC arrangements made recycling easier to achieve than in some other areas of the country, where residents had to separate materials themselves.
- ii. From discussions with street cleansing and enforcement personnel and evidence from tonnage records, it did not appear that AWC had resulted in a discernible increase in levels of fly-tipping to date.
- iii. A main focus for the service in the current year was on communal properties, in terms of containment options and improving levels of recycling.
- iv. All waste was weighed, so the authority could have confidence in the data collected.
- v. Leaflets to explain AWC arrangements were available in the principal languages spoken in Herefordshire.
- vi. Members were invited to contact the service about opportunities to improve collection arrangements for residents locally.
- vii. There was an ongoing programme for bin swap requests and replacements for damaged units. It was noted that black sacks would continue to be a feature for some residents, particularly for flats and communal developments.

- viii. Bags of rubbish left by the side of public litter bins were regularly inspected to determine the origin of the contents and were followed up appropriately by community protection team.
- ix. It was acknowledged that some people did not compost due to concerns about vermin but excellent advice could be obtained from volunteer master composters and residents could purchase subsidised compost bins and waste digesters.
- x. It was confirmed that the capital cost of the black bins had been paid off as a consequence of the savings accruing from reduced levels of waste.
- xi. AWC meant that single compartment vehicles were more efficient to run currently but, with the current contract ending in 2023 and emerging changes to waste legislation and regulations, the council would need to consider how the waste management service would be provided in the next couple of years.

The Cabinet Member, Contracts and Assets wished to record his thanks to the team leader and the rest of the team for their hard work, particularly for their efforts to resolve residents' issues face-to-face.

Energy from Waste (EfW) Update

- 9. *Our shared 200,000 tonnes per annum EfW due to be operational in Spring 2017*
- 10. *Will produce more than 16MW of electricity for the National Grid (enough for all households in Hereford city)*
- 11. *Time lapse video available to view on www.severnwaste.com*

The Cabinet Member, Contracts and Assets commented on the progress that was being made with EfW infrastructure and confirmed that the facility was on schedule to start testing in Autumn 2016 and become operational in Spring 2017. The Chairman suggested that members might wish to take the opportunity to visit the EfW in due course.

Future Work

- 12. *Garden waste collection service: seasonal collection (March to October?); opt in service and chargeable to residents; and fortnightly collection from a wheeled bin (brown?)*
- 13. *Will only be considered if we can recover cost of service from users*

In response to questions, the team leader commented:

- Unlike some authorities, there was no provision for the chargeable collection of Christmas trees currently.
- Too much useful food was being wasted, at significant costs to household budgets and in terms of landfill disposal charges. Waste prevention was being encouraged through the 'Love Food Hate Waste' campaign.
- The potential for a chargeable garden waste collection service was being assessed. A committee member suggested Ledbury as a pilot area given its proximity to the green waste composting facility in Dymock.

- Provision was being made at household recycling centres for residents to donate items for re-use by charities at their various outlets in Herefordshire. It was requested that ward members be kept informed about developments so that they could help publicise reuse initiatives locally.
- The www.letswasteless.com website provided lots of information to residents in Herefordshire and Worcestershire, e.g. advice about real nappies.
- An overview was provided on some of the waste containment and collection measures being explored with residents and traders in Hereford city centre to minimise problems associated with litter and seagulls.
- It was noted that, whilst it could not be automatically sorted and recycled, black plastic had some benefits in terms of food preservation but it was hoped that it would be replaced by alternative materials eventually.

A committee member commented that water authorities were not obliged to plan for investment in waste plants and sewage treatment works to take account of business needs. It was considered that, as a county with large agriculture and production sectors, there was a need for a strategic lead to be taken on how the issues were dealt with. The Director for Economy, Communities and Corporate acknowledged that further work was required in consultation with the water authorities and local employers to ensure the adequate provision of waste and sewage services for businesses in Herefordshire.

The Chairman suggested that all councillors could benefit from a seminar / workshop on waste management issues.

RESOLVED: That the update be noted.

20. WORK PROGRAMME

A draft work programme was submitted for consideration. The Chairman drew attention to the following:

1. It was recommended that the September 2015 meeting be moved back to provide additional time for the task and finish group on the smallholdings estate to engage with tenants and stakeholders and to prepare its report.
2. To inform any future activity on football provision and on Hereford racecourse, it was envisaged that reports would be received in January 2016 on Edgar Street Athletic Ground and on property matters.
3. Arrangements were being made for an all member transportation workshop.
4. The work programme would be adjusted to reflect the other matters identified during the meeting.

A committee member commented on: the potential of the Understanding Herefordshire report to inform future, independent work programming; and the need to review the committee's topic selection criteria to ensure that issues were gathered and assessed on their merits rather than being filtered in the linear way suggested by the flow diagram and to reassess the meaning and approach to the 'Will scrutiny involvement be duplicating some other work?' box.

RESOLVED: That

- (a) the draft work programme, as amended, be noted; and**

(b) the meeting scheduled for Tuesday 8 September 2015 be moved to Wednesday 30 September 2015 at 10.00 am.

21. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Wednesday 30 September 2015 at 10.00 am

The meeting ended at 12.30 pm

CHAIRMAN



Meeting:	General overview and scrutiny committee
Meeting date:	30 September 2015
Title of report:	The development of a schools capital investment strategy
Report by:	Head of education development

Classification

Open

Key decision

This is not an executive decision.

Wards affected

Countywide

Purpose

To provide General overview and scrutiny committee with the opportunity to review and comment on the progress made in developing a schools capital investment strategy, including considering a presentation of evidence at the committee meeting.

Recommendations

THAT: the committee

- (a) Advise on any amendments or changes to the principles that will underpin the schools capital investment strategy;**
- (b) Consider the presentation given at the meeting and provide options that might be included or prioritised in the strategy; and**
- (c) Endorse the consultative and evidence based approach taken to the development of the strategy.**

Alternative options

- 1 The strategy does not have any principles that support or underpin it. Without some principles it is very difficult to engage with the reasoning for particular strategic approaches.
- 2 Different principles are consulted upon. The cabinet member agreed a draft set of principles to be consulted upon which were developed with and between stakeholders at the initial rounds of discussion. The formal process and consideration by the committee offers opportunity to further refine these.
- 3 The council develop a strategy without consultation potentially missing opportunities for creative and innovative ideas and solutions. A consultative approach requires significant investment, particularly discussion time, and without careful management may lead to poor decision making.
- 4 Without clear agreed evidence about the current situation and the state of Herefordshire schools the basis of the strategy would be without a secure foundation which would adversely affect decision making.
- 5 There are inevitably a range of options about what schemes get taken forward and it is important all available options are presented and considered against the principles and evidence.

Reasons for recommendations

- 6 The council needs to develop a clear approach to investment in schools across the county. Without a clear agreed approach the council will not be supporting its core aims of giving children the best start in life and developing Herefordshire as a great place to live and work. Overview and scrutiny can provide an important contribution to the development of the strategy.

Key considerations

- 7 The approach to developing a schools capital investment strategy has been informed by feedback from school leaders and from councillors. It has been recommended that overview and scrutiny have the opportunity to review the principles that have taken on board feedback from the initial consultation sessions and also review the findings from the work so far. This will enable the committee to contribute to the development of the strategy at an early stage.
- 8 Herefordshire local authority has a duty to supply sufficient school places. Currently there is a surplus of school places across the county as whole in both primary and secondary schools. In some areas however there are pressures on places and parents cannot get their choice of school.
- 9 Parents and carers are encouraged by government policy to make choices about schools for their children. Across the county as a whole on average only 50% of parents choose to send their child to their local school or catchment school. The reasons for parents/carers making these choices are varied but creates a challenge for planning of school places.
- 10 In addition to the challenges of parents expressing a preference, academy schools have the freedom to admit in excess of their published admission number. There is also an underlying assumption in the national system that popular schools be supported to expand. Popular schools expand and this sometimes creates

challenges to other schools whose reduction in numbers may bring about funding issues

- 11 In fulfilling its school place planning duty the local authority needs to understand the numbers of children being born and moving into new or existing housing. The local authority is required to submit five year forecasts to government but needs to look further ahead to ensure there is a proper supply.
- 12 The local authority wants to supply high quality places for children. While the quality of provision is most closely associated with highest standards of teaching, learning and leadership, the buildings do influence outcomes for children. Parents and carers, the community and employers do want to see buildings that are in good condition and are well maintained. In addition to good maintenance it is important consideration is given to energy efficiency and accessibility for those with disabilities.
- 13 There are government standards (Building Bulletin 103) that set out the preferred number type and size of spaces in schools and the outside areas for the number of children. Without these spaces being a suitable size the quality of the provision can be affected. There are schools that have buildings that are too small or are of a temporary nature. Equally there are schools that are on sites that are much bigger than needed. The strategy will need to address some of the challenges and opportunities these situations create. It may be that some of the land could be released for development or schools could look at consolidating through coming onto a single site. In some instances this might provide opportunities for the further development of all through schools.
- 14 The demography of Herefordshire is such that there are different sizes of school in different areas. It is important schools are integral to their community and there is no set size of school. The financial viability of schools is affected by the number of children on roll and while all schools should be planning ahead, schools with less than 105 on roll should have a detailed plan about their future arrangements. In some cases this may lead to formal partnerships between schools with new and alternative models of leadership.
- 15 The funding available to the local authority by way of grant from central government to consider renewal and redevelopment of buildings has reduced as all centrally available funding has been channelled into providing new places in other parts of the country. Funding, through both necessity and as best practice, needs to be used effectively and efficiently and sourced creatively. The development of a cohesive coherent strategy should give rise to investors feeling confident that the council has a worthwhile approach. This coupled with looking at variety of sources of funding including the conversion of revenue to capital, disposal of surplus land for development and borrowing are necessary elements of a strategy.

Community impact

- 16 Schools are an important and integral part of communities. Having a thriving high quality local school will support growth and development of an area. Many schools see themselves as integral to communities and support them through shared use of facilities, accommodation of nursery provision, and before and after school provision.

Equality duty

- 17 The strategy will have full regard the public sector equality duty and any scheme arising will have a full equalities impact assessment.

Financial implications

- 18 The development of the plan is a council project and is resourced by officer staffing within current budgets.

Legal implications

- 19 The proposal as detailed within the body of the report accords with the local authorities' statutory duty under s.13 of the Education Act 1996 which requires it to contribute toward the spiritual, moral, mental and physical development of the community by securing that efficient primary and secondary education are available to meet the needs of the population of its area.

Risk management

- 20 Without a clear cohesive coordinated capital investment plan that is developed collaboratively the following risks have been identified.
- a. The fabric of the schools deteriorates leading to expensive emergency remedial action
 - b. Opportunities for planned funding are lost as investment is seen as piecemeal and not providing best value
 - c. Some schools may end in crisis due to lack of foresight and planning
 - d. Opportunity to further improve standards in schools are lost
 - e. Schools become insular and isolated as opportunities to renew and redevelop are lost.

Consultees

- 21 Officers of the local authority have met with groups of head teachers and governors in all the market town areas. Additionally elected members have been offered briefing sessions and information. Officers have met with groups of schools, planners, the Diocese of Hereford and Archdioceses of Cardiff. The discussions have been supported with data, information and presentations that are available on the web.

Appendices

Appendix 1 School capital investment strategy - draft principles

Background papers

None identified.

School Capital Investment Strategy - Draft Principles

Under the 1996 Education Act section 14(1) a local authority has a duty to ensure there are enough school places for the children in their area. In Herefordshire we want to do this in a way that supports the delivery of high quality education and contributes to the attractiveness of the County as a place to live and work.

The School Capital Investment Strategy is a key strand of our overall Strategic Plan for Education which in turn complements the Childrens and Young Peoples Plan. The Schools Capital Investment Strategy sets out our collective approach to delivering our lawful duty and is based on the following principles:

1. High quality learning environments are more likely to deliver the best outcomes for all children and young people.
2. A high quality learning environment is one where;
 - a. The building is in good condition with an affordable and planned programme of maintenance. Where the combined cost of any backlog and future maintenance commitments becomes disproportional to the asset value renewal should be considered.
 - b. The building(s) have the right number of suitable places that are at least of the size as set out in the government building specifications. (Building Bulletin 103)
 - c. The buildings are supportive of the delivery of a suitable curriculum and learning.
 - d. There is sufficient suitable outdoor space including playing fields and all weather surfaces.
 - e. Children are not taught in temporary classrooms.
 - f. The building is energy efficient.
 - g. The school is fully accessible to children, staff and parent/carers with disabilities.
 - h. The school meets all health and safety requirements.
3. There will be a mix of size of schools in the city, market towns and villages across Herefordshire that will support the future population trends. We anticipate most parents choosing their local school but do want to support parents/carers choice. We will aim for 95% of parents to get their first preference school. There will be an appropriate number of faith places. We have no preference about whether schools are academy or not.
4. High quality popular schools will be supported to expand. Judgements about quality and popularity are based on;
 - a. Ofsted judgement is outstanding/good
 - b. 3 year trend of outcomes is good
 - c. Total number of parental first preferences received is in excess of published admission numbers over time.

- d. The schools expansion does not unduly compromise the quality aims set out in paragraph 2.
5. There is no preferred size or organisation of school. Opportunities to consolidate provision through development of all through schools and nursery provision will be encouraged.
6. All schools should be planning 5 years ahead. There are risks of continuity of education for small schools. Schools with less than 105 on roll, particularly those that are stand alone, are to have a detailed 5 year plan setting out arrangements for continuity. These plans could include succession planning arrangements, shared leadership and/or merger, federation or amalgamation.
7. Across Herefordshire as whole there should be no more than 10% surplus places. This margin is designed to reflect population variations and trends over time.
8. We want to be increasingly responsible towards the environment. This means
 - a. All schools are to work towards achieving a displayed energy certificate (DEC) rating level of grade C or above.
 - b. All schools are to sign up to and to work towards achieving a silver rating on the Eco schools status.
 - c. All schools are to seek to reduce energy consumption per child/ building area.
9. We will promote non-vehicular access routes to schools and seek to have schools located conveniently to the community assets.
10. Schools are to be accessible and achieve the highest standards compliant with Disability Discrimination Act requirements and Approved document M.
11. Financial investment will need to come from a variety of sources. These will include;
 - a. Specific grants and one off government schemes.
 - b. The planned release of sites to sell and reinvest.
 - c. Conversion of revenue funding to capital.
 - d. Herefordshire Council capital programme.
 - e. A local community council tax charge if they want support the continuation of a local school.
 - f. The Education Funding Agency Academy funding stream.
 - g. Diocesan board.
 - h. Developer contributions
12. There will be detailed consultation on any changes or investment proposals.



Meeting:	General overview and scrutiny committee
Meeting date:	30 September 2015
Title of report:	Revisions to the council tax reduction scheme
Report by:	Director of resources

Classification

Open

Key decision

This is not an executive decision.

Wards affected

Countywide

Purpose

To seek the views of the General overview and scrutiny committee regarding the proposed revisions to the current council tax reduction (CTR) scheme ahead of Cabinet review in October and Council approval in December.

Recommendation

THAT:

- a) **the committee provide comments on the proposals contained in this report.**

Alternative options

To reject the proposed changes to the current CTR scheme; this is possible but would require alternative compensatory savings to be identified.

Reasons for recommendations

To consider the proposed reductions to the level of subsidy provided through the CTR scheme to secure the delivery of the required savings as approved in the medium term financial strategy (MTFS).

Key considerations

Background

- 1 The national council tax benefit system was abolished with effect from 1 April 2013. It was replaced with a localised council tax reduction (CTR) system. The Council received a 10% reduction in its previous central government funding towards CTR. This funding is contained within the revenue support grant which has been reducing every year and it expected to continue to reduce in 2016/17.
- 2 National CTR support continues to protect pensioner discounts. The Council has discretion on CTR for working age claimants only. In 2013/14, following one-off funding support from Government, working age claimants Herefordshire's CTR subsidy was capped at 91.5%.
- 3 The CTR scheme for 2014/15 reduced working age claimants CTR subsidy to 84% of the applicant's council tax charge. This meant that at least 16% of the council tax bill due was payable by the CTR claimant. In addition subsidy was restricted to a band D property which meant that any working age CTR claimant who lived in a property banded above band D had their CTR subsidy based on 84% of a band D equivalent property.
- 4 The CTR scheme for 2015/16 remained the same as 2014/15, with the council giving £4.6m in council tax subsidy to working age claimants.
- 5 A public consultation on the proposed changes for 2016/17 has taken place, the results are summarised in the consultees section of this report and detailed in appendix 3. No amendments have been made to the proposals following consultation. The consultation responses and the views of the General overview and scrutiny committee will be considered by Cabinet on 15 October. Council approval on 18 December is required for any Cabinet recommended changes to the current scheme.
- 6 This report proposes the CTR scheme for 2016/17, year four of the local scheme. The MTFS approved by Council in February 2015 included savings of £150k from CTR for 2016/17. Current saving proposals have increased the saving requirement to £200k. The options for achieving this saving target are detailed in this report. The proposed changes would become effective from 1 April 2016.

Profile of CTR working age claimants

- 7 Working age claimants of CTR include single parents, single people and couples who could be unemployed, have limited capability for work on the grounds of ill health including disability, or are working but on a low income. The current CTR caseload profile is:

- Pensioners fully or partially unaffected by the CTR scheme 6,594
- Working age claimants* 6,738
- **Total CTR caseload 13,332**

**4,500 (approximately) working age claimants are in receipt of CTR at 84%, and therefore, have to pay 16% of their council tax liability. These claimants have an income which is at a level that entitles them to the maximum subsidy. The remaining claimants qualify for partial subsidy.*

8 The collection rates for council tax for the last three years are shown below:

- a) 2012/13 – 98.63% (prior to scheme)
- b) 2013/14 – 98.40% (based on CTR support 91.5%)
- c) 2014/15 – 98.10% (based on CTR support 84%)

In 2014/15 a collection rate of 82.5% was achieved for claimants in receipt of CTR.

9 The council tax liability for working age claimants is £6.5m, of which £4.6m of CTR subsidy was awarded in 2014/15. This left a total council tax charge of £1.9m.

10 A total of 8,672 summonses were issued in 2014/15. A sample of 500 shows that 38% (190) have been issued to tax payers who are in receipt of CTR. Assuming the sample is representative of the total then of the total 8,672 summons issued, 3,300 were issued to people who receive CTR, 49% of working age claimants receiving a summons. This would also suggest that for council tax payers not in receipt of CTR approximately 7% receive a summons. Following the issuing of a summons the usual debt collection process is followed which includes debt collection via deductions from benefits and/or earnings or the referral to debt recovery enforcement agencies.

11 The cost of chasing debt, staff, postage and the cost of summonses (£85) are added to the claimants' debt. In advance of this assistance is provided to those who fall behind in making payments by signposting to agencies, online personal budget planning tool and repayment options. A breakdown of the circumstances of the 190 sample CTR cases receiving a summons are detailed in the table below:

Circumstances	Sample Number	%
In receipt of Employment & Support Allowance*	100	53
In receipt of Income Support – with no other details known	32	17
In receipt of Jobseekers Allowance	25	13
Families with children (lone parents or couples) with low earnings and receiving tax credits	21	11
Single claimants working, with low earnings	8	4
Others	4	2
Total	190	100%

**Employment & Support Allowance (ESA) replaced Incapacity Benefit and is for claimants who, through illness or disability, are unable to play a full part in the labour market which prevents them from claiming Jobseekers Allowance. 39% of our working age caseload is made up of claimants in receipt of ESA, based on the sample 66% of these claimants are at risk of receiving a summons.*

Proposed CTR for 2016/17

Proposal 1 - reducing the level of CTR from 84% to 80% but also increase restrictions to CTR and protect CTR at 84% for certain claimants.

- 12 Overall this proposal is expected to deliver a net saving of approximately £240k pa, £199k relating to Herefordshire Council.
- 13 This proposal would see CTR reduced to 80%. There would be increased restrictions to CTR depending on the claimants property banding and savings. In addition certain claimants would continue to receive CTR of 84%. This is expected to deliver a net saving of approximately £144k pa. CTR would be protected at 84% where the claimant is either in receipt of severe disability premium, carers allowance or families with a child under the age of five.
- 14 **Band C restriction.** Proposal 1 would amend CTR from a band D restriction to a band C property restriction. Under this proposal any claimant who lives in a property above a band C would have their CTR capped at on 80% of a band C equivalent property in their parish. This proposal would generate a net saving of approximately £48k pa. This would impact 8.2% of working age claimants who reside in a property band D and above.
- 15 The table below details the percentage of working age CTR claimants by property band:-

Property band	Working Age claimants in receipt of CTR	%
Band A	2,683	40%
Band B	2,486	37%
Band C	1,017	15%
Band D	327	5%
Band E	155	2%
Band F	57	1%
Band G	13	0
Band H	0	0
Total	6,738	100%

- 16 The 327 band D claimants, if entitled to the maximum CTR discount, would see their council tax charge increase by £204 pa from the current £254 pa in 2015/16 to £458 pa. Appendix 1 - provides a table to show an estimate of the CTR claimants would have to pay under the 20% liability proposed and applying a band C restriction.

- 17 Property band restrictions applied nationally, across unitary authorities and across neighbouring authorities including Worcestershire and Gloucestershire are shown in the table below.

Property band restrictions	Neighbouring authorities	Unitary authorities	All authorities
Total LAs	12	56	326
Number - Restricted	3	15	75
% LAs using restriction	25%	27%	23%
Breakdown of band restricted			
Band A	0	1	5
Band B	0	2	4
Band C	0	2	6
Band D	2	8	52
Band E	1	2	8

- 18 **Reduce the capital limit to £6k.** Currently the CTR capital limit is £16k. Proposal 1 recommends reducing this to £6k. This would mean that claimants with capital above the limit would not receive CTR regardless of any other circumstances. Capital is defined as savings or property the claimant owns but does not include the property they live in or any personal possessions.
- 19 Reducing this limit to £6k would mean that approximately 110 claimants currently receiving CTR would cease to receive CTR. This would provide net savings of £48k pa. 110 claimants currently receiving CTR for 2015/16 will become liable for full council tax charge in 2016/17.
- 20 The take up of reducing the capital limit applied nationally, across unitary authorities and across neighbouring authorities including Worcestershire and Gloucestershire is shown below:-

Capital limit restriction	Neighbouring authorities	Unitary authorities	All authorities
Total LAs	12	56	326
Number reduced £16k capital limit	3	20	72
% LAs using this reduction	25%	36%	22%
Breakdown of restriction			
Limit £12k	0	0	1
Limit £10k	0	5	12
Limit £9k	0	0	1
Limit £8k	0	1	9
Limit £6k	3	14	49
Total	3	20	72

Proposal 2 - reducing the level of CTR from 84% to 80% with no other scheme changes.

- 21 This proposal is expected to deliver a net saving of approximately £240k pa, £199k relating to Herefordshire Council.
- 22 National statistics released for 2015/16 CTR schemes shown in the table below demonstrates the level of discount being applied nationally, across unitary authorities and across neighbouring authorities including Worcestershire and Gloucestershire:

Minimum CTR subsidy	Neighbouring authorities	All Unitary authorities	All councils
70%	0	3	9
Between 70% and 80%	0	16	44
80%	3	19	76
Between 80% and 91.5%	1	7	66
91.50%	1	2	46
Between 91.5% and 100%	0	0	9
100%	7	9	76
Total	12	56	326

Community impact

- 23 The corporate plan, agreed by Council in November 2012, has two broad priorities; supporting the development of a successful economy and improving quality of life for the people of Herefordshire. The council remains committed to ensuring public services are prioritised to meet the needs of the most vulnerable. However, the proposals in this report will have an impact on some residents, but there continues to be regard to support the elderly and vulnerable, with access to support such as council tax discretionary reduction funding.
- 24 The lowest earners in Herefordshire, approximately 4,500 individuals, currently pay 16% of their total Council Tax bill. This report supports a reduction in the discount awarded for some council tax payers in receipt of welfare benefits. Pensioners will continue to receive additional discounts and the vulnerable will continue to have access to welfare support to mitigate these changes.
- 25 The decisions in this report links to key elements of the Council's corporate plan and demonstrate the effective management of resources to help secure a balanced budget. The proposed changes could result in increasing individuals financial difficulties, this is being mitigated by providing options and support as detailed in this report.

Equality duty

- 26 A full Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) was carried out on the initial and subsequent revisions to the scheme and has been reviewed in the light of the revised proposals. The latest version is attached at Appendix 2.

Further information on the subject of this report is available from Josie Rushgrove, Head of corporate finance on Tel (01432) 261867

27 The proposals set out in this report will have an impact on working age benefit claimants. In addition, there is likely to be an increase in the level of non-payment and requests for debt advice.

Hardship Relief

28 Financial assistance is available under Herefordshire’s discretionary hardship policy. Assistance is subject to the meeting the following criteria:

- The taxpayer is facing exceptional and temporary hardship and they do not have access to other funds or assets that could be used to meet their council tax liability.
- Any reduction made in accordance with this policy short term assistance.
- The applicant’s eligibility to council tax reduction and all other statutory reductions has been determined.
- There are unusual and unforeseen circumstances which prevent the property from being occupied and this situation cannot be rectified within a reasonable period of time, for example because of flooding.
- The applicant has taken reasonable steps to resolve their situation prior to making their application.
- The applicant can demonstrate that their current circumstances are unlikely to improve in the following six months.

29 In 2014/15 there were two successful applications to the hardship scheme from applicants in receipt of CTR, providing relief of £578. The current policy is under review and will be updated before 1 April 2016. The scheme will continue to support vulnerable people in line with the Council’s corporate plan.

30 A meeting with representatives from the Children’s Society discussed the effects of enforcement on the family unit, especially those with children. It was agreed that Herefordshire would consider the issues raised both in the review of the recovery policy and in future decisions relating to the CTR scheme including the review of the discretionary hardship policy to include consideration for persons with disability, families with children and children leaving care.

31 National statistics released for 2015/16 CTR schemes in the table below demonstrates the number of hardship schemes currently in place nationally, across unitary authorities and across neighbouring authorities including Worcestershire and Gloucestershire.

Hardship Schemes	National	Unitary	Local
Total LAs	326	56	12
Number with hardship schemes	123	28	4
%	38%	50%	33%

32 In recognition of this the review of the Discretionary Hardship Policy is likely to assist more taxpayers which has been reflected in the approximate net savings from the proposed CTR changes.

Financial implications

- 33 Approving the proposed changes, either proposal 1 or proposal 2, will secure the delivery of the MTFs savings target of £200k in 2016/17. The proposed changes, if adopted, are not considered to result in a significant change to current workloads.
- 34 The table below shows the potential net savings from the CTR changes proposed. The net savings includes assumptions from the implementation of a revised hardship scheme and claimants changes expected from the summer budget Welfare Reforms.
- 35 Savings will also benefit preceptors; parish and town councils, West Mercia Police and Hereford & Worcester Fire and Rescue Service. Approximately 83% of the council tax bill paid is retained by Herefordshire Council.

Detail	Proposal 1 – CTR 80% with protections and restrictions £000 pa	Proposal 2 – reduction in CTR to 80% with no other changes £000 pa
CTR subsidy reduced to 80%	144	240
CTR capped at property band C	48	-
CTR removed if capital limit £6k or above	48	-
Total net saving per annum	240	240
Herefordshire's share of net saving pa (83%)	199	199
MTFS Savings Target 2016/17	200	200

Legal implications

- 36 The Council Tax Reduction Scheme is locally determined by each billing authority under section 13A and Schedule 1A of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.
- 37 For each financial year, each billing authority must consider whether to revise its scheme or to replace it with another scheme and this must take place no later than 31 January in the financial year preceding that for which the revision or replacement scheme is to have effect. If any revision has the effect of reducing or removing a reduction to which any class of persons is entitled, the revision or replacement must include such transitional provision relating to that reduction or removal as the authority thinks fit.
- 38 A statutory procedure is provided for under Paragraph 3 of Schedule 1A which a billing authority must follow when revising its scheme:
"3(1) Before making a scheme, the authority must (in the following order) –
(a) consult any major precepting authority which has power to issue a precept to it,
(b) publish a draft scheme in such manner as it thinks fit, and
(c) consult such other persons as it considers are likely to have an interest in the operation of the scheme
- 39 As well as complying with the statutory consultation scheme the process must also be fair. There are four basic requirements namely -
(i) be undertaken when proposals are at a formative stage;
(ii) include sufficient reasons for particular proposals to allow those consulted to give intelligent consideration and an intelligent response;
(iii) give consultees sufficient time to make a response; and
(iv) be conscientiously taken into account when the ultimate decision is taken.

Risk management

- 40 Approximately 40% of our current summons relate to CTR claimants. There is a risk that the claimants may not pay their council tax and move further into debt because of summons charges. This may eventually affect the collection statistics and place the households concerned into further financial hardship. This is to be mitigated through revisions to the hardship scheme. 2015/16 has seen a reduction in the number of claimants due to increases in earnings from employment.
- 41 Welfare reform announced in the summer budget will impact the current CTR scheme. Working age applicants in receipt of CTR will be subject to a reduction in working tax credits due to the earnings threshold being reduced. This is expected to increase CTR claimants from 1 April 2016. Estimates suggest that the effect of the changes to the working tax credit calculation will mean approximately £200 additional CTR payments per customer per year. In Herefordshire there are approximately 1,000 working age customers in receipt of working tax credit therefore this could result in additional CTR payments of £200k. This impact has been reflected in the approximate net savings detailed in this report.

Consultees

- 42 Consultation with the citizens of Herefordshire on the proposals for the CTR scheme commenced 6 July 2015 for a period of 6 weeks and concluded on 16 August 2015, which resulted in 68 responses. Prior to our consultation we met with the Children’s Society and incorporated their views and recommendations into our proposals. The consultation document was published online on Herefordshire Council’s website and included an online calculator to give an instance indicator of how the changes would affect the individual depending on their circumstances. In addition approximately 6,500 letters were issued to the current recipients of CTR who were most likely to be affected. During this period a meeting with welfare rights groups and 3rd sector organisations took place in order to capture the views of their service users. Consultation responses are attached as Appendix 3. A summary of responses is provided below:

	Strongly Agree / Agree	Strongly Disagree / Disagree
Proposal 1		
Financial support reduced to 80% with protections	51%	42%
CTR capped at property band C	45%	47%
Capital limit reduced to £6k	48%	47%
Total %	48%	45%
Proposal 2		
CTR reduced to 80% with no other changes	48%	45%

The results show no preference for either proposal.

Appendices

Appendix 1 Financial impact of 80% CTR and band C restriction

Appendix 2 Equality impact assessment

Appendix 3 CTRS consultation report

Background papers

None identified.

Appendix 1

Financial impact of 80% CTR and band C restriction

The table below details the weekly impact of the increase in council tax due from claimants if CTR support is reduced from 84% to 80% in conjunction with a band C restriction. The table is based on 2015/16 council tax charges for Hereford city.

Band	Annual CT charge 100% (£)	% of CTR claimants in each band	CTR payable 16% band D restriction (£)	CTR payable 20% with band C restriction (£)	Weekly increase in payments (£)
A	1,057	40%	169	211	0.80
B	1,233	37%	197	247	0.90
C	1,409	15%	225	282	1.09
D	1,585	5%	254	458	3.92
E	1,937	2%	606	810	3.92
F	2,290	1%	959	1,163	3.92
G	2,642	0.2%	1,311	1,515	3.92
H	3,170	0%	1,839	2,043	3.92

Subsidy is currently restricted to band D properties; this is proposed to be reduced to band C. This means that claimants living in a band D to H property will have their CTR restricted to band C from 2016/17. CTR subsidy at 80% of band C gives a chargeable amount of £282. The amount payable by claimants in properties above band C will be increased by the difference between the annual charge for the property they reside in and the annual charge of a band C property, please refer to the examples below.

Example 1: 327 CTR claimants live in a band D property. Currently, if they are entitled to full CTR, with the restriction at band D they would be liable to pay £254. Restricting CTR to band C would see an increase in the amount payable to £458.

Example 2: 57 CTR claimants live in a band F property. Currently, if they are entitled to full CTR, with the restriction at band D they would be liable to pay £959. Restricting CTR to band C would see an increase in the amount payable to £1,163.

	Example 1	Example 2
CTR payable at 20% of a band C charge	282	282
Plus the difference between property band and the band C	176	881
Total payable	458	1,163

The examples above show the minimum payment due ignoring other reliefs that may be applicable and claimants in receipt of higher income will be required to pay more than stated

**Equality Impact
Assessment
Council Tax Reduction
Scheme (CTRS)**

DRAFT - HERK/01/01/LSCT

Service Area	Revenues & Benefits Service
Policy/Service being assessed	Council Tax Reduction Scheme
Is this is a new or existing policy/service?	Existing Policy
If existing policy/service please state date of last assessment	17 October 2014
EIA Review team – List of members	Council Tax Reduction Project Group
Date of this assessment	21 August 2015
Signature of completing officer (to be signed after the EIA has been completed)	Anne Bradbury
Name and signature of Head of Service (to be signed after the EIA has been completed)	Peter Robinson

DRAFT - HEREFORD LSC

Form A1

INITIAL SCREENING FOR STRATEGIES/POLICIES/FUNCTIONS FOR EQUALITIES RELEVANCE TO ELIMINATE DISCRIMINATION AND PROMOTE EQUALITY



High relevance/priority



Medium relevance/priority



Low or no relevance/ priority

Note:

1. Tick coloured boxes appropriately, and depending on degree of relevance to each of the equality strands
2. Summaries of the legislation/guidance should be used to assist this screening process

Policy - CTRS	Relevance/Risk to Equalities																							
	Gender			Race			Disability			Sexual Orientation			Religion/Belief			Age			Socio-economic			Priority status For EIA		
State the Function/Policy /Service/Strategy being assessed:	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
CTRS – Maintain the current maximum level of council tax reduction so that taxpayers have to pay at least 16% of the council tax charge.			✓			✓			✓			✓			✓	✓						✓		
CTRS – Reduce the maximum level of council tax reduction so that taxpayers have to pay at least 20% of the council tax charge.			✓			✓			✓			✓			✓	✓						✓		
CTRS – Protected discount of the current 84% for those in receipt of severe disability premium, carers allowance and families with a child under the age of 5			✓			✓			✓			✓			✓			✓						✓

37

Policy - CTRS	Relevance/Risk to Equalities																							
	Gender			Race			Disability			Sexual Orientation			Religion/Belief			Age			Socio-economic			Priority status For EIA		
State the Function/Policy /Service/Strategy being assessed:	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
CTRS – Reduce the current Band D restriction to a Band C restriction so that taxpayers living in properties above a Band C would have CTR calculated on the Band C liability			✓			✓			✓			✓			✓			✓			✓	✓		
CTRS – Reduce the capital limit for CTR entitlement from £16k to £6k so that taxpayers who have capital of £6k and above would not be entitled to CTR (capital is defined as savings or property owned but not the property the taxpayer lives in or personal possessions)			✓			✓			✓			✓			✓			✓			✓	✓		

<p>Stage 1 – Scoping and Defining</p> <p>(1) What are the aims and objectives of policy/service?</p>	<p>The Council Tax Reduction Scheme (CTRS) has been in place since 01 April 2013 and replaced the National Council Tax Benefit (CTB) scheme. CTRS is a locally determined system of council tax support. The aim of the CTRS scheme is to provide financial assistance to council taxpayers who have low incomes.</p> <p>Persons who are of state pension age (persons who have reached the qualifying age of State Pension Credit) are protected under the scheme in that the calculation of the reduction they are to receive has been set by Central Government. For working age applicants however the reduction they receive is to be determined by the local authority.</p>
--	---

This equality impact assessment looks at the potential for **not only** protecting pensioners (as required under the legislation) **but also** retaining a large amount of the protections already present for working age within the existing CTRS scheme carried forward from the CTB scheme.

Where a **working age claimant** applies or continues to receive Council Tax Reduction, it is proposed that the reduction will be calculated on the same rules as the current CTRS scheme except for the following;

- Maintain the current maximum level of council tax reduction so that taxpayers have to pay at least 16% of the council tax charge
- Reduce the maximum level of council tax reduction so that taxpayers have to pay at least 20% of the council tax charge
- Protected discount of the current 84% for those in receipt of severe disability premium, carers allowance and families with a child under the age of 5
- Reduce the current Band D restriction to a Band C restriction
- Reduce the capital limit for CTR entitlement from £16k to £6k

These changes will apply from 01 April 2016

Central Government has not been prescriptive in how an authority should protect vulnerable groups, but points to the Council's existing responsibilities including the Child Poverty Act 2010, the Disabled Person Act 1986 and the Housing Act 1996 as well as the public sector equality duty in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.

The current level of assistance (*6,594 claimants and average amount per week of £18.50 per claimant*) is provided for pension age claimants, details for working age claimants are given at the end of this assessment.

<p>(2) How does the policy/service fit with the council's wider objectives?</p>	<p>All persons within the Council's area who have a low income may apply for support and assistance with their Council Tax.</p> <p>By making an application, providing evidence of their income and household circumstances, their potential entitlement for support will be calculated in line with Central Government prescribed requirements for the Council Tax Reduction scheme.</p> <p>The maintenance of a full reduction scheme, with few changes from the existing Council Tax Reduction Scheme fits with the Corporate objectives in that it meets, as far as possible, equality and sustainability.</p> <p>The reduction scheme assists the local economy and also ensures, as far as possible within the constraints on a reduced budget, that persons on a low income will be able to meet their Council Tax liability.</p> <p>Pension age claimants will not see a reduction in their support however working age cases will see a reduction in the support they currently receive.</p>
<p>(3) What are the expected outcomes of the policy/service? Who is intended to benefit from the policy/service and in what way?</p>	<p>The desired outcomes are as follows;</p> <p>Pension Age Claimants</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That all pensioners receive the level of support required by regulations set by Central Government (Council Tax Reduction Scheme (Prescribed Requirements) Regulations 2012); • That all pensioner claimants or existing working age claimants who rise to pension age are able to receive Council Tax Reduction in line with the regulations; and • That all pensioner claimants continue to receive the correct level of council tax reduction at all times. <p>Working Age Claimants</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That all working age claimants are still able to receive Council Tax Reduction but the level of reduction payable will reduce; and • That all working age claimants continue to receive the correct level of council tax reduction at all times.

<p>(4) Does this policy/service have the potential to directly or indirectly discriminate against any particular group?</p> <p>Please identify all groups that are affected and briefly explain why</p>	<p>RACE NO</p> <p>The reduction support scheme does not take race into account when calculating the level of support</p>	<p>AGE YES</p> <p>The reduction support scheme takes into account age when calculating the level of support available. Pensioners will not see any reduction in the support paid (as they are protected under regulations set by central government). Working age claimants will be affected due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction of the maximum level of council tax reduction so that taxpayers have to pay at least 20% of the council tax charge • Reducing the current Band D restriction to a Band C restriction • Reduce the capital limit for CTR entitlement from £16k to £6k 	<p>GENDER NO</p> <p>The reduction support scheme does not take gender into account when calculating the level of support</p>
	<p>RELIGION/BELIEF NO</p> <p>The reduction support scheme does not take religion or belief into account when calculating the level of support</p>	<p>DISABILITY NO</p> <p>The reduction support scheme continues to have in-built protections for disability in the form of;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the award of additional premiums for disablement; • disregarding higher levels of income where a claimant is in remunerative work and is disabled; and • there is no requirement to have non dependant deductions where a claimant is disabled 	<p>SEXUAL ORIENTATION NO</p> <p>The reduction support scheme does not take sexual orientation into account when calculating the level of support</p>

<p>(5) Are there any obvious barriers to accessing the service?</p>	<p>No – customers will continue to access the reduction scheme in an identical fashion to the existing Council Tax Reduction scheme. The approach of the Council has been to provide a range of options for claiming and customers are encouraged to make a claim at any time.</p>
--	--

(6) How does the policy/service contribute to promotion of equality?

The Council Tax Reduction scheme provides essential help towards the Council Tax liability for all claimants on a low income. By continuing to assess entitlement on a mean tested basis, similar to the national approach to means tested benefits, the scheme is equitable albeit that the level of support overall may be reduced to working age claimants.

(7) Does the policy/service have the potential to promote good relations between groups?

Due to the nature of the cuts required in the level of council tax reduction, all working age claimants will see a reduction to their current entitlement, however the way that the Council is introducing the changes by maintaining the means test, allows the most vulnerable to receive a relatively higher level of support.

DRAFT - HEREFORDSHIRE

DRAFT - HEREFORDSHIRE

<u>Stage 2 - Information Gathering</u>	
(1) What type and range of evidence or information have you used to help you make a judgement about the policy or service?	<p>Extensive modelling from existing data. The modelling has been based on changes to the existing Council Tax Benefit scheme administered by the Council.</p> <p>Modelling information has included number of working age claimants and amount of council tax benefit paid (<i>6,738 claimants and average amount per week of £14.37 per claimant</i>), claim numbers and benefit paid across council tax bands, range of income types and household make-up.</p>

**(2) What consultation/ information has been used?
What new consultation, if any, do you need to undertake?**

A full consultation with the public has been undertaken as required by the legislation (Local Government Finance Act 2012). Whilst pension age claimants are protected, the authority will still, as part of the consultation process, envisage pension age claimants and pensioners generally to respond to the consultation itself.

The consultation process is comprehensive and encourages a full response to the changes to the current reduction scheme, (notwithstanding the fact that the authority is obliged to implement the scheme determined by Central Government for pension age claimants).

Interest groups have been directly consulted as part of the process.

The Public consultation took place during the period 06.07.15 until 16.08.15

The results on the proposals are as follows:-

Proposal 1	Strongly Agree / Agree	Strongly Disagree / Disagree
Financial support 20% and	51%	42%
CTR cap to Band C	45%	47%
Capital Limit £6000	48%	47%
Average %	48%	45%
Proposal 2		
Financial support 20%	48%	45%

Stage 3 – Making a Judgement	
<p>(1) From your data and consultations is there any adverse or negative impact identified for any particular group?</p> <p>Is there any evidence of needs not being met? e.g. language or physical access barriers; lack of appropriate resources or facilities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No the impact on the working age group is consistent • Comments from the consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Financial - Inability to meet the increased charge
<p>(2) If there is an adverse impact, can this be justified?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A
<p>(3) What actions are going to be taken to reduce or eliminate negative or adverse impact?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assistance in meeting payments – 12 monthly instalments / payment arrangements to prevent recovery process • Advice of the Council Tax Discretionary Hardship Scheme for customers experiencing exceptional hardship
<p>(4) Is there any positive impact? Does it promote equality of opportunity between different groups and actively address discrimination?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No

<u>Stage 4 – Action Planning, Review & Monitoring</u>	
<p>If No Further Action is required then go to – Review & Monitoring</p> <p>(1) Action Planning – Specify any changes or improvements which can be made to the service or policy to mitigate or eradicate negative or adverse impact on specific groups, including resource implications.</p>	<p>Following the consultation, the changes proposed are to be reviewed. The scheme will be reviewed annually thereafter.</p> <p>The Council has established a full project plan to ensure that changes are introduced correctly, accurately and on time</p>
<p>(2) Review and Monitoring State how and when you will monitor policy and EIA Action Plan</p>	<p>Full monitoring of scheme implementation will be undertaken on a monthly basis in line with the accepted project plan.</p> <p>The Revenues and Benefits Service will undertake monthly and quarterly collection of data.</p> <p>The Council will review the policy annually. It is expected that due to changes in legislation and funding, that the level of Council Tax Support available will change annually.</p>

An Equality Impact Assessment on this policy was undertaken on 21 August 2015

Council Tax Reduction Scheme Consultation report

Contents

Introduction.....	3
Results	
Proposal 1: tax payers liable to pay 20% of their council tax unless protected.....	4
1a) CTR capped at band C.....	5
1b) Capital limit of £6000.....	5/6
Proposal 2: all tax payers liable to pay 20% of their council tax.....	6
Groups affected.....	7
About you.....	8
Do you currently pay council tax to Herefordshire Council.....	8
Are you currently receiving council tax reduction in Herefordshire.....	9
If you do not currently receive council tax reduction have you ever received it.....	9
Are you currently receiving housing benefit in Herefordshire.....	9
Which of these activities best describes what you are doing at present.....	10
What is your age group.....	10
What is your gender.....	11
Do you have parenting responsibilities.....	11
How would you describe your ethnic group.....	11
Appendix A: List of comments in respect of Proposal A.....	12/13
Appendix A: List of comments in respect of 1a.....	14/15
Appendix A: List of comments in respect of 1b.....	16/17
Appendix A: List of comments in respect of Proposal B.....	18/19
Appendix A: List of comments in respect of the Council financing the existing scheme...20/21	
Appendix A: List of comments in respect of affected groups.....	22/23
Appendix B: Letters.....	24/26

Introduction

The national council tax benefit system was abolished with effect from 1 April 2013. It was replaced with a localised council tax reduction (CTR) system alongside a 10% reduction in central Government funding for any local scheme when compared with the previous national council tax benefit scheme.

The Government continues to protect pensioners. This means that local schemes have identical council tax reduction rules for pensioners which remain in place under the previous council tax benefit system. The council does have discretion on CTR for working age claimants. In 2013/14, following one-off funding support from Government, working age claimants CTR subsidy was paid up to a maximum level of 91.5%.

The CTR scheme for 2014/15 reduced working age claimants CTR subsidy to 84% of the applicant's council tax charge, meaning that at least 16% of the council tax bill was payable by the claimant. In addition subsidy was restricted to a Band D property meaning any working age CTR claimant who lives in a property banded above band D has their CTR subsidy based on 84% of a Band D equivalent property.

The CTR scheme for 2015/16 remained the same as in 2014/15.

The MTFS approved by Council in February 2015 included savings of £150k from CTR for 2016/17. The options for achieving this saving target have been consulted on.

The Council Tax Reduction Scheme consultation was launched to seek the views of residents and interested organisations on proposed changes Herefordshire Council are considering making to their local scheme for working age applicants for 2016/17. The consultation questionnaire was published online on Herefordshire Council's website together with the consultation documents. In addition approximately 6500 letters were sent to current applicants who are likely to be most affected by any changes to the scheme informing them of the consultation, directing them to the website and giving them a contact number to ring if they would prefer a paper version of the consultation documents to be sent to them. A meeting took place with stakeholders such as social landlord, voluntary and charitable organisations where the consultation was discussed attendees were invited to contribute to the consultation on behalf of their service users.

The consultation period ran from 6th July to 16th August 2015.

This report details the results of the consultation questionnaire. In the tables in this report, all percentages are calculated as a proportion of the total number of responses to each question unless otherwise stated. All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Note that if respondents could select more than one answer to a particular question, the percentages may add up to more than 100%

Answers to questions requiring a free text answer are listed in appendix A. Every effort has been made to anonymise references to named or identifiable persons without losing the gist of the comments. There were also 2 letters/emails received in response to the consultation, the contents of which are included in appendix B.

Results

A total of 68 responses were received by the end of the consultation period, of these were 56 submitted online (This does not include the letters/emails that are included in appendix B)

1) Proposal 1 - would see working age council taxpayers liable to pay at least 20% of their council tax bill subject to other support changes.

Currently those working age council taxpayers eligible for CTR pay at least 16% of their council tax charge, receiving a discount of up to 84%.

This option proposes a lower level of financial support (80%) from April 2016; therefore claimants would become liable for the payment of a higher percentage of their council tax charge (20%) unless their discount is protected.

Individuals with protected discount would be those in receipt of severe disability premium, carers allowance or families with a child under the age of 5. These claimants will continue to receive their current levels of support.

To what extent do you agree or disagree this principle is fair?

	No.	%
Strongly Agree	15	24
Agree	17	27
Neither agree nor disagree	4	6
Disagree	12	19
Strongly Disagree	14	23
Total respondents	62	
Not answered	6	

In addition to these answers there were 20 additional comments relating to Proposal 1. Please see appendix A for the full list.

1a) The first additional restriction under Proposal 1 would see working age council taxpayers living in a property that is rated band D or above have their CTR capped at a maximum of 80% of the council tax charge on a band C equivalent property.

The current CTR is restricted to 84% of the council tax charge on a band D equivalent property and claimants have to pay the difference between their higher band council tax liability and a band D council tax liability.

To what extent do you agree or disagree this principle is fair?

	No.	%
Strongly Agree	12	19
Agree	16	26
Neither agree nor disagree	5	8
Disagree	8	13
Strongly Disagree	21	34
Total respondents	62	
Not answered	6	

In addition to these answers there were 20 additional comments relating to Proposal 1a. Please see appendix A for the full list.

1b) The second additional restriction under Proposal 1 would mean that, working age council taxpayers would not be entitled to receive any CTR if they exceed a capital limit of £6,000; the current level is £16,000. (Capital is defined as savings or property the claimant owns but does NOT include the property they live in or their personal possessions)

The current savings limit for entitlement to CTR is £16,000. We are proposing to reduce this to £6,000. This would mean that claimants with savings of £6,000 and above will not receive CTR regardless of any other circumstances.

To what extent do you agree or disagree this principle is fair?

	No.	%
Strongly Agree	20	32
Agree	10	16
Neither agree nor disagree	3	5
Disagree	14	23
Strongly Disagree	15	24
Total respondents	62	
Not answered	6	

In addition to these answers there were 25 additional comments relating Proposal 1b. Please see appendix A for the full list.

2) Proposal 2 -would see working age council taxpayers become liable to pay at least 20% of their council tax bill, an increase of 4%, with no other changes to the current scheme.

Currently those working age council taxpayers eligible for CTR pay at least 16% of their council tax charge, receiving support of up to 84%. This proposal would mean that these taxpayers would have a lower level of financial support (80%) through the scheme from April 2016, therefore becoming liable for the payment of a higher percentage of their council tax charge (20%).

To what extent do you agree or disagree this principle is fair?

	No.	%
Strongly Agree	11	18
Agree	16	27
Neither agree nor disagree	10	17
Disagree	8	13
Strongly Disagree	15	25
Total respondents	60	
Not answered	8	

In addition to these answers there were 24 additional comments relating Proposal 2. Please see appendix for the full list.

If you think the council should make an additional contribution from its own finances to continue with the current CTRS, how do you think this should be funded?

There were 23 additional comments relating to this question. Please see appendix A for the full list.

We want to ensure that any changes made are fair to everyone. To help us do this, please tell us if you think any of the principles above will particularly affect any specific groups of people. For example, due to age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnerships, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex or sexual orientation

	No.	%
Yes	30	53
No	27	47
Don't know	0	0
Total respondents	57	
Not answered	11	

If yes, please explain which groups and the reasons they might be affected.

There were 27 comments made, please see appendix A for the full list

About you

Note: This section only applied to respondents who replied in an individual capacity.

Do you currently pay council tax to Herefordshire Council?

	No.	%
Yes	56	92
No	5	8
Total respondents	61	
Not answered	7	

If yes, please tell us which council tax band (A-H) the property you pay council tax on is in? (If unsure leave blank)

	No.	%
Band A	5	15
Band B	8	24
Band C	5	15
Band D	10	29
Band E	3	9
Band F	1	2
Band G	2	6
Band H	0	0
Total respondents	34	
Not answered	34	

Are you currently receiving council tax reduction in Herefordshire?

	No.	%
Yes	33	54
No	28	46
Total respondents	61	
Not answered	7	

If you are not currently receiving council tax reduction in Herefordshire have you ever received it?

	No.	%
Yes	5	17
No	24	83
Total respondents	29	
Not answered	39	

Are you receiving housing benefit in Herefordshire?

	No.	%
Yes	24	42
No	33	58
Total respondents	57	
Not answered	11	

Which of these activities best describes what you are doing at present?

	No.	%
Employee in full-time job (30 hours plus per week)	19	32
Employee in part-time job (under 30 hours per week)	7	12
Self-employed full or part-time	4	7
On a government supported training programme	1	2
Unemployed and available for work	0	0
Full-time education at school, college or university	0	0
Retired whether receiving a pension or not	6	10
Looking after the home or family	9	15
Long term sick / disabled	23	38
Total respondents	68	
Not answered	0	

What is your age group?

	No.	%
Under 18	0	0
18 – 24 years	1	2
25 – 44 years	19	32
45 – 64 years	36	60
65 – 74 years	4	7
75+ years	0	0
Total respondents	60	
Not answered	8	

What is your gender?

	No.	%
Male	32	54
Female	27	46
Total respondents	59	
Not answered	9	

Do you parenting responsibilities?

	No.	%
Yes	21	37
No	36	63
Total respondents	57	
Not answered	11	

How would you describe your ethnic group?

	No.	%
White British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish	57	98
Other White (please specify below)	0	0
Any other ethnic group (please specify below)	1	2
Total respondents	58	
Not answered	10	

Appendix A

Proposal 1: tax payers liable to pay 20% of their council tax unless in a protected group

<p>Whilst I understand the constraints of budgets and the necessity to provide critical services, many people who currently receive reductions are already on or below the poverty line. Forcing them to pay an additional amount has a severe impact on their quality of life; in many circumstances when finances are critically stretched it is the necessities that are cut, things like heating and nutritional food, not disposable luxuries.</p>
<p>The government gave council's £21 million, what percentage did you give to vulnerable people like us when it was council tax benefit? because you gave us no help when it switched.</p>
<p>It is certainly not fair to force the poorest in the community to pay for the Council's problems. The cost to them (as against their contribution to HC funds) would be heavily disproportionate compared to those who pay council tax at normal rates.</p>
<p>I am weary of the attacks on the poor. When this Government has chosen to give its MPs a 10% rise the rest of us have to endure cuts. Any such pressures on those with little income will in the long run cost the taxpayer more in homelessness and all the other attendant results of poverty.</p>
<p>Why once again are single parents penalised as I will be looking for work soon as my daughter will be 5 years old in October 2015. I will be doing part time work and I will have pay more on council tax as well as housing benefit. How do you expect single parents be able to afford this as well as everything else? Just because our children will be over 5 years old. I'm strongly against this for single parents it's not fair!!!! Yeah</p>
<p>We are asked if this is fair but fair to whom? A decision such as this has to be viewed in the context of other welfare cuts, below inflation wage increases and the record, so far, of the impact of provisions reductions in support. If the National Debt line has raised concerns about the level of CT debt in the county then we need an analysis of how much this is due to previous cuts in benefit levels. Herefordshire has one of the highest rates of fuel poverty in England and is one of the poorest counties in terms of average incomes. There is no evidence that the Council has taken any of these factors into account.</p>
<p>While I don't accept the continued burden put on to those who CAN'T WORK. I accept that everyone paying 20% would at least be fair, but the further changes listed are unreasonable. Anyone who is disabled and can't work has a very low income, it is unacceptable to then distinguish the most disabled as needing more help, they already receive more benefits. Those who can't find work are also on a low income and hitting them harder seems counterproductive.</p>
<p>No change should be made but in Herefordshire this would be better than Proposal 2 because those with a disability and young children need to be spared any further cuts.</p>
<p>Although any increase in Council Tax is likely to cause further financial hardship for low income families, the fact that the most vulnerable will be protected is fairer than option 2, where no such protection is proposed.</p>
<p>This will affect those on maximum CTR, who fall into the lowest income bands, in particular the unemployed, disabled people and single parents. These people are already suffering from a range of other cuts and from benefit freezes, and having to find even a small amount a week will impact on their ability to buy food and fuel.</p>
<p>Households in the circumstances described are already suffering from cutbacks in other benefits and it seems especially cruel to inflict further expenses on them, especially when council tax is spent on such ridiculous schemes as the "Herefordshire you can" road signs.</p>
<p>What are we getting for paying Council Tax. No grass cutting, overgrown flower beds, not even a black bin liner, rubbish left - Nothing!</p>

I feel protecting those in receipt of carers allowance is definitely more fair than previous schemes and therefore not discriminating against those in need of care/providing care

This is a reasonable increase. I am not sure what a severe disability premium involves. Is this people receiving Personal Independence Allowance for their disability?

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE LOCAL COUNCIL TAX REDUCTION SCHEME HAD THE AIM -TO REDUCE THE COST OF THE SCHEME BY 10% IN LINE WITH LOSS OF GOVERNMENT GRANT -COMPARED TO 2012/2013. THE COUNCIL CHANGES HAD ALREADY REDUCED SCHEME COSTS IN 2014/15 BY 13.6%. NOW PLUS WHAT IS THE EFFECT OF THE CHANGES IN 2015/16? THIS SCHEME SHOULD STILL BE AIMED AT HELPING THOSE ON LOW INCOMES TO PAY COUNCIL TAX NOT GENERATE EXTRA FUNDS TOWARDS OTHER COUNCIL SPENDING

first the bedroom tax and then this , completely unfair to people on low income

Fair proposal but it should apply to all claimants. As I understand it pensioners will be exempt. Why? Their pension is higher than most benefits

acknowledge the fact that a rise is inevitable and as we would appear to have our payment protected under this option this would appear to be a fair rise

The reality is everyone on CTR has some form vulnerability or financial hardship to some degree or another. Indeed up until 3 years ago the successive Governments took the view that majority of people who stand to be affected by these proposals were sufficiently 'poor' that they would not be required to pay any ctax. Whilst you propose to protect certain groups there will be an additional cost to that in terms of data gathering and maintaining in addition to adding a further degree of complexity to an already complex system. You should also not lose sight of the fact that CTR is simply one benefit of several that claimants are in receipt of and given the changes to the other benefits announced at the recent budget disposal household income will be dropping significantly so there is even less chance of collecting the monies now outstanding

All poorer people should not be expected to pay more.

CTR capped at band C

<p>Whilst I understand the constraints of budgets and the necessity to provide critical services, many people who currently receive reductions are already on or below the poverty line. Forcing them to pay an additional amount has a severe impact on their quality of life; in many circumstances when finances are critically stretched it is the necessities that are cut, things like heating and nutritional food, not disposable luxuries.</p>
<p>We are in a disabled adapted terraced bungalow, how come it's banded a C</p>
<p>This would seem to be just another attempt at imposing the so-called bedroom tax.</p>
<p>Sorry as indicated above any cuts are wrong.</p>
<p>Why have all bands pay the same as one band? All bands should be separated and pay their own amount as that's why bands were put into place years ago</p>
<p>This assumes that the 327 households affected have the option to move into lower Band properties. Again what evidence is there that this option is available particularly given the shortage of cheaper properties? This is designed to punish people for something which may be beyond their power to resolve. That cannot be fair.</p>
<p>I live in a Band D property and receive full CTR; I have ME/CFS and can't work. I live in this property at no charge to the tax payer as my family own it. If I have to pay higher levels of Council Tax I won't be able to afford to live in this property and will have to move in to rented accommodation which will lower my Council Tax payments but also see the tax payer liable to pay my rent. This clearly is not a good situation for anyone. I already pay more council tax as I live in a Band D property, I would refuse to pay a higher percentage than someone in the same situation but living in a Band C or lower property.</p>
<p>Do not really think it is fair but it is better than Proposal 2.</p>
<p>This penalises two groups of people - firstly those with large families who need several bedrooms for children or other family members, and secondly people who live in larger properties but have had a change of circumstances so that their income is significantly reduced (i.e. probably people who have become disabled and unable to work). Capping their CTR amount will inevitably cause severe hardship to people on low incomes who do not have 'surplus' income to pay the extra amount.</p>
<p>It's not very fair in anyway or form.</p>
<p>What are we getting for paying Council tax? No grass cutting, overgrown flower beds, not even a black bin liner, rubbish left - Nothing! Cutbacks everywhere no matter what you put up or increase.</p>
<p>Our property is a band E so we are already capped at D. Our property rental is very competitive compared with the current rental market so what we would save by moving to a cheaper council tax brand we would more than make up for in excess rent. Neither option we could afford</p>
<p>AN INCREASE OF £200+WILL FURTHER INCREASE COLLECTION PROBLEMS FOR THE COUNCIL AND TAXPAYERS ALSO SEE ABOVE</p>
<p>it needs to be simpler</p>
<p>The banding of properties is in place for a reason. Making people in Band D pay for a Band C is not right and effectively dismisses the banding of properties, effectively becoming a farce.</p>
<p>Band D owners may have inherited their property but not necessarily have the means to pay bills.</p>
<p>On balance I think it is reasonable for the Council to take the view that it's not its priority to fund people to live in properties larger than they can afford.</p>
<p>Cannot believe there are no band H properties in Herefordshire. Maybe they all belong to councillors.</p>

It would be reasonable to assume that any benefit designated for public need would be both appropriately applied and fair. The council's proposal to restrict its tax benefit or CTR by the banding of the property could only be seen as unfair. Why would this be? The benefit, if rightly implied above, should appropriately find those people who are in need of it. Those who are in need may live in properties of varying values, as tenants, outright owners, mortgagors or by any other circumstance, but the criteria on which their need is judged is on their means to pay (be that income, savings and disposable assets). CTR should not be moderated by the banding of the property they live in, which itself is not a reliable guide to relative property value (as, for instance, many properties are still classified under the original and unreliable second gear, drive-by valuations decades ago), but more so, should not be based on the value of the property anyway, as this cannot clearly define the council services needed or used by a household (most of the services are provided on an equal level to everyone anyway, such as policing and rubbish collection); those people who find themselves in need of the benefit should be considered on the fluidity of their financial circumstances and not on the house they live in. Even owners in higher banded properties may still not have the advantage of fully owning their house, and, lumbered with a mortgage, should not have to be disproportionately punished for their situation. As a response, it would be too easy to flippantly suggest that a person should just move house; but consider how much of an upheaval and financial burden the cost of moving house is, it certainly could not help the circumstance of anyone who is need of the benefit. Furthermore the disabled, infirm and vulnerable would be more susceptible to such a situation, and outright homeowners would be expected to sell up their home to downgrade their banding, that means putting on the market and possibly waiting a year or so before any sale takes place before going through the upheaval of moving, perhaps away from family, friends, and settled situations such as school, with relatively huge costs involved which would defeat the purpose. So can this scenario be considered fair in light of a person's need relative to anyone else's, based on an arbitrary classification of the value of the property they live in and that they may have no financial asset from? Does this proposal promote impropriety and unfairness in its implementation? It already exists on a Band D restriction and has the advantage of only affecting a small percentage of people so the voice against it is possibly relatively small, unheard and maybe ignored. It is employed across hundreds of councils, so may be seen as acceptable, but this does not make it just in the same respect that the poll tax was universal but still considered unjust. It is discriminatory, has already increased the council tax liability for those on CTR below Band D by several hundred pounds over those above Band D and cannot claim to proportionately reduce the benefits of those who have the greater means; those of greater means are people who don't qualify for the benefit in the first instance. In a similar vein, the services that council tax pays for is disproportionate between town and rural Herefordshire.

All poorer people should not be expected to pay more.

Capital limit of £6000

<p>Whilst I understand the constraints of budgets and the necessity to provide critical services, many people who currently receive reductions are already on or below the poverty line. Forcing them to pay an additional amount has a severe impact on their quality of life; in many circumstances when finances are critically stretched it is the necessities that are cut, things like heating and nutritional food, not disposable luxuries.</p>
<p>Disgusting!! You must realise people are getting early pension payments, and the one chance they have to save or at least use the money for retirement plans or ISAS instead of having rip off life insurance plans, and you want to limit it to £6000. That's not going to help people saving for retirement is it?</p>
<p>The benefit of this would appear to be tiny - less than the annual cost of the mid-scale employee to administer this.</p>
<p>Now you are also penalising those with savings which may have been accrued over a lifetime of honest work and may be needed when they come off benefits. Short term thinking again.</p>
<p>This is not fair on people who already have enough problems but manage perhaps to be a bit frugal - even on a basic income. In this day and age £16,000 is low enough.</p>
<p>I think maximum saving should be for a household of £10,000...</p>
<p>As a homeowner it is essential I have sufficient savings to pay for necessary maintenance/repairs to my property. On the very low income I have I cannot save very much at all so could end up in debt with all the attendant problems. I don't think £16,000 is an unreasonable limit. £6000 would vanish if, say, a new roof was needed.</p>
<p>Again what evidence is there that provides the justification for this change. Is the suggested £6,000 an arbitrary sum or is it based on analysis? Also, unlike other Options no figure is given of the numbers likely to be affected.</p>
<p>At the worst allowed saving should be the same as for other benefits which sees them gradually reduced between £6,000 to £16,000. Lowering the limit to £6,000 further discourages people from saving, and therefore providing for themselves, which will make them more dependent on the State and Council.</p>
<p>Penalising people who wish to be careful with money, save and better themselves is no way to get them off benefits!</p>
<p>This is a drastic difference in savings allowed which I think is grossly unfair. It would be fairer to fix it at a figure which is mid-way, such as £10,000.</p>
<p>No it's not fair.</p>
<p>What are we getting for paying Council Tax. No grass cutting, overgrown flower beds, not even a black bin liner, rubbish left - Nothing! Cutbacks everywhere no matter what you put up or increase.</p>
<p>Very unfair, especially senior citizens that have a little savings especially if you pay for care.</p>
<p>how does this allow anyone to save for new washing machines, essential car bills etc</p>
<p>These 110 residents should definitely not have all their reduction taken away for saving their money up to £16,000. This is not in line with other benefit requirements which are at the £16,000 threshold which is a reasonable one. This may be the only security these people have and should not be discouraged or penalised for this. These people are likely not to own property or a private pension. This would be taking away these people's ability to do something to improve their circumstances. It would be discouraging and counterproductive in the long term.</p>
<p>Saving needs to be encouraged (in the past 8 years savings have not grown due to paltry interest rates) otherwise everyone will be encouraged to spend their savings and not fall into the trap of</p>

receiving no help at all if you are prudent. £16000 down to £6000 is too big a drop. If it has to fall then settle for £10000 savings.

THIS PROPOSAL REMOVES SUPPORT AND WILL ENCOURAGE SPENDING BY BORDER LINE CLAIMANTS TO ACHIEVE REDUCED SAVINGS TO A DANGEROUSLY LOW LEVEL AND PENALISES THOSE WITH RELATIVELY MODERATE LEVELS OF CAPITAL RESOURCES WHEN THE TAPER ARRANGEMENTS ALREADY REMOVE SUPPORT IN A GRADUAL WAY

if you are capable of earning and have £16000 in savings you should be able to pay in full/

People who have savings should not be persecuted for saving. In my case they have to last my entire life and be a funeral fund.

Band D owners have worked all their lives so must have saved for their old age now will be penalised for savings

The additional restriction is too drastic on a group who are already being screwed. £10,000 would be a more reasonable cap

Whilst there is clearly a disincentive to save again in the currently financial climate it is difficult to justify reducing Council Tax for those with sufficient money in the bank to pay.

I spent all my savings on council tax when I could get no help and then it is squeezed out of you again to keep paying and paying until you have no money, cannot get help and they have to jail you.

All poorer people should not be expected to pay more.

Proposal 2: all tax payers liable to pay 20% of their council tax

<p>Whilst I understand the constraints of budgets and the necessity to provide critical services, many people who currently receive reductions are already on or below the poverty line. Forcing them to pay an additional amount has a severe impact on their quality of life; in many circumstances when finances are critically stretched it is the necessities that are cut, things like heating and nutritional food, not disposable luxuries.</p>
<p>Option B is the best of two evils</p>
<p>Same argument as under proposal 1 above.</p>
<p>The worst of all the proposals. I know let us CUT the salary of all MPs and councillors and those at the top tier of the Council and see how much that saves. Just a cut of 4% which would not make any major difference to them. Cut 4% from those with little feels like a cut of 40% and more</p>
<p>I believe, although always difficult to find extra money, that this would be the fairest and most even handed solution. It should also be more cost effective for the Council to calculate and maintain.</p>
<p>As I said on my first comment yeah with families or working people with no children, but not single parents. I think it should change for us when our child leaves high school</p>
<p>It is assumed that this option means that there would be no disregard for protected groups as in Proposal 1. If that is correct then it would be helpful to clearly state this. Again there is no estimate here of how any households would be affected.</p>
<p>life is hard enough and proposal 2 seem to be the fairest across the board</p>
<p>While I don't accept the continued burden put on to those who CAN'T WORK. I accept that everyone in society has a part to play and would accept my equal share of the cost.</p>
<p>People who have more than £6,000 in the bank can afford the 4% rise, so this is why Proposal 1 is fair and this one is not. Because choosing to do a 4% rise on everyone actually hits the people with no money at all the hardest and they will already be squeezed by the tax credit cuts coming in April. You will have people defaulting on rent much more often which will lead to more money being spent by Herefordshire government on courts, bailiffs, etc. Proposal 1 while more complicated protects the poorest.</p>
<p>This proposal does not take account of vulnerable families who are in receipt of carers allowance or severe disability premium, who are already struggling with their low income.</p>
<p>This will affect those on maximum CTR, who fall into the lowest income bands, in particular the unemployed, disabled people and single parents. These people are already suffering from a range of other cuts and from benefit freezes, and having to find even a small amount a week will impact on their ability to buy food and fuel.</p>
<p>What are we getting for paying Council Tax. No grass cutting, overgrown flower beds, not even a black bin liner, rubbish left - Nothing! Cutbacks everywhere no matter what you put up or increase.</p>
<p>SEE ABOVE SCHEME ALREADY PRODUCING LOWER SCHEME COST TO THE COUNCIL THAN NEEDED TO RECOVER CUT IN GRANT</p>
<p>I believe the whole banding system is unfair. I also believe that rural residents do not get the same benefits or need the same resources from the council tax income that people living in the towns and cities do.</p>
<p>I think this is the best way forward at present. Although for the first time in my life I am dependant on benefits I am willing to pay more towards my services</p>
<p>This on the face of it seems to be a more sensible approach, being the scheme closest to the present CTR scheme. Therefore actually saving the council time and finances trying to enforce</p>

new schemes and causing in some cases extreme financial distress leading to poverty and homelessness
simpler
This seems to be fair as rise is below £1 per week meaning around £48 per annum on bill
The reality is everyone on CTR has some form vulnerability or financial hardship to some degree or another. Indeed up until 3 years ago successive Governments took the view that majority of people who stand to be affected by these proposals were sufficiently 'poor' that they would not be required to pay any council tax. You should also not lose sight of the fact that CTR is simply one benefit of several that claimants are in receipt of and given the changes to the other benefits announced at the recent budget disposal household income will be dropping significantly so there is even less chance of collecting the monies now outstanding
I strongly agree that the cap should be reduced from 84% to 80%. I strongly agree that there should be no additional relief above 80% of Band C I strongly agree that the savings limit should be reduced to £6,000 The truly vulnerable should continue to be protected - but maybe the criteria should be looked at more stringently.
Does it go down if we all put more in the pot? This should be means tested for pensioners too.
This is a blanket approach without considering some of the more vulnerable people in society as is the case in proposal 1
All poorer people should not be expected to pay more.

If you think the council should make an additional contribution from its own finances to continue with the current CTRS, how do you think this should be funded?

<p>Stop paying your chief executives obscene wages. No council exec should earn more than the prime minister of this country. Make better choices when demolishing council buildings when they haven't been up that long....how much did that cost the taxpayer i.e. council building that was on the end of the new development.</p>
<p>Increase charges for car parking in the city by say, 100%. Not only would this increase income, it would free up the city's road network (as it may encourage people to walk or car share etc) and in turn that would reduce council spending on related health issues such as obesity and all connected expenditure.</p>
<p>Perhaps cease to employ the officers who are unable to answer this question for themselves?</p>
<p>By bringing a charge for vehicles being sold on the side of road, you should charge a sales fee for all vehicles being sold as this is advertising and can cause people to slow down or park dangerously. Give a permit to register the keeper only so they could avoid this charge. But what it would do is stop all these people making money on the side by selling vehicles and not paying their taxes and help genuine businesses compete fairly.</p>
<p>I know, let us CUT the salary of all MPs and councillors and those at the top tier of the Council and see how much that saves. Just a cut of 4% which would not make any major difference to them. Cut 4% from those on little feels like a cut of 40% and more</p>
<p>Maybe by taking some people away higher up or areas that aren't really used or useful. The community shouldn't be penalised that's what Herefordshire council was all about I thought the community... Making Hereford better, and you're not doing this</p>
<p>I saw in the paper that 3 counsellors cost the council 400,000.</p>
<p>A start would be to show the cost of collection of unpaid CT as a result of previous cuts. Increasing the financial pressures on already poor households will have an effect in other policy areas. Could it be that the reported significant rises in full poverty, domestic abuse, and child abuse are in some way connected? The recent Understanding Herefordshire report studiously avoids addressing poverty (unlike previous reports!) but there are enough indicators to suggest that this is a growing problem in the County which the proposals will only add to.</p>
<p>The council do need to make sure that the CTR doesn't change further beyond 20% and the only acceptable way to do so is to reduce the cost of its highest earning employees. It is stunningly unacceptable that in a poor and underfunded county like Herefordshire that anyone in the council is earning over £100,000. Again I would refuse to pay higher rates than 20% unless the council stops wasting money on salaries it can't afford.</p>
<p>This could be funded by reducing grants to things such as Arts, Culture, Heritage, Sports, Leisure and many other projects. These are thing I for one feel should be self-sufficient. If they cannot manage without grants then there are not enough people interested in them so why keep them going.</p>
<p>Take the money from other programs that the council supports. Council money that supports needless employees - as long as the money does not get cut directly from the people. Cut staff in education and children's departments because most parents think the system is a mess and children are not learning anything anyway. The council is constantly throwing money at staff that do not do their jobs and then get replaced by new staff that do not do their jobs. It is the biggest waste of spending in the council, the educational and children's programs. No parents are satisfied with the council so that is where the staff needs to be cut or abolished.</p>
<p>I think the council needs to sort out its priorities, it's very nice to enable people to go out and have fun/hobbies, but you need to focus on basic care needs first. I say this as someone disabled, who</p>

can get help to go out partying if I want (which I can't do anyway!) but find it hard to get help to clean/cook etc. Would be very happy to see the council getting more of our money if they actually appeared to do anything useful with it, and stopped cutting services we desperately need, like the CAB.
Increase council tax across the board, in particular in higher bands.
Dropping all but the most essential capital expenditure and carrying out ongoing maintenance only.
Do not pay such huge salaries especially those over £40000
FROM THE ELEMENT INCLUDED IN THE FORMULA GRANT FOR THIS PURPOSE
cut the disgraceful wages paid to council executives
To be honest I think the council are struggling but doing their best. We all need to dig a little deeper, but I also think the reduction should be means tested in some way.
stop building roads that will not help traffic flow on Edgar Street and look at officers wages
Through discretionary housing payment scheme
I take issue with the fact that these proposals will actually save the council money. Clearly there is more council tax available to be collected but how easy it is to collect this money? The cost of postage for bills, reminders, summonses etc. The staff resource needs to administer these things. What about the indirect impact of causing financial hardship to individuals and families and the costs to the council of having to pick up the pieces at a later date.
The upper and middle management of the council could take a cut or reduction in their fat-cat salaries (2014 salaries for top 13 senior management were between £78,000 and £145,000 pa)! Another way don't spend £60,000, as the council were prepared to do earlier in the year, to pay for recruitment of various senior posts. Maybe by increasing the competency of the original incumbents or replacing departed staff with offers of internal promotion to competent individuals who have worked the area and understand the requirements, the council could save on those unwarranted reductions in CTR. How much does the council staff spend on non-essential activities, such as wining and dining, unnecessary hotel stays, taxis, first class tickets and consultant fees?
Simple, government funds to help poorer people/

Explain which groups and the reasons they might be affected.

Disabled, I am in the ESA support group
I think it will be unfairly affecting single, lone *working* parents who don't receive any maintenance from the absent parent. If the council looks at how these cuts will affect this group of people, they may understand how they might feel discriminated against.
This affects the poorest people in the community, many of who are also dealing with other issues, such as health.
In my situation I am struggling to pay and this will just put more pressure on me.
Anyone on low wages or benefits. This is not rocket science
I believe lowering the savings limit from £16,000 to £6,000 is very unfair to people that have managed to save and be frugal. After all having savings up to £16,000 is not much in this day and age. After all, transport is essential in Herefordshire so to replace a car or to keep money in an account to pay for a funeral (as a lot of people try to do now) etc etc soon reduces savings.
Single parents with children over the age of 5 years of age
I am 58 and employers have no interest in employing me in any serious capacity so I am stuck in a low paying part time job. Re-training is hardly an option at my age.
Particularly those who are disabled and their carers, young people and pregnant or new mothers on maternity leave.
Clearly all disabled people who can't work, like myself, will be unfairly hit by increasing the council tax payment, but proposal 1a is stunningly unfair on those who have previously done well and earned a good home, Band D or above, only then to have become ill and have to live off benefits.
The disabled are already affected by the so called bedroom tax, which does not allow for a spare room for carers or the need of an extra room for special equipment or when a couple just cannot sleep in the same room due to one of them having a disability.
It affects everyone because prices are going up and relief is going down. This will lead to high crime, robberies, etc. which will put additional strains on monies for police. This is the nature of poverty, it just gets worse.
Disabled people will be affected if Proposal 2 is implemented because their Council Tax liability will increase even though their benefits have not increased significantly.
These proposals will affect those on low incomes, which will mean there is a disproportionate effect on disabled people and parents (especially single parents). The changes only affect people of working age, so there is age discrimination.
Single mothers who should be able to concentrate on raising their children properly without having to seek work at all costs.
The state of paths and walkway. Overgrown hedges etc. Dangerous. Nothing done to help anymore.
discrimination against long term disabled
I think it is very important that people from any disadvantage must be enabled to make improvements to their own circumstances by being encouraged to save. The idea of only allowing their life savings to be £6,000 is unfair. Many of these people will be simply saving for old age or serious illness as they have little other security in their lives.
I think the proposals should apply to everyone equally especially not to be exempt due to age.
For a person who depends on benefits living alone for long term sickness. If Council Tax were to be increased it would be hard to manage financially.
Long term disabled - pensioners - lower income families. Any large increase will have a severe effect on those on a fixed income e.g. long term disabled, pensioners and families on low earnings

never achieving monetary security if they are forced to pay ever increasing council tax for an ever more decreasing level of council services vital for such families.

People with learning difficulties and vulnerable adults who cannot get a job and live on low income

People with a disability

Everyone is affected. Maybe shared through larger households who use more facilities could be an option.

Proposal 1 would take account of those who are more vulnerable, i.e. disability, elderly and young families whose income is potentially more restricted.

Those of disability, old age, infirmity, single parent families and anyone who is already in a position that may cause them to struggle significantly more than the average and will feel the effects greater of additional benefit cuts. This may be the straw that breaks the camel's backs for some!

It should help all people.

Dear Sir or madam

I will not be able to pay more
Council Tax at all with having to pay
all other bills it is a job to make ends
MEET as I only get Job Seekers

Allowance payed every 2 weeks

at £146-00 out of this money

I have to pay

£19-80p TOP UP RENT per week

£20- every 2 weeks electric

£19-68p water every month

£20-00 BT every 2 weeks

£38-00 council TAX monthly

as you will see I don't have
very little money for food

or cloths I am very worried about

things at the moment

Your Faithfully

please not

I have a disability and
illness. I have my own
home to keep. I pay council tax
and house benefit all so on
long term sick. Now it is time
to say about the council tax
number 1, one ticket for the
tip a month is not right when
you take a trailer which is
6" by 3 you have to have
tickets when I take 20 bags
in it and car does not have to
have a tickets they have the
same as I have. I think it is not
right. you send money in
the wrong way. Shut the tickets
that is not right. Town is going
to the dogs. you get less for
your council tax but you take
more of use those on long term
sick on low money. we have
not got it. The one that hold
that own name. I think it is
not right. It is time for you
to get it of those on pension
credit. make them pay some
council tax and houseing
benefit they have more money
than I get I will not pay
more for council tax

PTo

I go to mind in
heritor you give use less
money to keep it going
it is not right it keep them
out of hosp going to
mind and lot of them say
the same as I do ok

I have my own home to
mainten get the gas boiler
gone and a year pay of
boiler gas which is less than
most have to pay for I am
not happy what you are doing
to me putting it up



Meeting:	General overview and scrutiny committee
Meeting date:	30 September 2015
Title of report:	Work programme
Report by:	Governance services

Classification

Open

Key decision

This is not an executive decision.

Wards affected

Countywide

Purpose

To consider the committee's work programme and related scrutiny activities.

Recommendation

THAT the draft work programme (Appendix 1) be noted, subject to any amendments the committee wishes to make.

Alternative options

- 1 It is for the committee to determine its work programme to reflect the priorities facing Herefordshire. The committee needs to be selective and ensure that the work programme is focused, realistic and deliverable within existing resources.

Reasons for recommendations

- 2 The committee needs to develop a manageable work programme to ensure that scrutiny is focused, effective and produces clear outcomes.

Key considerations

Draft work programme

- 3 The work programme needs to focus on the key issues of concern and be manageable allowing for urgent items or matters that have been called-in.
- 4 Should committee members become aware of issues please discuss the matter with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and the Statutory Scrutiny Officer.
- 5 A revised work programme is appended (Appendix 1). The work programme will remain under continuous review during the year.
- 6 Revisions to the work programme include:
 - The report of the Smallholdings estate task and finish group will now be considered at the committee meeting on 27 October 2015.
 - A proposed item on Community Infrastructure Levy has been deferred; a briefing note for all members about the position with various policies is being prepared.
 - Capital investment programme and Housing strategy 2015-2018 items will now be considered at the meeting on 17 November 2015.
 - An item on the Community safety partnership has been brought forward to 19 January 2016 to enable the committee to receive the strategic plan prior to its consideration by Council in March; consequently, items for the 8 March 2016 committee meeting will be reconsidered by the Chairman / Vice-Chairman at a future agenda planning meeting.
 - Edgar Street Athletic Ground and Property update items will now be received on 10 May 2016.

Forward plan

- 7 The Forward plan, as at 22 September 2015, is attached for information (Appendix 2).

Community impact

- 8 The topics selected for scrutiny should have regard to what matters to residents.

Equality duty

- 9 The topics selected need to have regard for equality and human rights issues.

Financial implications

- 10 The costs of the work of the committee will have to be met within existing resources. It should be noted the costs of running scrutiny will be subject to an assessment to support appropriate processes.

Legal implications

- 11 The council is required to deliver an overview and scrutiny function.

Risk management

- 12 There is a reputational risk to the council if the overview and scrutiny function does not operate effectively. The arrangements for the development of the work programme should help mitigate this risk.

Consultees

- 13 The Chairman and Vice-Chairman meet on a regular basis to consider the work programme.

Appendices

Appendix 1 Draft work programme

Appendix 2 Forward plan (as at 22 September 2015)

Background papers

None identified.

General Overview and Scrutiny Committee: Draft Work Programme 2015/16

Agenda items

Wednesday 30 September 2015, 10.00 am	
The development of a schools capital investment strategy	To provide General overview and scrutiny committee with the opportunity to review and comment on the progress made in developing a schools capital investment strategy, including considering a presentation of evidence at the committee meeting.
Revisions to the council tax reduction scheme	To seek the views of the General overview and scrutiny committee regarding the proposed revisions to the current council tax reduction (CTR) scheme ahead of Cabinet review in October and Council approval in December.
Tuesday 27 October 2015 at 1.00 pm	
Task and finish group on the smallholdings estate	To consider the findings of the task and finish group and to recommend the report to the Executive for consideration.
Tuesday 17 November 2015 from 10.00 am (the budget presentation is received by the overview and scrutiny committees jointly, followed by formal meetings of each committee)	
Budget 2016/17	To consider the budget proposals for the next financial year.
Capital investment programme	To consider the proposed programme.
Corporate plan	To consider the updated corporate plan.
Housing strategy 2015-2018	To consider the proposed strategy.
Tuesday 19 January 2016 at 10.00 am	
School examination performance	To consider school performance for summer 2015.
Home to school transport	To receive an update on home to school transport provision.
Community safety partnership	To receive an update on the strategic plan.
Tuesday 8 March 2016 at 10.00 am	
To be confirmed	
Tuesday 10 May 2016 at 10.00 am	
Edgar Street Athletic Ground	Review of options for the longer term arrangements for the ground.
Property update	To receive an update report on property matters.

Task and finish groups

Work currently in progress:	Status:
Smallholdings estate	The task and finish group is currently preparing its report. It is anticipated that the report will be submitted to the committee for consideration on 27 October 2015.

Issues for possible future scrutiny activity

Topic	Status:
Football provision	It is suggested that scrutiny activity be considered following the receipt of the report on Edgar Street Athletic Ground in May 2016.
Racecourse	It is suggested that scrutiny activity be considered following the Property update in May 2016.

Briefing Notes

The following topics shall be dealt with via briefing notes:	Status:
Update on the Executive responses to the task and finish group report on Balfour Beatty Living Places	This update will be included as part of an annual update to committee members to be circulated by November 2015.
Update on the Executive responses to the task and finish group report on development management (planning)	A briefing note to be prepared by the end of January 2016.

Seminars / Workshops

The following seminars / workshops have been suggested:	Status:
Digital strategy	Being programmed as part of the next phase of member seminars / workshops in development.
Understanding Herefordshire	"

Appendix 2

Decision Date	Decision Month	Decision Maker	Directorate	Portfolio Holder	(SURNAME FIRST) Councillor / Officer Name	Issue Type	Report Title	Description	(SURNAME FIRST) Report Writer
24-Jun-15	June	Officer	Economy, Communities & Corporate		Hughes, Geoff	Non Key	Approval of the Decoration Contractor for the Business Units within Plot C21 on the Enterprise Zone	To seek approval for the appointment of BG Brain Decorators Limited to undertake the decoration of the new business units on plot C21 of the Hereford Enterprise Zone.	Webster, Nick
26-Jun-15	June	Officer	Assistant Director Place Based Commissioning		PROW, Balfour Beatty Living	Non key	Highways Act 1980, Section 119 proposed public path diversion order bridleway PD16 (part) in the parish of Pudleston	To consider an application under the Highways Act 1980, section 119, to make a public path diversion order to divert part of bridleway PD16 in the parish of Pudleston	White, Susan
30-Jul-15	July	Officer	Assistant Director Place Based Commissioning		Sue White, BBLP	Non key	Proposed Public Path Diversion Order Footpath LR10 (part) in the Parish of Ledbury	To consider an application under the Highways Act 1980, section 119, to make a public path diversion order to divert part of footpath LR10 in the parish of Ledbury	Sue White, BBLP
30-Jul-15	July	Officer	Assistant Director Place Based Commissioning		Sue White, BBLP	Non key	highways act 1980, section 119. proposed public path diversion order footpath MA18 (part) and MA23 (part) in the parish of mathon	To consider an application under the Highways Act 1980, section 119, to make a public path diversion order to divert part of footpath MA18 (part) and MA23 (part) in the parish of Mathon with associated creation orders	Sue White, BBLP
01-Aug-15	Aug-15	Officer	Economy, Communities & Corporate		Hughes, Geoff	Non key	Old market development, Hereford – appropriation of developed land to highway land	To seek the approval of the Director for Economy, Communities & Corporate to the appropriation of land at the Old Market development in Hereford (as shown on drawing number 00096.LA10C – see Appendix to the report) from private development land to public adopted highway land, following alterations to Newmarket Street, Hereford, along the development frontage, in accordance with the provisions of a Section 278 Highways Act 1980 Agreement dated 24 January 2013 (Section 278 Agreement)	Byng, Andy
10-Aug-15	August	Officer	Economy, Communities & Corporate		Hughes, Geoff	Non Key	Disposal of plot S6 - S7 within the Enterprise Zone at South Magazine, Rotherwas	To seek the approval of the Corporate Director ECC to the disposal of development land on the Enterprise Zone at South Magazine	Pearce, Mark
10-Aug-15	August	Officer	Economy, Communities & Corporate		Ball, Richard	Non key	Office and car park LED lighting	to replace energy inefficient lighting across three site with energy efficient LED lights in order to reduce energy and maintenance costs in addition to reducing carbon	Bennett, Claire
31-Aug-15	September	Employment Panel to consider report	Economy, Communities & Corporate		Hughes, Geoff	Non-Key	Designation of post of statutory officer		Hughes, Geoff
01-Sep-15	September	Cabinet Member - Transport & Roads	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Rone, Paul	Non Key	B42134 Cope Cross Street, Ross On Wye - Review of Priority Give Way	To review the existing unofficial priority give way system along Cope Cross Street, Ross On Wye and consider the appropriate way forward to address the highway issues at this location	Evans, Bruce
23-Sep-15	Sept	Officer	Economy, Communities & Corporate		Robinson, Peter	Non Key	ASD Module Renewal	Software module for the capture and maintenance of Associated Street Data for BS7666 corporate Addressing.	Duncan Trumper
23-Sep-15	September	Officer	Economy, Communities & Corporate		Robinson, Peter	Non Key	Sale of Hereford Buttermarket	To confirm the identity of the purchase of Hereford Buttermarket	Featherstone, Tony
24-Sep-15	September	Cabinet Member Infrastructure	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Price, Philip	Non Key	Option Appraisal for 16-18 High Town, Hereford (burnt out shops adjacent to Old House)	To consider which option is appropriate for the council to adopt in relation to these properties	Willimont, Marc
25-Sep-15	September	Council	Children's Wellbeing	Young People & Children's Services	Hough, Andy	Budget and Policy Framework (treat as Key)	Aylestone and Broadlands	To approve the virement of funding for Broadlands school and children's centre onto the Aylestone School	Andy Hough
25-Sep-15	September	Cabinet member: contracts and assets	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Cabinet Member - Contracts & Assets	Bramer, Harry	Key	Mediation arrangements in relation to legal disputes with a former contractor	To put in place arrangements for settlement via mediation to contractual disputes with the council's former street scene contractor.	Norman, Bill
25-Sep-15	September	Council	Children's	Young People & Children's Wellbeing	Lester, Jonathan	Budget and Policy Framework	Youth Justice Plan	To approve the Youth Justice Plan for 15/16	Jo Davidson
25-Sep-15	September	Council	Children's	Young People & Children's Wellbeing	Lester, Jonathan	Budget and Policy Framework	Children and Young People's Plan	To approve the children and young people's plan	Chris Baird
25-Sep-15	September	Council	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Hughes, Geoff	Non-Key	Designation of post of statutory officer	To designate a specific post to discharge the functions of Monitoring Officer	Hughes, Geoff
25-Sep-15	September	Officer	Children's Wellbeing		Davidson, Jo	Key	Pupil Services Award of Contract	Director of Children's Well-being to award the contract in respect of pupil referral services for Herefordshire following the completion of a formal tendering process	Knight, Les
25-Sep-15	September	Officer	Economy, Communities & Corporate		Robinson, Peter	Non key	Approval to Award Fixed Landline (Telephony) Contract for Herefordshire Council	This report outlines the contract award recommendation following a tender conducted by Herefordshire Council with Hoopole Ltd for the provision of Fixed Landline (Telephony) services.	MATHER, Nick

Decision Date	Decision Month	Decision Maker	Directorate	Portfolio Holder	(SURNAME FIRST) Councillor / Officer Name	Issue Type	Report Title	Description	(SURNAME FIRST) Report Writer
25-Sep-15	September	Officer	Economy, Communities & Corporate		Robinson, Peter	Non Key	Employee Salary Sacrifice Scheme	To propose the introduction of an on-line employee benefits scheme	Postles, TJ
25-Sep-15	September	Officer	Economy, Communities & Corporate		Robinson, Peter	Non Key	Community asset transfer disposal of freehold title of (a) Ledbury Heritage Centre, & (b) Ledbury Burgage Hall with associated footprint to Ledbury Places (registered charity)	To agree the disposal of the freehold title of: (a) Ledbury Heritage Centre; and (b) Ledbury Burgage Hall with associated footprint to Ledbury Places (registered charity).	Featherstone, Tony
29-Sep-15	September	Officer	Economy, Communities & Corporate		Hughes, Geoff	Non Key	Maintenance cover process for council car park pay machines	To approve the maintenance cover arrangements for the current and new car park pay machines	Jenner, Chris
30-Sep-15	September	Cabinet Member Contracts & Assets	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Contracts & Assets	Bramer, Harry	Key	Disposal of land within the Enterprise Zone at the South Magazine	To seek the approval of the Cabinet Member contracts and assets to the disposal of development land on the Enterprise Zone at the South Magazine, for the relocation and expansion of an advanced manufacturing business	Pearce, Mark
30-Sep-15	September	Overview and Scrutiny	Economy, Communities & Corporate		Peter Robinson	Key	Revision to the Council tax Reduction Scheme	to agree the council tax reduction scheme for 2016-17	Anne Bradbury
01-Oct-15	October	Officer	Children's Wellbeing		Hughes, Geoff	Non-Key	Teaching Trade Union Facilities Time	To provide a standardised approach to facilities time payments for teaching trade union representatives and to remove the historic situation of three trade union representatives being employed on council contracts to carry out this role	Baird, Chris
01-Oct-15	October	Officer	Economy, Communities and Corporate		Hughes, Geoff	Non Key	Fastershire Broadband Delivery	To consider extending milestone 11 of the Fastershire deployment to December 2015	Silver, Natalia
07-Oct-15	October	Cabinet Member Contracts & Assets	Contracts & Assets	Contracts & Assets	Bramer, Harry	Key	Approval to award a contract to specialist vendor neutral provider in order to establish a centrally led approach to procure, contract and performance manage Specialist Professional Services.	To award a contract to specialist vendor neutral provider, NEPRO, in order to establish a legally compliant council wide, consistent approach to centrally procure, contract and performance manage Specialist Professional Services.	Robinson, Peter
07-Oct-15	October	Cabinet Member Corporate Services	Corporate Services	Powell, Graham	Robinson, Peter	Key	Renewal of the Temporary Agency Contract.	To approve the recommendations of the procurement strategy for the new Temporary Agency Staff Contract.	Robinson, Peter
07-Oct-15	October	Cabinet Member Health & Wellbeing	Adults & Wellbeing	Health & Wellbeing	Morgan, Patricia	Key	To formalise current situation with Residential Scheme Livability provider (Wall Street) (not incontract)	To formalise existing contract extension until 31 March 2016	Saveker, Graham
07-Oct-15	October	Cabinet Member	Adults & Wellbeing	Health & Wellbeing	Morgan, Patricia	Key	Commissioning of Day Activities	To formalise the strategic direction of day activity development in Herefordshire reflecting the strategic objectives of the authority	Saveker, Graham
09-Oct-15	October	Cabinet Member Transport & Roads	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Transport & Roads	Rone, Paul	Non key	High Town Refurbishment Scheme	To approve scheme for consultation	Lane, Mairead
12-Oct-15	October	Cabinet Member Contracts & Assets	Contracts & Assets	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Bramer, Harry	Key	Confirming Disposals Policy for Council Owned Land on the Hereford Enterprise Zone	To seek Cabinet Member approval of the policy for the disposal of land on the Hereford Enterprise Zone	Pearce, Mark
13-Oct-15	October	Cabinet Member Health & Wellbeing	Adults & Wellbeing	Cabinet Member Health & Wellbeing	Morgan, Patricia	Key	Re-procurement of learning disability services (Midland Heart)	Award of the care and support contract(s) for learning disability services, following the procurement of a remodeled service via a competitive tender process	Archibald, Ewen
15-Oct-15	October	Cabinet	Adults & Wellbeing	Cabinet Member Health & Wellbeing	Morgan, Patricia	Non Key	Local Account	To receive a copy of the Local Account for sign off, following discussion at DLT, Leaders Briefing and HOSC	Harris, Paul
15-Oct-15	October	Cabinet	Children's Wellbeing	Cabinet Member Children's	Lester, Jonathan	Non Key	Future delivery arrangements for West Mercia Youth Offending Service (WMYOS)	To secure approval for proposed new delivery arrangements for West Mercia Youth Offending Service (WMYOS).	Bill Robinson (external) any queries to Chris Jones
15-Oct-15	October	Cabinet	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Peter Robinson	Key	Revision to the Council tax Reduction Scheme	to agree the council tax reduction scheme for 2016-17	Anne Bradbury
15-Oct-15	October	Cabinet	Children's Wellbeing	Cabinet	Knight, Karen	Key	Planned Capital Programme for Schools 2015/16	To approve the proposed expenditure of grants supporting school building improvements and maintenance work	Knight, Karen
15-Oct-15	October	Cabinet	Children's	Young People & Children's Wellbeing	Lester, Jonathan	Key	Adult Community Learning Plan 2015/18	To approve the adult community learning plan 2015/16	Heath, Alexia
15-Oct-15	October	Cabinet	Adults and Wellbeing	Cabinet Member Health & Wellbeing	Morgan Patricia	Key	Carers Strategy 2016 - 2019	To adopt a Carers Strategy for Herefordshire	Gardner, Ian

Decision Date	Decision Month	Decision Maker	Directorate	Portfolio Holder	(SURNAME FIRST) Councillor / Officer Name	Issue Type	Report Title	Description	(SURNAME FIRST) Report Writer
18-Oct-15	October	Regulatory Committee	Economic, Environmental & Cultural Services			Non Key	Report on Regulatory Activity by Environmental Health and Trading Standards	To note the main regulatory activities of the Council's Environmental Health & Trading Standards (EHTS) service for the year 2014/15 (period 1 April 2014 - 31 March 2015)	Pigrem, Mike /Willimont, Marc
19-Oct-15	October	Officer	Economy, Communities & Corporate		Hughes, Geoff	Non key	Disposal of land within the Enterprise Zone at Vincent Carey Road (part of Plot N15), Rotherwas	To seek the approval of the Corporate Director ECC to the disposal of development land within the Enterprise Zone at Vincent Carey Road, Rotherwas	Pearce, Mark
19-Oct-15	October	Officer	Economy, Communities & Corporate		Hughes, Geoff	Non key	Disposal of land within the Enterprise Zone at Vincent Carey Road (Plot N16), Rotherwas	To seek the approval of the Corporate Director ECC to the disposal of development land within the Enterprise Zone at Vincent Carey Road, Rotherwas	Pearce, Mark
19-Oct-15	October	Officer	Economy, Communities & Corporate		Hughes, Geoff	Non key	Disposal of land within the Enterprise Zone at Vincent Carey Road (Plot N17), Rotherwas	To seek the approval of the Corporate Director ECC to the disposal of development land within the Enterprise Zone at Vincent Carey Road, Rotherwas	Pearce, Mark
20-Oct-15	October	Cabinet Member	Adults and Wellbeing	Health & Wellbeing	Morgan, Patricia	Key	Remodelling and reprourement of Residential Respite Provision	The remodelling and reprourement of scheduled residential respite provision	Gardner, Ian
20-Oct-15	October	Cabinet Member Contracts and Assets	Economy, Communities and Corporate	Economy, Communities and Corporate	Bramer, Harry	Key	Disposal of land forming part of the former Whitecross School site, Baggallay Street, Hereford	To seek the approval of the Cabinet Member to the disposal of land forming part of the old Whitecross School site.	Featherstone, Tony
04-Nov-15	November	Officer	Health & Wellbeing		Samuels, Martin	Non key	Agreement for the provision of temporary accommodation for the homeless	To approve agreements with housing providers for the use of stock as temporary housing.	Connon, Trea
05-Nov-15	November	Cabinet	Adults and Wellbeing	Cabinet Member Health & Wellbeing	Morgan Patricia	Key	Carers Strategy 2016 - 2019 (TBC)	To adopt a Carers Strategy for Herefordshire	Gardner, Ian
05-Nov-15	November	Cabinet	Corporate Strategy & Finance	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Johnson, Anthony	Non Key	August budget monitoring report	To report the financial position of the Council for both revenue and capital	Robinson, Peter
05-Nov-15	November	Cabinet	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Cabinet Member - Contracts & Assets	Cabinet	Key	Commissioning & Commercial Strategy 2015-18	To approve new commissioning & commercial strategy 2015-18	Welsby, Wayne
05-Nov-15	November	Cabinet	Economy, Communities and Corporate	Contracts & Assets	Bramer, Harry	Key	Review of Small Holdings Estate	To seek Cabinet approval for future management arrangements for the Councils small holdings estate	Featherstone, Tony
05-Nov-15	November	Cabinet	Health & Wellbeing	Cabinet Member Health & Wellbeing	Morgan, Patricia	Key	Revisions to the Herefordshire Allocation Policy (TBC)	To approve amendments to the housing allocation policy	Connon, Trea
17-Nov-15	November	General Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Hughes, Geoff	Non key	Capital investment	To approve the councils capital programme and funding implications	Robinson, Peter
17-Nov-15	November	GOSC	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Robinson, Peter	Non Key	Budget setting, TMS and MTFS	To approve the 2016/17 budget and medium term financial strategy to 2019/20	Robinson, Peter
27-Nov-15	November	Employment Panel	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Economy, Communities & Corporate		Non Key	Living Wage	Introduction of Living Wage	Robinson, Peter
03-Dec-15	December	Cabinet	Adults and Wellbeing	Health & Wellbeing	Morgan, Patricia	Key	Homelessness Prevention Strategy & Homelessness Review 2015-2018	To seek approval for the Homelessness Prevention Strategy & Homelessness Review 2015-2018	Rogers, Sandie
03-Dec-15	December	Cabinet	Children's	Young People & Children's Wellbeing	Lester, Jonathan	Key	Colwall Primary School	To approve the replacement Colwall Primary School building	Andy Hough
03-Dec-15	December	Cabinet	Corporate Strategy & Finance	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Johnson, Anthony	Non Key	September budget monitoring report	To report the financial position of the Council for both revenue and capital	Robinson, Peter
03-Dec-15	December	Cabinet	Economy & Corporate Services	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Powell, Graham	Non Key	Quarter two corporate performance report	To review performance	Ball, Richard
03-Dec-15	December	Cabinet	Children's Wellbeing	Young People & Children's Services	Cabinet	Non Key	Herefordshire Safeguarding Boards Business Plan and Annual Report	To inform Cabinet of progress made towards the implementation of the Safeguarding Board Business Plan and Annual Report	Roughton, John

Decision Date	Decision Month	Decision Maker	Directorate	Portfolio Holder	(SURNAME FIRST) Councillor / Officer Name	Issue Type	Report Title	Description	(SURNAME FIRST) Report Writer
03-Dec-15	December	Cabinet	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Johnson, Tony	Key	Capital investment	To approve the councils capital programme and funding implications	Robinson, Peter
18-Dec-15	December	Council	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Peter Robinson		Key	Revision to the Council tax Reduction Scheme	to agree the council tax reduction scheme for 2016-17	Anne Bradbury
18-Dec-15	December	Council	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Robinson, Peter	Non Key	Capital Investment	To approve the councils capital programme and funding implications.	Robinson, Peter
18-Dec-15	October	Cabinet Member Contracts & Assets	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Bramer, Harry	Key	Accommodation Strategy Phase 2	To approve proposals for a new 3 year accommodation programme	Featherstone, Tony
08-Jan-16	January	Employment Panel	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Economy, Communities & Corporate		Non Key	Pay Policy Statement	To recommend the Pay Policy Statement to Council	Robinson, Peter
21-Jan-16	January	Cabinet	Adults & Wellbeing	Health & Wellbeing	Morgan, Patricia	Non Key	Herefordshire Tenancy Strategy 2012-2015	To review and update current Strategy in accordance with the Localism Act 2011 (s.150). The Strategy sets out matters to which the registered providers of social housing for its district are to have regard in formulating policies.	Jackson, Christa
21-Jan-16	January	Cabinet	Corporate Strategy & Finance	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Johnson, Anthony	Non Key	November budget monitoring report	To report the financial position of the Council for both revenue and capital	Robinson, Peter
01-Feb-16	February	Cabinet Member	Economy & Corporate Services	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Powell, Graham	Non Key	Cremation Charges	To approve the proposed cremation charges	Jenner, Chris
05-Feb-16	February	Council	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Neill, Alistair	Non Key	Living Wage	Introduction of Living Wage	Robinson, Peter
05-Feb-16	February	Council	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Neill, Alistair	Non Key	Pay Policy Statement	To approve the Pay Policy Statement	Robinson, Peter
05-Feb-16	February	Council	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Robinson, Peter	Non Key	Budget setting, TMS and MTFS	To approve the 2016/17 budget and medium term financial strategy to 2019/20	Robinson, Peter
11-Feb-16	February	Cabinet	Corporate Strategy & Finance	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Johnson, Anthony	Non Key	December budget monitoring report	To report the financial position of the Council for both revenue and capital	Robinson, Peter
11-Feb-16	February	Cabinet	Economy & Corporate Services	Economy & Corporate Services	Powell, Graham	Non Key	Quarter three corporate performance report	To review performance	Ball, Richard
11-Feb-16	February	Cabinet	Adults & Wellbeing	Health & Wellbeing	Cabinet	Key	Housing Strategy 2015-2018	To approve Housing Strategy 2015-2018	Sandie Rogers
15-Feb-16	February	Officer	Adult Health & Wellbeing		Samuels, Martin	Key	Award Parents 1st Contract	Approval to award Parents 1st contract to successful tender	Westlake, Andrea
04-Mar-16	March	Council	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Economy, Communities & Corporate	Robinson, Peter	Non Key	Council tax and precept setting	To set the 2016/17 council tax and associated precepts	Robinson, Peter