

Executive

Wednesday 2 November 2016

A meeting of the Executive will be held at the Town Hall, Royal Leamington Spa on Wednesday 2 November 2016 at **6.00pm**.

Membership:

Councillor A Mobbs (Chairman)
Councillor N Butler Councillor P Phillips
Councillor M Coker Councillor D Shilton
Councillor S Cross Councillor P Whiting
Councillor Mrs M Grainger

Also attending (but not members of the Executive):

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Whitnash Residents' Association (Independent) Group Observer | Councillor Mrs Falp |
| Labour Group Observer | Councillor Barrott |
| Chair of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee and Liberal Democrat Group Observer | Councillor Boad |
| Chair of the Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee | Councillor Quinney |

Emergency Procedure

At the commencement of the meeting, the Chairman will announce the emergency procedure for the Town Hall.

Agenda

1. **Declarations of Interest**

Members to declare the existence and nature of interests in items on the agenda in accordance with the adopted Code of Conduct.

Declarations should be entered on the form to be circulated with the attendance sheet and declared during this item. However, the existence and nature of any interest that subsequently becomes apparent during the course of the meeting must be disclosed immediately. If the interest is not registered, Members must notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest within 28 days.

Members are also reminded of the need to declare predetermination on any matter. If Members are unsure about whether or not they have an interest, or about its nature, they are strongly advised to seek advice from officers prior to the meeting.

2. **Minutes**

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 28 September 2016 **(To follow)**

Part 1

(Items upon which a decision by Council is required)

3. **Budget Review to 30 September 2016**

To consider a report from Finance **(Pages 1 to 20)**

Part 2

(Items upon which the approval of the Council is not required)

4. **Review of Support to Town & Parish Councils**

To consider a report from Finance **(Pages 1 to 16)**

5. **Public and Press**

To consider resolving that under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 that the public and press be excluded from the meeting for the following item by reason of the likely disclosure of exempt information within the paragraphs of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, following the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006, as set out below.

| Item Nos. | Para Nos. | Reason |
|-----------|-----------|---|
| 7 | 1 | Information relating to an Individual |
| 7 | 2 | Information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual |
| 7 | 3 | Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information) |

6. **Minutes**

To confirm the confidential minutes of the meeting held on 28 September 2016
(To follow)
(Not for publication)

Agenda published Monday 24 October 2016

General Enquiries: Please contact Warwick District Council, Riverside House, Milverton Hill, Royal Leamington Spa, Warwickshire, CV32 5HZ.

Telephone: 01926 456114

E-Mail: committee@warwickdc.gov.uk


For enquiries about specific reports, please contact the officers named in the reports You can e-mail the members of the Executive at executive@warwickdc.gov.uk

Details of all the Council's committees, Councillors and agenda papers are available via our website www.warwickdc.gov.uk/committees

Please note that the majority of the meetings are held on the first floor at the Town Hall. If you feel that this may restrict you attending this meeting, please call (01926) 456114 prior to this meeting, so that we can assist you and make any necessary arrangements to

help you attend the meeting.

The agenda is also available in large print, on request, prior to the meeting by calling 01926 456114.

| | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|
|  Executive 2 November 2016 | | Agenda Item No. 3 |
| Title | Budget Review to 30 September 2016 | |
| For further information about this report please contact | Mike Snow Andy Crump | Tel 01926 456800 Tel 01926 456810 |
| Wards of the District directly affected | N/A | |
| Is the report private and confidential and not for publication by virtue of a paragraph of schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, following the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006? | No | |
| Date and meeting when issue was last considered and relevant minute number | July 2016 Executive – Budget review to 30 June 2016 | |
| Background Papers | | |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Contrary to the policy framework: | No |
| Contrary to the budgetary framework: | No |
| Key Decision? | No |
| Included within the Forward Plan? (If yes include reference number) | Yes |
| Equality Impact Assessment Undertaken | No |
| | |

| | | |
|--|-------------|--------------------|
| Officer/Councillor Approval | | |
| Officer Approval | Date | Name |
| Chief Executive/Deputy Chief Executive | 17/10/2016 | Chris Elliott |
| Head of Service | 17/10/2016 | Mike Snow |
| CMT | 17/10/2016 | Chris Elliott |
| Section 151 Officer | 17/10/2016 | Mike Snow |
| Monitoring Officer | 17/10/2016 | Andrew Jones |
| Finance | 17/10/2016 | Andy Crump |
| Portfolio Holder(s) | 17/10/2016 | Cllr Peter Whiting |
| Consultation & Community Engagement | | |
| Not applicable | | |
| Final Decision? | | Yes |
| Suggested next steps (if not final decision please set out below) | | |
| | | |

1. Summary

- 1.1 This report updates Members on the latest financial position. Various changes to 2016/17 budgets been identified and are now presented to Members for approval.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Executive notes the latest variances for the General Fund budget, the projected outturn on budget and agrees to the budget changes detailed in paragraph 3.1. the Executive also note the latest variations on the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) as detailed in section 3.5.
- 2.2 That the Executive agree the changes to the Capital Programme detailed in paragraph 3.6.
- 2.3 That members note the new requirement for the Council's Audited Statement of Accounts to be approved by 31 July from 2017/18.
- 2.4 That it is agreed for the plan for the Council's Audited Statement of Accounts for 2016/17 to be approved by 31 July 2017.
- 2.5 That any revenue surplus or deficit balance on the General Fund on closing the Accounts from 2016/17 is appropriated to/from the General Fund Balance, and any revenue surplus or deficit balance on the HRA is appropriated to/from the HRA Capital Investment Reserve. Authority is delegated to the Head of Finance, in consultation with the Finance Portfolio Holder to amend these arrangements if necessary with this subsequently reported to Executive/Council.
- 2.6 That the Head of Finance, in consultation with the Finance Portfolio Holder has delegated authority to agree revenue and capital slippage at year end above items already allowed for in the Budget process, with these being reported to Members as part of the subsequent Final Accounts report to Executive.
- 2.7 That the Finance and Audit Scrutiny Committee, as the Council's Audit Committee, will in future be responsible for approving the Council's Audited Statement of Accounts.

3. Reasons for the Recommendations

3.1 General Fund 2016/17

- 3.1.1 The latest variances that have been identified by managers are shown below. Where they are not self-explanatory, more detail is provided. The figure reported to July's Executive was £900 (F), since then the additional variances have altered this figure to £246,400 (F), after appropriating extra parking revenue to the Parking reserve.

| | £ |
|--|------------|
| Building control restructure – ringfenced - for information only | 42,500 (F) |
| | |
| Total Variance to July Executive | 900 (F) |

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| Town Hall lease income – Bromford vacated, not replaced by another tenant yet | 9,800 (A) |
| Electricity | 207,000 (A) |
| Minor Variances | 6,500 (A) |
| Travel token usage Apr-June 2016 closure of scheme – no budget | 5,000 (A) |
| Johnston Publishing vacated 32 Hamilton Terrace –lost rental income | 14,000 (A) |
| Resettlement Service no longer provided - budget given up as saving | 4,400 (F) |
| Racing Club Warwick – additional electrical, drainage, tarmacking & fencing works | 25,000(A) |
| Crematorium income – Fees & Charges | 20,500 (F) |
| Business rates – Jubilee House | 11,600 (F) |
| increased B&B costs which are not eligible for Benefits Subsidy | 50,000 (A) |
| Legal Services – shared services | 40,000 (A) |
| Street Name & numbering | 10,000 (F) |
| Payments Processing transaction charges | 15,000 (A) |
| Investment interest | 131,000 (A) |
| Parking Income (Surplus to Parking reserve) | 176,000 (F) |
| Recycling Credits | 20,000 (F) |
| Council Tax subsidy less than anticipated | 16,000 (A) |
| Development Control – income – budget review & Fees & Charges | 293,000 (F) |
| Development Control– Agency Staff (increased workload) | 49,400 (A) |
| Planning Viability Appraisals | 10,000 (A) |
| One-off Housing Benefit New Burdens Grant | 16,900 (F) |
| Jubilee House –rents/service chg – Warks Ambulance Service vacated | 10,300 (A) |
| Althorpe Enterprise Hub –rents/service charge – large office vacated | 9,500 (A) |
| Cleaning Contract Contingency saving | 80,000 (F) |
| Electric cars – insurance costs | 4,200 (A) |
| Subsidence Claim – Settled – balance on provision | 62,300 (F) |
| Gym Reserve write back | 122,500 (F) |
| Non salary variances | 215,400 (F) |
| Salary Variances | 207,000(F) |
| Overall Variance | 422,400(F) |
| If extra Parking income appropriated to Reserve | 176,000(A) |
| Forecast position as at 31st March 2017 | 246,400(F) |

3.1.2 Salary variances

The following variances have been reported:-

| | £ |
|--|---------------------|
| Vacant posts and staff turnover in Contract Services | 77,100 (F) |
| Green Space Development salary overspend | 9,200 (A) |
| Assistant Conservation Officer post saving | 13,800 (F) |
| OSS/Reception salary – vacancies | 54,000 (F) |
| Neighbourhood Services -Community Rangers re-graded | 26,900 (A) |
| Housing Assessment Officer omitted from original budgets | 28,900 (A) |
| Development Services – Vacancies | 41,600 (F) |
| Financial Services – Vacancies | 57,200 (F) |
| Committee Services – new staff at bottom of scale | 5,800 (F) |
| Media Room– new staff at bottom of scale | 6,200 (F) |
| Customer Support Team – new staff at bottom of scale | 8,200 (F) |
| Warwickshire Direct– new staff at bottom of scale | 8,100 (F) |
| | |
| Total estimated Salary variance | £207,000 (F) |

- 3.1.3 Executive are asked to agree these changes to the General Fund Budget, which will result in £246,400 being allocated to the General Fund. The use of this funding will be considered as part of the 2017/18 Budget Report in February 2017.

3.2 Contingency Budgets

- 3.2.1 Appendix A gives details of the allocations out of this budget with a balance of **£71,500 (15% of original budget)** of £471,300) left for the rest of the year. This is after two further calls on this budget, authorised under the Head of Finance's delegated powers, for Accountancy sickness cover (£10,000) and for historical non-compliances for Payment Card Industry Data Security Standard (PCIDSS) £8,400
- 3.2.2 None of the 2016/17 Training Contingency Budget of £4,900 has currently been allocated. However, this budget was fully allocated in 2015/16 and is expected to be so this year, mainly for professional training.
- 3.2.3 There are other Contingency Budgets for Price Inflation (£24,000) and Contract Cleaning (£92,600). The Housing Support & Neighbourhoods' Manager is now able to return £80,000 of the Contract Cleaning Contingency as the contract is now not being re-let. The remainder may be surrendered later in the year. The position for 2017/18 and onwards will be made clear later in the year. Any forthcoming demands for the use of these budgets will be reported upon during the year

3.3 Revenue Slippage- Earmarked Reserves

- 3.3.1 Upon Closure of the 2015/16 Accounts, Revenue slippage from 2015/16 was been added into the 2016/17 budget, totalling £322,600 for the General Fund, see Appendix B1 for details and current year progress. £258,700 of revenue slippage was approved for the HRA at the same time and these can be seen in Appendix B2, with year to date progress highlighted.
- 3.3.2 Managers have stated that approval of these requests, at year-end, takes a long while and it delays commissioning of works etc., until early July. It is recommended that the Head of Finance, in consultation with the Finance Portfolio Holder, has authority to agree revenue slippage at year end, above items already allowed for in the Budget process, with these retrospectively reported to Members as part of the subsequent Final Accounts report to Executive.

3.4 Income Budgets

3.4.1 The Original Budget for 2016/17 Planning income was £702,000. The projected Planning income for the year has been increased by a further £293k, in addition to the £100k recurring increase previously reported. The 2016/17 budget will be mended to £1,095k accordingly. Due to the buoyant state of the market, income levels are likely to remain high in the short-term (2017/18). Longer term forecasting is more difficult. However, the Head of Development has agreed to, when competing work pressures allow e.g. Examination In Public, try to profile this income over the next 3-5 years.

- 3.4.2 Waste recycling income for the 1st quarter is understood to be in the process of being agreed with WCC – income is estimated to be up by £20k for 2016/17. Confirmation has now been agreed to similarly increase this budget for future years based on prior year outturn, tonnages to date, the continued growth in new properties and increase in the multiplier in line with inflation. This has now been built into the MTFS.
- 3.4.3 Car Parking income is well up on the previous year despite the price increase agreed earlier only recently being implemented. Whilst any uplift in this income is due to be earmarked for investment in parking, the projected outturn has been reviewed upwards by £176k. Forecast income for 2017/18 is again estimated to be up, despite the decision not to increase charges for next year at this stage. Any forecast increase in parking above inflation is appropriated into Parking reserves, to fund improvements and new builds. Since Fees and Charges were agreed in September, it has been agreed with the Head of Neighbourhood that it is reasonable to increase the Parking Income Budget by an extra £90k from 2017/18. This has now been built into the MTFS.
- 3.4.4 Cremation fee income for this year and next is holding up well, potentially up by £20k but is obviously influenced by a number of external factors e.g. cold winter, effectiveness of 'flu vaccine' etc. A number of new products offered at Crematorium introduced by the Bereavement Manager, were agreed by September's Fees and Charges report to Executive, ensuring income levels are maintained/exceeded for 2017/18. There are plans for further proposals, which will be reported to Executive.
- 3.4.5 Leisure centre income, based on last year's profiled income, is forecasting an under achievement against budget, potentially £200k (some of this due to the decision not to increase Fees and Charges from January 2017 to reflect disruption due to building works). However, this is being reviewed as part of Base Budget with Finance currently seeking to accommodate the various Leisure Centre options changes. A reserve has been created to mitigate some of this lost income with a more definitive position being reported in the base Budget report. Royal Spa Centre income is following a similar profile to previous years and the net position (reflecting payments to Artists and income) is forecast to be close to the budget for this year.
- 3.4.6 Appendix C gives details of income received compared to a profile budget to end of September and also shows this compared to previous years. The latest budget is also the estimated out-turn, unless notified in paragraphs 3.4.1 to 3.4.5 above.
- 3.4.7 The External Auditors presented their Audit Findings Report to Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee on the 20 September. The report referred to the large surplus over budget for 2015/16 largely as a result of unplanned income. They stated that the increased levels should have been known and reported sooner. Income monitoring is something that is being taken very seriously by the Senior Management Team. It is apparent that in the past, there have been overly cautious projections. Whilst overly optimistic projections are not sought, the skill is in making forecasts that are realistic and are not overly risky.

3.5 **HRA**

- 3.5.1 For 2016/17 HRA electricity is forecast to be overspent by £35,000 due to

increased usage throughout the year, and higher rates which are forecast to increase by approximately £1,400 per month from October 2016.

3.5.2 Communal and other cleaning is likely to be £45,000 under budget in 2016/17.

3.6 Capital

3.6.1 The following General Fund variances have been reported:-

| |
|--|
| Culture |
| Castle Farm Sports Pitch drainage - £73,000 budget slipped to 2017/18 |
| Play Area Improvement Programme increase by £195,800 funded from £66,300 section 106's and £129,500 request from Public Amenity Reserve. |
| New Gym Equipment - 2016/17 budget £29,300 saving |
| St Nicholas Park Tennis Courts -£23,000 Addition to Capital Programme following portfolio holder approval for Equipment Renewal Reserve draw-down. |
| Edmondscote Track Athletics Equipment - £10,900 - Addition to Capital Programme following Portfolio Holder approval for Equipment Renewal Reserve draw-down. |
| Victoria Skate Park £7,300 increase to budget funded from Section 106 |
| GF -Play Area Improvement Programme- further Section 106 monies of £1,884 to be used instead of Public Amenity Reserve |
| |
| Development |
| Jubilee House Phase 2 £331,300 budget - returned and to be earmarked within Capital Investment Reserve |
| 2 nd Warwick Sea Scout HQ £49,800 budget slippage to 2017/18 |
| |
| Chief Executive's Office |
| ICT - Overall underspend back to ICT Reserve. £21,300 |

3.6.2 Housing Revenue Account

| Scheme | Amount £ | Reasons |
|---|---------------------|--|
| Water Services | -9,700 | Reduction in 2016/17 budget. This is for responsive work and very unlikely to be spent. |
| Thermal Insulation | -89,900 | Not required –in 2016/17 – see below |
| Thermal Insulation | -40,000 | Virement to Door Entry/Security/Safety Systems |
| Door Entry/Security/Safety Systems | 40,000 | Virement from Thermal Insulation |
| Environmental Improvements - tenant participation | 1,000 | Increase budget funded from a 'gesture of goodwill' payment from Severn Trent. No overall cost to WDC. |

The main factor for not undertaking a thermal insulation programme 2016/17 was the lack of underlying data required to target properties. The Stock Condition Survey data should alleviate this, enabling WDC to identify properties lacking loft or cavity insulation as well as the solid brick wall properties.

A number of programmes in which WDC clad the external envelope of solid brick wall properties have been undertaken. Housing and Property Services have also been looking at how to access ECO (Energy Company Obligation) grant funding for WDC (officially designated) fuel poverty areas.

3.7. **Business Rates Retention and Pooling**

3.7.1 Net Business Rate Retention has not been amended within the forecast for the current year on the basis that any variation to the original estimated income is compensated for by changing the contribution from the Business Rate Volatility Reserve. Business Rate income for future years is currently being reviewed and will be included within the MTFs. Whilst Business Rate Retention has been in operation for three complete years now, there still remain many uncertainties in respect of the figures:-

- There are still some substantial appeals awaiting determination by the VOA.
- All properties are being revalued from 1 April 2017. This will create a new round of new appeals to be submitted.
- For 2017/18, alongside the new rateable values, the rate poundage is still to be determined.
- The Top-ups and Tariffs used in the Rate Retention system all need to be amended by DCLG to ensure authorities are not unduly benefited or lose out. Whilst there has been a consultation over this, the precise details are not expected to be known until the 2017/18 indicative Grant Settlement expected in December.
- 100% Business Rates Retention – this is expected to come in from 2020/21. Again, there are significant uncertainties how this will work in practice, with functions having to transfer from central to local government.

Consequently, forecasting Business Rates Retention is not straightforward. It is therefore imperative that the Council maintains a level of reserves (notably the Business Rates Volatility Reserve) to enable the Council to have some stability in its finances moving forward. Within the Medium Term Financial Strategy , there should be more detail on the project levels of Retained Business Rates.

3.7.2 The Council has been in the Coventry and Warwickshire Business Rates Pool since the start of Business Rates Retention. By pooling, councils seek to reduce the levy due to central government as part of the system, and retain more funds locally. For 2017/18 the pool should continue to operate with the same membership. However, it should be noted that Coventry will also be part of the new West Midland Pool as part of the Combined Authority. However, for the first year, that new pool is effectively a “desk top exercise”, consequently there should be no impact on the Coventry and Warwickshire Pool.

3.7.3 As in previous years, the Council members need to confirm their membership of the Pool in October ahead of the new financial year. Under delegated authority to the Head of Finance, in consultation with the Finance Portfolio Holder, this has been agreed.

3.8 **Other Funding Liabilities**

3.8.1 Members will be aware of the following projects for which further proposals will be reported ahead of the Council committing to the projects:-

- Re-development of Newbold Comyn and St Nicholas Park Leisure Centres

- Office Relocation project
- Re-development of Covent Garden Multi Storey Car Park
- Re-development of Linen Street Car Park

3.8.2 The Council also has the following liabilities for which there is some funding.

- Asset Maintenance Liabilities – following the review of Corporate Assets, the future cost of maintaining all the Council’s property assets and land holdings has been established, as previously reported to Executive. The cost of these works is only funded up to and including 2018/19. To fully fund the works required in subsequent years will amount to an additional cost averaging out at approximately £1m per annum.
- ICT – A separate ICT Reserve has been established to provide funding for the Council’s ICT infrastructure. Contributions of £250k, per annum, are being made to this reserve.
- Equipment Renewals Reserve – For some years the Council has maintained an Equipment Renewals Reserve to fund service equipment replacement. Contributions of £100k per annum are being made to this reserve.

3.8.3 It is important that the Council’s financial projections are as inclusive of all potential funding demands upon the Council as possible. It is important that Portfolio Holders and Heads of Service review all items currently budgeted for in the current and future years. Any further items which are currently not budgeted for, should be identified and where these are unavoidable included in projections and future Budget reports.

3.9 Early closure of accounts

3.9.1 Under the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015, the local authorities’ audited Statement of Accounts from 2017/18 must be published by 31 July 2018, and annually thereafter. Under the current regulations, the draft accounts must be completed and signed by the responsible finance officer by 30 June, with the audit and formal publication completed by 30 September.

3.9.2 With this new tighter timetable, it will be necessary for the draft accounts to be ready by the end of May, giving June and July for the audit to be completed.

3.9.3 The Annual Governance Statement forms part of the Statement of Accounts. This is prepared separately to the Accounts, and is currently agreed by Finance and Audit Scrutiny Committee before the end of June. The deadline for the completion and agreement of the AGS is similarly brought forward. In considering the Annual Governance Statement, the Finance and Audit Committee also agree the Internal Audit Report from the Council’s Audit and Risk Manager which supports the AGS.

3.9.4 These new arrangements will impact on the reporting arrangements to members. Currently the following reports are presented to members:-

| | | |
|------------|-----------------|---|
| Early June | Executive | Final Accounts report – to review revenue and capital outturn against budget and agree appropriation of any balances. |
| June | Finance & Audit | Agree Annual Governance |

| | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| | Scrutiny Committee | Statement and Internal Audit Annual Report |
| July | Finance and Audit Scrutiny Committee | Note draft Statement of Accounts (including AGS). |
| End September | Finance and Audit Scrutiny Committee | Consider External Auditor's Audit Findings Report on the Statement of Accounts |
| Before 30 September | Council | Formally approve audited Statement of Accounts. |

3.9.5 With the new reporting deadlines, it will not be possible to compress the above arrangements. Consequently an amended reporting regime is proposed.

3.9.6 The Accountants will need to give priority to the completion of the Statement of Accounts over the Final Accounts report to Executive. Consequently the current Final Accounts report is proposed to be reported to Executive in late July.

3.9.7 Within the current June Executive Final Accounts report, the use of any balance is agreed. Fortunately this has always been a surplus balance in recent years, and this has been appropriated to selected reserves. In future it is proposed that any surplus or deficit on the General Fund balance is appropriated to or from the General Fund Balance within the Statement of Accounts. It will then be possible for that appropriation to be reviewed as part of the later July Executive Final Accounts report, with any further allocation reflected in the new year's accounts. Similar arrangements will need to apply for the Housing Revenue Accounts, with the balance being automatically appropriated to/from the HRA Capital Investment Reserve. This changed arrangement for the treatment of balances in from 2016/17 Accounts will need to be agreed by Council, in the near future.

3.9.8 Also within the Final Accounts report in June, proposals for Revenue Slippage (Earmarked Reserves) and Capital Slippage are proposed. In recent years greater effort has gone into identifying these so as to include them in the new year Budget in February. With the Final Accounts report having to be delayed as part of the Early Closedown, there are likely to be problems if some items of revenue or capital slippage are delayed. Consequently, it is proposed that in future the Head of Finance, in consultation with the Finance Portfolio Holder, may agree items of revenue and capital slippage.

3.9.9 The Annual Governance Statement will need to be agreed by the end of May. The proposed committee timetable for 2017-19 incorporates a May Finance and Audit Scrutiny Committee which will enable this to be achieved.

3.9.10 The Audited Statement of Accounts are currently agreed by full Council. Under the Accounts and Audit Regulations, it is possible for this to be delegated to a council's audit committee, but not to a scrutiny committee. Consequently, Warwick District Council has continued to seek full Council approval. Most local authorities do have this function delegated to their audit committee which is generally believed to be a more efficient use of members' time, given the complexity and length of the document. The Council's Constitution does make it clear that the Finance and Audit Scrutiny Committee will act as the Council's audit committee. Also, it should be noted that the agenda of that Committee is structured such that audit and scrutiny items are considered separately. Consequently it is proposed that the approval of the audited Statement of Accounts should be carried out by the Finance and Audit Scrutiny Committee in

future. The Council's External Auditor has considered this proposal and does support this change. This will require a change to the Committee's functions within the Constitution to be agreed by Council.

3.9.11 Whilst the early closedown does not formally come into place until the production of the 2017/18 Statement of Accounts in the Spring of 2018, it is intended that early closedown should be piloted in closing the 2016/17 Accounts, with the reporting deadlines duly brought forward.

3.9.12 With these changes in place, the future reporting cycle for the Statement of Accounts will be as follows:-

| | | |
|------|--------------------------------------|--|
| May | Finance and Audit Scrutiny Committee | Agree Annual Governance Statement and Internal Audit Annual Report |
| July | Executive | Final Accounts report - to review revenue and capital outturn against budget and agree any further appropriation of any balances in new year accounts. |
| July | Finance and Audit Scrutiny Committee | Consider External Auditor's Audit Findings Report on the Statement of Accounts. Formally approve audited Statement of Accounts. |

3.9.13 Closing the Council's accounts, producing the Statement of Accounts (and associated working papers), and producing relevant reports for members are significant tasks. Whilst the bulk of this falls upon the Accountants, the work is reliant on contributions from officers across the Council. Consequently, early closedown is being managed as a project within the 2016/17 Finance Service Plan, with contributions and commitment required from all key stakeholders, including the officers from all services and the Council's External Auditors. The Executive may wish to task Portfolio Holders with ensuring that their Managers agree to meet this commitment.

3.9.14 As part of the early closedown, the following changes and initiatives will need to be pursued:-

- Greater reliance on estimates
- Certain elements of the work by external audit being undertaken earlier in the year
- More tasks undertaken on a rolling basis throughout the year, rather than just a year end
- Reducing the size of the notes to the accounts ("de-cluttering").
- Information from other Service Areas being produced much earlier and within earlier deadlines.

4. Policy Framework

4.1 Policy Framework

This report is in accordance with the Council's Financial Strategy as last approved by the Executive in February. This provides the Council with the resources to deliver its other policies and strategies.

4.2 **Fit for the Future**

One of the 3 Strands of Fit For the Future is ensuring that the Council achieves the required savings to enable it to set a balanced budget whilst also maintaining or improving service provision. This report updates Members on the financial projections for future years, savings required to be found and some of the key issues affecting the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy up to 2020/21.

5. **Budgetary Framework**

- 5.1 Based on the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy that was incorporated into the Fit For the Future report to Executive in June, the Council needed to secure savings of almost £700,000 over the next five years for the General Fund. The report proposed how savings could be made to achieve this. The Medium Term Financial Strategy is currently being updated and will be presented to members later in the year.
- 5.2 The Budget Review Process provides a planning tool to ensure resources are directed to the Council's priorities. Alongside the Council's own activities, external factors influencing its finances are also taken into consideration, for example Central Government Financing, the Business Rates Retention scheme, changes in legislation and the economy.
- 5.3 The Council maintains its Reserves to deliver Capital and other projects, and to ensure that there are sufficient resources available to manage unforeseen demands and continue to deliver its services. Close monitoring of these Reserve balances, together with plans to replenish them will preserve the financial stability of the organisation for future years.

6. **Risks**

- 6.1 The Council's Significant Business Risk Register contains several risks which are finance related. Shortage of finance will impact upon the Council's plans for the provision of services. Reduced income or increased expenditure will reduce the funding available.
- 6.2 The main sources of income which may be subject to reductions include:-
- Government grant (e.g. Revenue Support Grant, Benefits Administration Grant)
 - Business Rates Retention
 - Fees and charges from the provision of services
 - Rent income
 - Investment Income
- 6.3 Increased expenditure in service provision may be due to:-
- Inflation and price increases for supplies and services.
 - Increased demand for services increasing costs
 - Changes to taxation regime
 - Unplanned expenditure
 - Assumed savings in budgets not materialising

6.4 Triggers for increased costs or reduced income include:-

- Economic cycle – impacting upon inflation, interest rates, unemployment, demand for services, Government funding available
- Unplanned expenditure, e.g. Costs from uninsured events, Costs of planning appeals or other legal process
- Project costs – whereby there are unforeseen costs, or the project is not properly costed, or the risks related to them are not properly managed.
- Changes to assumptions underpinning the Medium Term Financial Strategy – these assumptions are closely monitored.

6.5 Key financial staff unavailable (illness, career move, retirement etc.) to provide financial advice or monitor, in conjunction with Managers, budgets and projects.

6.6 Many controls and mitigations are in place to help manage these risks. These include:-

- The comprehensive Budget Review process. This entails all budget managers reviewing their budgets on at least a monthly basis, considering previous, current and future years, along with any possible issues that may impact upon their budgets. As part of this process, Budget Review reports are issued to the Executive and Senior Management Team.
- Financial Planning with the Medium Term Financial Strategy/financial projections, bringing together all issues that will impact on the Council's finances in the medium term.
- Financial controls, including the Codes of Financial and Procurement Practice, system controls, reconciliations, audit (internal and external).
- Project Management and associated controls.
- Trained staff and access to appropriate professional advice (e.g. WCC Legal, Local Government Futures for advice on local government funding). Temporary professional staff to be used to augment resources in the event of staff unavailability.
- Risk Management process across the Council, including the on-going review and maintenance of risk registers.
- Scrutiny by Members of the Council's finances, including Budget Reports, and the financial implications of all proposals brought to them for consideration.
- Within the 2016/17 there is a Contingency Budget with an uncommitted balance of £71,500 (prior to this meeting) for any unplanned or unavoidable expenditure.
- Reserves – Whilst much of these Reserves have already been earmarked for specific projects, it is important that Reserves are held for any unforeseen demands.

- In addition to the reserves, the Council holds the General Fund Balance of £1.5m. This is available to accommodate any unplanned expenditure, or to make up any shortfall in income. However, the Council should seek to maintain the balance at this level.
- The specific causes of reductions to income or increased expenditure should continue to be managed by the relevant Service Area as part of managing the risks within each Service Risk Register. Individual Service Area Risk Registers are brought to Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee every 2 years.

7. Alternative Option(s) considered

- 7.1 Monitoring expenditure and income and maintaining financial projections is good financial management and part of good governance. Accordingly, to propose otherwise is not considered.

Contingency Budget**Appendix A**

| | | |
|---|----------------|-------------------------------|
| | £ | |
| Contingency February Budgets 2015/16 | 239,600 | |
| Final Accounts 2015/16 Report | 231,700 | |
| General Contingency 2016/17 | 471,300 | |
| Coventry and Warks Growth Hub 3 yr contrib. | -31,200 | March Executive |
| Cultural Services Programme Manager extension (September 2017 to March 2018) | -26,000 | March Executive |
| Prosperity Agenda | -25,900 | 6 April Executive |
| St Marys Lands | -75,000 | 6 April Executive |
| Council Relocation | -42,500 | 20 April Executive |
| | -4,700 | |
| | -6,400 | |
| Newbold Terrace East Road Markings | -3,000 | MS 11/5/2016 |
| Review of Internal Audit | -4,500 | MS 12/5/2016 |
| Peer Review | -3,600 | MS 21/6/2016 |
| Lift Restrictive covenant Harbury Land site | -103,000 | Cex urgent request 19/07/2016 |
| Review of Councillors' Allowances | -5,000 | July Executive |
| Cultural Services staff underpayment | -24,000 | July Executive |
| | -2,400 | |
| | -3,600 | |
| WMRF & Cadets Rent Refund | -16,600 | July Executive |
| PCIDSS -compliance - debit/credit charges | -8,400 | MS 20/9/16 |
| Accountancy sickness cover - Agency staff | -10,000 | MS 20/9/16 |
| Cultural Quarter | -4,000 | |
| General available | 71,500 | 15% |

Executive March 2015 - Funding requests

Agenda Number

| | | | | |
|----|--------------------------------|----------|---------------------------------|--------------------|
| 7 | HRA business Plan | £120,000 | Stock condition Survey | HRA |
| 9 | Lillington | £20,000 | Socio-economic research | GF contingency |
| 9 | Lillington | £20,000 | Further master planning work | GF contingency |
| 13 | Kites Nest Lane | £10,000 | Reinstatement costs | GF contingency |
| 14 | Combined Authority | £50,000 | Contribution | GF contingency |
| 19 | Lillington | £600,000 | Property acquisition | HRA |
| 19 | Lillington | £25,000 | Buckley Road Options Agreements | HRA |
| 19 | Lillington | £50,000 | Further technical work | GF contingency/HRA |
| 20 | Asset Management Redesign | £9,200 | Increased revenue costs | GF - recurring |
| 20 | Asset Management Redesign | £3,200 | Increased revenue costs | HRA - recurring |
| 20 | Asset Management Redesign | £31,800 | Retirement/Redundancy | GF ERR |
| 20 | Asset Management Redesign | £6,100 | Retirement/Redundancy | HRA ERR |
| 22 | Strategic Opportunity Proposal | £100,000 | | GF contingency/HRA |

GF Cont

£20,000
£20,000
£10,000
£50,000

£25,000

£50,000
£175,000

Earmarked Reserves as at 30 September 2016

| Description | Total Spend | Latest Annual Budget | Remaining Budget | Spent |
|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|
| | £ | £ | £ | % |
| 1 MOSAIC | 0 | 4,600 | 4,600 | 0.00 |
| 2 Skills Development | 0 | 28,200 | 28,200 | 0.00 |
| 3 Crematorium Rebrand | 0 | 24,000 | 24,000 | 0.00 |
| 4 Procurement | 5,000 | 6,200 | 1,200 | 0.00 |
| 5 Lillington Devel Std | 4,167 | 30,000 | 25,833 | 13.89 |
| 6 Strategic Opportunit | 34,200 | 85,600 | 51,400 | 37.61 |
| 7 Cremat. Generator | 2,625 | 11,000 | 8,375 | 0.00 |
| 8 St Marys Lands Clear | 54,000 | 50,200 | -3,800 | 107.57 |
| 9 ST MICH. LEPER HOSP | 4,100 | 4,100 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 10 Media Monitors | 0 | 2,500 | 2,500 | 0.00 |
| 11 DMC Move | 0 | 8,000 | 8,000 | 0.00 |
| 12 Payroll Development | 0 | 11,000 | 11,000 | 0.00 |

Earmarked Reserves as at 30 September 2016

| Description | Total Spend | Latest Annual Budget | Remaining Budget | Spent |
|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|
| | £ | £ | £ | % |
| 13 Staff Engagement | 300 | 9,000 | 8,700 | 0.00 |
| | 104,392 | 274,400 | 170,008 | 38.04 |

Appendix B1

Narrative

This refers to some work the Spa Centre is having done on segmenting its audiences which will inform its marketing strategy. They have located an agency who can complete this work on its behalf which is scheduled for early Nov 16- so the funds will be used before the end of the financial year

This relates to ESIF Business Support programme. There have been some delays, due to complications surrounding the tendering exercise and subsequently following the outcome of the UK EU referendum vote. However, Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) finally issued the agreement mid August. An invoice for WDC's contribution is imminent and we fully expect to clear the ear-marked reserve before the end of October

Following the work carried out to improve the facilities at Oakley Wood it was agreed that a rebranding exercise would be carried out to raise awareness of the offering at this site. This includes changes to the entrance signs, better on site directional signs, interpretation boards, and stationary branding. This is currently being procured and will be in place before the end of the year.

£5,000 used for Corporate Spend Analysis, balance not required.

The Council's LLP partner (PSP) withdrew support for the proposed scheme in late May. Since then we have been in discussion with another potential partner who is minded to proceed subject to suitable terms being agreed. The project sponsor (Chief Executive) hopes to bring a report forward before the end of the calendar year with recommendations about whether the project should continue, in what form and with what budget.

The overspend is being reviewed

Fully spent

Media monitors have now been purchased. Will be fully spent.

We have taken a decision not to relocate the Corporate Support Team. However there may be some residual costs which we need to accommodate to complete the relocation of Mike in his new role (which is part of this relocation project). Therefore we will be in a position by Christmas to determine if any money is required, which is unlikely.

This is driven by the timeline of Coventry City Council though the development of their own systems and contract. Future plans include utilising holiday & training access for the Self Serve system and a review of the recruitment portal. Present forecast spend against the reserve is £6,800 for training & building reports with a view for the rest of the reserve to be used against development work (based on CCC priorities).

Appendix B1

Narrative

Reserve to be utilised for communications, engagement relating to the Relocation project: training on agile working and managing teams, promotional material, ongoing updates. This has also been allocated linked to the 'Review of Salary Benefits and Recruitment'. As part of the Reward and Recognition stream of this review we have just signed up to a 'Voucher Scheme' enabling staff to access discounted products and services. £3,000 spend in Oct/Nov 2016 as above Approx £6,000 forecast for the training 2016/17 and promotional material for Relocation

HRA Earmarked Reserves as at 30 September 2016**Appendix B2**

| Description | Total Spend | Latest Annual Budget | Remaining Budget | Spent % | Narrative |
|--|--------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|---|
| | £ | £ | £ | % | |
| New Carpeting for Sheltered Schemes | 0 | 10,700 | 10,700 | 0 | The carpets are awaiting for the fire alarms and electrical works to be completed on Chandos Court and then a job will be logged with Ian Williams. To be completed and paid by 31 March 2017 at latest. |
| Stock Condition Survey - HRA Stock | 2,750 | 84,000 | 81,250 | 3.27 | £70,000 of costs with detail 'Stock Condition Survey' on CC 7782. Awaiting confirmation from Matt Jones to transfer to EMR. |
| Chandos Court New Mobility Scooter Store | 0 | 33,000 | 33,000 | 0 | Project Progress: We have provided the final specification to the contractor and we are now awaiting a start date for this project |
| Fire Precaution Works Across HRA Blocks of Flats | 19,029 | 60,000 | 40,971 | 31.72 | Project Progress: All Fire Risk Assessments for HRA Blocks of Flats have been received and the Property Team are now compiling a list of Fire Precaution Works into a Works ProgrammeFramework contractor to undertake these works. |
| Sheltered Schemes Alarm Systems | 0 | 207,000 | 207,000 | 0 | Increased by £136k as per exec 29th June 2016. Fire alarms will be starting shortly Tannery Court (£43,926 allocated) should be starting around 17/10/2016 other schemes will follow on from that. |
| | 21,779 | 394,700 | 372,921 | 5.52 | |

APPENDIX C**Major income budgets v actual 2013-2016****Crematorium**

| | £ | £ | £ | £ | % |
|--|-----------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------|----------|
| | Original budget | latest budget | Actual | variance | variance |
| crematorium fees 2013/14 | -940,300 | -1,105,800 | -1,134,700 | -28,900 | 2.6% |
| crematorium fees 2014/15 | -857,000 | -1,051,000 | -1,051,500 | -500 | 0.0% |
| crematorium fees 2015/16 | -902,600 | -752,800 | -1,045,200 | -292,400 | 38.8% |
| 2016/17 | latest budget | YTD 2016/17 | budget 2015/16 | YTD 2015/16 | |
| crematorium fees 2016/17 | -1,184,700 | -476,300 | -752,800 | -414,200 | |
| percentage of prior year actual/actual YTD | | 45.6% | | 39.6% | |
| Forecast indicative outturn based on prior year profile | | -1,201,900 | | | |
| Manager's Estimated out-turn | | -1,205,200 | | | |

Waste recycling credits

| | Original budget | latest budget | Actual | variance | variance |
|--|-----------------|---|----------------|-------------|----------|
| Recycling credit 2013/14 | -420,000 | -420,000 | -438,900 | -18,900 | 4.5% |
| Recycling credit 2014/15 | -420,000 | -420,000 | -423,500 | -3,500 | 0.8% |
| Recycling credit 2015/16 | -420,000 | -420,000 | -473,800 | -53,800 | 12.8% |
| | latest budget | YTD 2016/17 | budget 2015/16 | YTD 2015/16 | |
| Recycling credit 2016/17 | -440,000 | -112,500 | -420,000 | -18,600 | |
| percentage of prior year actual/actual YTD | | 23.7% | | 3.9% | |
| Forecast indicative outturn based on prior year profile | | N/A due to delays in prior year income | | | |
| Manager's Estimated out-turn | | -440,000 | | | |

Planning

| | Original budget | latest budget | Actual | variance | variance |
|--|-----------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------|----------|
| fees & charges general 2013/14 | -695,700 | -850,000 | -1,088,400 | -238,400 | 28.0% |
| fees & charges general 2014/15 | -695,700 | -896,300 | -1,031,700 | -135,400 | 15.1% |
| fees & charges general 2015/16 | -702,000 | -870,000 | -1,276,300 | -406,300 | 46.7% |
| | latest budget | YTD 2016/17 | budget 2015/16 | YTD 2015/16 | |
| fees & charges general 2016/17 | -1,095,000 | -663,600 | -870,000 | -711,200 | |
| percentage of prior year actual/actual YTD | | 52.0% | | 55.7% | |
| Forecast indicative outturn based on prior year profile | | -1,190,900 | | | |
| Manager's Estimated out-turn | | -1,095,000 | | | |

Car parking

| | Original budget | latest budget | Actual | variance | variance |
|--|-----------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------|----------|
| car parking fees 2013/14 | -2,411,100 | -2,506,100 | -2,766,400 | -260,300 | 10.4% |
| car parking fees 2014/15 | -2,494,100 | -2,706,100 | -2,898,100 | -192,000 | 7.1% |
| car parking fees 2015/16 | -2,606,100 | -2,746,100 | -2,997,200 | -251,100 | 9.1% |
| | latest budget | YTD 2016/17 | budget 2015/16 | YTD 2015/16 | |
| car parking fees 2016/17 | -2,966,100 | -1,599,698 | -2,746,100 | -1,447,178 | |
| percentage of prior year actual/actual YTD | | 53.4% | | 48.3% | |
| Forecast indicative outturn based on prior year profile | | -3,313,100 | | | |
| Manager's Estimated out-turn | | -3,010,000 | | | |


Royal Spa Centre (excludes non WDC admissions income and Artistes fees and expenses WDC)

| | Original budget | latest budget | Actual | variance | variance |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------|----------|
| 2013/14 | -266,100 | -227,100 | -171,400 | 55,700 | -24.5% |
| 2014/15 | -236,800 | -240,400 | -227,200 | 13,200 | -5.5% |
| 2015/16 | -236,700 | -236,700 | -248,700 | -12,000 | 5.1% |
| | latest budget | YTD 2016/17 | budget 2015/16 | YTD 2015/16 | |
| 2016/17 | -238,000 | -245,500 | -236,700 | -240,258 | |
| percentage of prior year actual/actual YTD | | 98.7% | | 96.6% | |
| Forecast indicative outturn based on prior year profile | | -254,100 | | | |
| Manager's Estimated out-turn | | -238,000 | | | |

Leisure Centres

| | Original budget | latest budget | Actual | variance | variance |
|--|-----------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------|----------|
| 2013/14 | -1,822,500 | -1,868,500 | -1,893,700 | -25,200 | 1.3% |
| 2014/15 | -1,862,900 | -1,920,200 | -1,917,800 | 2,400 | -0.1% |
| 2015/16 | -1,979,200 | -2,049,200 | -2,030,700 | 18,500 | -0.9% |
| | latest budget | YTD 2016/17 | budget 2015/16 | YTD 2015/16 | |
| 2016/17 | -2,126,400 | -990,700 | -2,049,200 | -1,045,800 | |
| percentage of prior year actual/actual YTD | | 48.8% | | 51.5% | |
| Forecast indicative outturn based on prior year profile | | -1,923,700 | | | |

This budget is now being reviewed in light of the potential total closures of SNP & NCLC

| | | |
|---|---|--|
|  Executive 2 November 2016 | | Agenda Item No. 4 |
| Title | Review of support to town and parish councils | |
| For further information about this report please contact | Mike Snow 01926 456800 | |
| Wards of the District directly affected | All | |
| Is the report private and confidential and not for publication by virtue of a paragraph of schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, following the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006? | No | |
| Date and meeting when issue was last considered and relevant minute number | Executive 27 July 2016 | |
| Background Papers | Correspondence with parish/town councils | |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Contrary to the policy framework: | No |
| Contrary to the budgetary framework: | No |
| Key Decision? | Yes |
| Included within the Forward Plan? (If yes include reference number) | Yes |
| Equality Impact Assessment Undertaken | No |
| | |

| | | |
|--|-------------|----------------------------|
| Officer/Councillor Approval | | |
| Officer Approval | Date | Name |
| Chief Executive/Deputy Chief Executive | 17/10/2016 | Andy Jones |
| Head of Service | 17/10/2016 | Head of Finance |
| CMT | 17/10/2016 | |
| Section 151 Officer | 17/10/2016 | Mike Snow, Head of Finance |
| Monitoring Officer | 17/10/2016 | Andy Jones |
| Finance | 17/10/2016 | Report from Finance |
| Portfolio Holder(s) | 17/10/2016 | Peter Whiting |
| Consultation & Community Engagement | | |
| Insert details of any consultation undertaken or proposed to be undertaken with regard to this report. Parish and Town Councils plus WALC have been consulted and their views incorporated into the Report | | |
| Final Decision? | | Yes |
| Suggested next steps (if not final decision please set out below) | | |
| | | |

1. **Summary**

- 1.1 In July the Executive considered a report on the funding that that the District Council provides to parish and town councils. Following the agreement of the recommendations, parish and town councils have been consulted on the proposal to reduce the funding. This report considers the responses and makes appropriate recommendations.

2. **Recommendation**

- 2.1 That the Council agrees to reduce the Concurrent service grants to parish and town councils by 50% for 2017/18, and stop this funding from 2018/19.
- 2.2 That the Council agrees to reduce the Council Tax Reduction grants for parish and town councils by 33.3% for 2017/18, 33.3% for 2018/19 and stop the grants from 2019/20.
- 2.3 That the Council reviews the reductions if as part of the Local Government 2017/18 Grant Settlement referendum principles will apply to local parish and town council for 2017/18.

3. **Reasons for the Recommendation**

- 3.1 The report considered by the Executive in July explained how the District Council still provides funding to parish and town councils for concurrent services (£50,000) and Council Tax Grant (£95,000). Many local authorities have ceased to provide this funding as their own funding streams have significantly reduced in recent years. The following links go to the [report](#) and [appendix](#).

- 3.2 The Executive agreed in July:-

That the Parish and Town Councils are consulted in line with the Warwickshire Local Councils' Charter on the following proposed changes in funding:-

- *That the Council agrees to reduce the Concurrent service grants to parish and town councils by 50% for 2017/18, and stop the grants from 2018/19.*
- *That the Council agrees to reduce the Council Tax Reduction funding for parish and town councils by 50% for 2017/18, and stop the grants from 2018/19.*

- 3.3 All 25 parish and town councils were written to (by letter and email) at the start of August to seek their views reducing the support as proposed. Responses were sought by 30 September. The Warwickshire Association of Local Councils (WALC) and Warwickshire Rural Community Council (WRCC) were also approached.
- 3.4 Responses have been received from 16 of the local councils, and from WALC. Those councils not responding tend to be the smaller councils. In monetary terms, the respondents receive 96.1% of Concurrent services allocation and 97.3% of council tax grant.
- 3.5 The responses have been summarised within Appendix A. The details of the individual responses are available on request.
- 3.6 Within the responses, the councils did acknowledge and understand the financial pressures faced by the council and the justification for the withdrawal

of Council Tax Grants. Many also acknowledged that many other district councils have already ceased the support.

- 3.7 The main concern from the proposals was the period for the withdrawal of both streams of funding over the two year period. It was pointed out that the potential increase in the local council element of the council tax may not be acceptable to local residents, and there is lack of time to consult over potential increases. In line with the WALC response, many suggested that the concurrent services funding was reduced over a 3 year period, and the council tax reduction grant over 4 years. The impact of this over future years for individual parish/town councils is shown within Appendix B1.
- 3.8 Taking into account the need for the Council to make savings, as reflected in the Medium Term Financial Strategy, and the proposal to extend the period over which the funding is phased, it is proposed to reduce the concurrent services funding over two years, and the grant over three years. This extends the largest element of the funding, the grant, over an additional year to the period originally proposed. By doing this, it is increasing the savings needed to be found by the Council in 2017/18 and 2018/19 above those currently assumed in the MTFS. This is considered in more detail in section 5. The impact of this over future years for individual parish/town councils is shown within Appendix B2.
- 3.9 Whilst there was overall acceptance of the reduction, Whitnash Town Council is strongly opposed to the removal of the concurrent services support (but accepted the loss of the Council Tax Reduction Grant), as shown within their response. Within the response they note the sums paid by the District Council to maintain neighbourhood open spaces owned by the District Council in addition to the destination parks. It should be noted that the neighbourhood open spaces maintained by the District include some sites that do not really fit into a park category e.g. cemeteries. The District also looks after other areas of open space which have been included as they are classed as green corridors e.g. cycle-paths and connecting footways. The response also suggests that the District Council may wish to maintain Whitnash open spaces instead, for which the cost may prove to be far higher than paid by Whitnash.
- 3.10 Several responses have made reference to the Local Government Finance Settlement Technical Consultation paper issued on 15 September. Within this consultation, the Government is proposing that parish/town councils:-
- Whose Band D precept is higher than that of the lowest charging district council in 2016/17 (£75.46) and
 - That have a total precept of more than £0.5m:

will be subject to the same requirement as district councils to hold a referendum to agree any council tax increase of £5 or 2%, whichever is the higher. The government estimate that this will affect 120 of the 8,800 parish councils nationally. It will be noted that no parish or town councils in Warwick district have council tax or precepts of these levels, and would continue to be well below these levels if the parish funding ceased and local council taxes were increased to compensate.

- 3.11 However, in order to avoid parishes being unduly constrained by referendum principles for taking on responsibilities from other tiers of local government, the Technical Consultation proposes that parishes will not be subject to the

referendum principles, where there has been a transfer of responsibilities and certain conditions are satisfied.

- 3.12 The Consultation also seeks views as to whether to extend the referendum principles to all parish and town councils, in order to reflect the impact of higher increases on local tax payers. Whilst the Government is not advocating this response within the consultation, there is the risk that local parish/town councils may be restrained in increasing their council tax to compensate for the proposed reduction in support from the District.
- 3.13 How the final referendum principles are to be applied should be known as part of the Local Government Grant Settlement (provisional in December, final in February 2017), ahead of the District Council agreeing its budget for 2017/18. If it is apparent that the local parish and town councils are to be restrained in their ability to increase their element of the Council Tax from 2017/18, the District Council should review the extent to which support is reduced.

4. **Policy Framework**

- 4.1 **Policy Framework** – The Council has provided concurrent services for many years. It is believed that these probably started following local government re-organisation in 1974, these being provided under S136 of the 1972 Local Government Act. The Council agreed to provide the Council Tax Reduction payments from 2013/14 when local council tax reduction commenced.
- 4.2 **Fit for the Future** – As detailed in section 5, within the Fit For the Future programme, £145,000 savings are proposed from concurrent services and parish grants towards the additional savings target of circa £700,000 (as included within the June Fit For the Future Executive report).

5. **Budgetary Framework**

- 5.1 Within the Council's budgets there is currently the following funding for parish/town councils:-

| | |
|--|---------|
| • Concurrent Services | £50,500 |
| • Council Tax Reduction Compensation Funding | £95,000 |

- 5.2 Within the 2 June Executive Fit for the Future report, details were included of how the Council should seek to make more savings in future years as funding is reduced further(see para 5.1). Within the proposed savings that was agreed by the Executive to be progressed, is a Review of Concurrent Services and parish support that will generate savings of £145,000. If the Council is not able to make these savings, it will be necessary to seek to make savings elsewhere or to reduce services. As members are aware, significant savings have been made in recent years whilst protecting main services. As a result, identifying new savings initiatives is becoming increasingly difficult.
- 5.3 The original proposal within the June Fit for the Future report was for the £145k funding to cease from 2017/18. However, following the July report where it was proposed to phase the reduction over 2 years, the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) now assumes the funding is phased out over 2 years. This has presented an additional pressure on the forecast 2017/18 Budget.

- 5.4 If the reduction in funding is phased over 3 and 4 years (as discussed in paragraph 3.7) with concurrent services funding over 3 years and the grant over 4 years, the savings profile will be as follows (rounded):-

| | 2017/18 £000 | 2018/19 £000 | 2019/20 £000 | 2020/21 £000 | Total £000 |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| MTFS(rounded) | 70 | 75 | | | 145 |
| Savings Profile | 40 | 40 | 40 | 25 | 145 |
| Additional savings required in year | 30 | 30 | (40) | (25) | 0 |

If funding is reduced as per the WALC proposals, this will present an adverse position to the figures within the Council's MTFS. This means that additional savings will need to be secured in the interim period until the funding has fully reduced by 2020/21, so placing further pressure on the Council's finances and the MTFS.

- 5.5 As discussed in paragraph 3.8, it is proposed that the funding is reduced over 2 years for the concurrent services and 3 years for the grant.

| | 2017/18 £000 | 2018/19 £000 | 2019/20 £000 | 2020/21 £000 | Total £000 |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| MTFS(rounded) | 70 | 75 | | | 145 |
| Savings Profile | 57 | 57 | 31 | 0 | 145 |
| Additional savings required in year | 13 | 18 | (31) | 0 | 0 |

With this profile of reduction to the funding, the additional savings to be found against those assumed in the MTFS are reduced, with savings of £13k and £18k to be found in 2017/18 and 2018/19 respectively. This funding reduction is the basis of the recommendations in 2.1 and 2.2.

6. Risks

- 6.1 If the funding is agreed to continue, this will increase the pressure on the District Council's finances, increasing the other savings to be found and possibly reduce or cease service provision.
- 6.2 Whilst parish/town councils currently have the ability to increase their element of the council tax to cover this funding ceasing, they could choose to cease or reduce the level of service they provide to their local residents.
- 6.3 As suggested in the response from Whitnash TC in paragraph 3.8, there may be pressure on the District Council to take over certain functions from parish/town councils, with the additional costs that be incurred.

7. Alternative Option(s) considered

- 7.1 Members may choose not to progress the savings proposed, or to propose other levels of savings or savings profiles. This will mean the Council will need to seek to identify alternative savings. Paragraph 5.4 shows the savings profile

should the funding be reduced over a 3 year period for concurrent services and 4 years for the grant.

- 7.2 As an alternative, members may wish to consider phasing the reduction of all funding over three years.

| | 2017/18 £000 | 2018/19 £000 | 2019/20 £000 | 2020/21 £000 | Total £000 |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| MTFS(rounded) | 70 | 75 | | | 145 |
| Savings Profile | 48 | 48 | 49 | 0 | 145 |
| Additional savings required in year | 22 | 27 | (49) | 0 | 0 |

Under this scenario, additional savings will be required until 2019/20 over those forming the recommendations, but this is lower than the savings required from the WALC proposal. The impact of this over future years for individual parish/town councils is shown within Appendix B3.

- 7.2 If the grants are maintained, albeit at a lower level, the administrative work involved (for the District and parish/town councils) will still exist

| Joint Parish Council | *Comments on proposed reduction | *Comments on Proposed phased reduction | *Description of Phased reduction Proposed | Precepts |
|------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Baddesley Clinton | Not affected much as only receive Council Tax Grant of £341 | None | None | N/a |
| Baginton PC | <p>“ disappointed that this may become necessary and register our objection to the proposal”</p> <p>“Councillors have asked whether the concept of a 'parachute payment' could be considered for the hardest-hit Councils in the event that the proposed reduction of both the Concurrent Services and Council Tax Reduction Grants are applied over 2-years”</p> | <p>“applying such a devastating reduction of support onto small Parish Councils is irresponsible and unjustified”</p> <p>“Removal of your Grants whilst simultaneously capping precept increases is unprecedented in leaving smaller Parish Council vulnerable. A parachute payment for some Councils, alongside a lengthened withdrawal period, is the key to sustainability for WDC”</p> | <p>22% per annum.</p> <p>“Baginton PC will therefore urge WDC to either abandon or moderate the proposal to cut our funding by 22% per annum”.</p> | <p>“at £34.32 per Band D Property, the Baginton Precept is already at the national average and need to increase by 20% per annum to accommodate the changes”</p> |
| Barford, etc Joint PC | <p>“ withdrawal of financial support can only serve to reduce the provision of such facilities within rural communities and hence lead to greater rural isolation, rural deprivation and greater dependency on private transport”</p> <p>State that “ Barford council has provided a widely recognised recreational facility of some excellence which is now being treated as a destination in its own right with many of our visitors coming from the urban areas declaring our facilities to be far superior for their purposes and enjoyment.”</p> | <p>“If WDC is minded to follow the recommendations to reduce the two important sources of PC funding then we will support the John Crosling of WALC proposal that such funding is withdrawn in a gentle and progressive manner”.</p> | <p>- “A phased out reduction that gives those severely impacted a better chance to change and adapt to the situation.</p> | <p>“an 8.7% increase in precept will replace the loss of funding but empathy for those Councils that cannot respond by an appropriate increase in precepts”.</p> |
| Beausale etc PC, | Not affected as only receive Council Tax Grant of £25. | None | None | None |

| Joint Parish Council | *Comments on proposed reduction | *Comments on Proposed phased reduction | *Description of Phased reduction Proposed | Precepts |
|-----------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| Bishops Tachbrook PC | “This parish currently receives £4,160 as a concurrent service allocation. To reduce this by 50% next year (£2,080) with no grant the following year we do not believe is acceptable. With regard to the Council Tax Reduction Grant, whilst this has been reducing, it is still significant at £1,557 and there is a risk that the number of claimants could increase; an increase that we have no control over” | -“Our suggestion would be a gradual reduction over 5 years which would allow us to gradually adjust to an increased maintenance charge” “ to allow us to adjust and see the full impact” | Proposed reductions as follows: 20% 2017/18 20% 2018/19 20% 2019/20 20% 2020/21 20% 2021/22 | Precepts currently stands at £40.23 and will increase to £45.98 if the funding sources are removed. |
| Bubbenhall PC | The current proposal to cut both by half next year leaves Bubbenhall Parish Council with no time to consult with our community with a view to adjusting our precept according to our priorities. | “In order to build in some time to respond to these changing circumstances- Bubbenhall Parish Council suggests that the Concurrent Services funding is reduced by one third each year so would be phased out by 2019 and that the Council Tax Reduction Grant is cut by a quarter each year to be phased out by 2020”. | Concurrent Services reduction- 33.3% 2017/18 33.3% 2018/19 33.3% 2019/20 Council Tax Reduction Grant; 25% 2017/18 25% 2018/19 25% 2019/20 25% 2020/21 | Precepts currently stands at £36.53 and will increase to £47.82 if the funding sources are removed. |
| Budbrooke PC | Agree to the Council Tax grants cut but are opposed to the cuts in contribution made by WDC for concurrent services. | “ residents in Rural areas should , without question be treated equally , so WDC should continue to repay Budbrooke for the care and maintenance of the same facilities“ “Therefore, we object to any further cut to concurrent services, which had already been reduced some years ago. | None specified | Precepts currently stands at £30.03 and will increase to £37.54 if the funding sources are removed. |
| Burton Green PC | “Burton Green Parish Council had that much to consider at its September meeting that this and other items simply didn't get an airing. Apologies for this. There is | N/A | N/A | Precepts currently stands at £41.75 and will increase to £43.18 if the funding sources are removed. |

| Joint Parish Council | *Comments on proposed reduction | *Comments on Proposed phased reduction | *Description of Phased reduction Proposed | Precepts |
|-------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| | no further meeting between now and 30th September so unless an extension is provided a response will not be forthcoming from Burton Green PC”. | | | |
| Bushwood PC | None | None | None | Not affected by the proposed changes |
| Cubbington PC | “pressure on Warwick District Council to seek savings wherever they can be identified, indicate a review of concurrent services funding is appropriate. Nevertheless, we cannot agree concurrent services funding should cease entirely” | “We feel that a more gradual adjustment to the change in circumstance which is proposed will enable us to better plan any service reductions that are unavoidable, and to phase in any precept increases we may decide are tolerable and/or permissible. Accordingly, we request, if the grant reductions identified in your report are to be implemented, the period over which the grants are tapered to zero is extended to four years, rather than two” | Reduction by 25% over 4 years. | Precepts currently stands at £31.03 and will increase to £37.98 if the funding sources are removed. |
| Eathorpe, etc PC | “We have discussed the removal of the Concurrent Services, and advise you that we are not in favour of the proposals. The reason for its introduction was to compensate for the costs to parish councils for those services already provided for in urban areas. It does, therefore, penalise the rural areas” | No | N/A | Precepts currently stands at £28.60 and will increase to £38.96 if the funding sources are removed. |
| Hatton PC | Not affected as only receive Council Tax Grant of £324 | None | None | N/A |

| Joint Parish Council | *Comments on proposed reduction | *Comments on Proposed phased reduction | *Description of Phased reduction Proposed | Precepts |
|------------------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| Kenilworth Town Council | “Kenilworth Town Council supports Warwick District Council and regrettably accepts the reduction, however Members expressed concern for other Town Councils in the area” | None | N/A | Precepts currently stands at £18.50 but will increase to £19.39 if the funding sources are removed. |
| Lapworth PC | “ but disappointed with the decision to consider withdrawing both grants and with the proposed speed of implementation”. | “Lapworth Parish Council is off the view that this will cascade pressure for Local Parish Councils to increase their proportion of Council Tax demand with little opportunity for advanced consultation or planning” | A gradual implementation/ reduction: 2017/18 25% 2018/19 50% 2019/20 75% 2020/21 remove | Precepts currently stands at £18.66 but will increase to £21.73 if the funding sources are removed. |
| Leamington Spa Town Council | “The Town Council considered this matter at its meeting on 12 th September and resolved that it will support a more gradual phasing out of the concurrent services funding and the Council Tax Reduction Grant. | “It is considered that a phased reduction in support will enable Parishes to plan the necessary adjustments to their Precepts levels whilst enabling the District Council to reduce its budgetary pressures over the four year period”. | Concurrent services funding to be reduced by 33.3% commencing in 2017/18. Council Tax Grant to be reduced by 25% each Year commencing 2017. | Precepts currently stands at £19.74 but will increase to £21.83 if the funding sources are removed. |
| Leek Wootton, etc PC | “recognises the rationale behind WDC’s proposal and made three observations: 1) Will only be able to maintain the same level of service if precepts are increased 2) The significant disparities in the level of funding between parishes and will like to arrange a meeting to discuss. 3) “In the view of the necessary percentage | None | None | Precepts currently stands at £15.02 but will increase to £20.28 if the funding sources are removed. |

| Joint Parish Council | *Comments on proposed reduction | *Comments on Proposed phased reduction | *Description of Phased reduction Proposed | Precepts |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| | increase in the parish precept, it is essential that the District Council publicise the proposed changes so that parishioners can fully understand the basis of the switch... ” | | | |
| Norton Lindsay PC | Minimal impact as only receive £560 concurrent service allocation and £61 Council Tax Grant | None | None | N/A |
| Old Milverton & Blackdown PC | Minimal impact as only receive Council Tax Grant of £351 | None | None | N/A |
| Radford Semele PC | “the impact of the proposal before any change to the precept, above the rate of inflation, is to cut discretionary expenditure to £6,000. The impact of that will be to limit severely the actions of the Parish Council” “if the decision is implemented and other easily available funding sources do not replace it then the Parish Council has sufficient reserves to remain solvent until council elections in 2019” | No | None | Precepts currently stands at £26.06 and will increase to £31.64 if the funding sources are removed. |
| Rowington PC | None | None | None | N/a |
| Shrewley PC | Minimal impact as only receive Council Tax Grant of £125 | None | None | N/a |
| Stoneleigh & Ashow, etc PC | Minimal impact as only receive £170 concurrent service allocation and £466 Council Tax Grant. | None | None | N/a |

| Joint Parish Council | *Comments on proposed reduction | *Comments on Proposed phased reduction | *Description of Phased reduction Proposed | Precepts |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Warwick Town Council | Warwick Town Council support the scheme proposed by WALC | “The Concurrent Services support is cut over three years and the Council Tax Reduction Grant is cut over a four year period. This would enable WDC to reduce its financial pressures by approximately £40,00 a year for three years with the residual figure approaching £24,000 going in the fourth year | Proposed reduction to total WDC budgets as follows:— Concurrent Services - a reduction of £16,863 per year for three years. Grant - a reduction of £23,750 per year for four years. | Precepts currently stands at £28.92 and will increase to £31.45 if the funding sources are removed. |
| Weston -under - Wetherley PC | “For a small council these changes will have significant impact on our funding”. | “I request the amendment in the reduction and withdrawal of grants and funding extended to a period of three years”. | 33.3% in 2017/18 33.3% in 2018/19 33.3% in 2019/20 For both concurrent services allocation and council tax grant. | Precepts currently stands at £26.06 and will increase to £31.64 if the funding sources are removed. |
| Whitnash TC | “Whitnash Town Council strongly objects to the reduction and eventual cessation of concurrent services grant. The removal of both the concurrent services funding and the council tax reduction grant simultaneously is a harsh blow to Parish and Town Councils”. Response challenged the amounts paid by the District Council on neighbourhood open spaces (and destination parks) that it maintains, whilst similar neighbourhood areas will continue to be a cost on parish councils, with double taxation effectively being in force for residents of the parishes. | “The reduction and cessation of concurrent services grant is clear discrimination against our residents who will incur double taxation because our local parks are not classified as ‘destination parks’..” | “The current proposal to cut both grants by half next year leaves Whitnash Town Council and the Parishes with no time to consult with their communities with a view to adjusting precepts to align with our priorities” | Precepts currently stands at £43.48 and will increase to £49.94 if the funding sources are removed. |

| Joint Parish Council | *Comments on proposed reduction | *Comments on Proposed phased reduction | *Description of Phased reduction Proposed | Precepts |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| <p>Warwickshire & West Midlands Association of Local Councils – John Crossling – County Officer</p> | <p>“WALC accepts that WDC will be unable to continue the support they have given to the Parishes in the District but is concerned at the speed of the proposed ending of the scheme”.</p> | <p>“Accordingly I have suggested that the Concurrent Services support is cut over three years and the Council Tax Reduction Grant is cut over a four year period. This would enable WDC to reduce its financial pressures by approximately £40,000 a year for three years with the residual figure approaching £24,000 going in the fourth year”.</p> | <p>Concurrent Services - a reduction of £16,863 per year for three years. Grant - a reduction of £23,750 per year for four years. “If you are able to support this proposal it will demonstrate your firm commitment to the Local Councils Charter and the recognition of the need to support each other during these difficult times.”</p> | <p>Parishes have the ability to compensate for some or all of the loss of income through their precepts; however the Government have just released a consultation document that proposes to extend the referendum principal to Local Councils - starting with the largest Parish councils but potentially extending it to all. If a parish has to run a referendum it is likely to cost in the region of £1,000.</p> |

APPENDIX B1

Concurrent reduced over 3 years and Grant over 4 years.

| Parish | Concurrent Service Allocations | Grant | 2017/18 reduction in funding | 2018/19 reduction in funding | 2019/20 reduction in funding | 2020/21 reduction in funding | Total reduction over 4 years | Band D 2016/17 | Band D 2017/18 | Band D 2018/19 | Band D 2019/20 | Band D 2020/21 | Band D 2017/18 increase | Band D 2018/19 Increase | Band D 2019/20 increase | Band D 2020/21 increase | Precept 2016/17 | Precept 2017/18 | Precept 2018/19 | Precept 2019/20 | Precept 2020/21 |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | % | % | % | % | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ |
| Baddesley Clinton | | 341 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 341 | 39.39 | 40.35 | 41.31 | 42.27 | 43.23 | 2.4% | 2.4% | 2.3% | 2.3% | 3,500 | 3,585 | 3,671 | 3,756 | 3,841 |
| Baginton | 3,690 | 922 | 1,463 | 1,459 | 1,459 | 231 | 4,612 | 34.32 | 39.08 | 43.83 | 48.58 | 49.33 | 13.9% | 12.2% | 10.8% | 1.5% | 10,545 | 12,008 | 13,467 | 14,927 | 15,157 |
| Barford, Sherbourne & Wasperton | 2,290 | 1,415 | 1,119 | 1,116 | 1,116 | 354 | 3,705 | 50.19 | 51.50 | 52.81 | 54.12 | 54.54 | 2.6% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 0.8% | 42,787 | 43,906 | 45,022 | 46,138 | 46,492 |
| Beausale, Haseley, Honiley & Wroxall | | 225 | 56 | 56 | 56 | 56 | 225 | 22.50 | 22.67 | 22.85 | 23.02 | 23.19 | 0.8% | 0.8% | 0.8% | 0.8% | 7,314 | 7,370 | 7,427 | 7,483 | 7,539 |
| Bishops Tachbrook | 4,160 | 1,557 | 1,779 | 1,775 | 1,775 | 389 | 5,717 | 40.23 | 42.02 | 43.80 | 45.59 | 45.98 | 4.4% | 4.2% | 4.1% | 0.9% | 40,000 | 41,779 | 43,553 | 45,328 | 45,717 |
| Bubbenhall | 3,190 | 398 | 1,165 | 1,162 | 1,162 | 100 | 3,588 | 36.53 | 40.20 | 43.85 | 47.51 | 47.82 | 10.0% | 9.1% | 8.3% | 0.7% | 11,602 | 12,767 | 13,929 | 15,091 | 15,190 |
| Budbrooke | 4,540 | 1,080 | 1,786 | 1,782 | 1,782 | 270 | 5,620 | 30.03 | 32.42 | 34.80 | 37.18 | 37.54 | 8.0% | 7.3% | 6.8% | 1.0% | 22,481 | 24,267 | 26,049 | 27,831 | 28,101 |
| Burton Green | | 642 | 161 | 161 | 161 | 161 | 642 | 41.75 | 42.11 | 42.46 | 42.82 | 43.18 | 0.9% | 0.8% | 0.8% | 0.8% | 18,788 | 18,949 | 19,109 | 19,270 | 19,430 |
| Bushwood | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cubbington | 7,780 | 2,538 | 3,233 | 3,225 | 3,225 | 635 | 10,318 | 31.03 | 33.21 | 35.38 | 37.56 | 37.98 | 7.0% | 6.6% | 6.1% | 1.1% | 46,000 | 49,233 | 52,458 | 55,684 | 56,318 |
| Eathorpe, Hunningham, Offchurch, Wappenbury | 2,650 | 125 | 916 | 914 | 914 | 31 | 2,775 | 28.60 | 31.36 | 34.11 | 36.86 | 36.96 | 9.7% | 8.8% | 8.1% | 0.3% | 9,500 | 10,416 | 11,330 | 12,244 | 12,275 |
| Hatton | | 324 | 81 | 81 | 81 | 81 | 324 | 11.23 | 11.32 | 11.40 | 11.49 | 11.57 | 0.8% | 0.8% | 0.8% | 0.7% | 10,600 | 10,681 | 10,762 | 10,843 | 10,924 |
| Kenilworth | | 8,624 | 2,156 | 2,156 | 2,156 | 2,156 | 8,624 | 18.50 | 18.72 | 18.95 | 19.17 | 19.39 | 1.2% | 1.2% | 1.2% | 1.2% | 177,504 | 179,660 | 181,816 | 183,972 | 186,128 |
| Lapworth | 2,950 | 500 | 1,110 | 1,107 | 1,107 | 125 | 3,450 | 18.06 | 19.24 | 20.42 | 21.60 | 21.73 | 6.6% | 6.1% | 5.8% | 0.6% | 17,000 | 18,110 | 19,218 | 20,325 | 20,450 |
| Leamington Spa | | 34,248 | 8,562 | 8,562 | 8,562 | 8,562 | 34,248 | 19.74 | 20.26 | 20.79 | 21.31 | 21.83 | 2.7% | 2.6% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 323,386 | 331,948 | 340,510 | 349,072 | 357,634 |
| Leek Wootton | 2,700 | 103 | 928 | 925 | 925 | 26 | 2,803 | 15.02 | 16.76 | 18.50 | 20.23 | 20.28 | 11.6% | 10.3% | 9.4% | 0.2% | 8,010 | 8,938 | 9,862 | 10,787 | 10,813 |
| Norton Lindsey | | 560 | 61 | 202 | 202 | 15 | 621 | 29.40 | 30.31 | 31.23 | 32.14 | 32.21 | 3.1% | 3.0% | 2.9% | 0.2% | 6,500 | 6,702 | 6,904 | 7,106 | 7,121 |
| Old Milverton & Blackdown | | 351 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 351 | 45.11 | 45.40 | 45.69 | 45.98 | 46.27 | 0.6% | 0.6% | 0.6% | 0.6% | 13,649 | 13,737 | 13,825 | 13,912 | 14,000 |
| Radford Semele | 3,290 | 1,090 | 1,371 | 1,368 | 1,368 | 273 | 4,380 | 26.06 | 27.80 | 29.55 | 31.29 | 31.64 | 6.7% | 6.3% | 5.9% | 1.1% | 20,452 | 21,823 | 23,191 | 24,560 | 24,832 |
| Rowington | 1,260 | 898 | 645 | 644 | 644 | 225 | 2,158 | 39.06 | 40.29 | 41.52 | 42.75 | 43.18 | 3.2% | 3.1% | 3.0% | 1.0% | 20,430 | 21,075 | 21,719 | 22,364 | 22,588 |
| Shrewley | | 125 | 31 | 31 | 31 | 31 | 125 | 14.80 | 14.87 | 14.95 | 15.02 | 15.09 | 0.5% | 0.5% | 0.5% | 0.5% | 6,311 | 6,342 | 6,374 | 6,405 | 6,436 |
| Stoneleigh & Ashow | 170 | 466 | 173 | 173 | 173 | 117 | 636 | 30.36 | 30.68 | 31.01 | 31.33 | 31.55 | 1.1% | 1.1% | 1.0% | 0.7% | 16,263 | 16,436 | 16,609 | 16,783 | 16,899 |
| Warwick | | 29,144 | 7,286 | 7,286 | 7,286 | 7,286 | 29,144 | 28.92 | 29.55 | 30.18 | 30.82 | 31.45 | 2.2% | 2.1% | 2.1% | 2.0% | 334,415 | 341,701 | 348,987 | 356,273 | 363,559 |
| Weston-under-Wetherley | 1,290 | 350 | 518 | 517 | 517 | 88 | 1,640 | 37.86 | 40.65 | 43.44 | 46.22 | 46.69 | 7.4% | 6.8% | 6.4% | 1.0% | 7,031 | 7,549 | 8,066 | 8,584 | 8,671 |
| Whitnash | 10,070 | 9,474 | 5,732 | 5,722 | 5,722 | 2,369 | 19,544 | 43.48 | 45.38 | 47.26 | 49.15 | 49.94 | 4.4% | 4.2% | 4.0% | 1.6% | 131,705 | 137,437 | 143,159 | 148,881 | 151,249 |
| Total Warwick District Council Area | 50,590 | 95,001 | 40,647 | 40,597 | 40,597 | 23,750 | 145,591 | 29.29 | 30.65 | 32.00 | 33.36 | 33.70 | | | | | 1,305,773 | 1,346,420 | 1,387,017 | 1,427,613 | 1,451,364 |

Appendix B2

Concurrent reduced over 2 years and Grant over 3 years

| Parish | Concurrent Service Allocations | Grant | 2017/18 reduction in funding | 2018/19 reduction in | 2019/20 reduction in | 2020/21 reduction in | Total reduction over 4 | Band D 2016/17 | Band D 2017/18 | Band D 2018/19 | Band D 2019/20 | Band D 2020/21 | Band D 2017/18 increase | Band D 2018/19 increase | Band D 2019/20 increase | Band D 2020/21 increase | Precept 2016/17 | Precept 2017/18 | Precept 2018/19 | Precept 2019/20 | Precept 2020/21 |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | % | % | % | % | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ |
| Baddesley Clinton | | 341 | 114 | 114 | 114 | 0 | 341 | 39.39 | 40.67 | 41.95 | 43.23 | 43.23 | 3.2% | 3.1% | 3.0% | 0% | 3,500 | 3,614 | 3,727 | 3,841 | 3,841 |
| Baginton | 3,690 | 922 | 2,153 | 2,152 | 307 | 0 | 4,612 | 34.32 | 41.33 | 48.33 | 49.33 | 49.33 | 20.4% | 16.9% | 2.1% | 0% | 10,545 | 12,698 | 14,850 | 15,157 | 15,157 |
| Barford, Sherbourne & Wasperton | 2,290 | 1,415 | 1,618 | 1,616 | 471 | 0 | 3,705 | 50.19 | 52.09 | 53.98 | 54.54 | 54.54 | 3.8% | 3.6% | 1.0% | 0% | 42,787 | 44,405 | 46,021 | 46,492 | 46,492 |
| Beausale, Haseley, Honiley & Wroxall | | 225 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 0 | 225 | 22.50 | 22.73 | 22.96 | 23.19 | 23.19 | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 0% | 7,314 | 7,389 | 7,464 | 7,539 | 7,539 |
| Bishops Tachbrook | 4,160 | 1,557 | 2,600 | 2,598 | 518 | 0 | 5,717 | 40.23 | 42.85 | 45.46 | 45.98 | 45.98 | 6.5% | 6.1% | 1.1% | 0% | 40,000 | 42,600 | 45,199 | 45,717 | 45,717 |
| Bubbenhall | 3,190 | 398 | 1,728 | 1,728 | 133 | 0 | 3,588 | 36.53 | 41.97 | 47.41 | 47.82 | 47.82 | 14.9% | 13.0% | 0.9% | 0% | 11,602 | 13,330 | 15,057 | 15,190 | 15,190 |
| Budbrooke | 4,540 | 1,080 | 2,631 | 2,630 | 360 | 0 | 5,620 | 30.03 | 33.55 | 37.06 | 37.54 | 37.54 | 11.7% | 10.5% | 1.3% | 0% | 22,481 | 25,112 | 27,741 | 28,101 | 28,101 |
| Burton Green | | 642 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 0 | 642 | 41.75 | 42.23 | 42.70 | 43.18 | 43.18 | 1.1% | 1.1% | 1.1% | 0% | 18,788 | 19,002 | 19,216 | 19,430 | 19,430 |
| Bushwood | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cubbington | 7,780 | 2,538 | 4,738 | 4,735 | 845 | 0 | 10,318 | 31.03 | 34.22 | 37.41 | 37.98 | 37.98 | 10.3% | 9.3% | 1.5% | 0% | 46,000 | 50,738 | 55,473 | 56,318 | 56,318 |
| Eathorpe, Hunningham, Offchurch, Wappenbury | 2,650 | 125 | 1,367 | 1,367 | 42 | 0 | 2,775 | 28.60 | 32.72 | 36.83 | 36.96 | 36.96 | 14.4% | 12.6% | 0.3% | 0% | 9,500 | 10,867 | 12,233 | 12,275 | 12,275 |
| Hatton | | 324 | 108 | 108 | 108 | 0 | 324 | 11.23 | 11.35 | 11.46 | 11.57 | 11.57 | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 0% | 10,600 | 10,708 | 10,816 | 10,924 | 10,924 |
| Kenilworth | | 8,624 | 2,880 | 2,872 | 2,872 | 0 | 8,624 | 18.50 | 18.80 | 19.10 | 19.39 | 19.39 | 1.6% | 1.6% | 1.6% | 0% | 177,504 | 180,384 | 183,256 | 186,128 | 186,128 |
| Lapworth | 2,950 | 500 | 1,642 | 1,642 | 167 | 0 | 3,450 | 18.06 | 19.81 | 21.55 | 21.73 | 21.73 | 9.7% | 8.8% | 0.8% | 0% | 17,000 | 18,642 | 20,284 | 20,450 | 20,450 |
| Leamington Spa | | 34,248 | 11,439 | 11,405 | 11,405 | 0 | 34,248 | 19.74 | 20.44 | 21.14 | 21.83 | 21.83 | 3.5% | 3.4% | 3.3% | 0% | 323,386 | 334,825 | 346,229 | 357,634 | 357,634 |
| Leek Wootton | 2,700 | 103 | 1,384 | 1,384 | 34 | 0 | 2,803 | 15.02 | 17.62 | 20.21 | 20.28 | 20.28 | 17.3% | 14.7% | 0.3% | 0% | 8,010 | 9,394 | 10,779 | 10,813 | 10,813 |
| Norton Lindsey | | 560 | 300 | 300 | 20 | 0 | 621 | 29.40 | 30.76 | 32.12 | 32.21 | 32.21 | 4.6% | 4.4% | 0.3% | 0% | 6,500 | 6,800 | 7,101 | 7,121 | 7,121 |
| Old Milverton & Blackdown | | 351 | 117 | 117 | 117 | 0 | 351 | 45.11 | 45.50 | 45.88 | 46.27 | 46.27 | 0.9% | 0.8% | 0.8% | 0% | 13,649 | 13,766 | 13,883 | 14,000 | 14,000 |
| Radford Semele | 3,290 | 1,090 | 2,009 | 2,008 | 363 | 0 | 4,380 | 26.06 | 28.62 | 31.17 | 31.64 | 31.64 | 9.8% | 8.9% | 1.5% | 0% | 20,452 | 22,461 | 24,469 | 24,832 | 24,832 |
| Rowington | 1,260 | 898 | 930 | 929 | 299 | 0 | 2,158 | 39.06 | 40.84 | 42.61 | 43.18 | 43.18 | 4.5% | 4.3% | 1.3% | 0% | 20,430 | 21,360 | 22,289 | 22,588 | 22,588 |
| Shrewley | | 125 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 0 | 125 | 14.80 | 14.90 | 15.00 | 15.09 | 15.09 | 0.7% | 0.7% | 0.7% | 0% | 6,311 | 6,353 | 6,394 | 6,436 | 6,436 |
| Stoneleigh & Ashow | 170 | 466 | 241 | 240 | 155 | 0 | 636 | 30.36 | 30.81 | 31.26 | 31.55 | 31.55 | 1.5% | 1.5% | 0.9% | 0% | 16,263 | 16,504 | 16,744 | 16,899 | 16,899 |
| Warwick | | 29,144 | 9,734 | 9,705 | 9,705 | 0 | 29,144 | 28.92 | 29.77 | 30.61 | 31.45 | 31.45 | 2.9% | 2.8% | 2.7% | 0% | 334,415 | 344,149 | 353,854 | 363,559 | 363,559 |
| Weston-under-Wetherley | 1,290 | 350 | 762 | 762 | 117 | 0 | 1,640 | 37.86 | 41.96 | 46.07 | 46.69 | 46.69 | 10.8% | 9.8% | 1.4% | 0% | 7,031 | 7,793 | 8,554 | 8,671 | 8,671 |
| Whitnash | 10,070 | 9,474 | 8,199 | 8,190 | 3,155 | 0 | 19,544 | 43.48 | 46.19 | 48.89 | 49.94 | 49.94 | 6.2% | 5.9% | 2.1% | 0% | 131,705 | 139,904 | 148,094 | 151,249 | 151,249 |
| Total Warwick District Council Area | 50,590 | 95,001 | 57,025 | 56,930 | 31,635 | 0 | 145,591 | 29.29 | 31.27 | 33.25 | 33.70 | 33.70 | | | | | 1,305,773 | 1,362,798 | ##### | 1,451,364 | 1,451,364 |

APPENDIX B3

Concurrent reduced over 3 years and Grant over 3 years.

| Parish | Concurrent Service Allocations | Grant | 2017/18 reduction in funding | 2018/19 reduction in funding | 2019/20 reduction in funding | 2020/21 reduction in funding | Total reduction over 4 years | Band D 2016/17 | Band D 2017/18 | Band D 2018/19 | Band D 2019/20 | Band D 2020/21 | Band D 2017/18 increase | Band D 2018/19 increase | Band D 2019/20 increase | Band D 2020/21 increase | Precept 2016/17 | Precept 2017/18 | Precept 2018/19 | Precept 2019/20 | Precept 2020/21 |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | % | % | % | % | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ |
| Baddesley Clinton | | 341 | 114 | 114 | 114 | 0 | 341 | 39.39 | 40.67 | 41.95 | 43.23 | 43.23 | 3.2% | 3.1% | 3.0% | 0.0% | 3,500 | 3,614 | 3,727 | 3,841 | 3,841 |
| Baginton | 3,690 | 922 | 1,540 | 1,536 | 1,536 | 0 | 4,612 | 34.32 | 39.34 | 44.33 | 49.33 | 49.33 | 14.6% | 12.7% | 11.3% | 0.0% | 10,545 | 12,085 | 13,621 | 15,157 | 15,157 |
| Barford, Sherbourne & Wasperton | 2,290 | 1,415 | 1,237 | 1,234 | 1,234 | 0 | 3,705 | 50.19 | 51.64 | 53.09 | 54.54 | 54.54 | 2.9% | 2.8% | 2.7% | 0.0% | 42,787 | 44,024 | 45,258 | 46,492 | 46,492 |
| Beausale, Haseley, Honiley & Wroxall | | 225 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 0 | 225 | 22.50 | 22.73 | 22.96 | 23.19 | 23.19 | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 0.0% | 7,314 | 7,389 | 7,464 | 7,539 | 7,539 |
| Bishops Tachbrook | 4,160 | 1,557 | 1,909 | 1,904 | 1,904 | 0 | 5,717 | 40.23 | 42.15 | 44.07 | 45.98 | 45.98 | 4.8% | 4.5% | 4.3% | 0.0% | 40,000 | 41,909 | 43,813 | 45,717 | 45,717 |
| Bubbenhall | 3,190 | 398 | 1,198 | 1,195 | 1,195 | 0 | 3,588 | 36.53 | 40.30 | 44.06 | 47.82 | 47.82 | 10.3% | 9.3% | 8.5% | 0.0% | 11,602 | 12,800 | 13,995 | 15,190 | 15,190 |
| Budbrooke | 4,540 | 1,080 | 1,877 | 1,871 | 1,871 | 0 | 5,620 | 30.03 | 32.54 | 35.04 | 37.54 | 37.54 | 8.4% | 7.7% | 7.1% | 0.0% | 22,481 | 24,358 | 26,230 | 28,101 | 28,101 |
| Burton Green | | 642 | 214 | 214 | 214 | 0 | 642 | 41.75 | 42.23 | 42.70 | 43.18 | 43.18 | 1.1% | 1.1% | 1.1% | 0.0% | 18,788 | 19,002 | 19,216 | 19,430 | 19,430 |
| Bushwood | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cubbington | 7,780 | 2,538 | 3,446 | 3,436 | 3,436 | 0 | 10,318 | 31.03 | 33.35 | 35.67 | 37.98 | 37.98 | 7.5% | 6.9% | 6.5% | 0.0% | 46,000 | 49,446 | 52,882 | 56,318 | 56,318 |
| Eathorpe, Hunningham, Offchurch, Wappenbury | 2,650 | 125 | 927 | 924 | 924 | 0 | 2,775 | 28.60 | 31.39 | 34.17 | 36.96 | 36.96 | 9.8% | 8.9% | 8.1% | 0.0% | 9,500 | 10,427 | 11,351 | 12,275 | 12,275 |
| Hatton | | 324 | 108 | 108 | 108 | 0 | 324 | 11.23 | 11.35 | 11.46 | 11.57 | 11.57 | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 0.0% | 10,600 | 10,708 | 10,816 | 10,924 | 10,924 |
| Kenilworth | | 8,624 | 2,880 | 2,872 | 2,872 | 0 | 8,624 | 18.50 | 18.80 | 19.10 | 19.39 | 19.39 | 1.6% | 1.6% | 1.6% | 0.0% | 177,504 | 180,384 | 183,256 | 186,128 | 186,128 |
| Lapworth | 2,950 | 500 | 1,152 | 1,149 | 1,149 | 0 | 3,450 | 18.06 | 19.29 | 20.51 | 21.73 | 21.73 | 6.8% | 6.3% | 6.0% | 0.0% | 17,000 | 18,152 | 19,301 | 20,450 | 20,450 |
| Leamington Spa | | 34,248 | 11,439 | 11,405 | 11,405 | 0 | 34,248 | 19.74 | 20.44 | 21.14 | 21.83 | 21.83 | 3.5% | 3.4% | 3.3% | 0.0% | 323,386 | 334,825 | 346,229 | 357,634 | 357,634 |
| Leek Wootton | 2,700 | 103 | 936 | 933 | 933 | 0 | 2,803 | 15.02 | 16.78 | 18.53 | 20.28 | 20.28 | 11.7% | 10.4% | 9.4% | 0.0% | 8,010 | 8,946 | 9,880 | 10,813 | 10,813 |
| Norton Lindsey | 560 | 61 | 207 | 207 | 207 | 0 | 621 | 29.40 | 30.34 | 31.27 | 32.21 | 32.21 | 3.2% | 3.1% | 3.0% | 0.0% | 6,500 | 6,707 | 6,914 | 7,121 | 7,121 |
| Old Milverton & Blackdown | | 351 | 117 | 117 | 117 | 0 | 351 | 45.11 | 45.50 | 45.88 | 46.27 | 46.27 | 0.9% | 0.8% | 0.8% | 0.0% | 13,649 | 13,766 | 13,883 | 14,000 | 14,000 |
| Radford Semele | 3,290 | 1,090 | 1,463 | 1,459 | 1,459 | 0 | 4,380 | 26.06 | 27.92 | 29.78 | 31.64 | 31.64 | 7.1% | 6.7% | 6.2% | 0.0% | 20,452 | 21,915 | 23,373 | 24,832 | 24,832 |
| Rowington | 1,260 | 898 | 721 | 719 | 719 | 0 | 2,158 | 39.06 | 40.44 | 41.81 | 43.18 | 43.18 | 3.5% | 3.4% | 3.3% | 0.0% | 20,430 | 21,151 | 21,869 | 22,588 | 22,588 |
| Shrewley | | 125 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 0 | 125 | 14.80 | 14.90 | 15.00 | 15.09 | 15.09 | 0.7% | 0.7% | 0.7% | 0.0% | 6,311 | 6,353 | 6,394 | 6,436 | 6,436 |
| Stoneleigh & Ashow | 170 | 466 | 212 | 212 | 212 | 0 | 636 | 30.36 | 30.75 | 31.15 | 31.55 | 31.55 | 1.3% | 1.3% | 1.3% | 0.0% | 16,263 | 16,475 | 16,687 | 16,899 | 16,899 |
| Warwick | | 29,144 | 9,734 | 9,705 | 9,705 | 0 | 29,144 | 28.92 | 29.77 | 30.61 | 31.45 | 31.45 | 2.9% | 2.8% | 2.7% | 0.0% | 334,415 | 344,149 | 353,854 | 363,559 | 363,559 |
| Weston-under-Wetherley | 1,290 | 350 | 548 | 546 | 546 | 0 | 1,640 | 37.86 | 40.81 | 43.75 | 46.69 | 46.69 | 7.8% | 7.2% | 6.7% | 0.0% | 7,031 | 7,579 | 8,125 | 8,671 | 8,671 |
| Whitnash | 10,070 | 9,474 | 6,528 | 6,508 | 6,508 | 0 | 19,544 | 43.48 | 45.64 | 47.79 | 49.94 | 49.94 | 5.0% | 4.7% | 4.5% | 0.0% | 131,705 | 138,233 | 144,741 | 151,249 | 151,249 |
| Total Warwick District Council Area | 50,590 | 95,001 | 48,627 | 48,482 | 48,482 | 0 | 145,591 | 29.29 | 30.76 | 32.23 | 33.70 | 33.70 | | | | | 1,305,773 | 1,354,400 | ##### | 1,451,364 | 1,451,364 |