

GENERAL FUND REVENUE ACCOUNT - 3 YEAR PROJECTION
(@ October 2002)

<u>DETAIL</u>	<u>Budget</u> <u>2002/03</u> £	<u>Forecast</u> <u>2003/04</u> £	<u>Forecast</u> <u>2004/05</u> £	<u>Forecast</u> <u>2005/06</u> £
Environmental Services	2,924,540	2,997,654	3,072,595	3,149,410
Housing & Community Services	2,849,110	2,920,338	2,993,346	3,068,180
Finance & Management	3,827,860	3,923,557	4,021,645	4,122,187

Total Committee Spending **9,601,510 9,841,548 10,087,586 10,339,776**

Capital Financing Adjustment	-567,920	-582,118	-596,671	-611,588
Adjustment for Deferred Charges	-830,460	-851,222	-872,502	-894,315
Commutation Adjustment	-443,470	-265,565	-175,973	-133,000

Net Spending **7,759,660 8,142,643 8,442,440 8,700,874**

Contingencies

Bad and Doubtful Debts	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000
Local Plan	-9,000	92,500	-89,500	0
Local Elections	0	40,000	0	0
Print Room Deficit	16,000	16,000	16,000	16,000
Regradings	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000

Known Variations

Reduction in Pension Contributions	-19,690	-19,690	-19,690	-19,690
Net Savings in CEC Accounts	-10,490	-10,490	-10,490	-10,490
Car Leasing Scheme/Cash Alternative *	0	22,000	22,000	-19,000
Leasing *	0	40,000	40,000	40,000
Census	0	-2,500	-2,500	-2,500
Equalisation of Travel Concession Scheme	0	21,400	21,400	21,400
2002/2003 Pay Settlement	22,600	45,500	45,500	45,500
Increase in Employer's N.I. Rates	0	37,500	37,500	37,500
Backfunded Pensions falling out	0	-30,000	-75,000	-55,000
Increase in Insurance Premiums	48,000	48,000	48,000	48,000
Legal Fees	15,000	0	0	0
* Net projected overspend as per week 17 monitoring	46,000	46,000	46,000	46,000

Approved Service Developments

Contribution to Asian Over 60's Club	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Legal & Member Services' Restructure	18,250	18,250	18,250	18,250
Regrading of Housing Advice Officers	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
IT & Customer Services Restructure	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000

One-off Developments approved in January 02

Community Strategy	0	-5,000	-5,000	-5,000
Gresley Cemetery - Gate Pillars	0	-3,000	-3,000	-3,000
Tree Maintenance - Stenson Fields	0	-5,000	-5,000	-5,000
Repairs - GHBC	0	-7,500	-7,500	-7,500
Litter Bins	0	-5,000	-5,000	-5,000
Tourism Economic Impact Assessment	0	-1,800	-1,800	-1,800
District Boundary Signs	0	-5,500	-5,500	-5,500
Civic Offices - Lift Maintenance	0	-1,500	-1,500	-1,500
Refuse Collection - Jubilee Tuesday	0	-6,000	-6,000	-6,000

GENERAL FUND REVENUE ACCOUNT - 3 YEAR PROJECTION
(@ October 2002)

<u>DETAIL</u>	<u>Budget</u> <u>2002/03</u> £	<u>Forecast</u> <u>2003/04</u> £	<u>Forecast</u> <u>2004/05</u> £	<u>Forecast</u> <u>2005/06</u> £
On-going costs of capital projects approved in January 2002				
Financial Management System	0	25,000	25,000	25,000
Maurice Lee Park	0	0	24,000	24,000

Developments approved in July 2002

Gresley Common	12,500	0	0	0
Play Equipment	2,500	0	0	0
Leisure Centre Car Park	3,500	0	0	0
Refurbishment of Council Offices	20,000	0	0	0
Crime Reduction in Parks	3,000	0	0	0
Derby & Sandiacre Canal Trust	2,000	0	0	0
Environmental Health System	950	0	0	0
Elections & Administrative Assistant	9,500	9,000	9,500	9,500
Continuation of Recycling Centres	13,500	15,750	15,750	15,750
Land Searches	8,750	15,500	15,500	15,500
Collection of side refuse after bank holidays	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000

On-going costs of capital projects approved in July 2002

Coton Community Park	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
New Play Equipment	0	500	500	500

NET REVENUE EXPENDITURE

8,046,530	8,616,563	8,673,860	9,000,794
------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------

FINANCING (Income)

Revenue Support Grant	1,268,000	1,293,360	1,319,227	1,345,612
Redistributed Business Rates	3,460,000	3,529,200	3,599,784	3,671,780
Council Tax	3,235,881	3,415,786	3,638,513	3,875,919
Transfers from Earmarked Reserves	16,000	0	0	0

7,979,881	8,238,346	8,557,524	8,893,310
------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------

Contribution from / to(-) Usable Reserves	66,649	378,217	116,336	107,483
---	--------	---------	---------	---------

TOTAL FINANCING

8,046,530	8,616,563	8,673,860	9,000,794
------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------

USABLE RESERVES

Balance as at 1st April	1,904,468	1,516,819	873,037	580,727
General Fund Surplus / Deficit (-)	-66,649	-378,217	-116,336	-107,483
Contribution to Commutation Reserve	-321,000	-265,565	-175,973	-133,000
Contribution to other Earmarked Reserves	0	0	0	0

Balance as at 31st March

1,516,819	873,037	580,727	340,244
------------------	----------------	----------------	----------------

HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT 3-Year Projection
 (@ October 2002)

	<u>Budget</u> 2002/03	<u>Forecast</u> 2003/04	<u>Forecast</u> 2004/05	<u>Forecast</u> 2005/06
	£	£	£	£
Main Summary Account				
Expenditure on Repairs & Maintenance	4,459,010	4,570,485	4,684,747	4,801,866
Rent Rebates	4,837,910	4,958,858	5,082,829	5,209,900
Capital Charges	1,037,810	1,037,810	1,037,810	1,037,810
	10,334,730	10,567,153	10,805,387	11,049,576
Rent Income	-8,669,130	-8,634,494	-8,644,238	-8,662,277
Housing Subsidy	-1,382,750	-1,537,478	-1,673,892	-1,790,332
Other Income	-231,870	-237,667	-243,608	-249,699
	-10,283,750	-10,409,639	-10,561,738	-10,702,307
	50,980	157,514	243,649	347,269
Known/Potential Variations				
Non Recurring Items	0	-57,510	-57,510	-57,510
Reduction in Pension Contributions	-5,730	-5,730	-5,730	-5,730
Stock Condition Survey B/F	50,000	0	0	0
Housing Repairs B/F	85,000	0	0	0
Balance to Fund Change & Impt Programme	13,000	0	0	0
Sheltered Housing - Key Storage	2,000	0	0	0
2002/2003 Pay Settlement	5,700	11,400	11,400	11,400
Increase in Employer's N.I. Rates	0	9,500	9,500	9,500
Ex-gratia Payments	17,700	0	0	0
Increase in Insurance Premiums	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000
Upgrading Internal Fire Doors	4,700	4,700	4,700	4,700
Subsidy - Change to Methodology	0	50,000	50,000	50,000
Deficit / Surplus (-) for Year	235,350	181,874	268,009	371,629
Balances B/F	1,262,565	1,027,215	845,341	577,332
(Deficit) / Surplus (-) as above	-235,350	-181,874	-268,009	-371,629
Balances C/F	1,027,215	845,341	577,332	205,703

HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT 3-Year Projection
 (@ October 2002)

	<u>Budget</u> 2002/03	<u>Forecast</u> 2003/04	<u>Forecast</u> 2004/05	<u>Forecast</u> 2005/06
	£	£	£	£
Main Summary Account				
Expenditure on Repairs & Maintenance	4,459,010	4,570,485	4,684,747	4,801,866
Rent Rebates	4,837,910	4,958,858	5,082,829	5,209,900
Capital Charges	1,037,810	1,037,810	1,037,810	1,037,810
Rent Income	-8,669,130	-8,634,494	-8,644,238	-8,662,277
Housing Subsidy	-1,382,750	-1,537,478	-1,673,892	-1,790,332
Other Income	-231,870	-237,667	-243,608	-249,699

Known/Potential Variations

Non Recurring Items	0	-57,510	-57,510	-57,510
Reduction in Pension Contributions	-5,730	-5,730	-5,730	-5,730
Stock Condition Survey B/F	50,000	0	0	0
Housing Repairs B/F	85,000	0	0	0
Balance to Fund Change & Impt Programme	13,000	0	0	0
Sheltered Housing - Key Storage	2,000	0	0	0
2002/2003 Pay Settlement	5,700	11,400	11,400	11,400
Increase in Employer's N.I. Rates	0	9,500	9,500	9,500
Ex-gratia Payments	17,700	0	0	0
Increase in Insurance Premiums	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000
Upgrading Internal Fire Doors	4,700	4,700	4,700	4,700
Subsidy - Change to Methodology	0	50,000	50,000	50,000

Deficit / Surplus (-) for Year	235,350	181,874	268,009	371,629
Balances B/F	1,262,565	1,027,215	845,341	577,332
(Deficit) / Surplus (-) as above	-235,350	-181,874	-268,009	-371,629
Balances C/F	1,027,215	845,341	577,332	205,703

BUDGET TIMETABLE 2002/3

Date	ACTION	RO
26/6	Service & Financial Planning Meeting – consider out-turn and growth proposals that can be accommodated.	CFO
25/7	Finance & Management ❖ Report on out-turn for General Fund & Housing Revenue Account	CFO
26/9	COUNCIL – ❖ Submission of Statement of Accounts (2001/2)	CFO
End Sept	DEADLINE – Budget Guidance to be prepared and distributed to all Divisional Managers.	CFO/ FSM
Wk 1 Oct	Meeting with Heads of Department – discuss with heads of department savings/growth priorities/targets in their area.	CFO FSM
Wk 4 Oct	Second meeting with Heads of Department – discuss savings proposals that will be submitted by their department as well as their views on their departments priority growth items.	CFO FSM CMT
30/10	CMT – consider presentation from Divisional Managers from Environmental & Development Services on Service Plans (i.e. John Hansed, David Soanes, John Birkett, Mark Alflat)	DM
1/11	DEADLINE – Briefing reports on six monthly progress within Service Plans forwarded to Policy prior to despatch to members	PBV DM
6/11	CMT – consider presentation from Divisional Managers from Housing & Community Services on Service Plans (i.e. Stuart Bachelor, Housing Services plus Chris Swain, Joy Willoughby)	DM
7/11	COUNCIL – consider corporate plan	DCE
13/11	CMT – consider presentation from Divisional Managers from Central Services on Service Plans (i.e. Legal & Democratic Services, Sally Knight, Kevin Stackhouse, Tony Stamper, IT Services)	DM
14/11	Environmental & Development Services Committee – consider Service Plans	DCE
15/11	DEADLINE for divisional managers ❖ Submission of Capital and Revenue Growth proposals	DM
21/11	Housing & Community Services – consider Service Plans	HCS
W/c 17/11	One day member/officer meeting to assess capital proposals against agreed criteria	CFO
W/c 25/11	One day member/officer meeting to assess revenue proposals and savings options against criteria agreed by Finance & Management	CFO
28/11	Finance & Management Committee – consider Service Plans	CE CFO
30/11	DEADLINE for ❖ Calculation of Base Budget Position	FSM
End Nov	LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE SETTLEMENT (provisional)	
11/12	Service & Financial Planning Working Group (1 day) to consider savings and growth proposals	CFO
7/1	Environmental & Development Services ❖ Consider budget proposals ❖ Consider capital bids	CFO/ DCE
9/1	Housing & Community Services ❖ Consider budget proposals ❖ Consider capital bids	CFO/ HCS

BUDGET TIMETABLE 2002/3

Date	ACTION	RO
16/1	Finance & Management ❖ Consider F&M revenue & capital budget proposals ❖ Agrees overall budget revenue proposals for consultation ❖ Agree proposed corporate capital programme	CFO/ CE
23/1	COUNCIL ❖ Approve Council tax base ❖ Considers District Audit Management Letter	CFO/ RBM
27/1	Finance & Management (Special) – undertake consultation with Business and voluntary groups on budget proposals. (Corporate Services Scrutiny Committee in attendance)	
27/1	Corporate Services Scrutiny Meeting – invite representations from ❖ Trade Unions	CFO/ DCE
End Jan	LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE SETTLEMENT (final)	
20/1 TO 6/2	Schedule Area Meeting for public consultaion on budget proposals	LDSM/ CFO/ FSM
10/2	Corporate Services Scrutiny Meeting – report on consultation process and proposals to Finance & Management – meeting no later than 18/2	CFO/ DCE
18/2	Finance & Management ❖ Consider final budget proposals in the light of the Final Local Government finance settlement ❖ Consider representation from Scrutiny Committee ❖ Agree budget proposals for submission to Budget Council	CFO
	County Council Budget Meeting	
27/2	BUDGET COUNCIL ❖ Set Council budget ❖ Agree Best Value Performance Plan (Shortened Format)	CFO DCE

REVENUE SPENDING BIDS - SCORING SYSTEM

1 <u>To what extent are we already committed (10% Weighting)</u>		(Weight)
Totally unavoidable	2	10
Could ignore/delay at a cost	1	5
It is avoidable at little or no cost	0	0
2 <u>Costs (5% Weighting)</u>		
The costs can be fully met by savings elsewhere	2	5
The costs can be partly met by savings elsewhere	1	2
None of the costs can be met by other savings	0	0
3 <u>For how long is the funding required (5% Weighting)</u>		
1 year only	4	5
2 years	3	3
3 years	2	2
On-going	1	1
4 <u>Can future efficiencies be made (10% Weighting)</u>		
Almost certainly (and these can be reasonably estimated)	2	10
Possibly (but need investigating)	1	5
No	0	0
5 <u>How much External Finance is available (10% Weighting)</u>		
75%+	4	10
50% to 74%	3	7
25% to 49%	2	5
< 25%	1	2
Nil	0	0
6 <u>How certain & secure is it (10% Weighting)</u>		
Definitely	3	10
Possibly	2	6
Potentially	1	3
No	0	0
7 <u>Is it Statutory (10% Weighting)</u>		
Yes	1	10
No	0	0

8 What contribution will it make to Government targets & initiatives
(10% Weighting)

Essential contribution	3	10
Key contribution	2	6
Minor contribution	1	3
No contribution	0	0

9 What contribution will it make to the Council's Key Aims
(25% Weighting)

Essential contribution	3	25
Key contribution	2	16
Minor contribution	1	8
No contribution	0	0

10 What contribution will it make to Service Plans (5% Weighting)

Essential contribution	3	5
Key contribution	2	3
Minor contribution	1	1
No contribution	0	0

PRIORITISING CAPITAL SPENDING: ASSESSMENT CRITERIA**EXTERNAL FINANCE (20% Weighting)**

1. *Has money been set aside to provide the capital provision for the Council element of the scheme?*

3	Resources set aside within Capital Programme
2	Committee approval with capital resources identified for scheme
1	Committee approval with no specific resources identified
0	No approval/resources identified

2. *How secure is the external finance.*

3	Bd accepted – all finance secure or Not reliant on external finance
2	Major finance – bid accepted and secure
1	Bid submitted for finance
0	No bids made

3. *What conditions apply to the external finance?*

3	No conditions made – freely available
2	Few conditions made
1	Conditions made but steps in place to achieve them
0	Many conditions affecting the implementation of the scheme

SUSTAINABILITY (Weighting 30%)

4. *How have the capital costs been assessed?*

3	Estimates over the last 12 months with professional input
2	Estimates produced over 12 months ago but uprated for inflation
1	Some attempt to estimate costs based on similar schemes
0	No detailed estimated

5. *What action could be taken if the final capital costs exceeded the budget?*

3	Potential to reduce the scheme without a major impact
2	Reduction in scheme will have a discernible impact
1	Reduction in scheme will have significant impact on key objectives
0	No potential to reduce the scheme

6. *Would other partners increase their contributions if capital costs rose?*

3	Potential for increasing contributions – already explored
2	Potential for increasing contributions – to be explored
1	Some other funding opportunities available
0	No potential for increasing contributions

7. *What assumptions have been made in assessing running costs?*

3	Detailed assessment based on experience of similar projects
2	Indication of costs of similar projects elsewhere
1	Some attempt to look at experience elsewhere
0	Lack of detail and little basis on previous projects

CAPITAL STRATEGY 2002-3

8. **Where running costs are to be covered from existing budgets**
- What will the impact of making reduction elsewhere be?
 - How will reductions be made in time to implement new scheme?

3	Impact on existing budgets set out clearly and agreed with members
2	Some detail of initial impact and proposals for implementation
1	Initial ideas/assessment
0	No assessment

9. **To what extent do running costs require an additional growth bid to be approved? ?**

3	Accommodated within existing budgets
2	Growth bid made and approved within existing provision
1	Growth bid submitted and awaiting approval
0	No bid made

10. **Where income is anticipated:-**

- On what basis has income been estimated?
- What track record is there to justify anticipated levels of income?
- What is the maximum fluctuation in income and why?
- How will anticipated spending adjust to increases or decreases in income?

3	Income estimates based on survey. Costs fluctuate with income
2	Income estimates based on survey but costs do not change
1	Some attempt made to assess income and show how costs will change
0	Little detailed estimates. Costs will not change in line with income

COUNCIL AIMS & OBJECTIVES (Weighting 30%)

11. **What are the main aims and objectives, which the project will contribute towards?**

3	Essential contribution to agreed Council aim/objective
2	Key contribution to agreed Council aim/objective or agreed strategy
1	Contribution to Council aim/objective or outline strategy
0	Minor contribution

12. **If a strategy is mentioned, when was the strategy formally adopted?**

NATIONAL PRIORITIES (Weighting 10%)

13. **What are the main national and regional priorities which the project will contribute towards?**

3	Essential contribution to agreed National aim/objective
2	Key contribution to agreed National aim/objective or agreed strategy
1	Contribution to National aim/objective or outline strategy
0	Minor contribution

14. **If a priority is mentioned, when was the strategy formally adopted?**

SERVICE PRIORITIES (Weighting 10%)

15. **What will be the impact of failing to implement the project on:-**

- Agreed Service Plan priorities

3	Essential contribution to agreed Service aim/objective/key best value recommend.
2	Key contribution to agreed Service aim/objective or agreed strategy/recommended within best value review
1	Contribution to Service aim/objective or outline strategy
0	Minor contribution

Table 3 : Citizen Panel's views on the Council's Aims and Objectives (District)

Council Aims	Number	Weighted Number	% age
Economic Development	2053	2049	13.67%
Caring for the Environment	2386	2351	15.89%
Providing Decent Homes	1724	1714	11.48%
Community & Leisure Development	1776	1749	11.83%
Providing "Best Value" Services	2445	2431	16.28%
Managing our Business	2074	2064	13.81%
Leading the Community	1675	1661	11.16%
Supporting the National Forest	881	907	5.87%
Total	15014	14926	100.00%

- 1 Providing Best Value services
- 2 Caring for the Environment
- 3 Managing our business
- 4 Economic Development

Area Meetings

District Level

The top 4 Council aims and priorities (using weighted data) which are important to the public are

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| 1 | Economic Development |
| 2 | Caring for the Environment |
| 3 | Providing "Best Value" services |
| 4 | Managing our Business |

Due to the small sample size, there are no significant differences between the top 4 Council aims and priorities identified by the public apart from ranking order.

Rank	Weighted Data	Un weighted data
1	Economic Development	Caring for the Environment
2	Caring for the Environment	Providing "Best Value" services
3	Providing "Best Value" services	Economic Development
4	Managing our Business	Managing our Business

Weighted data is the "corrected" or "balanced" data

Therefore, to determine which council aims and priorities are important to the public at a district level, the weighted data should be used. However, to determine which council aims and priorities are important to people within a locality or Area the unweighted data should be used

Interestingly, most of the respondents thought that "Providing 'value for money' services and "managing our business" were things which we should be undertaking as a prerequisite requirement "Supporting the National Forest" was the Council aim that very few people regarded as important. This finding is also borne out by the recent survey undertaken in relation to the Derbyshire Cultural strategy

