



South
Derbyshire
District Council

Paperless Test Committee

Date: Wednesday, 09 January 2013
Time: 18:00
Venue: Council Chamber
Address: Civic Offices
Civic Way
Swadlincote
Derbyshire
DE11 0AH

F. McArdle
Chief Executive

Civic Offices, Civic Way,
Swadlincote, Derbyshire DE11 0AH

www.south-derbys.gov.uk

Please ask for: Debra Townsend
Phone: (01283) 595848
Minicom: (01283) 595849
DX 23912 Swadlincote

Our ref: DT/CL
Your ref:

Date: 4th January 2013

Dear Councillor,

PAPERLESS TEST COMMITTEE

A Meeting of the Paperless Test Committee will be held in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Civic Way, Swadlincote on **Wednesday, 9th January 2013 at 6.00 p.m.** You are requested to attend.

A buffet will be available before the Meeting in the Members Lounge adjoining the Council Chamber.

Yours faithfully,

F. McArdle
Chief Executive

To: **Conservative Group**
Councillors Mrs. Patten, Watson, Mrs. Watson and Wheeler.

Labour Group
Councillors Frost and Richards.

AGENDA

Open to Public and Press

1. Apologies and to note any substitutes appointed for the Meeting.
2. To note any declarations of interest arising from any items on the Agenda.
3. To receive any questions by members of the public pursuant to Council Procedure Rule No.10.
4. To receive any questions by Members of the Council pursuant to Council Procedure Rule No.11.

4a Any other business

Discussion of any other business not on the agenda.

- | | | |
|----------|--|----------------|
| 5 | <u>Item 5. Crazy Golf finance</u> | 3 - 4 |
| | Details | |
| 6 | <u>Item 6. TC Performance Report Sept12 201213 v2</u> | 5 - 18 |
| | Details | |
| 7 | <u>Item 7. Council Tax Scheme</u> | 19 - 52 |
| | Details | |

Exclusion of the Public and Press:

The Chairman may therefore move:-

That in accordance with Section 100 (A) of the Local Government Act 1972 the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the Meeting as it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that there would be disclosed exempt information as defined in the paragraph of Part I of the Schedule 12A of the Act indicated in the header to each report on the Agenda.

REPORT TO:	PAPERLESS TEST COMMITTEE	AGENDA ITEM: 5
DATE OF MEETING:	9TH JANUARY 2013	CATEGORY: OPEN DELEGATED
REPORT FROM:	MARK ALFLAT	
MEMBERS' CONTACT POINT:	M ROSEBURGH Ext 5774 malcolm.roseburgh@south-derbys.gov.uk	DOC:
SUBJECT:	FINANCING OF CRAZY GOLF FACILITY AT ROSLISTON FORESTRY CENTRE	REF:
WARD(S) AFFECTED:	ROSLISTON	TERMS OF REFERENCE: TC

1.0 Recommendations

- 1.1 That Committee approve use of the Rosliston FC café sinking fund for repairs to the Crazy Golf Facility at the site.

2.0 Purpose of Report

- 2.1 To explain the poor condition of the Crazy Golf facility at Rosliston FC and make the case to utilise the Rosliston café sinking fund to effect remedial works.

3.0 Detail

- 3.1 A custom made crazy golf facility illustrating the life cycle of a bird was installed at Rosliston Forestry Centre (RFC) using external funding approximately 4 years ago. The frame and flooring of the holes was made from timber which has rotted and become unsafe. Negotiations were held with the designer and installer but no compensation was forthcoming as warranty had run out before problems appeared and neither contractor was willing to accept responsibility or liability. The facility has now been out of commission either partly or fully for over a year. It is prominently sited near to the visitor centre and a main path and its poor condition and failure is both an embarrassment and financial loss of approx £4,000pa to the site partners.
- 3.2 The RFC Partnership executive believe it is a priority that the facility is repaired and brought back into use to protect the reputation of the centre and restore the income to the site. However there are insufficient funds within the centre's annual maintenance budget to pick up a repair of this size and remedial work of this nature would not secure external funding.
- 3.3 In considering the options to finance the works the executive considered that utilising the RFC café sinking fund would provide an effective solution.
- 3.4 When setting up the tenancy agreement with the existing café operator it was agreed that rent would be paid as both a base rent and % share of turnover. The share of turnover was set up as a separate "café sinking fund" outside the centre's main

business plan and for use in managing the Council's responsibilities in relation to the lease e.g. windows, roof, external decoration etc. In fact the fund has been used to replace all the café windows.

- 3.5 The sinking fund arrangement has been in place since 2008 and accumulated £34,523.80. Nearly £11,000 was utilised in replacing the windows leaving a balance of £23,560 with an anticipated £10,000 of further income for the period Sept 2011 to Sept 2012 anticipated in the near future.
- 3.6 There are no café works pending or projected so it is considered that using £14,000 from the fund to finance the crazy golf works is no risk to the authority.
- 3.7 Different options and estimates have been sought by the partners to undertake the necessary works and the Best Value quote is for £14,000. The quote includes for concrete bases rather than timber and is a much more robust design necessitating less maintenance.
- 3.8 It is therefore requested that £14,000 is sanctioned as a contribution from the café sinking fund towards the Crazy Golf remedial works. The intention is to undertake the works asap to improve the site appearance and have the feature ready for the main season next year.

5.0 Financial Implications

- 5.1 The use of £14,000 will reduce the café sinking fund but it retains enough balance to cover all needs and will continue to be replenished annually.

6.0 Corporate Implications

- 6.1 RFC contributes significantly to the Council's Lifestyle Choices theme and the strategic objective of improving the health and well being of our residents and communities.

7.0 Community Implications

- 7.1 RFC contributes significantly to the Sustainable community strategy and in particular the themes of healthier communities and children and young people.

8.0 Background Papers

- 8.1 None

REPORT TO:	PAPERLESS TEST COMMITTEE	AGENDA ITEM: 5
DATE OF MEETING:	9TH JANUARY 2013	CATEGORY: DELEGATED
REPORT FROM:	CHIEF EXECUTIVE	OPEN
MEMBERS' CONTACT POINT:	Head of Corporate Services Kevin Stackhouse (01283 595811) Kevin.stackhouse@south-derbys.gov.uk	DOC: u/ks/performance monitoring/1213/fm performance report Sept 12
SUBJECT:	Corporate Plan 2009 to 2014: Performance Management Report (1st April to 30th September 2012)	
WARD (S) AFFECTED:	All	TERMS OF REFERENCE: TC

1.0 Recommendations

1.1 That the Committee:

- (a) Note the progress and achievements during the period 1st April to 30 September 2012, in relation to the Council's Corporate Plan 2009/14.
- (b) Review where progress has failed to achieve the specified target (where applicable) and consider the adequacy of the remedial action taken.
- (c) Receive a quarterly overview of the number of accidents as part of the Council's Health & Safety performance management framework.

2.0 Purpose of Report

- 2.1 To report details of progress and achievements during the period 1st April to 30th September 2012, in relation to the Council's Corporate Plan 2009 –2014.
- 2.2 Details are provided in the respective appendices outlined below, which are attached to this report.
 - Progress against Corporate Plan 'Key Projects' as attached at Appendix A; and,
 - Progress against Corporate Plan 'Performance Measures' as attached at Appendix B.
- 2.3 Following a request of the previous meeting of this Committee, to provide an overview of the number of accidents, which have occurred within the Council during the current quarter compared with the previous year. – Appendix C.

3.0 Detail

Executive Summary

It is important that Members scrutinise the performance of the Council as part of the democratic process. This report reflects the 2nd quarter's performance on the key targets the Council has set and approved.

Corporate Plan 2009/14

- 3.1 To provide context the Council's Corporate Plan 2009-14 Action Plan consists of four main 'themes' or 'priorities' (*Sustainable Growth & Opportunity: Safe & Secure: Lifestyle Choices: and Value For Money*)
- 3.2 In March 2012, the Corporate Plan was refreshed along the current themes, with an emphasis being placed on 'how our actions' will make a difference to our residents and stakeholders. In order to focus our actions, performance will be measured against a reduced number of actions or 'key projects' and performance measures
- 3.3 Each 'theme' contains a number of 'Outcomes' that help explain what the 'theme' is about. In order that the Council and its stakeholders are able to tell whether the 'outcomes' are being delivered, a number of 'Key Projects' (with a series of 'tasks/ milestones') and performance measures have been allocated to each 'Outcome' that will be monitored either on a quarterly or annual basis.
- 3.4 This Committee is responsible for the delivery of 4 'outcomes' [*Financial resilience- a sustainable financial base maintained; 'Cutting costs' not services; Strong leadership and robust governance; and An improved customer experience*] within the '**Value for Money**' theme.

Progress to 30th September 2012

Key Projects

- 3.5 Table 1 below summarises the progress made against 'key projects.' It shows that 6 (100%) tasks for the quarter have been completed.

Table 1: Progress against Corporate Plan Projects (as at 30th September 2012)

Theme	'Completed' Tasks	'Failed' Tasks	'Not Applicable'	Total
Value For Money	6 (100.0%)	0	0	6 (100.0%)

Performance Measures

- 3.6 Table 2 overleaf, provides a summary of performance against targets for both the current quarter and projected out turn for the year. It shows that 6 (85%) quarterly targets have been achieved. It is also forecast that all 7 (100%) of the targets will be met by the year-end.

Table 2: Performance Measures – performance against targets (as at 30th September 2012)

Theme	Quarter Target 'Achieved'	Quarter Target 'Failed'	Quarter Target 'N/a'	Total	Projected Annual Target 'On Track'	Projected Annual Target 'At Risk'
Value For Money	6 (85%)	0 (0%)	1 (15%)	7 (100.0%)	7 (100.0%)	0

Managing Risks

- 3.7 The Council has a comprehensive risk register, which details all known service risks, control mechanisms and review dates. Table 3 below outlines the main risks across the Value for Money theme of the Corporate Plan.

Table 3: Managing Risks

Risk Description	Degree of Control	Risk Rating	Mitigating Action
Corporate Services consists of small, discrete and specialist teams where detailed knowledge and experience rests with individuals. Consequently, resilience is a risk.	Treat the Risk	Reduced from Medium to Low	<p>The implementation of the generic Corporate Assistant Post ensures greater coverage across legal, democratic and licensing services.</p> <p>The Audit Partnership provides additional resources and coverage. There has been an increase in resources for the Financial Services Unit and it is being reshaped following its transfer back to the Council.</p> <p>Option of Northgate Partnership providing cover and temporary resources where necessary.</p> <p>The likelihood of the risk occurring is now considered relatively low. If the risk materialised, there would be a short-term cost which would be financed from within existing resources.</p>
Reliance on Partnerships to deliver services. Includes partners ceasing to exist or going out of business.	Treat the Risk	Reduced from High to Medium	<p>Continue to monitor closely the performance frameworks, which include early warning signs of deteriorating service delivery.</p> <p>Support Northgate and the Audit Partnership to develop the Regional Business Centre and attract new Clients to protect their service base.</p> <p>Ensure License cover continues for key computer systems used in service delivery.</p> <p>The likelihood of the risk occurring is low due to safeguards in place and the Partnerships are maturing and offer stability.</p> <p>However, the risk will be retained and monitored as the impact of the risk occurring could be greater. Cost, service delivery and reputation could be affected into the medium-term and any financing may need to call on Reserve Balances.</p>

Corporate Risks

3.8 In addition to risks that may impact upon the individual Themes and Priorities in the Corporate Plan, the Council maintains a Corporate Risk Register. This analyses the strategic issues and external factors that potentially impact across all council services. The associated risks are identified as part of the corporate planning process. These risks are regularly reviewed and an update is provided in Table 4, below.

Table 4: Managing Corporate Risks

Risk Description	Degree of Control	Risk Rating	Mitigating Action
<p>Further reductions in Government Grant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local authorities are expected to face further reductions over and above those currently notified. This includes a reduction in funding to support the new Council Tax Allowance scheme. In addition, uncertainty around how the new NNDR redistribution system will impact upon the Council. 	Treat the Risk	Remains High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Medium-term Financial Plan in place covering 5-years. This allows for a reduction in overall resources. Budgets considered prudent with provisions for inflation and growth. Current reserves are healthy and would help to sustain further reductions in the short-term allowing time for more sustainable action. On-going work/transformation programme in place to generate efficiencies and budget savings. As a growth area, overall reduction could be mitigated through the New Homes Bonus and the new national redistribution system. The risk remains high until the financial settlement is known in detail. The MTFP now allows for 13% and 8% reductions in base line funding for 2013/14 and 2014/15 respectively. The Council may need to review spending levels in addition to that already being undertaken
<p>Continuing effects of the Economic Downturn</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a growth area, potential income streams from planning and grants are limited, whilst pressure remains on expenditure. In addition, an increase in the number of people claiming benefits and finding difficulty in paying council tax and housing rent. Development & regeneration projects such as the Depot relocation are delayed which hinders service provision and limits the ability to meet identified needs such as affordable housing. 	Tolerate the Risk	Remains Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budgets for income streams and specific grant allocations are assumed at current minimum levels; service provision is based on this. Council Tax has been frozen for the last 2 years and included in the MTFP. Measures in place to maximise benefit subsidy and fraud is proactively being pursued with successful prosecutions. The Asset Management Plan has been refocused to ensure our assets are being positioned to react to an economic upturn. On-going dialogue with developers and housing providers to look at alternative options for regeneration. The risk remains Medium, but it is considered that the Council is undertaking as much action as reasonably possible to mitigate these external factors.
<p>Keeping pace with Technology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council's IT infrastructure is becoming dated and capacity to store and handle data 	Treat the Risk	Remains Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The IT strategy has identified some key projects that will now be rolled out during 2012/13, with the server infrastructure now upgraded and a separate back-up facility created on-site. E-mail archiving/storage system, desktop virtualisation and Microsoft

Risk Description	Degree of Control	Risk Rating	Mitigating Action
efficiently is becoming limited compared to more modern day solutions.			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> upgrade now being planned. Disaster recovery solution being implemented off-site. Although the risk remains Medium, current investment and positive actions over the remaining year should lower this risk in the longer-term term.
<p>Business Continuity and in particular the loss of the main Civic Offices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council services are predominantly managed from one Administrative Building. Currently there is no alternative building to accommodate an IT facility that is crucial to enable many services to operate. 	Treat the Risk	Remains High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Back-ups are made and stored off-site. Plans now in place to provide a new back-up facility for IT at the new Oaklands Village. This should be operational by Dec 2012. Maintain relationships with other agencies & partners to secure different accommodation on a reciprocal basis if required. Could take advantage of spare capacity in private sector market although this would depend on timing. Although the likelihood of occurrence is low, the potential impact of this risk is high. However, current investment into the Oakland Village to provide a disaster recovery solution should lower this risk in the longer-term term.
<p>Capacity and Resilience in Service Provision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reducing staff and budget resources could create capacity and resilience within council services. 	Treat the Risk	Remains Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training and development programme being reviewed to include change management and “doing more with less.” Current structures becoming mature and bedding in although pressure remains. May need to review service provision depending on financial settlement.
<p>Partners and Voluntary Sector</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial pressures on partners who deliver services with or on behalf of the Council, including voluntary organisations. 	Tolerate the Risk	Remains Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current grant funding is being maintained for all supported organisations. Spending can be refocused to meet external funding requirements and is project based rather than on-going. Dedicated officer time to support the voluntary sector and local organisations. The risk remains Medium, but it is considered that the Council is undertaking as much action as reasonably possible to mitigate external factors.

4.0 Financial Implications

4.1 There are no specific financial implications relating to this report. The need to continually improve whilst delivering the ambitions of the Corporate Plan will require a sustained efficiency programme, including the shifting of resources to the priority areas.

5.0 Corporate Implications

5.1 No other specific legal, HR or other resource implications.

6.0 Community Implications

6.1 The Council aspires to be an “excellent” Council in order to deliver the service expectations of our communities. This performance report evidences an improvement in how we are meeting those demands and expectations.

Health and Safety - Accident Statistics 2012/13

Purpose of the Report

This report provides an overview of the number of accidents that have occurred within the Council for the period 1 July – 30 September 2012.

Background

The Health & Safety Officer provides advice and training on health and safety matters across the Council. This Officer is also responsible for producing management information on the number of accidents. These are collated on a regular basis and are reported to the joint Health & Safety Committee. This Committee reviews the accidents and makes recommendations or learning that needs to be implemented.

Accident Statistics

The Council's accident statistics are broken down into RIDDOR (Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations, 1995) and Non RIDDOR accidents. Non RIDDOR accidents do not have to be reported to the Health & Safety Executive, but nevertheless were accidents at work.

RIDDOR accidents are those:

- Where a member of staff has been required to stay in hospital for 24 hours after an accident;
- Where a member of the public was taken to hospital for treatment after the accident;
- If the accident results in the member of staff being off work for 3 days after the date of the accident.

The table overleaf shows the number of accidents that have occurred during the current quarter (1 July to 30 September 2012) by reportable accident type and category and the year to date.

The table also provides comparative details of the number of accidents for the previous year (2011/12)

Table: Number and type of accidents by category for the current quarter (1 July to 30 September 2012): Number of accidents to date for the financial year (2012/13): Total number of accidents for the previous year (2011/12)

Accident category	Current Quarter (1 July - 30 Sep 2012)			Current Year (2012/13) To date		Previous Year (2011/12) Actual	
	Non RIDDOR	RIDDOR	Total	Non RIDDOR	RIDDOR	Non RIDDOR	RIDDOR
Struck by object inc. sharps)	1	-	1	5	-	11	-
Manual handling	-	1	1	1	2	4	3
Slip, trip or fall	1	-	1	2	-	4	3
Contact with vehicle	-	-	-	1	-		1
Contact with machinery	-	-	-	1	-	1	1
Minor injury (as a result of a play scheme activity)	3	1	4	8	1	11	2
Other	1	-	1	3	1	3	-
Total	6	2	8	21	3	34	10
Member of Public	3	1	4	12	1	3	10
Employee	3	1	4	9	2	7	24

During the current quarter there were six non-RIDDOR minor accidents. Three of these accidents occurred at the depot, which resulted in existing risk assessments being reviewed and control measures being reinforced. The other three minor accidents involved children on summer play schemes.

During this period, there were two RIDDOR accidents. The first accident involved an employee hurting his back, when helping a colleague pull a large heavy refuse bin. The accident became a reportable incident because the person was away from work for over seven consecutive days. The second accident involved a child who had split her lip on a play scheme activity and was taken to hospital. (Note: being taken to hospital constitutes a RIDDOR reportable accident.)

In summary, there were eight accidents during this current period, compared to 17 accidents in the previous quarter (1 April – 30 June 2012).

During the current year to date, there have been 24 accidents, (21 RIDDOR and 3 non-RIDDOR accidents) involving 13 members of the public and 11 employees. In 2011/12 there were a total of 44 accidents.

Background Papers

Accident Statistics – Health & Safety file

Outcome	VO 1 - Financial resilience - a sustainable financial base maintained			Status
Project	VP 01 - Universal Credits and Localism of Council Tax support	Q1 Task	VP 01.1 Initial options and implications considered.	Achieved
		Q2 Task	VP 01.2 Preferred options out for consultation	Achieved
		Q3 Task	VP 01.3 New scheme approved	
		Q4 Task	VP 01.4 New scheme implemented	

Comments/ Remedial Action
Report considered by the Committee on 6th September 2012.
Update report considered by the Committee on 18th October 2012.

Outcome	VO 2 - 'Cutting costs not services'			Status
Project	VP 02 - Continue the programme of procurement and service transformation reviews in accordance with the Council's Business Improvement Plan	Q1 Task	VP 02.1 This is set out in the Business Improvement Plan, which is reported separately to Council	Achieved
		Q2 Task	VP 02.2 This is set out in the Business Improvement Plan and reported separately to Council	Achieved
		Q3 Task	VP 02.3 This is set out in the Business Improvement Plan and reported separately to Council	
		Q4 Task	VP 02.4 This is set out in the Business Improvement Plan and reported separately to Council	

Comments/ Remedial Action
This has helped achieve the efficiency savings generated to-date as reported under performance VM04. Several smaller scale projects being monitored through the Business Improvement Board.
As above.

Value For Money: Projects

Appendix A

Outcome	VO 2 - 'Cutting costs not services'			Status
Project	VP 03 - Upgrade the IT Server infrastructure to increase capacity & provide IT capability across the Council	Q1 Task	VP 03.1 Upgrade the Server estate	Achieved
		Q2 Task	VP 03.2 Determine virtualisation and remote access solution	Achieved
		Q3 Task	VP 03.3 Procure and implement the preferred solution	
		Q4 Task	VP 03.4 Upgrade Microsoft Office	

Comments/ Remedial Action
This has included an upgrade to the Council's Disaster Recovery/Back-up Solution with a "mirrored" system operating outside of the Computer Suite in a secure location elsewhere in the Civic Offices.
E-mail archiving software is being set up and tested. The VDI (Virtual Desktop Infrastructure) solution (or "Thin Client") will be based on a Dell and Microsoft platform to maintain compatibility.

Outcome	VO 3 - Strong leadership & robust governance			Status
Project	VP 04 - Adopt a Code of Practice for Elected Members and review the Overview & Scrutiny process in light of statutory guidance	Q1 Task	VP 04.1 Report on detailed regulations	Achieved
		Q2 Task	VP 04.2 Consider options and approve preferred framework	Achieved
		Q3 Task	VP 04.3 Raise awareness and conduct training	
		Q4 Task	VP 04.4 Implement Local Code	

Comments/ Remedial Action
A new Standards Committee and Code of Conduct for Members approved by Council on 28th June 2012.
Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommended some minor changes to the Constitution at its meeting on 12th September 2012.

Outcome	VO 4 - An improved customer experience			Status
Project	VP 05 - Communicate and engage with our communities to ensure that the Council is delivering services in ways appropriate to them	Q1 Task	VP 05.1 Annual Report & Work Plan reported to Committee	Achieved
		Q2 Task	VP 05.2 Monthly Media Report	Achieved
		Q3 Task	VP 05.3 Monthly Media Report	
		Q4 Task	VP 05.4 Monthly Media Report	

Comments/ Remedial Action
Approved by the Committee on 21st June 2012.
Report circulated monthly. In addition, media releases made on proposals for a Council Tax Support Scheme and External Auditors report. Annual Report published.

Outcome	VO 4 - An improved customer experience			Status
Project	VP 06- Develop and adopt an 'Access to Services Strategy' for all residents	Q1 Task	VP 06.1 Establish customer access requirements	Achieved
		Q2 Task	VP 06.2 Determine impact on technology and assess impact on front line services	Achieved
		Q3 Task	VP 06.3 Consult on proposals with stakeholders	
		Q4 Task	VP 06.4 Commence transformation and implement new processes	

Comments/ Remedial Action
Strategy and Governance arrangements were approved by the Committee on 26th April 2012.
Consultation and data gathering taking place in all Council Departments. Process mapping to commenced in areas of high customer interaction. Progress being monitored by a Project Board.

Outcome	Measure	Actual 2011/12	Target Quarter 2 2012/13	Actual Quarter 2 2012/13	Status	Annual Target 2012/13	Predicted Out turn 2012/13	Status	Comments/ Remedial Action
VO 1 - Financial resilience - a sustainable financial base maintained	VM 01- Publish a 'fit for purpose' Medium Term Financial Plan	Feb-12	Review following 2011/12 out turn	Review undertaken	Green	Feb-13	Feb-13	Green	Updated MTFP considered by the Committee on 6th October ahead of the 2013/14 budget round.
	VM 02 - Disposal of assets deemed 'surplus to requirements' to generate income. (£)	£123,087	£0	£0	Green	£50,000	£75,000	Green	Approved land sale at Pennine Way being progressed.
	VM 03- Maximising the 'take -up' of grant income for the Council (£)	New	n/a	n/a	Grey	Increase in New Homes Bonus and Benefit Subsidy	As Target	Green	
VO 2 - 'Cutting costs not services'	VM 04 - On-going efficiency savings. (£)	£340,893	£150,000	£155,154	Green	£230,000	£230,000	Green	Savings to-date from restructure of Direct Services (£121k) as reported to the Committee in April 2012, together with smaller procurement savings.
VO 3 - Strong leadership & robust governance	VM 05 - Achieve an external 'fit for purpose' Code of Corporate Governance assessment. (As assessed by External Audit)	Jun-11	AGS signed off by External Auditors	Sign off completed	Green	Jun-12	Jun-12	Green	As reported to the Audit Committee on 27th September.
VO 4 - An improved customer experience	VM 06 - Percentage of satisfied customers contacting or dealing with the Council.	94.00%	85.00%	95.00%	Green	85.00%	94.00%	Green	
	VM 07 - Respond to 95% of all official complaints within 10 working days	New	95.00%	100.00%	Green	95.00%	95.00%	Green	13 complaints received and answered although 3 were not fully resolved as additional information was awaited. On average, all complaints were responded to in 8.5 days

REPORT TO:	PAPERLESS TEST COMMITTEE	AGENDA ITEM: 7
DATE OF MEETING:	9TH JANUARY 2013	CATEGORY: DELEGATED
REPORT FROM:	CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER	OPEN
MEMBERS' CONTACT POINT:	KEVIN STACKHOUSE (01283 595811) CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER Kevin.stackhouse@south-derbys.gov.uk	DOC: u/ks/council tax support scheme/dec12report/progress report Dec 12
SUBJECT:	LOCAL COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME – FINAL PROPOSALS	REF
WARD (S) AFFECTED:	ALL	TERMS OF REFERENCE: TC

1.0 Recommendations

- 1.1 That a Local Council Tax Support Scheme for South Derbyshire is approved in principle subject to the Local Government Financial Settlement for 2013/14.
- 1.2 That the final Scheme with the detailed parameters laid under regulations, is approved and recommended to Full Council at a Special meeting of the Committee on 10th January 2013.

2.0 Purpose of Report

- 2.1 To establish final proposals to implement a Local Council Tax Support Scheme for South Derbyshire. This follows the Government's proposal to abolish the national benefits scheme as it applies to Council Tax on 31st March 2013.
- 2.2 This will be replaced by a new system of local support on 1st April 2013 to be determined and administered by the billing authority (i.e. South Derbyshire District Council). The report provides an update and further analysis following the Committee's initial deliberations and proposals for a local scheme at its meetings on 6th September and 18th October 2012.

<http://south-derbys.cmis.uk.com/south-derbys/Meetings/tabid/70/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/397/Meeting/1509/Committee/278/Default.aspx>

<http://south-derbys.cmis.uk.com/south-derbys/Meetings/tabid/70/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/397/Meeting/1517/Committee/278/Default.aspx>

- 2.3 The report also includes feedback from the consultation on the changes, options available and the Committee's initial proposals.

2.4 Provisions for implementing a local support scheme are contained in the Local Government Finance Act (2012) which received Royal Assent on 31st October 2013. An Act of Parliament now imposes a duty on billing authorities to make a localised scheme **by 31st January 2013**.

2.5 As previously reported, the biggest challenge to the Council is dealing with a shortfall of approximately £1/2m in funding to support benefit claimants in the new scheme.

3.0 Detail

3.1 After considering the various options on 6th September, the Committee set out some outline proposals. The implications of these proposals were analysed in detail at the Committee's meeting on 18th October.

3.2 The proposals formed a package designed to protect certain groups from losing financial support in the new system, encouraging work, together with generating additional revenue by reducing other council tax discounts to help fund the loss of £1/2m in grant funding.

3.3 The proposals were as follows:

- To protect all Pensioners in the new scheme at their current level of support; this is a legislative requirement.
- To protect people with disabilities in the new scheme at their current level of support.
- To protect war widows and war disabled pensioners in the new scheme at their current level of support (***under the Armed Forces Covenant this will now also provide full disregard for military compensation payments in calculating benefit***)
- To extend the current tapering scheme for those moving off benefit and into employment as a means of encouraging people back into work.
- To work closer with partners to support single parent families with childcare arrangements and to access financial support in employment.
- To charge a Council Tax premium on long term empty properties (2 years) and to charge Council Tax on empty properties after 3 months.
- The net cost of the new scheme after generating additional funding would be allocated as a straight line reduction in current benefit across all unprotected working age claimants.

3.4 Effectively, this would produce a local scheme that would be based on the key features of the current national scheme.

3.5 Consequently, basic benefit entitlement would continue to be calculated on the current parameters, thresholds and allowances, etc as the national scheme. However, non-protected working age claimants would then reduce by a

straight line percentage and would therefore pay a greater amount of their overall Council Tax liability.

- 3.6 Pensioners will be protected by keeping in place national rules with eligibility and rates being defined in Regulations broadly similar to those currently in place.

Funding

- 3.7 It was highlighted in paragraph 2.5 that the Council faces a shortfall in funding of £1/2m due to the reduction in national resources being allocated for council tax benefit. The funding allocation for a local scheme has provisionally been set at approximately £4.565m. The current cost of benefit awarded in South Derbyshire for council tax is £5.077m, i.e. a difference of £512,000.
- 3.8 As reported in October, each of the proposals outlined above was costed and compared against the estimated funding available. This is summarised in the following table. An analysis of current claimants is detailed in **Appendix 1**.

Provisional Grant Funding	£4,565,000
Levy Premium on Long-term Empty Properties	£45,900
Charge Council Tax on Properties empty for longer than 3 months	£188,094
Total Estimated Funding Available	£4,798,994
Protecting Pensioners	-£2,441,530
Protecting Disability Households	-£566,975
Protecting War Widows and War Disabled	-£5,500
Extending Benefit Entitlement for People returning to Work	-£24,000
Funds Remaining	£1,760,989
Total Cost of Current Benefit to remaining Working Age Claimants	£2,061,701
Potential Shortfall	<u>£300,712</u>

Options previously considered (but not approved) to remove the remaining second home discount of 10% and to charge council tax on properties awaiting structural repair after six months would generate around £65,000 per year. This amount is not included above.

- 3.9 The above table shows the potential shortfall (after protecting certain groups) against the total cost of current benefit awarded for all remaining unprotected groups, i.e. working age claimants.

Potential Straight Line Reduction for Working Age Claimants

- 3.10 The potential shortfall of £300,000 equates to **15%** of benefit currently paid to unprotected working age claimants. On average, this equates to a reduction of £2.18p per week. This would be spread across approximately 2,600 households (6% of all households in the District) with over 80% of these households in Council Tax Bands A and B.

Contribution towards Council Tax

- 3.11 Approximately 2,000 of these households currently receive 100% benefit and would start paying Council Tax.
- 3.12 As previously reported, this potentially brings to the fore the collection of relatively small amounts of tax, together with affordability for some households. This is analysed later in the report.

Further Parameters and Transitional Grant

- 3.13 The Council does have a considerable degree of flexibility in formulating its local scheme for working age claimants. Regulations laid down under the Act afford full protection to pensioners, i.e. they can be no worse off under the new local scheme compared to the current national scheme.
- 3.14 In addition, the Government have asked councils to be mindful of other groups who may be “vulnerable” and have reiterated local authority duties towards:
- Public Sector Equality under the Equality Act 2010
 - The Armed Forces Covenant (May 2011)
 - Mitigating the effects of child poverty (The Child Poverty Act 2010)
 - Preventing homelessness (The Housing Act 1996)
- 3.15 In October, the Government announced additional support to councils in the form of a transitional grant for one year only. This is aimed at supporting the development of new schemes. £100m nationally has been made available for 2013/14. This equals approximately 20% of the original funding taken out.

Criteria

- 3.16 The grant is voluntary and to qualify, billing authorities must adopt schemes which ensure that:
- Those who would be entitled to 100% support under current council tax benefit arrangements pay between zero and no more than 8.5% of their net council tax liability.
 - The taper rate does not increase above 25% (it is currently 20%).
 - There is no sharp reduction in support for those entering work.
- 3.17 Although not included in the criteria, the Government would not expect councils to impose large additional increases in non-dependent deductions. The amount of grant attributable to South Derbyshire is approximately **£124,000**, broken down as follows:
- District Council - £14,000

- County Council - £90,000
- Police Authority - £14,000
- Fire and Rescue - £6,000

3.18 This grant has been confirmed and will be available for 2013/14 if the Council wish/are able to fulfill the criteria and apply. However, applications cannot be made until February 2013 which is after the statutory deadline for approving a local scheme. A decision would be made by the Government during March 2013.

Would the Council Qualify?

3.19 Comparing the Committee's initial proposals to the criteria above, the conditions regarding the taper rate and reducing support for those entering work would be met. The proposals do not include altering the taper rate, although this was one of the options consulted on. In addition, the proposals include increasing support for those entering work by extending the current 4 week protection period.

3.20 However, the key criteria of limiting any decrease in support to a maximum of 8.5% for those currently receiving 100% benefit would not be met. This is due to the 15% decrease required across all working age claimants, including those currently receiving full (100%) support.

Indicative Effect

3.21 **Appendix 2** details the effect of the 8.5% cap. After factoring in the transitional grant, but assuming other proposals remain unchanged, the overall financial position would be as follows:

Provisional Grant Funding	£4,565,000
Transitional Grant (Confirmed)	£123,422
Levy Premium on Long-term Empty Properties	£45,900
Charge Council Tax on Properties empty for longer than 3 months	£188,094
Total Estimated Funding Available	£4,922,416
Protecting Pensioners	-£2,441,530
Protecting Disability Households	-£566,975
8.5% Cap for those currently in receipt of full (100%) support	-£1,306,221
Protecting War Widows and War Disabled	-£5,500
Extending Benefit Entitlement for People returning to Work	-£24,000
Funds Remaining	£578,190
Total Cost of Current Benefit to remaining Working Age Claimants	£639,637
Potential Shortfall	£61,447

3.22 The above table shows that a reduction of £61,447 would be required from the remaining unprotected groups should the Council wish to apply for the transitional grant. As Appendix 2 highlights, this would require a **10%** reduction in current benefit for all remaining working age claimants who currently pay some Council Tax.

3.23 Under this scenario, for those households currently receiving 100% support, an average reduction of £1.39p (at the 8.5% cap) per week applies, with the average being £1.25p per week extra, for those working age claimants currently paying some Council Tax.

Additional Consultation

3.24 It is considered that the Council has undertaken an extensive consultation exercise regarding the options and indicative proposals. (http://www.south-derbys.gov.uk/council_and_democracy/council_tax/ctsupport_consultation/default.asp)

3.25 The results and feedback from the consultation are detailed later in the report.

3.26 Some questions have been raised on whether new or further consultation would be required if councils were to apply for the transitional grant. This would be on the basis that consultation may not have been extensive enough concerning reductions in current benefit to working age claimants.

3.27 It is considered that the Council's consultation is sufficient. The consultation included a range of possible reductions for working age claimants. In addition, it was indicated (Option 3 in the Consultation) that some reduction, on an average basis, would apply to unprotected groups depending on other sources of finance to meet the overall shortfall of £1/2m.

Main Grant Funding

3.28 Although the transitional grant has been confirmed, the main grant (provisionally £4.5m) is still subject to change as part of the Local Government Financial Settlement which is due on or around 20th December 2012.

3.29 Clearly, given the significance of this figure, even a 1% variation on the provisional amount could affect the final decision on the make-up of a local scheme.

3.30 The main data on which the council tax support grant will be based is the number of benefit claims. The most recent data which will be used for the settlement shows that the Council's caseload has slightly reduced. Overall, across all councils nationally, claims have increased.

3.31 Consequently, as a proportion, the Council could see a reduction in its share compared to the provisional amount. This may not necessarily correlate to the reduced cost of benefit awarded locally.

3.32 Therefore, it is recommended that a local scheme is approved in principle subject to the final grant figure. A final decision can then be made at a meeting of the Committee on 10th January 2013.

Risks and Issues

3.33 As previously reported, there are several risks and issues that will need to be managed in a local scheme. These have been highlighted nationally and will

be common to many councils. They include the collection of additional low level debt and potentially, the affordability of some households to pay additional Council Tax in addition to other benefit changes also being implemented next April.

Debt Collection and Affordability

- 3.34 If current benefit is to be reduced as proposed, then there will be a difficult balance to achieve between collection and affordability. With or without transitional grant, there are fairly low levels of additional debt to collect, which on average would amount to approximately £2 per week.
- 3.35 However, in total this generates approximately £300,000 and £185,000 excluding and including transitional grant respectively.
- 3.36 A perceived advantage of the transitional grant option, compared to a straight line reduction for all working age claimants, is that households who currently do not pay any Council Tax will lose less, and this is seen as affording greater protection to those on the lowest household incomes.
- 3.37 However, additional debt will still need to be collected and the collection rate is extremely difficult to predict. Some councils are budgeting for a collection rate as low as 40%. At some stage in the future, it is likely that additional sums may need to be set-aside in the bad debts provision if collection rates fall significantly. This would become a cost to all Preceptors and effectively offset the original income debit.
- 3.38 In addition, once a demand is issued for Council Tax, the Council will have a statutory duty to collect and pursue non-payment. Besides the potential to incur additional costs, this may prove uneconomical in any case.

Demand

- 3.39 In addition, councils will need to manage the volatility in the number of overall claims. In the longer-term, demographic changes could increase the number of pensioners who, as a protected group, could put pressure on local resources.
- 3.40 The current number of claims and overall amount involved has remained fairly consistent so far in 2011/12. The latest figures show approximately 30 less claimants compared to the total in May 2012 which is the basis for the calculations in the current options appraisal.

Payments by Working Age Claimants

- 3.41 Currently, out of the 2,655 working age claimants, approximately 700 pay some Council Tax and this averages £450 per year per household. This leaves nearly an additional 2,000 households who will start paying some Council Tax under the indicative proposals.

- 3.42 Depending on the transitional grant option, the average amount involved would range from £1.39p to £2.18p per week, with much of this at the lower end (Band A properties).
- 3.43 Affordability aside, these are relatively modest amounts of between £70 and £100 per year which, under legislation, would be collected in monthly installments unless the household agreed differently.
- 3.44 Currently, there are a small number of these amounts collected, but clearly this would significantly increase the amount of lower level debt.

Calculating the Actual Reduction

- 3.45 The proposals assume that there is a straight line percentage reduction in the amount of support awarded, as calculated under existing methodology (say **Option 1**).
- 3.46 An alternative (**Option 2**) would be to reduce the amount of Council Tax that can be claimed for, i.e. all working age claimants would pay a fixed percentage of their Council Tax bill first and then be eligible for support on the remainder.
- 3.47 A possible drawback of Option 1 is the indiscriminate nature of a straight line percentage. Option 2 could be seen as a more transparent and easier to understand option if everyone is asked to pay a proportion of their Council Tax bill, with benefit then calculated as normal.
- 3.48 For households with the same Council Tax liability but with different income, Option 2 will result in everyone facing an equal reduction in cash terms. This is considered more progressive than having an equal reduction applied to the different levels of support awarded.
- 3.49 In addition, Option 2 would potentially lower the cut-off point for benefit entitlement at the margins for those not receiving full support. In some cases, existing claimants would fall over a “cliff edge” and may no longer be eligible for any support.

Estimated Impact of Paying Some Council Tax

- 3.50 For illustrative purposes and excluding transitional grant first, all working age claimants would be required to pay 15% of their Council Tax bill and then benefit entitlement would be calculated on the reduced liability. This would generate additional Council Tax of approximately £350,000 compared to £300,000 from a straight line cut in benefit. This is higher because the percentage reduction is being applied on a greater amount.
- 3.51 Including transitional grant, if all working age claimants paid 8.5% of their Council Tax bill, this would generate approximately £200,000. This is above £185,000 generated by reducing benefit for those on full support by 8.5% (to qualify for the transitional grant) together with those on partial benefit (10%).

3.52 Consequently, with this option, all working age claimants would be affected by the same percentage, i.e. 8.5%, whilst eligibility for the transitional grant would be possible.

3.53 It should be noted that under both options, the issues of collecting lower level debt and potentially taking people out of benefit at the margins will apply.

A Banded Support Scheme

3.54 At the last Committee, some discussion took place on the option of implementing a banded scheme whereby support would be limited to a particular Council Tax band.

3.55 Under the current national scheme all of the Council Tax a household is liable to pay is eligible for benefit. This means that any household from Bands A to H can get a full 100% rebate (depending on circumstances) regardless of the Band, i.e. it does not take account of the size or value of the property.

3.56 One of the targeted options included in the Council's consultation was to change this parameter and limit support to a Council Tax Band.

3.57 For example, if support was limited by applying it to a Band A property, this would reduce current benefit entitlement by approximately £230,000 in total and at Band B by just under £100,000.

3.58 Approximately 700 households would be affected under a Band A scheme with an average reduction in current support of £300 per year, with the minimum being over £100.

3.59 A perceived advantage is that a banded scheme affords greater protection to households in the lowest bands. However, as the above figures highlight, fewer households share the burden and it increases significantly in the higher bands. The average reduction would be 13.5% in a Band A scheme.

3.60 A banded scheme may also lead to some households who currently receive 100% support paying additional amounts. In some cases this could be higher than 8.5% which would preclude the Council from qualifying for transitional grant. This was highlighted in the Government's briefing accompanying the transitional grant scheme.

Illustrative Financial Implications of a Banded Scheme

3.61 Given the provisional shortfall in funding of £1/2m and assuming no transitional grant, a local banded scheme limited to a Band A property would achieve the following:

Reduction in Benefit from a Banded Scheme (at Band A)	£230,000
Levy Premium on Long-term Empty Properties	£45,900
Charge Council Tax on Properties empty for longer than 3 months	£188,094
Total Estimated Funding Available	£463,994
Estimated Funding Required	£512,000

3.62 The above table shows that there would still remain a shortfall based on the provisional grant figure.

The Council's Collection Fund

3.63 The resultant transactions of a local scheme will be accounted for in the Collection Fund. As a growth area, the Council effectively carries an in-built surplus on its Collection Fund due to the increase in properties each year. The Council Tax Base is set at a particular time each year, but invariably this is exceeded as the next financial year progresses due to a continuing increase in new properties.

3.64 This surplus is shared between the preceptors in arrears, each year. This can vary depending on yearly collection performance but is effectively used to reduce Council Tax or contribute to the Council's budget in future years. The surplus is not budgeted.

3.65 It has been recommended that this surplus is maintained to manage the risk of volatility and demand, together with collection, during the year - i.e. it is held as a contingency for non-collection, changing circumstances, etc. pending on how the local scheme develops over time. As reported in October, the estimated surplus on the Collection Fund for 2012/13 is £196,000.

3.66 If a deficit is incurred due to non-collection or an increase in support for the local scheme, this would be transferred across to the General Funds of the precepting authorities (excluding Parish Councils).

Regular Review

3.67 As previously highlighted, the transitional grant (if applied for) will only be for 2013/14. Clearly, under this scenario, the local scheme will need to be reviewed before 2014/15 to assess the impact.

3.68 In any case, given other risks and issues, the scheme will be reviewed on a regular basis throughout the year with progress reports being made to this Committee.

Computer Systems

3.69 Based on the main options and indicative proposals, no major changes would be required to the system that is used to administer Revenues and Benefits. If software changes are required, this will be met from the Government Grant of £80,000 received earlier in the year to accommodate such changes.

Administration

3.70 This could increase with a new local system although if existing parameters are largely maintained, this should not be significant. There may be additional work required to implement the new system and in communication to claimants at the outset. This will be kept under review.

Consultation

- 3.71 The consultation period ran from 15th August to 7th November 2012. This took place through a general survey and questionnaire, together with various focus and special interest groups, supported by the CVS. Presentations were also made at Area Forums, the South Derbyshire Partnership and the Parish Liaison Group.
- 3.72 The other preceptors of Council Tax have been consulted through the Derbyshire Financial Officers Association.
- 3.73 The consultation analysis is detailed at **Appendix 3**. The main themes that arose were as follows:
- The most popular option from the surveys returned was Option 4, i.e. a targeted reduction by changing the way in which current entitlement is calculated. This was followed by Options 1, 3 and 2 based on 77 responses.
 - Option 4 was also favored by the Citizen's Advice Bureau although this would depend on which specific parameters were chosen.
 - There was positive support for charging council tax on empty homes and residents felt that the Council should tackle the issue of empty homes.
 - Generally, residents also felt that everyone should contribute something towards the new scheme with the shortfall in funding being shared as much as possible, i.e. "everyone should pay something."
 - General concern was expressed about the implications, although there has been an appreciation of the Council's position and that it needs to resolve the issue.
 - Discussions took place in the focus groups on other changes to the welfare system also being implemented next April and their affect on certain groups such as single parent families.
 - There was a general endorsement for a scheme that is designed to recover shortfalls directly associated with the reduction in government funding, after taking reasonable account of any increases in claims and prudent recovery assumptions. However, reluctance to support a scheme which could be seen to 'over recover' any shortfall
 - The Council should consider some enhanced role in helping households affected to access specialist advice and support. Along with other authorities in Derbyshire the Council has been approached by the Derbyshire Financial Inclusion Partnership for a relatively small grant of £5,000 to provide additional services.
 - Using its powers, the Council should set up a Discretionary Hardship Fund, which could operate on similar lines to that which provides assistance to households to pay their rent in exceptional circumstances.

Equality Impact Assessment

3.74 The main options and indicative proposals have also been subject to an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) in accordance with Council Policy and in particular to ensure “due regard” under the Equalities Act 2010.

3.75 Alongside the consultation, the results of the EIA are summarised in **Section 4 of Appendix 3**. The main points are shown in the following table.

Group	Positive impact	Negative impact
Socio/Economic	<p>The local Council Tax Support scheme would be based on the key features of the current national scheme. Basic benefit entitlement would continue to be calculated on the current parameters, thresholds and allowances as the national scheme.</p> <p>This means people can still apply for both housing benefit and local council tax support at the same time based on similar rules of entitlement until such time as other changes under the Welfare Reform agenda come into force e.g. Universal Credit.</p>	The local Council Tax Support scheme means the ‘non-protected’ working age claimants of the local scheme would have their benefit entitlement reduced on a straight line percentage or alternatively have to pay a fixed percentage of the headline bill.
Age	All pensioners to be afforded full protection under legislation in all local schemes.	N/a
Disability	The homeowner or dependent within the household who is registered disabled is protected by the local scheme.	N/a
Gender /Transgender		No disproportionate impact.
Marital status		No disproportionate impact.
Pregnancy / maternity	Explore ways of supporting single parent mothers (and fathers) through childcare arrangements or in accessing employment. Signposting to the County Council who offer advice and support associated with childcare arrangements and accessing the financial support that is in place.	Not to protect the current benefit entitlement for single parent families.
Sexual orientation		No disproportionate impact.
Ethnicity		Customers whose first language is not English may not be able to easily understand the changes in the scheme. This will be reviewed to

		establish if any problems for other members of the community become evident.
Religion / Beliefs		No disproportionate impact.

Next Steps

- 3.76 As previously highlighted, the final grant settlement for a local council tax support scheme is still awaited. Therefore, it is recommended that a scheme is approved in principle and that this is adjusted depending on the final amount awarded. This will be reported at a special meeting of the Committee on 10th January 2013.
- 3.77 At this meeting, the Committee will need to recommend full details of all changes to the Full Council meeting on 24th January 2013. As the national scheme is being abolished, detailed regulations will need to be laid down and adopted by the Council.
- 3.78 These will include recognition of all protected groups including full protection for war widows and the war disabled.

4.0 Financial and Corporate Implications

- 4.1 These are detailed in the report.

5.0 Community Implications

- 5.1 As detailed in the report, the proposals will have an impact upon residents of the District who currently claim benefit or in the future may become eligible for support under a local scheme.

6.0 Background Papers

- 6.1 *Localising Support for Council Tax in England*, DCLG Statement of Intent and Implementation papers (May 2011).

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/localgovernment/localgovernmentfinance/lgfinancebill/>

- 6.2 *The Welfare Reform Act*, Department for Works and Pensions, details and further reading.

<http://www.dwp.gov.uk/policy/welfare-reform/legislation-and-key-documents/welfare-reform-bill-2011/>

- 6.3 *The Local Government Finance Bill (2011) – a brief Guide*

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/localgovernment/localgovernmentfinance/lgfinancebill/>

Provisional Grant Funding	£4,565,000
Transitional Grant (Confirmed)	£123,422
Levy Premium on Long-term Empty Properties	£45,900
Charge Council Tax on Properties empty for longer than 3 months	£188,094
Total Estimated Funding Available	£4,922,416
Protecting Pensioners	-£2,441,530
Protecting Disability Households	-£566,975
8.5% Cap for those currently in receipt of full (100%) support	-£1,306,221
Protecting War Widows and War Disabled	-£5,500
Extending Benefit Entitlement for People returning to Work	-£24,000
Funds Remaining	£578,190
Total Cost of Current Benefit to remaining Working Age Claimants	£639,637
Potential Shortfall	£61,447

Average Ctax of £1,200 * 170 properties * 50% levy * 50% not for sale * 90% collection

Lowest Ctax of £972 * 654 properties in 11/12 / 365 days * 120 days average between 3 and 6 months * 90%

180,663 10%

Provisional Grant Funding	£4,565,000
Levy Premium on Long-term Empty Properties	£45,900
Charge Council Tax on Properties empty for longer than 3 months	£188,094
Total Estimated Funding Available	£4,798,994
Protecting Pensioners	-£2,441,530
Protecting Disability Households	-£566,975
Protecting War Widows and War Disabled	-£5,500
Extending Benefit Entitlement for People returning to Work	-£24,000
Funds Remaining	£1,760,989
Total Cost of Current Benefit to remaining Working Age Claimants	£2,061,701
Potential Shortfall	£300,712

Average Ctax of £1,200 * 170 properties * 50% levy * 50% not for sale * 90% collection

Lowest Ctax of £972 * 654 properties in 11/12 / 365 days * 120 days average between 3 and 6 months * 90%

302,006 15%

ANALYSIS OF CURRENT BENEFIT CLAIMANTS

PENSIONER HOUSEHOLDS

Band	Total			Passported			Non-passported		
	Number	£	Average	Number	£	Average	Number	£	Average
A	1,599	1,104,583	691	938	733,707	782	661	370,876	561
B	728	616,511	847	438	410,680	938	290	205,831	710
C	386	368,078	954	196	210,790	1,075	190	157,288	828
D	202	218,657	1,082	101	123,838	1,226	101	94,819	939
E	58	81,879	1,412	33	52,289	1,585	25	29,590	1,184
F	24	40,161	1,673	16	27,679	1,730	8	12,482	1,560
G	7	11,661	1,666	5	7,368	1,474	2	4,293	2,147
H	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	3,004	2,441,530	813	1,727	1,566,351	907	1,277	875,179	685
	#DIV/0!			57%	64%		43%	36%	

DISABILITY HOUSEHOLDS

Band	Total			Passported			Non-passported		
	Number	£	Average	Number	£	Average	Number	£	Average
A	424	319,357	753	243	201,554	829	181	117,803	651
B	144	130,620	907	86	85,589	995	58	45,031	776
C	60	57,034	951	32	35,647	1,114	28	21,387	764
D	36	40,991	1,139	16	19,946	1,247	20	21,045	1,052
E	8	9,798	1,225	2	2,674	1,337	6	7,124	1,187
F	2	4,258	2,129	0	0	0	2	4,258	2,129
G	3	4,917	1,639	2	4,308	2,154	1	609	609
H	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	677	566,975	837	381	349,718	918	296	217,257	734
	#DIV/0!			56%	62%	Page 3	44%	38%	

WORKING AGE CLAIMANTS

15%

Band	Total			Passported			Non-passported			Reduction (£)		
	Number	£	Average	Number	£	Average	Number	£	Average	Total	Average	Per Week
A	1,578	1,132,990	718	1,111	867,217	781	467	265,773	569	165,254	105	2.01
B	656	529,776	808	370	339,194	917	286	190,582	666	77,271	118	2.27
C	219	194,265	887	107	112,562	1,052	112	81,703	729	28,335	129	2.49
D	141	138,832	985	61	72,569	1,190	80	66,263	828	20,250	144	2.76
E	42	44,728	1,065	15	20,143	1,343	27	24,585	911	6,524	155	2.99
F	14	18,202	1,300	5	7,471	1,494	9	10,731	1,192	2,655	190	3.65
G	5	8,408	1,682	5	8,408	1,682	0	0	0	1,226	245	4.72
H	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Total	2,655	2,067,201	779	1,674	1,427,564	853	981	639,637	652	301,514	114	2.18
				63%	69%		37%	31%				

WORKING AGE CLAIMANTS

10%

Band	Total			Passported			8.5% Cap - Passported			Non-passported			Reduction		
	Number	£	Average	Number	£	Average	Total	Average	Per Week	Number	£	Average	Total	Average	Per Week
A	1,578	1,132,990	718	1,111	867,217	781	73,713	66.35	1.28	467	265,773	569	26,577	56.91	1.09
B	656	529,776	808	370	339,194	917	28,831	77.92	1.50	286	190,582	666	19,058	66.64	1.28
C	219	194,265	887	107	112,562	1,052	9,568	89.42	1.72	112	81,703	729	8,170	72.95	1.40
D	141	138,832	985	61	72,569	1,190	6,168	101.12	1.94	80	66,263	828	6,626	82.83	1.59
E	42	44,728	1,065	15	20,143	1,343	1,712	114.14	2.20	27	24,585	911	2,459	91.06	1.75
F	14	18,202	1,300	5	7,471	1,494	635	127.01	2.44	9	10,731	1,192	1,073	119.23	2.29
G	5	8,408	1,682	5	8,408	1,682	715	142.94	2.75	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00
H	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00
Total	2,655	2,067,201	779	1,674	1,427,564	853	121,343	72.49	1.39	981	639,637	652	63,964	65.20	1.25
				63%	69%					37%	31%				

APPENDIX 3

Council Tax Scheme – Consultation Feedback received from Events and Focus Groups.

1. Introduction

As part of the development of the new local Council Tax Support scheme, the Council embarked on a period of 12-week statutory consultation commencing on the 15th August 2012, to find out the views of residents that could be affected by this scheme.

This consultation included a survey, which was available online and hard copy format that was supported by information on the options available. It also included a number of drop in sessions around the district with residents. Meetings have also been held with key partners including CVS and CAB, and other voluntary groups. Two focus groups were also held with 20 members of the citizens' panel. In total the consultation contacted over 4,000 people directly and sent out information through the press and social media across the district. A list of all the consultation carried out is shown in Appendix A.

2. Survey Results

Between 15th August 2012 and 7th November 2012, the Council ran an online and hard copy survey on the options available in designing a new local Council Tax Support Scheme. This survey was promoted through a media launch on the 15th August and was publicised through a further 2 media releases and with regular updates on Twitter and signposting at each of the events highlighted in section 3. The Council received 77 responses of which 50 came online and 27 came in through hard copy. The results of this survey are highlighted below.

Which option do you prefer?

Answer Options	1	2	3	4	Rating Average	Response Count
Option 1 - Adopting the current national benefit scheme and absorbing the cost against current and future budgets.	25	15	25	12	2.31	77
Option 2 - Increase the Council Tax level and/or reviewing discounts to make up the shortfall in funding.	11	13	13	40	3.06	77
Option 3 - A maximum reduction of between 25% and 30% on Council Tax Benefit across all unprotected groups.	15	22	27	13	2.49	77
Option 4 - A targeted reduction by changing the way we calculate Council Tax Benefit entitlement.	26	27	12	12	2.13	77

- Option 4 is the most popular choice with a rating average of 2.13 with 26 out of 77 respondents ranking it number 1.
- The second most popular choice is Option 1 with a rating average of 2.31 with 25 out of 77 respondents ranking it number 1.
- The third most popular choice is Option 3 with a rating average of 2.49 with 15 out of 77 respondents ranking number 1.
- The least popular choice is Option 2 with a rating average of 3.06 with 11 out of 77 respondents ranking it number 1.

APPENDIX 3

We received further comments from residents as part of this survey and these have informed this report. These are available if requested.

Who responded to the survey?

We had a wide range of responses; the two most popular areas were Swadlincote and Newhall with just under 40% of the total responses. We have also had responses from residents from across the district.

Around 75% of residents who responded were Council Tax Payers and over 30% lived in a household who were in receipt of Council Tax Benefit. Around a third of respondents also received other forms of benefit.

There was a wide age range of respondents, but only 4% were from under 25's with more men than women responding. Over 12% that responded considered themselves to have a disability. The vast majority over 93%, who responded, were White British.

3. Events

The report lists below a description of the key issues raised at each of the community sessions.

Wednesday 19 September – South Derbyshire Partnership Board – held at the Old Post in Newhall.

Attendees – District Council, Police, CVS, Toyota, Burton and South Derbyshire College and Old Post

Key Issues that were raised:

- Suggestions to taper the return to work benefits so to provide a gradual reduction of benefits rather than an arbitrary cut off from all benefit to none.
- All attendees supported the suggested changes around the charges for Empty Homes.

Thursday 20 September – Communities and Equalities Forum – held at CVS Offices in Swadlincote.

Attendees – Framework Housing (supporting 16 to 24 years), Metropolitan Support Trust (Housing Support), ShoutOut Learning Disability Forum, Derbyshire Housing Aid, SOVA (support for people/families at risk of involvement in crime), Staffordshire Buddies, P3 (housing support for people with mental health issues), Reach Young People's Project, Homestart (support for families with children under 5) SDCVS, SDDC Councillors

Key Issues that were raised:

- To be clear which groups will be protected in addition to government directions.
- Mental Health should be included in definition of 'disability'.
- Increase in charges to empty properties supported by all.

Monday 24 September – Citizens Panel Focus Group – held at Council Offices in Swadlincote.

Attendees – Group were a well-informed, cross-section of residents from across the district.

Key Issues that were raised:

- Main areas that people were most keen to see action over were:
 - Empty properties/2nd homes to reduce the non-payment duration and increase the payment for properties empty over 2 years.
 - Including child benefits as income.

APPENDIX 3

- It was also agreed that whatever solution may be forthcoming, there may still be a need for exemptions to be in operation.
- Understanding that any changes may create increased administration costs and that these need to be managed carefully.
- Understand need to protect the most vulnerable groups in the community.
- Straw poll of options:
 - Greatest number of people felt there should be a mixed solution between Option 3 and Options 2 or 4.

Tuesday 25 September – Citizens Panel Focus Group – held at Council Offices in Swadlincote.

Attendees – Members of the Citizens Panel attended from the following areas: Woodville, Etwall, Bretby, Stenson Fields and Swadlincote

Key Issues that were raised:

- People were most keen to see action over the following areas:
 - Helping people back into work through back to work incentives and provision of additional child care options.
 - No matter how small benefits payments are, everyone should pay something.
- Straw poll of options:
 - Greatest number of people felt there should be a mixed solution between Option 2 and Options 3 or 4.

Tuesday 25 September – Area Forum – Stanton Village Hall.

Attendees – Residents, Members, Parish Members

Key Issues that were raised:

- The changes will hit the most vulnerable people the hardest.
- Support for empty property charges.
- Suggested charging for parking.

Wednesday 26 September – Voluntary Sector Forum – Goseley Community Centre, Hartshorne

Attendees – Homestart (families with children under 5), Umbrella (children with special needs), Enrych (Learning Disability), CAB, Village Games, Metropolitan Support (Housing), Raynauds & Scleroderma Self Help Support Group, Burton Hospital League of Friends, P3 (housing support mental health), iDecide (Housing options for over 55s), Derby Diocese Faith in Action, Framework (housing support 18-24yrs), SARAC (sexual and domestic abuse), SDCVS, Self Advocacy in Action (Learning Disability Advocacy)

Key Issues that were raised:

- Recognition that SDDC is in difficult position and has to do something to tackle this issue.
- Concern that the burden will fall on the most vulnerable people who are already under pressure.
- Concern that people don't know about this and they will be shocked by the bills they receive in April at the same time as introduction of other benefit cuts. Suggestion that SDDC and partners need to plan now for the increase in demand on support services.
- General support for empty properties charges.

APPENDIX 3

- Need to ensure the burden is spread as thinly as possible, including exploring the possibility of increasing Council Tax.
- Suggest charging for parking came up again.

Tuesday 2 October – Parish Liaison Group – Council Chamber.

Attendees – Members, Parish Members

Key Issues that were raised:

- Concerns that the single person discount scheme was being excluded from the consultation.
- What is the Council doing in terms of NNDR benefit and encouraging people back to work.
- Should remove the exemption and start charging from the first day of occupation following an empty home, particularly with finance repossessions.

Wednesday 3 October – Tenants Forum, Unity Close, Church Gresley

Attendees – Tenant representatives

Key Issues that were raised:

- Concern around the impact of the bedroom tax and universal credit along with reduction in council tax support.
- Welfare benefit cuts are going to affect the same people and these are often the most vulnerable in society.
- Discussion around treating child benefit as an income in the calculation. Some in support but others felt this would again impact on single parent families.
- Concern that when people went back to work, if this did not work out and they would go back on benefits that this would take some time to resolve this claim.
- Definition of disability related to protection of vulnerable groups and how this would be determined particularly around mental disabilities.
- The new support scheme should be as fair as possible across the board and that everyone should pay something towards the savings.
- Some of the group felt that single parents should be protected.

Wednesday 3 October – North East/Melbourne Area Forum – Barrow-on-Trent Village Hall.

Attendees – Members, Parish Members

Key Issues that were raised:

- Looking to see what initiatives to get people back into work are available. This could be through the County Council and Voluntary Sector providers to provide single parents with support through childcare and extending the HB taper to 8 weeks.
- Issue of poor transport links for young people particularly in rural areas. Looking to tackle this through future development.

Wednesday 10th October - Etwall/North West Forum – Sutton-on-the-Hill Village Hall

Attendees – Residents, Council Members and Officers

Key Issues that were raised:

- Concern that any changes would result in an increase in staffing levels in terms of chasing the debt and processing the new scheme.

APPENDIX 3

- Concerned of the impact of reducing the empty homes charge to 3 month would impact on small developers and housing developments.
- The welfare reform changes and the impact on the lowest paid in communities.

Tuesday 16th October – Swadlincote Area Forum – Goseley Community Centre

Attendees – Residents, Council Members and Officers

Key Issues that were raised:

- This could affect low-income working families as well as those on other benefit.

Tuesday 23 October – Linton Area Forum, Coton-in-the-Elms Community Centre

Attendees – Residents, Council Members, Parish Members, County Members and Officers

Key Issues that were raised:

- Are there enough jobs to enable people to come off benefit?
- Overall support from the room that bringing empty properties back into use would have knock on benefits across the district so we should be looking at all we do to bring these back into use.
- Concern about a rise of the number of claimants over the past 6-9 months. The Council had seen a rise over a year ago but the figure has remained stable over the last 9 months.

Thursday 25 October – Mercia and Repton Area Forum, Milton Village Hall

Attendees – Residents, Council Members, Parish Members, County Members and Officers

Key Issues that were raised:

- General agreement this should be a shared burden and not one shouldered by the 2500 working age people currently in receipt of CTB although this raised concerns about the cost of collection.
- General agreement that empty properties and second homes should be charged more.

In addition to the above SDCVS/SDDC has promoted the consultation as below:

- Funding Fair – Monday 8th October – Ashfield House, Ashby Road, Burton-on-Trent, attended by representatives of approximately 90 South Derbyshire community groups, paper copies available.
- Southern Derbyshire Health & Social Care Forum – Tuesday 9th October – York Road Church, attended by representatives of 40 community groups, paper copies available.
- CVS Newsletter Article distributed to 160 recipients.
- CVS E-bulletin x 2 (16th August and 25th October) to 370 recipients.
- Distribution of survey to clients of direct services as appropriate.

The Chief Executive of the South Derbyshire CAB has submitted the following response:

South Derbyshire CAB strongly support a 3.25% increase in council tax as a first option and only would look to ask people on benefits to contribute as a last resort.

APPENDIX 3

Further Comments

As a bureau that works on behalf of the local community of South Derbyshire we have consulted with our staff and clients to voice their opinion on the proposed changes.

Option 1

There was a general consensus that this option should not affect public services such as the Police Authority, the Fire Service and Parish Councils who are already suffering due to cutbacks.

Option 2

This appears to be a viable option although the funds generated will not be enough to make up the difference required.

We would support the idea of a full charge being levied to those people with second homes.

We would also support charging council tax earlier where a property is empty or awaiting a major repair.

We would have liked more information on what a smaller increase in council tax would be – for example a 3.2% rise and then add the revenue to be collected from one of the targeted reductions such as the second home rebate and then show the estimated shortfall to maintain current service?

Option 3

We strongly disagree with the option – although the Council is protecting certain vulnerable groups this option would still mean that people already on a low income being hit further.

It would encourage further child poverty and force more people to become financially excluded. To ask a household already struggling and reliant on benefits to find an extra £5.00 per week could cause severe hardship and added pressures. This could result in council tax arrears, bailiff action which in the long run would increase the council costs and recoverability would become more and more difficult.

Option 4

The general consensus on targeted reductions was generally positive but NOT to all; The banded Discount Scheme is a possibility but we would require further information on the amount of households this would affect and who are living in those households. This would generate a big saving to the council and would mean fewer cuts in other areas.

The idea of halving the savings limit seems fair and wouldn't necessarily cause hardship.

We strongly disagree with including Child Benefit as income – this again is encouraging child poverty. Similarly with the child maintenance – this is a very insignificant saving and is paid for the responsibility of a child – no child should have to suffer because of the cuts being made by the government.

We strongly disagree with introducing a maximum limit on the amount of council tax benefit that can be paid: whilst it appears to be a small amount to pay (10%) this would cause severe hardship for the most vulnerable people in society again. Many of the other changes mentioned appear to create small savings but collectively could help.

The suggestion of increasing the taper from 20p to 25p is a possibility but more information is needed to fully assess who this would impact and how many. We felt that there was insufficient information to be able to formulate the available options overall.

4. Equality Impact Assessment

The Council has prepared an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) based on the guidance provided by the Department for Communities and Local Government on the options to be considered. This is available on request.

APPENDIX 3

Listed below are some of the potential impacts on groups based on each of the 4 proposed options.

Option 1 - Adopt the current national benefit scheme and absorbing the cost against current and future budgets:

- People on limited means will pay similar amounts to what they pay currently in their Council Tax and those with nothing to pay will continue to pay nothing.
- Funding gap will widen each year (as funding reduces over time) having a delayed negative impact on households with limited means. This could impact on the provision of services for vulnerable groups if funding is cut through this option.

Option 2 - Increase the Council Tax level and / or review discounts to make up the shortfall in funding:

- Funding for the pensioner scheme provided, generally, Council Tax payers will benefit from changes to Council Tax discounts.
- All Council Tax payers could potentially pay more to bridge the funding gap.
- People of a State Pensionable Age are exempt and the proportion of older people in South Derbyshire is projected to increase. Liability will fall on the working age population

Option 3 – A maximum reduction of between 25% and 30% on Council Tax Benefit across all unprotected groups

- Achieves the reduction and provides funding for the pensioner scheme, maintaining current benefit entitlement for pensioners.
- Based on current levels of Council Tax Benefit means that about 33% of claimants (approx 2,000 households) would need to make up the difference. This would reduce their current support towards council tax by as much as 25-30% or on average of up to £5 per week.
- People on limited means will have to pay towards their Council Tax and will affect the overall income of each household.
- Wider welfare reform will also introduce negative impacts to some households. It is not possible to quantify at this moment With the introduction of the Benefits Cap and changes to the rules relating to under occupation in social housing- it is not possible to quantify this at the moment because
 - a) DWP data relating to customers who will be potentially affected is out of date and may not be accurate and
 - b) Changes relating to under occupation relates to claimants in social housing and this information is not available at this point in time. The information is currently being gathered over the next few weeks.
- People of a State Pensionable Age are exempt and the proportion of older people in South Derbyshire is projected to increase. Liability will fall on the working age population.

Option 4 - A targeted reduction by the way we calculate Council Tax Benefit entitlement

This option depends on the options proposed. Recent Government announcements mean that some of the potential options are no longer viable or will not now be allowed by legislation.

APPENDIX 3

Based on the current option being considered

Group	Positive impact	Negative impact
Socio/Economic	<p>The local Council Tax Support scheme would be based on the key features of the current national scheme. Basic benefit entitlement would continue to be calculated on the current parameters, thresholds and allowances as the national scheme.</p> <p>This means people can still apply for both housing benefit and local council tax support at the same time based on similar rules of entitlement until such time as other changes under the Welfare Reform agenda come into force e.g. Universal Credit.</p>	The local Council Tax Support scheme means the 'non-protected' working age claimants of the local scheme would have their benefit entitlement reduced on a straight line percentage or alternatively have to pay a fixed percentage of the headline bill.
Age	All pensioners to be afforded full protection under legislation in all local schemes.	N/a
Disability	The homeowner or dependent within the household who is registered disabled is protected by the local scheme.	N/a
Gender /Transgender		No disproportionate impact.
Marital status		No disproportionate impact.
Pregnancy / maternity	Explore ways of supporting single parent mothers (and fathers) through childcare arrangements or in accessing employment. Signposting to the County Council who offer advice and support associated with childcare arrangements and accessing the financial support that is in place.	Not to protect the current benefit entitlement for single parent families.
Sexual orientation		No disproportionate impact.
Ethnicity		Customers whose first language is not English may not be able to easily understand the changes in the scheme. This will be reviewed to establish if any problems for other members of the community become evident.
Religion / Beliefs		No disproportionate impact.

APPENDIX 3

A summary of the findings of the EIA is set out below:

- The EIA has enabled the Council to initially assess the impact of all of the principles which will shape the Local Council Tax Support Scheme (LCTSS) following consultation.
- Steps have been taken to minimise hardship and /or help people to budget and make payments at affordable rates
- The Council is considering using its powers to set up a Discretionary Hardship Fund, which would operate on similar lines to the current Discretionary Payments scheme to help householders pay their rent in exceptional circumstances, and an enhanced role by helping households affected to access specialist advice and support.
- The EIA has been reviewed in light of the consultation process and during the development of the final Scheme.
- Steps will be taken to introduce, implement and inform people of the new local Council Tax Support scheme and how they will be potentially affected.
- Need to identify those measures that the Council is going to take in supporting people with the changes and what monitoring will be undertaken to measure actual impacts of any changes to the proposed scheme.
- The adopted Scheme would be reviewed on an annual basis.

5. Themes

Some of the main themes coming out of the consultation are:

- The most popular option from the surveys returned was Option 4 - A targeted reduction by changing the way we calculate Council Tax Benefit entitlement.
- From the consultation process it can also be identified that residents felt that the Council should tackle the issue of empty homes discount.
- Residents also felt that everyone should contribute something towards new scheme. 'The shortfall in funding should be shared as much as possible, i.e. "everyone should pay something". There is positive support for charging council tax on empty homes.'
- 'Concern has been expressed, although there has been an appreciation of the Council's position and that it needs to resolve the issue. Discussion has taken place on other changes to the welfare system and their affect on certain groups such as single parent families and taking into account Child Benefit in assessing entitlement
- General endorsement for a scheme that is designed to recover shortfalls directly associated with the reduction of government funding, after taking reasonable account of any increased in claims and prudent recovery assumptions, but reluctance to support a scheme which could be seen to 'over recover' any shortfall
- The Council to consider some enhanced role in helping households affected to access specialist advice and support. Along with other authorities in Derbyshire the Council has been approached by the Derbyshire Financial Inclusion Partnership for a relatively small grant.
- The Council has the power to set up a Discretionary Hardship Fund, which could operate on similar lines to help households pay their rent in exceptional circumstances

APPENDIX 3

Appendix A – Schedule of Consultation undertaken – 4146 direct contacts.

What	When	Format	Officer	Venue	Complete	Target
Press Launch	15 August 2012	Electronic/ Online	Carole Warburton	N/A	15/8/12	All Residents through the local media.
General CVS Email Alert	August 2012	Electronic	Pam Wood (CVS)	N/A	16/8/12 and 25/10/12	370 recipients inc Community Groups, Individuals CVS Staff & Volunteers.
Social Media	During the consultation	Electronic	Julia Dowding	N/A	15/8/12 - 7/11/12	All @sddc followers (over 2,000 but not all resident in South Derbyshire).
Targeted CVS Email Alert to specific stakeholders	August 2012	Electronic	Pam Wood (CVS)	N/A	16/8/12	110 groups including CAB Mental Health Association Learning Disability Forum VSF Members.
Volunteer briefing to clients accessing CVS services	August 2012	Briefing	Pam Wood (CVS)	N/A	16/8/12	35 individuals who support hard to reach and socially isolated individuals accessing services such as food parcels.
Direct mail out	September 2012	Mail shot	Julia Dowding	N/A	10/9/12	2000 unprotected claimants.
Direct mail to citizens panel	September 2012	Mail shot	Julia Dowding	N/A	30/8/12	1000 members of the Citizens Panel, residents of the district.
CVS Newsletter Article	September 2012	Paper/ Electronic	Pam Wood (CVS)	N/A	30/9/12	160 recipients inc Community Groups, Individuals CVS Staff & Volunteers.
Media Release	13 th September	Electronic/ Online	Keith Bull	N/A	13/9/12	Residents through the local media.
SDP Board Meeting	19 th September 10.00am start	Presentation	Kevin Stackhouse and Martin Guest	Old Post Centre, Newhall	19/9/12	14 individuals representing key partners across the district.

APPENDIX 3

What	When	Format	Officer	Venue	Complete	Audience
Learning Disability Forum	20 th September	Hard copy questionnaires	Pam Wood (CVS)	Rosliston Forestry Centre	20/9/12	40 adults with learning disabilities.
Communities and Equalities Forum	20 th September 2.30pm start	Presentation and discussion with hard copy questionnaire	Ray Keech Martin Guest/ Pam Wood (CVS)	SDCVS 48 Grove Street, Swadlincote, Derbyshire DE11 9DD	20/9/12	20 members representing a range of Community and Equality Groups.
Focus Groups	24 th and 25 th September	Presentation and discussion with hard copy questionnaire	Ray Keech Pam Wood (CVS) facilitate	Council Chamber, Civic Offices	25/9/12	17 members of the Citizens' Panel expressing the views.
Newhall/Midway Area Forum	25 th September 6.00pm start	Presentation and discussion with hard copy questionnaire	Kevin Stackhouse Pam Wood (CVS)	Stanton Village Hall Woodland Road, Stanton, Derbyshire. DE15 9TH	25/9/12	28 attendees at the meeting.
Voluntary Sector Forum (VSF)	26 th September 12.00pm start	Presentation and discussion with hard copy questionnaire	Ray Keech Pam Wood (CVS)	Goseley Community Centre Hartshill Road Hartshorne	26/9/12	20 individuals representing 15 Community Groups (inc Hard to Reach) and Stakeholder Groups (inc CAB, Money Advice).
Parish Liaison Group	2 nd October 6.00pm start	Presentation and discussion with hard copy questionnaire	Kevin Stackhouse Martin Guest	SDDC Council Offices	2/10/12	20 Parish Chairs/Clerks from across the district.
Tenants Forum	10.30 – 11.30am on the 3 rd October	Presentation and discussion with hard copy questionnaire	Ray Keech Martin Guest	Unity Close Community Room, in Church Street, Church Gresley.	3/10/12	25 SDDC tenants and residents.

APPENDIX 3

What	When	Format	Officer	Venue	Complete	Audience
North East/Melbourne Area Forum	3 rd October 6.00pm start	Presentation and discussion with hard copy questionnaire	Kevin Stackhouse Martin Guest	Barrow-on-Trent Village Hall Twyford Road, Barrow-on-Trent. Derby. DE73 7HA	3/10/12	10 attendees at the meeting.
Funding Fair	8 th October	Hard copy questionnaires	Pam Wood (CVS)	Ashfield House, 218 Ashby Road, Burton-on-Trent DE15 0LA	8/10/12	90 South Derbyshire community groups.
Southern Derbyshire Health & Social Care Forum	9 th October	Hard copy questionnaires	Pam Wood (CVS)	York Road Church, Church Gresley	9/10/12	40 community groups, paper copies available.
North West/Etwall Area Forum	10 th October 6.00pm start	Presentation and discussion with hard copy questionnaire	Kevin Stackhouse Martin Guest	Sutton-on-the-Hill Village Hall Marlpitt Lane, Sutton-on-the-Hill, Derby. DE6 5JA	10/10/12	21 attendees at the meeting.
Central/Swadlincote Area Forum	16 th October 6.00pm start	Presentation and discussion with hard copy questionnaire	Kevin Stackhouse Pam Wood (CVS)	Goseley Community Centre Hartshill Road, Hartshorne, Derbyshire. DE11 7HN	16/10/12	20 attendees at the meeting.
CVS AGM	19 th October	Hard copy questionnaires	Pam Wood (CVS)	Repton Village Hall	19/10/12	60 individuals including CVS Members, Stakeholders, Funders and the General Public.
South/Linton Area Forum	23 rd October 6.00pm start	Presentation and discussion with hard copy questionnaire	Kevin Stackhouse Martin Guest (CVS)	Coton-in-the-Elms Community Centre Elms Road, Coton-in-the-Elms, Swadlincote, Derbyshire. DE12 8HD	23/10/12	26 attendees at the meeting.

APPENDIX 3

What	When	Format	Officer	Venue	Complete	Audience
Mercia/ Repton Area Forum	25 th October 6.00pm start	Presentation and discussion with hard copy questionnaire	Kevin Stackhouse Pam Wood (CVS)	Milton Village Hall Main Street, Milton, Derbyshire. DE65 6EH	25/10/12	20 attendees at the meeting.
Media Release	13 th September	Electronic/ Online	Keith Bull	N/A	2/11/12	Residents through the local media.

APPENDIX 3