

2010/11 Budget Recommendations and Conclusions

Recommendations

The Resources and Performance Scrutiny Board, having undertaken a review of the Council's prioritisation matrix, revenue expenditure by service and reviewed the capital bids received as part of the 2010/11 process, recommends that the Executive considers the following recommendations:

Non Consulted and Miscellaneous Services

1. That individual contingency costs for "key man cover" from all service areas should be transferred to a central risk provision. This would result in a cost reduction of £7K in 2010/11 (based on draft 1 of 2010/11 budget).
2. That as a result of the analysis of the shredding costs (£16K 2008/09) it was established that the capital bid for the provision of an in-house shredding facility was no longer viable and also a new contract was being explored for the provision of shredding services. This supplier is with a local organisation which employs people with learning disabilities and should lead to a £7K saving if awarded.
3. That all advertising/communications/publications activity and expenditure should be centralised under the Communications Service cost centre.
4. That the £16K savings delivered through the revised Cherwell Link distribution contract should be 'banked' or earmarked for special issues or allocated to cover an increase in the number of annual issues.
5. That the budget for purchase of IT equipment and materials should be centralised within the ICT cost centre and efficiencies sought.
6. That in order to deliver some cost savings the Democratic Services team should seek the views of members as to whether they wanted or needed a Year Book, and in what format (£787 2009/10).
7. That the Resources and Performance Scrutiny Board should monitor and review the impact of the Distribution, Print and Post cost savings proposals during 2010/11, and if they do not deliver the required levels of savings to conduct a more detailed scrutiny as part of the 2011/12 budget to identify further saving options (based on nice/necessary/statutory analysis).
8. That the costs of the Members Photo should be borne by the Members themselves (£277 2009/10).
9. That the potential for savings on Christmas Lights (£66K 2009/10) should be considered as part of the 2011/2012 budget process. The process should include early consultation (in Q1 2010) with Banbury Town Council, Bicester

Town Council and Kidlington Parish Council.

10. That the Resources & Performance Scrutiny Board should conduct a scrutiny/VFM review into all support service costs in the early part of 2010/11 to feed into the 2011/12 budget.

Capital Programme

11. That a further review of capital bids, financing, impact on cashflow and investment income will need to be considered before schemes are recommended for inclusion in the 2010/11 budget.
12. That the capital programme for 2010/11 should include an ICT Capital Reserve to cover investment in those lesser value, lower rated capital bids. This should include all ICT bids scoring 21 or less and that the value of the ICT Capital Reserve should be set at £150K. The creation of this ICT Capital Reserve should be conditional on the fact that the expenditure against it would be subject to rigorous controls and monitoring by the Capital Review Group and the Finance Scrutiny Working Group.
13. That the £575,000 capital bid for the Mandatory Disabled Facilities Grants should be recommended for approval subject to recommendation 11 above.
14. That the Council should support the work of Housing Services, in collaboration with Registered Social Landlords, to introduce alternative strategies and creative solutions to meet the needs of the disabled and elderly tenants. The general issue of Mandatory Disabled Facilities Grants should be addressed by Overview and Scrutiny during 2010/11.

Conclusions

Issue / Service Area	Conclusion
Non Consulted Services	
Community Planning	The Working Group concluded that there was little scope to identify further budget savings in this service area until/unless there was no longer a requirement for significant planning and consultation activity.
Chief Executive Office	The Working Group concluded that there was little scope to identify further budget savings in this service area.
Member Services	The Working Group concluded that there was little scope to identify further budget savings in this service area over and above those items singled out in the draft recommendations.
Democratic Services	The Working Group concluded that there was little scope to identify further budget savings in this service area over and above those items singled out in the draft recommendations.
Miscellaneous Services	
Anti Social Behaviour	The Working Group was satisfied with the information provided on the anti social behaviour service budget.
Licensing	The Working Group concluded that there was little scope to identify further budget savings in this service area due to constraints on income and expenditure and the requirement for the service to breakeven.
Museum and Tourist Information Centre	The Working Group concluded that in light of the 2009/2010 budget cuts there was little scope to identify further budget savings in this service area.
Tourism	The Working Group was satisfied with the information provided on the tourism service budget.
Arts	The Working Group was satisfied with the information provided on the arts service budget.
Landscaping	The Working Group was satisfied with the information provided on the landscape service budget.

Energy Costs and Consumptions	The Working Group was satisfied with the information provided on energy costs and consumption.
Capital Programme	
Planning Capital Bids	The Working Group was satisfied with the information presented.
Economic Development	The Working Group was satisfied with the information presented.
Finance Capital Bids	The Working Group was advised that this bid was linked to a mandatory requirement for all Local Authorities to change their financial reporting arrangements and adopt the International Financial Reporting System (IFRS). The Working Group was satisfied with the information presented.
Housing Capital Bids	<p>The Working Group noted the information and agreed that the following bids should go forward without amendment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bid 28: Discretionary Housing Grants• Bid 32: Banbury Foyer and Banbury Youth Hub• Bid 34: Funding for Mollington and Hornton Rural Exception Sites• Bid 36: Purchase of Temporary Accommodation Bryan House, Bicester and Edward Street, Banbury <p>The following bids were the subject of recommendations (11, 13, 14):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bid 30: Mandatory Disabled Facilities Grants (DFG's)• Bid 31: Equity Loans Scheme• Bid 35: Acquisitions of properties in rural areas
Customer Service and ICT New Capital Bids	The Working Group noted the information and agreed that those bids with an individual score of more than 21 points should go forward to the Executive for consideration. Those bids with a score of 21 points or less were the subject of a separate recommendation (12).

Scrutiny Officer

2 December 2009