

**Housing VFM Revisit**  
**Executive Summary**  
**Cherwell District Council**

<b>Timetable</b>	<b>Papers Finalised</b>	<b>Meeting Date</b>
CMT	11 June 2010	16 June 2010
Use of Resources	12 July 2010	15 July 2010
Executive	23 July 2010	2 August 2010



<b>Revision History</b>		
<b>Revision Date</b>	<b>Previous Revision Date</b>	<b>Summary of Changes</b>
19 May 2010		Initial draft
27 May 2010	19 May 2010	Housing and Finance contributions added
8 June 2010	27 May 2010	Amendments following project meeting and JH comments
10 June 2010	8 June 2010	Annex on support costs, additional volumetric data
11 June 2010	10 June 2010	Final draft agreed with JH, GG
23 July 2010	11 June 2010	Revised annex on support costs

## Value for Money Revisit of Housing - Executive Summary

---

### 1 Introduction

#### Purpose of this report

- 1.1. This report sets out the findings of the VFM revisit of Housing. 'Revisit' reviews are intended to look at services that have already undergone a full value for money review but are still identified as high cost when compared to other councils. In this case the initial identification of high cost and the follow through to this study has been shown to be affected by an incorrect submission and analysis of the financial data used by Government and the Audit Commission. (see para 2.6 below).
- 1.2. The aim of a revisit review is to refresh key information on the service to an extent that will allow an overall judgement on the value for money it offers. It is not intended to be as in-depth as a full VFM review or to take up significant amounts of staff resource to complete. To achieve this, the review uses information that is readily available rather than undertake new areas of research.

#### Introduction

- 1.3. The Housing service was subject to a full VFM review during 2007/08, which reported to Executive in May 2008. The key recommendations of the Review can be summarised as:
  - Absorbing £250,000 in 2008/09 growth bids with no additional revenue
  - Continue to implement the Housing Service Improvement Plan
  - Make full use of benchmarking data to identify areas for improvement and efficiency
  - Focus on performance improvements in homelessness and temporary accommodation
  - Reduce the overall costs of the service by a reduction of £500,000 to the base budget over three years

#### VFM Conclusion

- 1.4. The overall conclusion of the review is that the service is now **below average cost** for housing strategy and private sector housing, and remains **above average cost** for homelessness, but the latter is driven by local circumstances and activity rather than unnecessary spend. It has **high performance** in terms of lower use of temporary accommodation, delivery of affordable housing and responding to the recession. It is **high quality** in terms of high levels of user satisfaction.

#### Cherwell in context

- 1.5. Cherwell is among the least deprived districts in the country although there are significant pockets of disadvantage; seven areas in Cherwell are in the worst 10% in England on the skills, education and training domain of the Index of Deprivation 2007, this includes the wards of Grimsbury & Castle, Ruscote and Neithrop. The Child Well-being Index (CWI) 2009 supports these findings but also reveals particularly poor scores for health, housing and crime.
- 1.6. To support this further a considerable amount of work undertaken by Housing Services relates to the provision of services for vulnerable people and particularly to those living in these three wards. Our service records show:

- 32% of all requests for assistance received by the private sector housing team come from within the three wards
- a third of all housing register applicants currently live within the three wards
- 50% of all enforcement interventions involve properties/landlords within the three wards

There is clearly a strong correlation between the nature of the work of the housing services teams and the needs of those residents living in those areas. This correlation manifests itself in a variety of ways and includes but is not limited to the following:

- The increased need for access to a home that is affordable
- An increased use of privately rented properties by BME communities – in particular by the Eastern European populations – and the associated resources
- A greater importance attached to housing services working more closely with partner agencies and to assume a wider remit of responsibility in the interests of getting things done and improving outcomes for local residents
- An increased risk of becoming homeless or going into debt that requires preventative measures to help the individual and to mitigate the risks to the Council of picking up such costs
- Spending more time with customers to help them define their needs and requirements
- Working with partners to understand and deliver on the links between housing and the environment
- Undertaking a wider range of initiatives to support the Sustainable Communities Strategy priorities that impact on the Communities ambition – such as the Miller Road self build scheme, the Youth Hub and the Willy Freund Centre

1.7. Major changes to how the service operates have been instigated since the initial review:

- delivery of housing adaptations through the Home Improvement Agency is now fully in-house
- amalgamation of the Banbury Homes rent deposit scheme with Cherwell's Spend to Save scheme and established one scheme for Cherwell (Private Accommodation Lettings Scheme)
- reconfiguration of staffing arrangements within the Housing Needs Team to mitigate the impact of the recession
- aided the council to achieve savings through redeployment opportunities into housing services from housing benefit/council tax outsourcing
- transfer of Community Development & (temporarily) Community Transport functions into strategic housing
- a full set of customer service standards and satisfaction measures have been introduced, and the equality and diversity agenda has been developed significantly
- fully integrated into Oxfordshire choice based lettings scheme
- exited a number of high cost temporary accommodation contracts/ working arrangements and re-commissioned new, less expensive temporary accommodation
- strengthened partnership working through joint commissioning and strategic working

1.8. The service has adapted to the economic downturn through the production of an Affordable Housing & Recession Action Plan to counteract the local effects of the economic downturn – good progress has been made which includes:

- CDC appointed as a fast track authority in introducing a mortgage rescue scheme (assisted over 100 enquiries to date, 10 completions and 15 cases in the pipeline) – our track record has put Cherwell as the 6<sup>th</sup> highest performing authority for successful mortgage rescue completions
- In spite of the economic downturn, the affordable housing delivery outturn of 199 units for 2009/10 was the highest figure since current records began.
- CDC commissioned an acquisition scheme working with a RSL and using the Council's recycled capital budget earmarked for affordable housing. This scheme enabled the RSL to purchase properties on the open market at a time when property prices were deflated due to the economic downturn. In turn they provided CDC with nomination rights to the properties so that we were able to re-house those on the housing register. Out of the 17 properties purchased, 9 were much needed larger 4 bedroom houses suitable for larger households and to meet the specific needs of those families with disabilities.

1.3 Whilst no longer in a recession we are still in a period of economic recovery. The longer term housing implications of the recession will take some time to emerge and any change in local housing markets and house prices will present further challenges for the service.

### Staffing

1.9. The staffing structure in Housing has changed as follows;

Established Posts	At 31/3/2009		At 31/3/2010	
	Posts	Vacancies	Posts	Vacancies
	FTE	FTE	FTE	FTE
Head of Housing Services	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
Strategic Housing	5.00	0.00	5.00	0.00
Housing Needs	18.00	2.32	18.89	1.30
Private Sector Housing	10.65	1.00	7.68	1.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>34.65</b>	<b>3.30</b>	<b>34.56</b>	<b>2.30</b>

Generally the staffing levels in the service have been stable. This is a reflection of the Service Plan, which applies an investment in a strong permanent and professional staff team to remedy past deficiencies in case work and control external "failure" costs (homelessness acceptances and temporary accommodation). The changes that have occurred are as follows:

- A post has moved under TUPE from Banbury Homes to cover the private accommodations letting scheme, plus some internal staffing reconfiguration to absorb the Banbury Homes scheme. The costs associated with this post were offset against an existing vacancy of Housing Options Officer.
- In March 2009 the Housing Needs team underwent a further minor staff reconfiguration to mitigate the impact of the recession. This allowed us to reallocate staff within the teams to areas of pressure and tackle levels of increasing housing need. This was a cost neutral exercise.
- A Private Sector Development Officer post has been established on a secondment basis to take forward the Private Sector Housing Strategy Action Plan. This post has been funded from Planning and Housing Delivery Grant and Recession Impact funding and is a two year post until 31 March 2012.
- A long standing vacancy in the Home Improvement Agency has been temporarily filled through short term contracts. This post is being held to assist with an identified redeployment issue that should come to a close by end of 2010.

- In April 2010 following a review of EMT the Community Development and Community Transport functions transferred into the Strategic Housing area of Housing Services. This resulted in the Strategic Housing Team establishment increasing from 5 FTEs to 7 FTEs (excluded from the above table)

### Expenditure

- 1.10. The budget and expenditure of the service is set out in the table below. A breakdown of support service charges is attached as Annex 1

	2008/09 Actual	2009/10 Actual	2010/11 Approved Budget
Employee Costs	1,233,736	1,194,697	1,244,204
Premises Costs	101,113	87,020	59,065
Transport Costs	51,679	113,630	51,654
Supplies & Services	305,082	207,627	343,734
Third Party Payments	425,679	551,500	243,218
Support Services	351,069	398,231	349,836
Internal Support Services	349,363	317,777	319,829
Capital Charges	96,848	83,456	92,260
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>2,914,568</b>	<b>2,953,938</b>	<b>2,703,800</b>
Government Grant	105,578	55,479	86,050
Other Grants	117,603	160,740	123,433
Fees And Charges	139,989	95,543	106,474
Charges To Other Mgt Centres	0	112,430	102,800
Rental & Interest Income	112,296	84,340	62,565
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>475,466</b>	<b>508,512</b>	<b>481,322</b>
<b>Net Expenditure</b>	<b>2,439,102</b>	<b>2,445,426</b>	<b>2,222,478</b>

- 1.11. Key issues to highlight are;

- Net service expenditure has reduced by £217k (-8.9%) since 2008/09
- Third party payments have reduced overall by £182 (-42.9%) since 2008/09, with a peak in expenditure in 2009/10. The reductions are attributable to the termination of the costly OSLA nomination agreement, less use of private contractors and consultants and reductions in the use of bed and breakfast. Peaks in 2009/10 were due to unforeseeable costs relating to the liability for the treatment of asbestos in former council housing stock
- A reduction in building maintenance & repairs and office accommodation charges has led to a £42k (41.6%) reduction in premises charges
- Staff support costs have remained fairly constant, although still make up a large proportion (24.8%) of gross expenditure.

## 2 Findings from the Review

- 2.1. The review has used financial data from 11 CIPFA comparator authorities to provide 2010/11 comparative budget data, assessed progress with implementing recommendations of the last review, analysed the most recent performance, quality and productivity information available for the service, and assessed the financial contribution the service has made to the authority.

### Progress since the full VFM Review

2.2. The service has implemented the majority of the May 2008 recommendations. Highlights from this are:

- The service achieved its £500,000 VFM savings target 2 years ahead of schedule, with a total saving of £660,000 to be delivered in 2010/11 (see 2.4 below).
- A customer satisfaction framework has been introduced for housing services where performance and customer satisfaction information is collected quarterly and analysed by Housing Services Management Team.
- Review of the rent deposit scheme undertaken in January 2009. Amalgamated CDC rent deposit scheme with Banbury Homes Rent Deposit Scheme to create and operate one scheme, "Private Accommodation Lettings Scheme" (PALS) for Cherwell. PALS launched January 2010.
- Private Sector Housing Strategy completed and adopted by Council, includes action plan and item on returning empty homes to use.
- Completed exit strategy from high cost temporary accommodation contracts such as OSLA bringing about considerable savings on temporary accommodation costs.
- Reduced level of temporary accommodation ahead of government target – reducing from an all time high number of 438 households occupying temporary accommodation in March 2006 to 115 by March 2008 and achieving our temporary accommodation target of 33 by March 2010.

2.3. Exceptions to this are:

- Further benchmarking and process benchmarking with other authorities has not progressed as planned. A good deal of work was instigated and undertaken, facilitated by the Housing Quality Network (HQN), but a failure of local partners to fully engage, and problems with data means that the service does not necessarily have a better picture of where further costs could be taken out of processes. An update benchmarking exercise is planned for August 2010 to be followed by process mapping work to aid comparisons.
- It has not been possible to pursue Champion or Beacon status for the excellent Housing Service performance due to a lack of available support. However CDC has been a major partner including recognition for Oxfordshire as a Centre of Excellence for its joined up housing service delivery to young people.

2.4. The key achievement has been the delivery of VFM savings 2 years ahead of time and £160k (+31.7%) more than planned, as illustrated in the tables below;

<b>VFM Review Savings targets</b>	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12
Temporary Accommodation	(71)	(124)	(18)	(3)
Spend to Save	0	(25)	(25)	(25)
Salary/Consultancy Savings	0	(20)	(40)	(20)
Additional staff/process savings	0	(20)	(45)	(65)
<b>Total</b>	<b>(71)</b>	<b>(189)</b>	<b>(128)</b>	<b>(113)</b>
Cumulative	(71)	(260)	(388)	(501)

<b>VFM Review Actual Savings</b>	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12
Temporary Accommodation	(164)	(164)		
Spend to Save	(42)	(102)		
Salary/Consultancy Savings	0	(55)		

Additional staff/process savings	0	(47)	(86)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>(206)</b>	<b>(368)</b>	<b>(86)</b>	<b>0</b>
Cumulative	(206)	(574)	(660)	(660)

- 2.5. Despite a cumulative saving of £660k the net expenditure for the service has actually reduced by less. This is due to exceptional expenditure around asbestos removal in former council housing stock (total of £350k) and car allowance buy-out costs (£55k) in 2009/10. Neither of these major costs can be attributed to Service related actions and can be isolated from a VFM analysis.

### Current Expenditure Comparison

- 2.6. Investigation into Cherwell's revenue outturn (RO) and revenue estimate (RA) forms has shown that allocations on these forms made in previous years have been incorrect. This had a significant affect on the conclusions previously drawn about the comparative service costs and is reflected in the Audit Commission analysis tools. As part of this review the figures have been corrected for use in this VFM Study. They now show a greater allocation of expenditure to housing strategy, reductions in the allocation to homelessness, and crucially a reallocation of private rented housing standards expenditure to the correct category 'environmental and regulatory services'. This has set the overall cost of the service accurately and allowed more meaningful comparison with other authorities.
- 2.7. Extensive checking has been undertaken with other authorities to ensure their RA returns have been correctly completed. Although there may still be different ways in which authorities account for their spend this gives us the most up-to-date and best estimate to compare ourselves with. Comparisons have been undertaken on expenditure, less capital, and less homelessness grant.
- 2.8. Key findings from the 2010/11 budget comparisons with CIPFA family comparators are;
- Cherwell is now the 5<sup>th</sup> highest spending authority out of 12, with costs 8% (£180,500) higher than the CIPFA family average, and 56% higher than the lowest quartile spend (+£870,000).
  - Homelessness costs in Cherwell are 54% higher than average (+£261,000) and 270% higher than the lowest quartile (+£544,000).
  - Due to differences in accounting practice across different authorities costs for strategic housing and private sector housing standards are best considered together. These show Cherwell as spending 9.4% less than average (-£166,600) or 34.8% more than the lowest quartile spend (+£414,000)
  - In terms of comparisons with Huntingdonshire, used as the best comparator authority in the previous VFM review, Cherwell remains 18% more expensive overall (+£357,000), and 18% more expensive for homelessness (+£113,500).
- 2.9. The majority of difference in spend is for homelessness, with lower costs in other areas of housing. However, it is clear from the deprivation data and analysis of metrics that the reason for additional spending is because of higher levels of homelessness activity. This is illustrated below;
- Cherwell has the worst levels of child welfare within the family group, which goes some way to explaining the larger than expected homelessness issue the area deals with, as most statutory provision is linked to adults with children, pregnancies or teenage homelessness.



- Cherwell had the 3<sup>rd</sup> highest level of homelessness applications per 1,000 population in 2009, but only the 7<sup>th</sup> highest level of homelessness acceptances, illustrating the success of prevention work
- We continue to see a year on year increase in applicants to the housing register and approaches for housing advice and assistance (2366 in 2007/8 rising to 2624 new applications in 2009/10)
- The number of families in bed and breakfast remains fairly constant (32 in 2007/08, 34 in 2009/10) as has casework for prevention (233 in 2008/09, 236 in 2009/10), but this is set against an improvement in performance for prevention (see 2.11 below)
- Recent movement in the housing market is resulting in a higher number of landlords giving notice to their tenants with the intention of selling the property once vacated (May 2009, 14 cases compared with May 2010, 28 cases).

### Performance and Satisfaction

2.10. Service performance has improved markedly since the previous VFM review:

- Homelessness acceptances, which had reached 2 per quarter in Q3 2007/08, increased to 20 in Q1 2008/09, and are now at 10 per quarter in Q4 2009/10.
- The number of households in temporary accommodation has fallen from 117 (2007/08) to 29 (2009/10); a 75% reduction, and achieved more quickly than the agreed strategy
- The number of affordable homes delivered has increased from 160 (2007/08) to 199 (2009/10) despite the economic downturn, well in excess of the corporate target of 100.
- DFG delivery performance has increased significantly from demand-led spend of £782k in 2007/8, to £910k in 2008/9 and £950k in 2009/10).
- Number of homes where serious hazards resolved: 59 in 2007/8, 62 in 2008/9 and 93 in 2009/10.

2.11. Homelessness prevention has seen a significant improvement in performance, resulting in fewer homelessness applications and so achieving savings;

	2007	2009	% diff
Approaches/caseload	924	1067	15%
Applications taken	364	263	-28%
Homelessness duty accepted	168	115	-32%
As a % on presentations	46%	44%	-2%

2.12. Drivers for this performance are:

- The successful implementation of the Temporary Accommodation Strategy to reduce the use of bed and breakfast, and the promotion of alternative pathways for those presenting as homeless
- Use of capital funding to acquire empty housing units for use as affordable housing by housing associations, with Cherwell acquiring nomination rights to the units
- Development of a successful landlord grant which provides part funding for improvements (levering landlord investment) in return for nomination rights
- The successful implementation of the affordable housing recession action plan that enable the Council and its partners to focus on tackling the impact of the economic downturn.

- Our ability to set out our direction of travel and undertake excellent partnership working through a range of strategic activities such as the production of the private sector housing strategy and older persons housing strategy.
- Following the 2007/08 restructure, the embedding of staff into their roles and the consolidation of team and partnership working.

2.13. Satisfaction surveys are now run across the service. Complaints and compliments are also monitored by each part of the service as are service delivery standards. Latest available satisfaction figures for 2009/10 are as follows;

Area	Satisfaction scores
Choice based letting system	90%
Housing options advice	28.5% excellent, 71.5% good
Temporary accommodation	24.3% excellent, 48.3% good, 18.9% less than satisfactory
Disabled Facilities Grant works	100%
Quality of small repairs grant works	100%
Landlords satisfied following pro-active HMO inspections	100%
Private accommodation lettings scheme (customers)	46.7% excellent, 53.3% good
Private accommodation lettings scheme (landlords)	53.4% excellent, 40% good

### Leverage

2.14. An analysis of partnership working and inward investment between 2006/07 and 2009/10 has calculated total inward investment raised by the Council's housing services and their partners of approximately £125,000,000. Inward investment includes but is not limited to:

- Affordable housing delivery – HCA grant, RSL private borrowing and other contributions from partners
- Homelessness Revenue on a range of initiatives – such as Family Mediation and Assertive Outreach project, Oxford House refurbishment and the Willy Freund Centre refurbishment
- Supporting People funding – to allow vulnerable people to secure the right support in their home
- Home Improvement grants – such as Disabled Facilities Grants and Landlord Improvement Grants from GOSE

### Housing Contribution to corporate initiatives

2.15. Housing Services makes significant contributions to other Council priorities which are not in the strictest sense “direct housing responsibilities”- however, housing may take a lead role because it already has in place established partnership working, or because the completion of work is necessary to the authority's and housing's long term objectives. Such examples include but are not limited to:

- Planning and Affordable Housing Policy – e.g. Housing Services has coordinated major pieces of evidence gathering to inform the LDF such as financial viability assessments and housing need and housing market intelligence, as well as undertaking the lead project role for the Supplementary Planning Document. Strategic hours – 20 hours per month
- CDC Agenda for Domestic Abuse – Case work and attendance at partnership meetings – operational hours and strategic hours – 25 hours per month
- CDC Agenda for Substance Misuse and lead contributor to Community Development – Strategic hours – operational hours and strategic hours – 25 hours per month

- CDC Agenda for young people (sports and recreation and antisocial behaviour) – e.g. re-commissioning of young peoples services to join SP budgets with OCC, Children & Young Peoples commissioning budgets to provide better value for money and prioritisation of placements to relevant priority cases. Young people hub – to address the priorities for CDC of joining up young peoples services at point of delivery, to assist NEETs etc., Operational hours and attendance at YP group/ and strategic hours – 25 hours per month
- Considerable partnership working to bring together voluntary sector organisations, statutory agencies, RSL partners and CDC to address CDC priorities. This partnership working has had considerable success and much as been achieved through pooling resources and attracting both CDC and external funding e.g. Charterplus, CLG funding. Examples are: Willy Freund Centre refurbishment – this was a scheme where a number of funding streams including CLG, CDC capital and Charterplus were brought together to enable the refurbishment of a much needed resource for young people.
- CDC Agenda for antisocial behaviour, e.g. MAPPa and related meetings, RSL/Housing ASB development work – operational hours and strategic hours – 25 hours per month
- Family Intervention Project (FIP) development with OCC – 15 hours per month
- Brighter Futures in Banbury – Leading the Thematic Group for Housing and the Environment also Housing Services contribution towards the other Thematic Groups – operational and strategic hours 30 hours per month

### 3 Conclusions

- 3.1. The proactive spend to save and preventative approach currently undertaken by Housing Services has provided the Council with considerable savings over the past 3 years alongside marked improvements in performance. Changes to this approach must be considered with caution as a move towards providing a reactive service only would see a return in the longer term to increasing numbers of homelessness and use of temporary accommodation with the considerable costs associated not just to this Council but other statutory agencies, not to mention and indeed the very people affected by this.
- 3.2. Against this, the council must plan for potential savings required of it through reduced grant settlement. The scenarios below set out the savings and implications against each of the three models used for the MTFS. Each assumes the loss of the Homelessness grant. The development of savings against these scenarios will form part of a wider exercise, and it has not been possible to pursue this to completion as part of the Review.
- 3.3. Additional savings of £100,000 have been identified as achievable in 2011/12 with no adverse affect on service performance

MTFS Scenario	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	Total Saving
Identified VFM Saving	£ 100,000			
Base Budget	£ 2,122,478	£ 2,122,478	£ 2,122,478	£ 100,000
5% Annual Savings	£ 111,124	£ 105,568	£ 100,289	
Base Budget	£ 2,111,354	£ 2,005,786	£ 1,905,497	£ 316,981
6.5% Annual Savings	£ 144,461	£ 135,071	£ 126,291	
Base Budget	£ 2,078,017	£ 1,942,946	£ 1,816,654	£ 405,824

Savings	Amount	Year	Comment
Reconfiguration of staffing arrangements to address changes within Housing Needs Team to include a reduction in staffing levels.	£60,000	2011/12	Changes within the Housing Needs team staffing establishment resulting from: a) potential voluntary redundancy request b) improved working arrangements within the Housing Accommodation Team presents opportunity to reduce staffing levels c) Request for reduction in working hours
Potential to realise further savings from reviewing temporary accommodation arrangements.	£40,000	2011/12	Review of existing temporary accommodation management agreement with Charter/Sanctuary due to unsatisfactory performance. This presents an opportunity to bring this function back in-house and absorb additional work into current working and staffing arrangements. Thereby achieving a saving and improved performance/customer satisfaction.

#### 4 Recommendations

- 4.1. Note that the service has delivered £160,000 savings above the £500,000 savings target set in the previous VFM review, and that these have been delivered ahead of schedule
- 4.2. Note the achievement of all other recommendations from the previous VFM review, save for those around process benchmarking, and ensure these are pursued during 2010/11 to identify areas of greater efficiency
- 4.3. Make further efficiency savings of £100,000 in the following areas by April 2011;
  - Reduced and reconfigured staffing arrangements in line with the needs of the service to achieve savings of £60,000
  - Reviewed temporary accommodation contract management arrangements with Charter/Sanctuary to achieve savings of £40,000 and improve contract performance

2009/10 Support Service Charges for Housing	Strategic Housing	Housing Needs	Private Sector Housing	Total
Chgs for Valuations & Estate Mgt	833	2,473	1,174	4,480
Chgs for Payroll	1,801	5,346	2,537	9,684
Chgs for Insurances	1,843	5,469	2,596	9,908
Chgs For Internal Audit	1,445	4,288	2,035	7,768
Charges for Controls	306	909	432	1,647
Chgs for Prof Pers Servs	7,889	23,411	11,112	42,412
Chgs for Procurement	2,051	6,087	2,889	11,027
Chgs for Training	4,568	13,557	6,434	24,559
Chgs Job Evaluation	1,721	5,109	2,425	9,255
Chgs for Health & Safety	1,398	4,148	1,969	7,515
Chgs for Canteen	1,512	4,487	2,130	8,129
Chgs for Reception & Telephone	1,985	5,891	2,796	10,672
Chgs for Printing & Photocopying	2,884	8,559	4,063	15,506
Chgs for Office Services General	2,192	6,505	3,087	11,784
Chgs for Office Services Mailing & Franking M/Cs	2,259	6,705	3,182	12,146
Chgs for Caretaking/Cleaning/Security	5,411	16,058	7,622	29,091
Chgs for Gen Maint Operatives	11	33	16	60
Chgs for Legal Services	7,341	21,786	10,341	39,468
Chgs for IT Client Management	3,691	10,953	5,199	19,843
Chgs for Multi Function Devices	910	2,699	1,281	4,890
Chgs for Information & Security	6,348	18,839	8,942	34,129
Chgs for ICT Infrastructure Support	8,542	25,349	12,031	45,922
Chgs for ICT OCN	474	1,405	667	2,546
Chgs for ICT On Line Service	1,846	5,478	2,600	9,924
<b>SUPPORT SERVICES</b>	<b>69,261</b>	<b>205,546</b>	<b>97,559</b>	<b>372,365</b>
Salaries & Employee Costs	18,688	55,397	26,030	100,115
Premises Costs	223	660	310	1,193
Transport Costs	191	567	267	1,026
Computer Software	2,162	6,410	3,012	11,584
Other Supplies & Services	1,485	4,402	2,068	7,955
Customer Service Centre Recharge	6,933	20,551	9,656	37,140
Other Third Party Payments	333	987	464	1,783
Support Costs	10,279	30,470	14,317	55,066
Other Adjustments	-903	-3,372	365	-3,910
Capital Charges	92	273	128	493
Recharge to Corporate & Democratic Core - J Hoad	-1,507	-4,466	-2,099	-8,072
<b>DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION</b>	<b>37,977</b>	<b>111,878</b>	<b>54,519</b>	<b>204,374</b>
<b>DIVISIONAL ADMIN - HEAD OF HOUSING RECHARGE</b>	<b>20,643</b>	<b>61,263</b>	<b>29,078</b>	<b>110,984</b>
<b>TOTAL INTERNAL SUPPORT SERVICES</b>	<b>58,620</b>	<b>173,141</b>	<b>83,597</b>	<b>315,358</b>