For consideration by Cabinet on 28 July 2009

General Fund

Number	Service	Budget	Carry Forward Request £	
1	City Contract (Direct) Services	Three Stream Waste Collection	38,000	FC
2	Corporate Strategy	Statutory Place Survey	17,300	FC
3	Cultural Services	The Dome : Repair & Maintenance	900	
4	Cultural Services	Heysham Mossgate	10,000	FC
5	Cultural Services	Salt Ayre Sports Centre : Advertising	1,600	
6	Democratic Services	Civic Receptions and Mayoral Functions	800	
7	Economic Development & Tourism	Business Development Grants	4,300	
8	Financial Services	Software : ICON Managed System	37,100	FC
9	Health & Strategic Housing	Dog Warden Service : Signage	3,800	
10	Information & Customer Services	Equipment Maintenance : Authentication Tokens	3,900	
11	Legal & Human Resources	Hackney Carriage Licensing: Taxi Ranks	5,000	
12	Planning Services	Office Equipment	3,200	
13	Revenue Services	LHA Funding : Proprint package and software	35,000	FC
			160,900	
Housing F	Revenue Account			
14	Council Housing	Central Control : Audit Costs	3,200	
15	Council Housing	Electrical Inspections	25,000	FC
16	Council Housing	Management & Admin : Marketing	3,300	
17	Council Housing	Electricity : Photo Electric Cells	20,000	FC
	-		51,500	

[&]quot;FC" denotes Full Council approval also required, if the requests are approved in full by Cabinet.

Further details relating to each request are attached.....

SERVICE	City Council (Direct) Services
BUDGET HEADING	Three Stream Waste Collection
AMOUNT	£38,000

1

What is the request to be spent on?

We are currently trying to get through as many flats and caravan parks as we can now, mainly putting communal facilities in which usually involves 1100 for residual and 240 for recyclate. However most caravan (or park homes) are requesting individual bins and boxes. Based on the surveys and information we have completed so far we require the following

181 x 1100 eurobins; 1,680 x 240 eurobins; 4,131 boxes

A total of £76,400 - this request would go part way towards it.

Why the spend didn't/couldn't occur last year.

The budget was committed to developing other parts of the scheme. No data existed on the number of residential caravan sites and flat/apartment blocks. Each park or block has to be looked at individually and consultation with residents and Management Companies is essential at each site, this in itself is a lengthy time consuming process. Some of the work was started last year, but came to a halt when the specific budget ran out.

The reasons why we are committed to still doing this work.

We have made a commitment through the Cost sharing agreement to reach 100% coverage in providing three stream waste collection services throughout the district.

Why we can't use this year's budget allocation.

This year's budget is adequate to allow us to continue to promote, replace lost/stolen or additional containers to properties on the existing scheme but will not allow us to continue with our commitment to include these properties that are outside the existing scheme.

What the implications for service delivery will be if the carry forward is not approved.

There will be inconsistencies throughout the district in collection frequencies and methods.

When the spend needs to be incurred.

2009-2010

Financial Services Comments

There is no specific budget underspending relating to this request although as a Service, CC(D)S had a net controllable underspend of £160,000 of which £38,000 relates to Three Stream Waste generally. As the request is in excess of £10,000 then full Council approval would be required. The amount requested is lower than the full amount required but will allow the commencement of a phased implementation programme and the remaining amount would need to be considered as a growth item within the 2010/2011 budget process.

SERVICE	Corporate Strategy
BUDGET HEADING	Statutory Place Survey
AMOUNT	£17,300

2

What is the request to be spent on?

Payment for cost of 'Place Survey'.

Why the spend didn't/couldn't occur last year.

2008/09 - £20k allocated to carry out the national (statutory) Place Survey. Spend to year end £2726.92. Mori have still to invoice for final cost of survey (as a result of delays in signing off the survey by central government).

The reasons why we are committed to still doing this work.

Contractual obligation - Statutory requirement

Why we can't use this year's budget allocation.

There is no budget allocation – Statutory Place Survey takes place every two years.

What the implications for service delivery will be if the carry forward is not approved.

A contracted piece of research work requires final payment.

When the spend needs to be incurred.

Not yet known but likely to be first half of year.

Financial Services Comments

There was an underspend of £17,300 against the budget of £20,000 for the Statutory Place Survey. The survey work was carried out in 2008/09 but then the results had to be passed to Central Govt to be analysed and approved before MORI were able to issue an invoice for the work – though an amount should have been accrued in the 2008/09 accounts. There is no budget allocation in 2009/10. As the request is in excess of £10,000 then full Council approval will be required.

SERVICE	Cultural Services
BUDGET HEADING	Dome – R & M of Buildings
AMOUNT	£900

3

What is the request to be spent on?

Replacement of main access doors to The Dome / Waterfront bar which have severe weather damage and if not repaired will be a security issue to the building.

Why the spend didn't/couldn't occur last year.

With the announcement the Dome was to close on 01 June 2009 it was deemed not necessary as the building was to be moth balled.

The reasons why we are committed to still doing this work.

The doors will continue to deteriorate and are an increasing security risk.

Why we can't use this year's budget allocation.

Dome budgets cut back for 2009/10 to operate a nine month operating year.

What the implications for service delivery will be if the carry forward is not approved.

Security risk to the building.

When the spend needs to be incurred.

As soon as possible.

Financial Services Comments

There was a £4,200 underspent on repair and maintenance with an overall underspend on the Dome of £6,900. Monitoring against the Dome's operating budget for the current year will be reported on in Qtr 1 PRT.

SERVICE	Cultural Services
BUDGET HEADING	Heysham Mossgate
AMOUNT	£10,000

4

What is the request to be spent on?

To meet any clawback of external funding in relation to professional fees for the Heysham Mossgate Project.

Why the spend didn't/couldn't occur last year.

Discussions are still ongoing with the PCT.

The reasons why we are committed to still doing this work.

This is to cover external funding put in place for the project, which will need repaying if it does not go ahead. As discussions are still ongoing with regards to the future of this project, no request for reimbursement has been made by LCDL. The Council may still be liable for the reimbursement of this money back to LCDL once a decision has been made.

Why we can't use this year's budget allocation.

There is no budget allocation in 2009/2010.

What the implications for service delivery will be if the carry forward is not approved.

£10,000 revenue implication from somewhere else within the budgets of the Service, when spend occurs.

When the spend needs to be incurred.

No decisions made on the project timescales yet.

Financial Services Comments

Balance of £10,000 on this account would be carried forward to cover any potential repayment of Grant Funding from Lancashire County Developer Ltd, though this could have been accrued within the 2008/09 accounts. This will be the third time this budget has been requested to be carried forward. As the request is for £10,000 then full Council approval would be required.

SERVICE	Cultural
BUDGET HEADING	Misc Advertising
AMOUNT	£1,600

5

What is the request to be spent on?

Advertising signage ordered and received in March 2009, but charged to 09/10.

Why the spend didn't/couldn't occur last year.

The year end creditor was missed and therefore this has been accounted for/paid in 2009/10 in error.

The reasons why we are committed to still doing this work.

Work completed in 2008/09.

Why we can't use this year's budget allocation.

This year's budget has been earmarked toward the £119,000 savings approved on Salt Ayre operations.

What the implications for service delivery will be if the carry forward is not approved.

£119,000 savings would have a shortfall – other compensating savings would need to be identified (though the amount involved is small).

When the spend needs to be incurred.

Already spent in 2009/10.

Financial Services Comments

Misc Advertising within this Cost Centre was £1,400 underspent at outturn which is slightly less than the requested £1,600. As noted above the whole of this budget for 2009/10 has been earmarked towards the £119K savings target in place – though this needs to be cross referenced with the communications & marketing savings target also (to avoid any double counting).

SERVICE	DEMOCRATIC SERVICES
BUDGET HEADING	CIVIC RECEPTIONS AND MAYORAL
	FUNCTIONS
AMOUNT	£800

6

What is the request to be spent on?

Cost of Civic Heads Day for Mayor of 2008/09, which took place on 28 April 2009.

Why the spend didn't/couldn't occur last year.

Mayor requested that the event was arranged at the end of his civic year, so fell into 2009/10 financial year.

The reasons why we are committed to still doing this work.

Expenditure incurred in April.

Why we can't use this year's budget allocation.

Would reduce available budget for the Mayor of 2009/10.

What the implications for service delivery will be if the carry forward is not approved.

The Civic Programme for the 2009/10 Mayor will have to be reduced during a year when there could be additional calls on expenditure to ensure that the centenary of Lancaster Town Hall is appropriately celebrated.

When the spend needs to be incurred.

Event taken place on 28th April 2009.

Financial Services Comments

There is a total spend of £12,700 against a Civic budget of £14,800 in 2008/09, leaving an underspend of £2,100.

SERVICE	Economic Development & Tourism
BUDGET HEADING	Business Development Grants
AMOUNT	£4,300

7

What is the request to be spent on?

The carry forward request relates to an underspend on the Business Development Grants budget in 2008/09. If approved, the funding would be added to the 2009/10 Business Development Grants budget of £20,000 for payments of grant offers under the City Council's Rent Grant Scheme for businesses and funded by the Lancaster District Local Strategic Partnership (Second Homes funding).

Why the spend didn't/couldn't occur last year.

The original budget of £21,800 was boosted during the year by £6,000 Lancashire Local Area Agreement funding to support start up and early stage businesses at a time when it was expected that additional funding would be needed to meet the high level of demand. Subsequently, take up, although high, fell a little short of expectations, resulting in the underspend of £4,289 against the total budget of £27,800.

The reasons why we are committed to still doing this work.

As noted above, the 2008/09 Business Development Grants budget was boosted by an additional £6,000 of Local Area Agreement funding to support start up and early stage businesses. Carrying the budget underspend forward would ensure that the whole of the LAA funding provides additional support for such activity rather than potentially being seen as having simply displaced part of the City Council funding for the Scheme in 2008/09. Furthermore, the Scheme forms part of the City Council response to the economic downturn and the additional resources will maximise the number of businesses that can be supported.

Why we can't use this year's budget allocation.

It is expected that the current year's budget allocation of £20,000 will be fully utilised against commitments/payments of Rent Grant to businesses and that this may not be sufficient to meet demand. A total of £23,511 was offered as Rent Grants in 2008/09. Bearing in mind the Scheme was only introduced in July 2008, it is likely that demand for support in 2009/10 will at least total a similar amount. The additional funding would help meet this potential additional demand.

What the implications for service delivery will be if the carry forward is not approved.

Reliance on the allocated budget of £20,000 alone could result in the Scheme being closed to new applications before the end of the year, resulting in businesses seeking assistance being turned away. Approval of the carry forward would enable more businesses to be supported, resulting in the creation of additional jobs.

When the spend needs to be incurred.

The spend would be incurred during 2009/10 against payments of Rent Grant.

Financial Services Comments

There is an underspend of £4,300 relating to Rent Grants to businesses, against a budget of £27,800. Underspends have also occurred in previous years as follows:

2006/07 - £16,600 additional unbudgeted income (C/F agreed as part of 06/07 closedown)

2007/08 - £31,700 underspend transferred to the reserve (reserve closed 08/09)

Failure to carry forward this underspend will not result in clawback of any money.

SERVICE	Financial Services
BUDGET HEADING	ICON Managed Service
AMOUNT	£37,100

8

What is the request to be spent on?

The ICON cash receipting system is to be moved to a hosted environment, which will increase data security when compared to the current receipting system and will also ensure compliance with the terms and conditions of the Payment Card Industry Data Security Standard (PCIDSS).

Why the spend didn't/couldn't occur last year.

The implementation of this system was delayed by contract negotiations with the supplier and is taking place between April and July 2009.

The reasons why we are committed to still doing this work.

A legally binding contract has already been agreed and signed with regard to the acquisition of this system.

Why we can't use this year's budget allocation.

The budget allocation for 2009/10 relates only to the annual running costs but the budget for 2008/09 relates to the initial licence fee and original implementation costs.

What the implications for service delivery will be if the carry forward is not approved.

No alternative sources of funding have been identified at this stage. The City Council needs to act within the current PCIDSS compliance regulations or any breach could result in substantial fines, so given this and the contractual position regarding the service, there is no viable option to terminate.

When the spend needs to be incurred.

April to June 2009.

Financial Services Comments

There is an underspend of £37,100, against a budget of £37,500. As the request is in excess of £10,000 then full Council approval would be required.

SERVICE	Health & Strategic Housing
BUDGET HEADING	Dog Warden Service
AMOUNT	£3,800

9

What is the request to be spent on?

Introduction and implementation of Dog Control Orders (DCOs)under the Clean Neighbourhoods & Environment Act. To be spent on signage, a legal requirement of the legislation.

Why the spend didn't/couldn't occur last year.

A growth bid of £12,000 was submitted for 2008/09, however it was granted over 2 years, £6,000 for 2008/09 and £6,000 for 2009/10. Approximately £10,000 of the growth bid was intended for signage, therefore it could not be purchased last year before this year's allocation was available.

The reasons why we are committed to still doing this work.

It is essential to introduce Dog Control Orders in order to deal with the persistent problems of fouling and stray dogs in the district. Introduction of DCOs is an important part of this service's Business Plan and Service Plan

Why we can't use this year's budget allocation.

The £10,000 required for signage needs to be sourced from both last year's and this year's budget allocations.

What the implications for service delivery will be if the carry forward is not approved.

Signage is a legal requirement of the legislation. The £10,000 allocated for signage is estimated to cover 'gateway' signage, provided on major entry routes to the district, plus more specific signs where essential. Without the funding for this we would be unable to proceed with the DCOs.

When the spend needs to be incurred.

During this financial year

Financial Services Comments

£3,800 requested is the total underspend on the Dog Warden Service. There is no budget available in 2009/10 to fund all signage needs.

SERVICE	Information & Customer Services
BUDGET HEADING	Equipment Mtce - Fixed
AMOUNT	£3,900

10

What is the request to be spent on?

This spend relates to a need to extend security options for home and mobile workers by providing authentication tokens.

Why the spend didn't/couldn't occur last year.

We were still assessing the various technical options to fully understand their limitations and implications.

The reasons why we are committed to still doing this work.

The authentication tokens will provide a secure and manageable method of accessing the Council's network and met national security standards. Overtime the Council will save money on licenses for equivalent software.

Why we can't use this year's budget allocation.

There is no budget allocation for these items in 2009/10 as the need for changing the Council's security has emerged as part of the recent Gov Connect project.

What the implications for service delivery will be if the carry forward is not approved.

The older software solution can be used in the interim as a short term solution but over time a different robust mechanism will need to be procured.

When the spend needs to be incurred.

September 2009.

Financial Services Comments

There was an underspend of £3,900 in 2008/09 on the Equipment Maintenance budget of £24,000. This budget was not specifically earmarked for spending on authentication tokens, however there is no budget available in 2009/10 and in time savings will be made as referred to above.

SERVICE	Legal and HR
BUDGET HEADING	Hackney Carriage Licensing
AMOUNT	£5,000

11

What is the request to be spent on?

The cost of providing additional taxi ranks in the district.

Why the spend didn't/couldn't occur last year.

A review of taxi ranks has been underway with the Police, the County Council and the trade for some time. There is no specific budgetary provision as this is a one off item.

The reasons why we are committed to still doing this work.

Additional ranks are needed to improve the service to the public, and to assist with enforcement issues, particularly late at night. A number of complaints have been received that there are insufficient ranks and that current ranks are not in the most appropriate locations. The consultation process with the police and highway authority has been ongoing for a considerable time, as it is not easy to agree on suitable locations.

Why we can't use this year's budget allocation.

There is no budget allocation for this item, as it is a one-off. In order to proceed it would be necessary to raise the additional income from fees in a future year.

It should be noted that taxi licensing income is subject to specific statutory rules. The income arises mainly from the licence fees charged by the Council. The legislation requires that the fees are set at a level that meets the Council's costs of administering and enforcing the licensing regime. It is not lawful to make a profit (although clearly given the uncertainty of how many licence applications will be received, it is extremely difficult to budget for and achieve a "break even" situation). It could be argued that having made a surplus in 2008/09, the Council should adjust its fees downwards to project for a similar deficit in 2009/10, but this has not been done. However, any criticism or challenge that the Council has made a profit on taxi licensing could be countered if the surplus were carried forward for expenditure on a taxi licensing issue.

What the implications for service delivery will be if the carry forward is not approved.

Complaints and enforcement problems will continue unless funding can be found.

When the spend needs to be incurred.

As soon as possible.

Financial Services Comments

There was an overall underspend in 2008/09 of £6,200, of which £4,976 related to additional Hackney Carriage/Private Hire fee income. Whilst the additional income was not specifically earmarked for taxi ranks in 2008/09 it does ensure the bulk of the surplus is reinvested in the Hackney Carriage function.

SERVICE	Planning
BUDGET HEADING	Office Equipment
AMOUNT	£3,200

12

What is the request to be spent on?

Maintenance of software agreement for Eureka time management system that was a legacy from Engineering as a Service. Current agreement runs until March 2013.

Why the spend didn't/couldn't occur last year.

Invoice was in dispute as we wished to terminate license.

The reasons why we are committed to still doing this work.

Advice from legal services that terms of licence are legal.

Why we can't use this year's budget allocation.

We will have this year's bill to pay which together with other CAD and GIS software licence commitments will exceed our current budget.

What the implications for service delivery will be if the carry forward is not approved.

The use of CAD and GIS is essential to the operation of the Engineering Team within Planning Services. The current years budget will be exceeded.

When the spend needs to be incurred.

ASAP

Financial Services Comments

There is an underspend of £3,200, against a budget of £10,800. This item could have been accrued within the 2008/09 accounts, but the invoice was under dispute and a favourable outcome was expected.

SERVICE	REVENUES
BUDGET HEADING	Local Housing Allowance (LHA) Funding
AMOUNT	£35,000

13

What is the request to be spent on?

Purchase of Proprint package and Server to replace Formscape as management tool and assistance re impact of recession on collection rates, etc.

Why the spend didn't/couldn't occur last year.

Impact of LHA spread over a number of years.

The reasons why we are committed to still doing this work.

Legal obligation.

Why we can't use this year's budget allocation.

Insufficient funds available.

What the implications for service delivery will be if the carry forward is not approved.

We will not be able to produce suitable documentation, bills, notifications to our customers.

When the spend needs to be incurred.

As soon as possible

Financial Services Comments

There was a total spend of £53,000 in 2008/09 against a net DWP/LHA grant of £89,000, leaving an underspent balance of £36,000. There is no budget allocation in 2009/10. As the request is in excess of £10,000 then full Council approval will be required. The request relates to capital spend and as such the carry forward funding, if approved, will need to be transferred to capital as direct revenue financing. In addition, the supporting documentation will be required to update the capital programme.

SERVICE	Council Housing
BUDGET HEADING	Central Control
AMOUNT	£3,200

14

What is the request to be spent on?

£3,200 - Initial audit costs for accreditation by the Telecare Services Association including customer satisfaction survey.

Why the spend didn't/couldn't occur last year.

Telecare Services Association (TSA) initial audit for accreditation and renewal of the call centre did not take place within the last financial year due to the introduction of a new standard by TSA and changes in staffing/ management.

The reasons why we are committed to still doing this work.

TSA accreditation must be attained this financial year in order to continue to operate and be awarded contracts by Lancashire Social Services for the provision of the Telecare and Carers Support Services.

Why we can't use this year's budget allocation.

There is no allocation within this year's budget for the initial audit costs.

What the implications for service delivery will be if the carry forward is not approved.

The Emergency Call Centre will lose contracts with Lancashire County Council resulting in a loss in income making the call centre less viable.

When the spend needs to be incurred.

Pre December 2009

Financial Services Comments

The underspend in 2008/09 was £8,200. The carry forward request can be accommodated within this.

SERVICE	Council Housing
BUDGET HEADING	Electrical Inspections
AMOUNT	£25,000

1	5

What is the request to be spent on?

The inspection of electrical installations with Council Housing Properties.

Why the spend didn't/couldn't occur last year.

Late start on contract.

The reasons why we are committed to still doing this work.

Work commenced in 2008/09 and needs to be completed.

Why we can't use this year's budget allocation.

Other priorities in the 2009/10 programme would be affected.

What the implications for service delivery will be if the carry forward is not approved.

Changes would need to be made to the 2009/10 programme which would result in some electrical installations not being inspected which could result in a faulty installation not being identified.

When the spend needs to be incurred.

Works are ongoing.

Financial Services Comments

This request can be accommodated from within the 2008/09 underspend of £58,400.

As the request is in excess of £10,000 then full Council approval will be required

SERVICE	COUNCIL HOUSING SERVICES	
BUDGET HEADING	COUNCIL HOUSING MGT AND	
	AD/MARKETING	
AMOUNT	£3,300	

16

What is the request to be spent on?

The marketing of a choice based lettings scheme which will require extensive publicity.

Why the spend didn't/couldn't occur last year.

Implementation delayed due to low stock level. Government has now imposed a specific target regardless of stock numbers meaning a scheme has to be introduced.

The reasons why we are committed to still doing this work.

To meet the Government target that all Local Authorities should be operating a choice based lettings scheme by 2010. This is incorporated into the Service's Business Plan.

Why we can't use this year's budget allocation.

This year's budget will not cover the cost of advertising required to launch the new scheme.

What the implications for service delivery will be if the carry forward is not approved.

The scheme will not have the same impact if we do not have the necessary means to advertise properties to encourage tenants to bid for properties which could ultimately lead to increased void loss and will impact on our key performance indicator for this area of work.

When the spend needs to be incurred.

2009/10

Financial Services Comments

The carry forward can be funded from the under spend on this budget in 2008/09 of £3,400.

SERVICE	COUNCIL HOUSING
BUDGET HEADING	ELECTRICITY
AMOUNT	£20,000

•	1	7

What is the request to be spent on?

Change over from time clocks to photo electric cells in order to reduce energy costs.

Why the spend didn't/couldn't occur last year.

Other projects delayed the commencement of this project.

The reasons why we are committed to still doing this work.

Efficiency works that will reduce energy consumption for the lighting of communal areas.

Why we can't use this year's budget allocation.

Improvement works funding allocated to other projects.

What the implications for service delivery will be if the carry forward is not approved.

Inefficient use of fuel reflected in tenant service charges.

When the spend needs to be incurred.

By March 2010.

Financial Services Comments

The Electricity Budget was under spent by £26,500 in 2008/09; this includes £24,700 previously carried forward from 2007/08 for photo electric cells. The amount requested for carry forward can be accommodated. This was identified as a potential area for carry forward within the PRT process.

As the request is in excess of £10,000 then full Council approval will be required.