CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL

CABINET

3 FEBRUARY 2011

REPORT OF HEAD OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

RESPONSIBLE PORTFOLIO LEADER: LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

BUDGET CONSULTATION PROCESS 2011-12

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 To update Members in relation to the findings of the Budget Consultation process 2011-12.

2. Recommendation

2.1 That Members in determining the budget for 2011-12 to 2013-14 take into account the results of the Consultation process.

3. Key Issues

3.1 In light of the impact of the Coalition Governments Emergency Budget in June 2010 and the then pending Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR2010) both the Budget Process and its Consultation process was amended this year.

3.2 The revised budget process involved every aspect of the Budget and Service Delivery being subject to review. A number of key themes were identified incorporating: Asset Management; Procurement; Efficiency; Outsourcing; Shared Services; Income Generation together with the identification of the minimum levels of service for both Mandatory and Discretionary Functions.

3.3 This in addition to the generation of efficiency savings involved all discretionary services being considered as potential saving Policy Options for consideration by Members. Presentations on the budget and the options available have been made to all three political groups throughout the budget process.

3.4 In evaluating the options a Budget Consultation process was undertaken whereby residents were asked to identify which services are the most important to residents. There were 493 responses to the consultation and a copy of the results of the consultation process was provided to Cabinet as part of the consideration of its Balanced Budget/Consultation Options as determined at its meeting of the 25 November 2010.

3.5 At this meeting Cabinet resolved that In light of the uncertainties in both the timing and amount of the Local Government Settlement and the pending consultation documents on additional funding potentially available to the Council, which will have an impact upon the annual savings requirements, that a balanced provisional budget could not be produced at this stage. However potential options were made available for public consultation (Annex1/2)

3.6 Consultation was undertaken via the Council’s Website; Business Ratepayer representatives; the Council’s Scrutiny Committee- Delivering Change Panel and the Council’s Shadow
Cabinet. In light of the unique situation the Council faced this year with a consultation budget not being determined; the public consultation already taken; and the cost of consultation no Budget Citizens Panels have been undertaken this year.

3.7 However Cabinet have commissioned for future use the generation of a budget simulator that encourages members of the public to consider where both reductions (and enhancements) to council services and budgets should fall, where efficiencies might be made, and where income might be generated. The software for the simulator is free to councils and its use will enable Consultation to take place throughout future year’s budget process both on-line and at Community forums; Citizens Panels and specific budget meetings. Further details are contained in section 2 of the main report.

3.8 The closing date for submissions as part of the formal consultation has closed although Cabinet can elect to receive any other submissions at today’s meeting.

3.9 Separate Annexes to this report detail the responses received from the Delivering Change Panel (Annex 3); individuals and Groups (Annex 4) and Unison (Annex 5).

3.10 The Delivering Change Panel considered the options at its meeting of the 10 January 2011 and proposed certain amendments to the consultation options as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0149</td>
<td>Rationalisation of Number of Committees</td>
<td>Members raised concern and did not agree with reducing the number of Committees, particularly Policy Development Committees. Members were of the opinion that if Policy Development Committees’ were removed there would be no avenue for Members to raise their issues and concerns and therefore the Panel wished to see other options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0245</td>
<td>Rationalisation Opening Hours Rugeley and Hednesford</td>
<td>Members raised concerns about the limited service now proposed and discussed how linking with the Police, Social Services etc could work. Further information was therefore required on opening hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0340</td>
<td>Deletion of Official Car</td>
<td>Members raised concern that no other options had been considered and were of the opinion that a viable alternative was needed in order for the Chairman to carry out his civic duties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.11 In addition the Panel recommended that Cabinet consider an additional saving option whereby the Sports and Arts Development Sections were merged in order to provide a multi functional service and provide savings in advance of outsourcing.

3.12 Individual comments have been received in relation to the:

- 0068 Relocation of the Ranger Centre

3.14 Details relating to Shadow Cabinet’s response to the Consultation are still awaited.

3.15 No responses have been received to date from the Business Ratepayer consultees.

4. Conclusions and Reason(s) for Recommendations

4.1 Cabinet in determining a balanced budget will need to take account the results of the consultation process in finalising its recommendations to Council.

5. Other Options Considered

5.1 There are no other options in respect of this report.

6. Report Author Details

Bob Kean, Head of Financial Management, Ext. 4334
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Section 1

1. Contribution to Council Priorities (i.e. CHASE, Corporate Plan)

1.1 The revenue budget reflects the agreed priorities of the Council as determined by the Delivering Change process and hence directly contributes to CHASE and the Corporate Plan. The Standstill Budget expresses the cost of continuing with the Council’s current policies into the future whereas Delivering Change both determines and re-allocates resources in accordance with agreed priorities.

Section 2

2. Contribution to Promoting Community Engagement

2.1 The Determination of a budget for Consultation is an essential part of Community Engagement

2.2 The Consultation process to date has included an initial Budget Consultation (see Annex 6) whereby residents were asked to identify which services are the most important to residents and regular Budget updates have been provided as part of the Chase Matters publication.

2.3 In order to promote budget consultation in future years the development of a Budget Simulator based upon the You Choose model has been commissioned

2.4 You Choose is an online budget simulator that encourages members of the public to consider where council budget cuts should fall, where efficiencies might be made, and where income might be generated.

2.5 The tool was originally developed by the London Borough of Redbridge to engage with its residents in the difficult decisions that arise from budget reductions but as greater use in the overall budget process. However, the software can be individually tailored by councils.

2.6 It is largely based upon the SIMALTO framework used by the Council three years ago which not only engages with residents in decisions about how they spend their revenue budgets and determines priorities but also provides an analysis of where money is currently spent and hence help residents understand the tough choices the council faces in setting its budget and level of Council Tax.

2.7 In partnership with the Local Government Group and YouGov, You Choose is now freely available to all Local Government Association member councils

2.8 The Simulator will be populated with the cost of current services following the approval of the 2011-12 budget and potential enhancements/reductions to services will be developed early in the new financial year.

Section 3

3. Financial Implications

3.1 The budgetary provision for consultation was amended as part of the 2010-11 Budget whereby funding for a vacant post in PR and Marketing was deleted.
3.2 Provision exists within the 2010-11 budget for the costs of the budget process including consultation. The cost of a Citizens Panel was estimated to be £4,800 but was considered not to add value to this year’s process.

3.3 Financial implications of the budget process have been referred to through out the report.

Section 4

4. Legal Implications

4.1 In preparing a revenue budget for the district the Council is legally obliged to consult with its relevant stakeholders. Statutory budget consultees include trades unions, the voluntary sector and the business sector; however it is best practice to consult on its actual proposals with a wide range of consultees as possible.

4.2 Any additional savings options which relate to Council staff and are subsequently included within the proposed Balanced Budget for 2010-11 shall be subject to compliance with relevant Council policies and applicable legislation.

4.3 The legal implications are set out throughout the report including the statutory requirement for the Council to set a balanced budget.

Section 5

5. Human Resource Implications

5.1 In accordance with the Council’s normal practice a series of employee and trade union briefings were undertaken at the same time as the Council’s budget proposals were made available to the public.

5.2 Further targeted briefings and consultations will take place with both employees and trade unions once the Council’s final budget proposals are determined.

Section 6

6. Section 17 (Crime Prevention)

6.1 Not applicable

Section 7

7. Human Rights Act Implications

7.1 There are no identified implications in respect of the Human Rights Act 1996

Section 8

8. Data Protection Act Implications

8.1 There are no identified implications in respect of the Data Protection Act
Section 9

9. Risk Management Implications

9.1 The risk management implications of the budget are contained within the Reserves and Balances report which is contained as part of this Agenda.

9.2 The consultation process enables the public and other consultees to be engaged in the budget setting process and in addition to fulfilling a statutory requirement contributes to ensuring the vision and aims and objectives of the council are effectively managed.

Section 10

10. Equality and Diversity Implications

10.1 In preparing a Balanced Budget Cabinet will need to ensure that due regard is made to Equality and Diversity Implications as well as financial considerations. The Standstill Budget will reflect the Council’s current Equality and Diversity policy whereas changes to service provision will need to be addressed as part of the Delivering Change process.

Section 11

11. List of Background Papers

Annexes

Annex 1 Consultation Options
Annex 2 Consultation Options Part Two
Annex 3 Delivering Change Panel Notes
Annex 4 Relocation of Ranger Centre
Annex 5 Unison Comments
Annex 6 Budget Consultation 2011/2012
### Annex 1

**Financial Plan 2011-12 to 2013-14**

**Consultation Process**

**Savings Options for Consideration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>2011-12 Estimate</th>
<th>2012-13 Estimate</th>
<th>2013-14 Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0029A</td>
<td>Car Parks - Charge for Parking in Rugeley Service Areas</td>
<td>£2,800</td>
<td>£2,800</td>
<td>£2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0029B</td>
<td>Car Parks - Charge Staff for Car Park Use</td>
<td>£36,000</td>
<td>£36,000</td>
<td>£36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0029C</td>
<td>Car Parks - Charge Blue Badge Holders to park</td>
<td>£-129,000</td>
<td>£53,000</td>
<td>£54,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0030</td>
<td>Rationalisation of Community Safety Monitoring arrangements</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£62,820</td>
<td>£63,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0031</td>
<td>Cemeteries - Review of Charges</td>
<td>£12,430</td>
<td>£18,020</td>
<td>£24,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0068</td>
<td>Relocation of Ranger Centre</td>
<td>£2,450</td>
<td>£2,500</td>
<td>£2,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0071</td>
<td>Reduction Discretionary Rate Relief</td>
<td>£6,000</td>
<td>£6,000</td>
<td>£6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0078A</td>
<td>Reduction to Minimum Standards - Corporate Support &amp; Administ</td>
<td>£49,380</td>
<td>£49,750</td>
<td>£50,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0078B</td>
<td>Reduction in Admin and Typing Services</td>
<td>£10,450</td>
<td>£10,530</td>
<td>£10,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0084A</td>
<td>Credit Union - Cease</td>
<td>£25,000</td>
<td>£25,000</td>
<td>£25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0084B</td>
<td>Economic Development - Admin Support</td>
<td>£21,470</td>
<td>£21,630</td>
<td>£22,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0088</td>
<td>Redefinition of Env.Enforcement Officers as Env Prot Assistants</td>
<td>£22,090</td>
<td>£25,450</td>
<td>£29,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0090</td>
<td>Pest Control - Removal of Subsidy</td>
<td>£16,650</td>
<td>£17,220</td>
<td>£17,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0121</td>
<td>Housing Strategy - Statutory Minimum</td>
<td>£30,480</td>
<td>£30,780</td>
<td>£31,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0140</td>
<td>Licensing - Removal of Subsidy</td>
<td>£7,960</td>
<td>£16,310</td>
<td>£24,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0149</td>
<td>Rationalisation of Number of Committees</td>
<td>£42,130</td>
<td>£42,770</td>
<td>£43,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0163</td>
<td>Delete Bowling Green Maintenance</td>
<td>£10,100</td>
<td>£12,760</td>
<td>£12,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0169</td>
<td>Development Control Restructure - 0.3 FTE</td>
<td>£11,580</td>
<td>£11,670</td>
<td>£11,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0245</td>
<td>Rationalisation Opening Hours Rugeley and Hednesford</td>
<td>£48,770</td>
<td>£48,770</td>
<td>£49,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0335/6/8</td>
<td>Review of Civic Hospitality</td>
<td>£5,680</td>
<td>£5,750</td>
<td>£5,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0337</td>
<td>Review of Leader - Hospitality</td>
<td>£730</td>
<td>£740</td>
<td>£750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0340</td>
<td>Deletion of Official Car</td>
<td>£17,080</td>
<td>£17,050</td>
<td>£17,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0616</td>
<td>Deletion of Children's Fund CCDC Contribution</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
<td>£5,050</td>
<td>£5,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Option</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage take up of Early Retirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seek Volunteers for permanent reduction in hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seek potential Voluntary Redundancies subject to valid Business Case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freeze Increments for 12 month period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage pay reduction for 12 month period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voluntary reduction in working hours with associated reduction in pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTES OF THE MEETING OF THE DELIVERING CHANGE PANEL
MONDAY 10 JANUARY, 2011 AT 4.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PRESENT: Councillors
Jones, R. (Chairman)
A.F. Bernard
J. Bernard

Officers
Kean, R. Head of Financial Management
Brown, S.G. Chief Executive
Tunnicliffe, J. Senior Committee Officer

(An apology for absence was received from Councillor Mrs. P.A. Ansell).

1. **Appointment of Chairman**

   Councillor R. Jones was appointed Chairman for the meeting.

2. **Declarations of Interests of Members in Contracts and Other Matters and Restriction on Voting by Members**

   There were no Declarations of Interests declared.

3. **Presentation – Budget Update**

   Mr. R. Kean, Head of Financial Management outlined the format of the meeting and stated that as in previous years two meetings of the Panel were scheduled and the second meeting, subject to Members requirements, would take place on Thursday 13 January, 2011. He advised that the situation was different this year since there was currently no budget for consultation but options for consideration as recommended by Cabinet.

   He then gave a presentation and provided a brief summary for Members on the current budget position, the major issues facing the Council and the financial background to the consultation options. He advised the Panel that with regard to Council Tax the likely maximum amount that could be set, as outlined in the provisional local government settlement would be 2.5% although legislation had not yet been laid before parliament. However, if the Council set a 0% Council Tax for 2011-12 the Government would provide compensation worth around £149,000.

   A copy of the Cabinet Resolution, savings options and those not considered were circulated to the Delivering Change Panel, and clarification was provided in relation to any required Option.
Draft General Fund Revenue Budget 2011-12 to 2013-14 Resolution

Members referred to 3 (b) and asked if the unions had been liaised with regarding potential changes to terms and conditions. Mr. S.G. Brown, Chief Executive advised that the unions were fundamentally opposed to any change in terms and conditions and a report on this would be discussed at the DMT meeting tomorrow before submission to Cabinet.

Members then referred to 3 (c) and asked about the sharing of other functions with Stafford Borough Council. The Chief Executive advised that Building Control and ICT had now transferred and discussions were taking place regarding a number of other services.

The Head of Financial Management referred to Annex 1 (Savings Options for Consideration) and advised the Panel that based upon the latest budget projections as at today all of the Savings Options would need to be taken in order to achieve a balanced budget.

The Head of Financial Management provided a brief summary in relation to the Savings Options for consideration and informed the panel that additional considerations had arisen as part of the consultation exercise in relation to the Deletion of the Children’s Fund Contribution which would result in a reduction in the savings quoted. Members were asked to consider each option and determine if any response to the consultation option should be provided to Cabinet.

Savings Options for Consideration

Specific comments and agreement of the panel was reached on the following options:

0149 – Rationalisation of Number of Committees (Members raised concern and did not agree with reducing the number of Committees, particularly Policy Development Committees. Members were of the opinion that if Policy Development Committees’ were removed there would be no avenue for Members to raise their issues and concerns and therefore the Panel wished to see other options).

0245 – Rationalisation Opening Hours Rugeley and Hednesford (Members raised concerns about the limited service now proposed and discussed how linking with the Police, Social Services etc could work. Further information was therefore required on opening hours).

0340 – Deletion of Official Car – (Members raised concern that no other options had been considered and were of the opinion that a viable alternative was needed in order for the Chairman to carry out his civic duties).

The Head of Financial Management distributed a schedule of Savings Options that had not been recommended by Cabinet and asked whether the Panel wished to support any of the options or submit comments to Cabinet.
Savings Options Not Recommended for Consideration

0030 – Deletion of Community Safety Monitoring arrangements (Members raised concern regarding the CCTV monitoring and asked for this to be reviewed by the Scrutiny Committee).

0218 – Sports Development Section
0289 – Arts Development Section
(Members recommended that Cabinet consider an option to Merge the above two sections in order to provide a multi-functional service and provide savings in advance of outsourcing)

Members were asked to consider whether there were any additional options which should be referred to Cabinet for consideration as part of the budget setting process.

Consideration was given to whether income was being maximised from the property portfolio and other services

The Head of financial Management indicated that this was a strand of savings that had generated a number of break even proposals however the current economic climate was having a major negative impact upon rental income.

In relation to a request from Members income from Masts etc would be looked into further.
Following consideration of this, Members had no further options they wished to put forward.

The Chairman and Members of the Panel agreed that there would not be a need to convene the meeting scheduled for 13 January, 2011.

The meeting closed at 5.50 p.m.
1. **Purpose of Briefing Note**

   1.1 To update Cabinet on the recent successful negotiations with Natural England generating £32K per annum to the Council.

   1.2 To update Cabinet on the consultative process with member of staff potentially at risk of redundancy and the users of the Ranger Centre.

2. **Recommendation(s)**

   2.1 To reconsider the Policy Option 0068 in light of the following;

   2.2 Increased Income of £32K per annum from Natural England over the next ten years

   2.3 Relatively low revenue savings per annum (£7K following the removal of the rental income)

   2.4 Feedback from staff affected and users of the service.

3. **Key Issues**

   3.1 In September 2010 the Parks and Open Spaces section of Environmental Services submitted 40 Policy Options to reduce/delete services. In line with guidance formalised by the creation of a data base, all discretionary services were identified along with their associated costs.

   3.2 The potential closure of Deavall’s Farm which is also known as the Ranger Centre was put forward as an option to raise a Capital receipt and relocate the service to Hawks Green Depot.

   3.3 The timescales surrounding the Policy Option Process meant that no detailed costings or consultation with staff affected /users was possible.

   3.4 Following consideration by DMT and the Reality Group this was put forward to Cabinet for further consultation. The results of this consultation are summarised in Table 1 below and detailed in Annex 1.
## Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walsall College</td>
<td>Favours Deavall’s Farm for supported Learning students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Staffs &amp; Shropshire Healthcare NHS</td>
<td>Concern that their service users may not be able to adapt to a busy Urban Depot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mencap</td>
<td>Relocation Depot may impact upon clients with Learning Difficulties and Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Gratton - Volunteer of the Year 2010</td>
<td>Relocation would impact on volunteering if not retained at Deavall’s Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Gozzard - Current Volunteer</td>
<td>Would impact upon current team developed at Deavall’s Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Evans – Current Volunteer</td>
<td>Concerned about impact on works program to establish a new base.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Advantages /Disadvantages of the Proposal are summarised below in Table 2.

## Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Release Site for Capital Receipt</td>
<td>Need to retain buffer from Highway as Council do not own all of entrance road restricting site to 4 - 5 properties max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Saving of £9.5K</td>
<td>Costs to be absorbed by Depot. Loss of £2.1K small business rental income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Asset Management Costs to multi-use building</td>
<td>Need to establish, messroom, teaching rooms at Hawks Green Depot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentrate all plant, vehicles on one site</td>
<td>Need to establish storage areas for 3 vehicles, twotrailers,minitractor,andimplements, motorised machines and hand tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operate all services from one Depot</td>
<td>Could jeopardise Higher Level Stewardship Grant (see Business Case-Annex 2). Issue of access for volunteers, especially those with learning difficulties accessing the Depot. Policy Option 0029B Council car park charges for users would affect Volunteers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 In accordance with the Council’s Redundancy Policy the Service Manager and Human Resources have started the process of consultation with the member of staff who is potentially at risk. As redundancy is been proposed as a result of the employer intending to cease activities of the business at that location, the affected employee was asked for comments surrounding that proposal.

3.6 The employee may useful suggestions but these were mostly about reducing costs, increasing efficiencies around the Deavall’s building. As the employee only works six hours a week the savings were relatively small in relation to the proposed savings of relocation.

3.7 There is a separate issue that the employee rents from the Council a part of the Building from where he operates his company called Timberwolves who supply the Council and a number of other organisations with bespoke timber products. The income issue is addressed in Paragraph 3.5, Table 2.

4.0 Conclusion

4.1 Whilst at first consideration the closures of Deavall’s Farm as the base for the Ranger Centre is straightforward there are a number of factors that have emerged since the Policy Option was proposed.

4.2 The re-negotiation of the High Level Stewardship (HLS) is a major turning point in the decision making process which was not confirmed until December 2010. So as to be clear, it is not certain that the HLS Grant will not be achieved if the relocation goes ahead but the Grant is paid on results. Whilst the Council could use external Contractors to undertake this work as indicated in the Business Case this has proven to be expensive in the past and so using volunteers is extremely cost effective for the Council.

4.3 Much of this work is difficult to specify and for this reason the work has never been added to the existing Streetscene Contract. Regardless of who undertakes the work the Council will still have the overall responsibility for the hundreds of Hectares of Conservation Areas.

4.4 Perhaps not as easy to measure is the role the Council has in developing long life learning and transferable skills. Given the Council’s withdrawal from most of the voluntary skill sector training programs such as the Forest of Mercia this is the only Land based/Conservation skill set offered by the Council which maybe have be overlooked by the groups considering this Policy Option as the results of the consultation have indicated.
ANNEX 1 - LETTERS RECEIVED AS PART OF THE CONSULTATION.

ANNEX 2 – BUSINESS CASE FOR RETENTION.
PROPOSED CLOSURE OF DEAVALL’S FARM

The Countryside Service’s Case for Retention
Introduction

Deavall’s Farm is a registered agricultural holding used as a base by the Countryside Service, and a workshop within the building is let to Timberwolves, a small business manufacturing bespoke wood products.

Closure of the premises was put forward as a potential savings option at the Cabinet meeting held on 25th November 2010. The potential savings stated in the resolution made by Cabinet were £2,450.00 per annum in 2011-12, rising to £2,530.00 by 2013-14. However, it is understood that this publicly available figure is incorrect and that savings would be in the region of £10,000.00 per annum.

It is considered that this proposal does not fully take into account the financial benefits of retaining the premises and that closure may in fact result in a financial loss to the Authority rather than a saving. This document sets out a case for its retention.

Volunteers

Perhaps one of the strongest arguments for retention of the premises is the degree to which the Authority benefits from unpaid labour. At present the building is used by a large number of volunteers on a regular basis. The financial benefits are considerable as the work carried out by the volunteers would otherwise need to done by either paid staff or contractors. The majority of the work carried out is of an essential and environmentally sensitive nature.

To calculate the financial benefits a comparison was made between work carried out in October and November 2010 and precisely the same type of work undertaken by contractors earlier in the year. The work consisted mainly of scrub removal from heathland sites. It was possible to convert the lowest quote supplied by contractors to a price per square meter. The area cleared by volunteers was then accurately measured using GIS and the precise value of the work calculated. This in turn allowed an accurate figure to be calculated for the value of volunteer labour over a full year, the three years covered by the budget proposals, and for a longer term of ten years. There are a minimum of two volunteer work days a week with an average of ten volunteers per day.

The results are shown in table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value of Volunteer Labour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£116,542.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 3 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£349,628.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1,165,420.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note

All figures exclude staff time and take no account of inflation.

This is a considerable benefit to the Council both financially but also in terms of carrying out the works. Indirectly it gives the council status in terms of local/community involvement, education and health and wellbeing.
Creating the right environment for the volunteers is essential in terms of ensuring they have an enjoyable experience and return on a regular basis. Apart from the staff involved and having a varied range of work to undertake on the site it is the provision of a meeting place which is easily accessible and provides good indoor facilities for training as well as a mess room and toilet facilities.

A wide cross section of the community is involved in volunteer activities including those that are less able bodied and those with mental health issues. These volunteers often require gentle coaxing back into mainstream life through interaction with small groups in a calm, pleasant and intimate environment, so as to build up their confidence levels. Deavall’s farm provides this environment being relatively small scale, quiet and in a pleasant and tranquil setting. The depot on the other hand, being a bustling operating commercial centre would or could not provide this ambience. This would result in a negative impact on the range and number of volunteers/groups coming forward which in turn would reduce the amount of essential work undertaken. Most importantly it would also reduce the Council standing in terms of the breadth and nature of volunteer provision and working with and for the community. An example of our customers views are attached as Annex 1.

Cost of moving

There will be additional costs to the Council involved in moving the Countryside Service to alternative premises. It will be necessary to provide office space, secure storage for mowers, chipper, tractor, farm implements, trailers, hand tools, materials, chemicals and hay, in addition to cattle handling facilities. In effect it would be necessary to provide like for like storage facilities as there is no spare capacity within the existing premises. Whilst the final costs appear to be unknown at this stage, some initial work has been undertaken to cost the replacement of cattle handling facilities. Initial investigations into the possibility of providing a mobile cattle crush and associated portable corral have shown that these are likely to cost in the region of £20,000.00. This one item alone would therefore effectively wipe out all of the published cost savings, and account for two years of savings if the higher unofficial figure is used. It is therefore difficult to see how the proposed measures will result in significant cost saving over the financial period under consideration.

It should also be taken into account that there would be a small loss of income from the rent that is generated by having Timberwolves on the premises. At present this brings in an income of £2,080.00 per annum. It is not clear if this has been taken into account when calculating running costs or potential savings, as this agreement is with the Councils Asset Service Manager.

Grants

At present Cannock Chase Council receives approximately £8,000.00 per annum from Natural England to help manage a large proportion of its landholding. However, a new agreement has just been negotiated that will significantly increase the amount grant aid...
that the Council will receive. Verbal confirmation of a successful bid has already been made and a written contract is expected shortly.

Whilst this grant aid is being given with the express purpose of improving the conservation status of the Council’s landholding, it none the less opens up the possibility of using some of the money to offset running costs at Deavall’s Farm. Whilst this should be seen as a measure of last resort, the premises do facilitate the management activities necessary to meet the Council’s contractual obligations with Natural England and it would therefore be seen to be a legitimate use of the grant.

Grant aid would be guaranteed for a period of ten years and is worth a minimum of £327,705.00. Grant aid would be made up of both revenue and capital payments. Revenue payments will be fixed, whilst capital payment would vary according to the work required. The capital payment will only be made on successful completion of specified works. Therefore only the revenue element of the grant would be available to offset running costs. A break down of expected income from grant aid for the next three years is set out in table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Income year 1</th>
<th>Income year 2</th>
<th>Income year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>£25,220.99</td>
<td>£25,220.99</td>
<td>£25,220.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>£5,200.24</td>
<td>£31,098.44</td>
<td>£1,098.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£30,421.20</td>
<td>£56,319.43</td>
<td>£26,318.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This shows that sufficient income would be generated to meet the predicted savings that may result from the closure of Deavall’s Farm from the revenue element of the grant.

**Conclusions**

It is evident that closure of Deavall’s Farm is likely to result in a significant decrease in volunteer activity. Whilst this activity does not appear on balance sheets as no invoices are generated, it has been shown that it is worth a considerable amount of money to the Council. It must be stressed that most of the work that is undertaken is of an essential and sensitive nature enabling contractual and legal obligations to be met. On an annual basis this would be more than eleven times the savings that are likely to result from closure of the premises. It can also be seen that the value of the work over a ten year period would exceed the value of the capital receipt predicted to be in the region of £350,000-£400,000.

In addition it has been shown that there would be significant costs involved in relocating the Countryside Service. The precise costs are unknown at this stage, but estimates for the provision of new cattle handling facilities alone have been shown to wipe out at least two years of predicted savings.

From these figures it is evident that taking into account volunteer labour there is a potential loss to the Council of £369,628.00 over three years. This is set against a potential cost saving of just £30,000.00. The potential loss to the Council is therefore more than 12 times that of the savings based upon the higher unofficial figure of
£10,000.00 per annum. Whilst it is the case that a similar income could be achieved if the volunteer programme was operated from the Depot, the bid for grant aid was based on the service being operated from Deavall’s Farm.

These figures in themselves are sufficient to show that there is little merit in proceeding with closure. However, it has also been shown that any predicted cost savings could if necessary be met in full from Natural England grants. Although this later option should be seen as a last resort, as the loss of revenue will further increase the Council’s dependence upon volunteer labour in order to meet its contractual and legal obligations.

It is therefore proposed that the risk of jeopardising the imminent grant from Natural England is too high and is best avoided by retaining Deavall’s Farm as the base for the Countryside Service. It is therefore recommended on the basis of this business case to delete the option at the consultation stage.
01 December 2010

Simon Siddle
Countryside Officer, Cannock District Council
Devalls Farm
Hawkes Green Lane
Cannock
Staffordshire
WS11 7IP

Dear Simon

I have been bringing a volunteer group to Devalls Farm for the past 8 years. The farm has been a fantastic base for our Supported Learning Students as it provides work experience, disabled toilets, emergency facilities, wet and dry weather activities in the compound and indoor classrooms. We have benefitted from the indoor facilities, making bird boxes and gaining vital knowledge about the countryside.

The farm has been a source of great excitement as it itself represents the countryside and provides students with a rare opportunity to see wildlife and cows at their fingertips.

I am concerned that this proposed closure of the farm will affect the quality of the service offered and expertise that students receive and may mean that we are unable to continue to attend on Wednesdays.

Yours sincerely

Claire Anderson
Supported Learning Lecturer
Walsall College
Unison proposed alternative savings.

- Deletion of the £800 computer allowance for newly elected councillors, potential savings - £33,600 over 3 year period
- Deletion of the £33.30 internet access allowance for councillors paid monthly, potential savings - £16,383.60 p.a.
- Deletion of the council diary, potential savings £2,500 p.a.
- Reduction of street sweeping from 4 to 3 times a year, potential savings - £112,000.
- Reduction in the subsidy to football pitches currently £150,000, it should be noted that we will still have to cut the grass but this would still result in savings in excess of £100,000 p.a.

Total savings £33,600  (computer allowance)
 £49,150.80 (internet access over 3 years)
 £7,500.  (Council diary over 3 years)
 £336,000 (reduction in street sweeping over 3 year period)
 £300,000. (Reduced football subsidy over 3 years)

Grand total £726,250.80

- Also included would be to get local businesses to sponsor hanging baskets and Christmas lights – we are unable to provide these savings as we are not privy to the costs.
- Removal of away day costs for Cabinet (approx £540 per day twice a year, 3 year saving of £3240.00
- Removal of the computer allowance for senior officers of £1600.00 per year, approx savings over 3 year period £48,000.
Budget Consultation
2011/2012
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Appendix Questionnaire
The Consultation

Background
We reproduce the introductory page of this consultation regarding the Budget 2011/12.

There is no secret that money is tight for public services right now. With national debt at record levels, organisations like local councils are having to look at new ways of delivering services for less money.

The coalition Government that came into power in May made it very clear that reducing national debt was its number one priority. The Government has made a number of cuts and efficiency savings over the last few months already - but the toughest cuts will come into force in April next year.

We don’t want to make these kinds of huge changes without involving you.

We need to prepare for the cut in Government support that is coming our way. We already started this when we set the budget in March for 2010-2013 which anticipated a 5% year-on-year reduction in Government grants.

Additionally, over the last six years we have made £2.4 million of efficiency savings and taken £3.2 million out of service provision.

We won’t know until October or November exactly how much we will need to save when the Government publishes its Spending Review. This sets out exactly how much each Government department, including local government, will have to spend. We do know, however, that the Government is imposing a Council Tax freeze and public sector pay freeze. Therefore, we have to make savings of between £1.2 million and £2 million a year from 2011 for the next three years.

This is a huge challenge and could effectively represent a 25% reduction in the Council’s net expenditure.

As part of this process, we are looking at completely transforming the services we provide. We need to put ourselves in the best possible position to face up to the ever tightening purse strings.

This is where you come in because we do not believe it is right to make these kinds of huge changes without involving you.

There’s a lot of information in this Budget special. I hope it’s not too overwhelming but we are determined to keep you fully informed of the size of the task ahead of us and, with your help, to tackle it.

Stephen Brown, Chief Executive
Methodology

Residents of Cannock Chase District Council were consulted via:

On line:
The questionnaire was accessible through the Website www.cannockchasedc.gov.uk and had a prominent position on the homepage.

Responses: 83

The questionnaire was distributed via Chase Matters.

Responses: 203

The questionnaire was also distributed via face to face engagement.

Responses: 207

Total sample: 493

The full questionnaire can be found at Appendix A
Results 2010

Cannock Chase District Council

PR & Marketing
The following indicates the main results arising from the consultation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Category</th>
<th>Overall Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Safety</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Development</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways and Transportation</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Services</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Service categories Environmental Services and Community Safety are clearly considered to be the most important by those who responded to this consultation.

- Community services are, overall, the least important category in the opinion of this sample. It should be noted, however, that Parks and green spaces do score highly (see next page).
Thirty four different services were listed for consideration.

We report here the six most important and the six least important.

**Most Important Services**

- Refuse collection & recycling (Environmental Service) 3.87
- Street cleaning (Environmental Service) 3.78
- Tackling flytipping (Environmental Service) 3.69
- Working with partners to reduce crime (Community Safety) 3.67
- Food safety inspections (Environmental Service) 3.66
- Parks and green spaces (Community Service) 3.61

- Of the six ‘most important services’ four come under the category Environmental Services.

**Least Important Services**

- Arts development (Community Service) 2.61
- Allotments (Community Service) 2.73
- Prince of Wales Centre (Community Service) 2.85
- Promoting Tourism (Community Service) 2.92
- Museum of Cannock Chase (Community Service) 2.98
- Maintenance of Council car parks (Highways & Transportation) 3.04

- Of the six ‘least important services’ five come under the category Community Services.
Full Results

The total sample responding to the consultation is **493**.

The Margin of Error for this sample size is +/- 4.5%

Not all responded to every question and we have discounted those who responded ‘Don't Know’.

Base sizes for each question are therefore variable and represent those who expressed an opinion.

Throughout responses have been rated in order that a Mean Score may be deduced.

- **Very important** = 4
- **Fairly important** = 3
- **Not very important** = 2
- **Unimportant** = 1
Community Services

Chase and Rugeley leisure centres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly unimportant</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly important</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base 473  Mean 3.17

- 79% consider that Chase and Rugeley leisure centres are Important.

Prince of Wales Centre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly unimportant</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly important</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base 457  Mean 2.85

- 70% consider that the Prince of Wales Centre is Important.
Museum of Cannock Chase

Base 473  Mean 2.98
- 76% consider that the Museum of Cannock Chase is Important.

Sports development

Base 476  Mean 3.13
- 80% consider that Sports development is Important.
59% consider that Arts development is Important.

94% consider that Parks and green spaces are Important.
• 71% consider that Promoting tourism is Important.

• 63% consider that Allotments are Important.
87% consider that Countryside management is Important.

86% consider that Playing pitches are Important.
Average mean scores for Community Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks and green spaces</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryside management</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing pitches</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase and Rugeley leisure centres</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports development</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum of Cannock Chase</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting tourism</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince of Wales Centre</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts development</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall this Category</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental Services

Refuse collection and recycling

- Very important: 91%
- Fairly important: 8%
- Fairly unimportant: 0%
- Unimportant: 1%

Base 485  Mean 3.87

- 99% consider that Refuse collection and recycling are Important.

Street cleaning

- Very important: 81%
- Fairly important: 17%
- Fairly unimportant: 2%
- Unimportant: 0%

Base 485  Mean 3.78

- 98% consider that Street cleaning is Important.
Food safety inspections

- Fairly unimportant: 4%
- Unimportant: 1%
- Fairly important: 23%
- Very important: 72%

Base 484  Mean 3.66
- 95% consider that Food safety inspections are Important.

Tackling flytipping

- Fairly unimportant: 2%
- Unimportant: 1%
- Fairly important: 23%
- Very important: 74%

Base 485  Mean 3.69
- 97% consider that Tackling flytipping is Important.
85% consider that Licensing is Important.

92% consider that Cemeteries are Important.
93% consider that Pest control is Important.

87% consider that Noise control is Important.
83% consider that Stray dog control is Important.

90% consider that Dog fouling enforcement is Important.
86% consider that Air pollution is Important.
**Average mean scores** for **Environmental Services**

### Environmental Services - Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refuse collection and recycling</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street cleaning</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tackling flytipping</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food safety inspections</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pest control</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog fouling enforcement</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise control</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air pollution</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stray dog control</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall this Category</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning and Development

**Town centre markets**

- **Very important**: 42%
- **Fairly important**: 37%
- **Unimportant**: 9%
- **Fairly unimportant**: 12%

*Base 485  Mean 3.11*

- 79% consider that Town centre markets are Important.

**Economic development**

- **Very important**: 53%
- **Fairly important**: 38%
- **Unimportant**: 3%
- **Fairly unimportant**: 6%

*Base 470  Mean 3.42*

- 91% consider that Economic development is Important.
89% consider that Planning is Important.

87% consider that Building control is Important.
Town centre regeneration

- 89% consider that Town centre regeneration is Important.

Maintaining conservation areas

- 91% consider that Maintaining conservation areas is Important.
Average mean scores for Planning and development

Planning and Development - Mean Scores

- Maintaining conservation areas: 3.44
- Town centre regeneration: 3.42
- Economic development: 3.42
- Building control: 3.32
- Planning: 3.32
- Town centre markets: 3.11
- Overall this Category: 3.34

ANNEX 6
Housing Services

Preventing homelessness

- Unimportant: 9%
- Fairly unimportant: 9%
- Fairly important: 33%
- Very important: 49%

Base 477  Mean 3.22

- 82% consider that Preventing homelessness is Important.

Accommodation standards for private tenants

- Unimportant: 7%
- Fairly unimportant: 15%
- Fairly important: 32%
- Very important: 46%

Base 470  Mean 3.19

- 78% consider that Accommodation standards for private tenants are Important.
Supporting provision of affordable housing

Base 466  Mean 3.30

- 84% consider that Supporting provision of affordable housing is Important.

Average mean scores for Housing Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Services - Mean Scores</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting provision of affordable housing</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing homelessness</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation standards for private tenants</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall this Category</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Highways and Transportation

Maintenance of Council car parks

- Unimportant: 10%
- Fairly unimportant: 13%
- Fairly important: 40%
- Very important: 37%

Base 481 Mean 3.04
- 77% consider that Maintenance of Council car parks is Important.

Supporting public transport

- Unimportant: 4%
- Fairly unimportant: 7%
- Fairly important: 25%
- Very important: 64%

Base 484 Mean 3.51
- 89% consider that Supporting public transport is Important.
**Average mean scores** for Highways and Transportation

### Highways and Transportation - Mean Scores

- **Supporting public transport:** 3.51
- **Maintenance of Council car parks:** 3.04
- **Overall this Category:** 3.27
Community Safety

Town centre CCTV cameras

- Unimportant: 7%
- Fairly unimportant: 8%
- Fairly important: 26%
- Very important: 59%

Base 480  Mean 3.36
- 85% consider that Town Centre CCTV cameras are Important.

Working with partners to reduce crime

- Unimportant: 2%
- Fairly unimportant: 4%
- Fairly important: 20%
- Very important: 74%

Base 480  Mean 3.67
- 94% consider that Working with partners to reduce crime is Important.
Average mean scores for **Community Safety**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Overall Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working with partners to reduce crime</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town centre CCTV cameras</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall this Category</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Mean Scores ALL Categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Overall Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Safety</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Development</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways and Transportation</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Services</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is no secret that money is tight for public services right now. With national debt at record levels, organisations like local councils are having to look at new ways of delivering services for less money.

The coalition Government that came into power in May made it very clear that reducing national debt was its number one priority. The Government has made a number of cuts and efficiency savings over the last few months already - but the toughest cuts will come into force in April next year.

"We don’t want to make these kinds of huge changes without involving you."

We need to prepare for the cut in Government support that is coming our way. We already started this when we set the budget in March for 2010-2013 which anticipated a 5% year-on-year reduction in Government grants.

Additionally, over the last six years we have made £2.4 million of efficiency savings and taken £3.2 million out of service provision.

We won’t know until October or November exactly how much we will need to save when the Government publishes its Spending Review. This sets out exactly how much each Government department, including local government, will have to spend. We do know, however, that the Government is imposing a Council Tax freeze and public sector pay freeze. Therefore, we have to make savings of between £1.2 million and £2 million a year from 2011 for the next three years.

This is a huge challenge and could effectively represent a 25% reduction in the Council’s net expenditure.

As part of this process, we are looking at completely transforming the services we provide. We need to put ourselves in the best possible position to face up to this ever tightening purse strings.

This is where you come in because we do not believe it is right to make these kinds of huge changes without involving you.

There’s a lot of information in this Budget special. I hope it’s not too overwhelming but we are determined to keep you fully informed of the size of the task ahead of us and, with your help, to tackle it.

Stephen Brown, Chief Executive
What we spend

For this year (2010/11) it costs £11 million net to provide services for you.

This excludes the cost of local tax collection and central services and providing housing for our council tenants (which is funded by income from housing rents).

From April 2011, because of a reduction in the amount of funding we get from the Government, we need to make savings of between £1.2 million and £2 million a year for the next three years.

This is a huge challenge and some difficult decisions will have to be made.

Did you know...
Over the last six years we have made £2.4 million of efficiency savings and taken £3.2 million out of service provision.

Your Council Tax bill is made up of charges from ourselves, Staffordshire County Council, Staffordshire Police Authority and Stoke on Trent & Staffordshire Fire Authority. A further charge is also included from parish councils.

It can sometimes be confusing to work out which public authority provides which service. Below are some of the services we provide and how much they cost.

- **Community Services**
  - Includes culture, sport, parks, tourism, allotments, playing pitches, recreation, museum, countryside rangers, leisure centres
  - **£4.879 million**

- **Environmental Services**
  - Includes recycling and refuse collection, street cleaning, licensing, food safety inspections, air pollution, cemeteries
  - **£3.052 million**

- **Planning & Development**
  - Includes development control, building control, economic development, running our town centre markets, conservation, town centre regeneration
  - **£1.050 million**

Complete and return the budget survey overleaf to:
PR & Marketing, Cannock Chase Council, Beecroft Road, Cannock, Staffordshire, WS11 1BG
on services

How are we tackling the huge cut in Government support from 2011?

Work has already started to identify how we can make the savings required from 2011.

1. **Our assets** - The buildings and land we own. We need to see if we can sell any of these and whether it is viable to keep all Council offices open.

2. **Sharing services** - We are progressing with proposals to share some of our services with Stafford Borough Council. The original plan to phase the sharing of some services is being accelerated in the light of the large-scale cuts facing local government. We are also now in discussions with the private sector to explore the potential for further cost-cutting measures.

3. **Fees and charges** - Additional income may be generated by increasing fees and charges. We are also having to look at other services that we may have to start charging for.

4. **Outsourcing services** - When we set the budget for this year, it was agreed that a private sector/third party partner would be selected to manage our Leisure and Culture services. Having a third-party partner manage these services for us would save us money each year. Outsourcing other services is also being considered as part of the budget-setting process.

5. **Reducing or stopping some of the services we currently provide** - We need you to tell us which of our services are important to you. Please use the survey on the back page of this Budget Special or log on to www.cannock.churnet.gov.uk/government.

**Housing Services**
Preventing homelessness, accommodation standards for private tenants and supporting the provision of affordable housing

£889,000

**Highways & Transportation**
Includes maintenance of our car parks and support for public transport, for example the Chase Line rail service

£425,000

**Community Safety**
Includes the network of CCTV cameras in the District, working with partners to reduce crime

£114,000

and you will be entered into a prize draw. Closing date is 20th September 2010.
How important are the following services? These are examples of the services we provide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Fairly important</th>
<th>Fairly unimportant</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase and Ruxley leisure centres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince of Wales Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum of Cannock Chase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and green spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryside management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing pitches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse collection and recycling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street cleaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food safety inspections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tackling fly-tipping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pest control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stray dog control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog fouling enforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air pollution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning and Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town centre markets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building control - processing plans and inspecting work on site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town centre regeneration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining conservation areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing homelessness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation standards for tenants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting provision of affordable housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highways and Transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of Council car parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting public transport - for example the Chase Line rail service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town centre CCTV cameras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with partners to reduce crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please fill in your details to be entered into a free draw. Return this form to PR & Marketing, Cannock Chase Council, Civic Centre, Beecroft Road, Cannock, WS11 1BG by September 30th 2010.

Name:__________________________ Address:__________________________

Postcode:______________________

Contact number:_________________
Analysis and reporting conducted by

Fiona Welch (Partner)

Quality Fieldwork & Research Services
86 Aldridge Road
Perry Barr
Birmingham
B42 2TP

0121 344 4848

quality@qfrs.co.uk