



# Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday, 8th December,  
2015  
6.30 pm

Committee Room Two  
Town Hall  
Redditch



[www.redditchbc.gov.uk](http://www.redditchbc.gov.uk)

**If you have any queries on this Agenda please contact  
Jess Bayley and Amanda Scarce  
Democratic Services Officers**

**Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH  
Tel: 01527 64252 (Ext. 3268 ) / 881443  
e.mail: [jess.bayley@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:jess.bayley@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk) /  
[a.scarce@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:a.scarce@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk)**



# Overview and Scrutiny

## Committee

Tuesday, 8th December, 2015

6.30 pm

Committee Room 2 Town Hall

### Agenda

#### Membership:

Cllrs: Jane Potter (Chair) Gareth Prosser  
 Gay Hopkins (Vice-Chair) Paul Swansborough  
 Joe Baker Jennifer Wheeler  
 David Bush Nina Wood-Ford  
 Andrew Fry

<p><b>1. Apologies and named substitutes</b></p>	<p>To receive apologies for absence and details of any Councillor (or co-optee substitute) nominated to attend this meeting in place of a member of this Committee.</p>
<p><b>2. Declarations of interest and of Party Whip</b></p>	<p>To invite Councillors to declare any Disclosable Pecuniary Interests or Other Disclosable Interests they may have in items on the agenda, and to confirm the nature of those interests, and any Party Whip.</p>
<p><b>3. Minutes</b> (Pages 1 - 8)</p>	<p>To confirm the minutes of the most recent meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee as a correct record.</p> <p>(Minutes attached)</p> <p><b>(No Specific Ward Relevance)</b></p>
<p><b>4. Bereavement Services Review of Cremation Fees and Charges and Proposed Capital Works - Pre-Scrutiny</b>  (Pages 9 - 16)  Guy Revans, Head of Environmental Services</p>	<p>To pre-scrutinise the Bereavement Services review of cremation fees and charges and proposed capital works.</p> <p><b><u>It has been agreed that this report can be released early.</u></b></p> <p>(Report attached).</p> <p><b>All Wards</b></p>
<p><b>5. Fees and Charges 2016/17 - Pre-Scrutiny</b>  (Pages 17 - 64)  Jayne Pickering, Executive Director, Finance and Resources</p>	<p>To pre-scrutinise the Council's proposed fees and charges for services in 2016/17.</p> <p><b><u>It has been agreed that this report can be released early.</u></b></p> <p>(Report attached)</p> <p><b>(No Specific Ward Relevance)</b></p>

# Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

Tuesday, 8th December, 2015

<p><b>6. Leisure Services Options Short, Sharp Review - Final Report</b></p> <p>(Pages 65 - 100)</p> <p>Councillor Jane Potter</p>	<p>To consider the content of the Leisure Services Options short, Sharp Review's final report and to determine whether to endorse the group's recommendations.</p> <p>(Report attached)</p> <p><b>(No Specific Ward Relevance)</b></p>
<p><b>7. Review of the Operation of Leisure Services</b></p> <p>Jayne Pickering, Executive Director, Finance and Resources</p>	<p>To pre-scrutinise the Review of the Operation of Leisure Services.</p> <p>(Report to follow)</p> <p><b>All Wards</b></p>
<p><b>8. Medium Term Financial Plan - Presentation</b></p> <p>Jayne Pickering, Executive Director, Finance and Resources</p>	<p>To receive an update on the Medium Term Financial Plan.</p> <p>(Presentation to follow)</p> <p><b>All Wards</b></p>
<p><b>9. Executive Committee Minutes and Scrutiny of the Executive Committee's Work Programme</b></p> <p>(Pages 101 - 112)</p>	<p>To consider the minutes of the latest meeting(s) of the Executive Committee and also to consider whether any items on the Executive Committee's Work Programme are suitable for scrutiny.</p> <p>(Minutes attached, November edition of the Executive Work Programme attached, December edition of the Executive Work Programme to follow).</p> <p><b>(No Specific Ward Relevance)</b></p>
<p><b>10. Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme</b></p> <p>(Pages 113 - 116)</p>	<p>To consider the Committee's current Work Programme, and potential items for addition to the list arising from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Forward Plan / Committee agendas</li><li>• External publications</li><li>• Other sources.</li></ul> <p>(Report attached)</p> <p><b>(No Specific Ward Relevance)</b></p>

# Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

Tuesday, 8th December, 2015

<p><b>11. Task Groups - Progress Reports</b></p> <p>Councillor Gareth Prosser</p>	<p>To consider progress to date on the current reviews against the terms agreed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.</p> <p>The current reviews in progress are:</p> <p>a) Joint Worcestershire Increasing Physical Activity Task Group – Redditch Borough Council representative, Councillor Gareth Prosser; and</p> <p>(Verbal reports)</p> <p><b>(No Specific Ward Relevance)</b></p>
<p><b>12. Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee</b></p> <p>Councillor Nina Wood-Ford</p>	<p>To receive a verbal update on the recent work of the Worcestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.</p> <p>(Verbal report)</p> <p><b>(No Specific Ward Relevance)</b></p>

# Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

Tuesday, 8th December, 2015

## 13. Exclusion of the Press and Public

Should it be necessary, in the opinion of the Borough Director, during the course of the meeting to consider excluding the public from the meeting on the grounds that exempt information is likely to be divulged, it may be necessary to move the following resolution:

“That, under S.100 (A) (4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following matter(s) on the grounds that it/they involve(s) the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the relevant paragraphs (to be specified) of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) of the said Act”.

These paragraphs are as follows:

Subject to the “public interest” test, information relating to:

- Para 1 – any individual;
- Para 2 – the identity of any individual;
- Para 3 – financial or business affairs;
- Para 4 – labour relations matters;
- Para 5 – legal professional privilege;
- Para 6 – a notice, order or direction;
- Para 7 – the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime;

and may need to be considered as ‘exempt’.

**(No Specific Ward Relevance)**



## Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday, 6th October, 2015

### MINUTES

#### Present:

Councillor Jane Potter (Chair), Councillor Gay Hopkins (Vice-Chair) and Councillors David Bush, Andrew Fry, Gareth Prosser, Paul Swansborough and Jennifer Wheeler

#### Officers:

D Allen, J Bough, M Bough, S Hanley, B Holden, J Pickering, L Tompkin and J Willis

#### Democratic Services Officers:

J Bayley and A Scarce

#### 37. APOLOGIES AND NAMED SUBSTITUTES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Joe Baker and Nina Wood-Ford.

#### 38. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND OF PARTY WHIP

Councillor Andy Fry declared an other disclosable interest in the Voluntary Sector Grants Programme, briefing paper due to his personal family connection to the Head of Community Services.

#### 39. MINUTES

Councillor Gareth Prosser requested that it be noted at minute No 35, Joint Worcestershire Increasing Physical Activity Task Group, that the group's final report would be considered by Worcestershire Council's Cabinet at its January 2016 meeting and not December 2015 as previously stated.

#### RESOLVED that

**the minutes of the meeting held on 1st September 2015 be confirmed as a correct record, subject to the amendment detailed above, and signed by the Chair.**

.....  
Chair

# Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday, 6th October, 2015

---

## 40. HOUSING PROVISION

The Chair reminded Members that an overview of both private sector housing provision and Council housing provision in the Borough had been requested during the scrutiny training session held in June 2015.

Officers provided Members with a briefing in respect of the key data sets currently available on the housing market in Redditch together with details of the private rented market in Redditch, the prevalence of benefit payments and rent shortfalls and the demand that loss of private rented accommodation generated for the Council's homelessness service as a whole.

Members were also updated on the housing register, allocations system and policy. This included information on the work of the housing advice assessment of housing need, the work of the Locality teams within the allocations process in order to understand people's needs and the current review of the allocations policy and the transformation work which was being carried out.

During consideration of this item Officers responded to the following points which were raised by Members:

- It was noted the data was produced in 2012 and the point was raised as to whether this would be updated. Officers confirmed that this data was produced with the support of Worcestershire County Council and as its approach had changed to that of a commissioning authority in many cases, the districts were in discussion as to how best to produce similar data in the future.
- The number of houses built in the Borough in the period covered by the report.
- Any information in respect of the number of developments where planning permission had been granted but the properties had not as yet been built and the effect this could potentially have on the availability of affordable housing.
- The percentage of Council tenancies and registered providers.
- Whether all those on the waiting list were Redditch residents. It was confirmed that approximately five per cent were from outside of the Borough.
- The Council's holistic approach to housing allocation and matching people with what they wanted.
- The effect of the spare room subsidy and the support that had been given to those who were required to move or wished to downsize their property.
- The turnaround of the void properties. This was approximately four to six weeks as the Council was carrying out more of the capital work using its own workforce, which was part of the wider



## Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday, 6th October, 2015

---

transformation work. It was anticipated that this turnaround time would reduce significantly as the new way of working became embedded.

- Managing the expectations of those on the non-priority waiting list – Officers dealt with this in a variety of ways, including producing data and examples of someone in a similar position and the time it had taken for others to move up the list or be allocated a property. The list was reviewed annually and those on it would be contacted to see whether their circumstances had changed or whether they still needed to be included.
- Whether the Council took account of parents who had joint custody of children and made allowance for a spare room. Officers confirmed that usually the property would be allocated to the parent who had financial responsibility for the child in terms of receiving any benefit support.
- The new regulations which had come into force during the week in respect of carbon monoxide and smoke detectors being installed in rented properties. Officers confirmed that any requirements would be met by the Council as a priority and Officers would ensure that any necessary work would be carried out in order for the Council to meet its statutory and moral responsibilities.

### **41. VOLUNTARY SECTOR GRANTS PROGRAMME - BRIEFING PAPER**

Officers noted that at the previous meeting they had been invited to provide an update in respect of the lack of progress in recruiting an apprentice to support the Council's grants programme. Members were advised that the council would not recruit to this apprentice post until it could be ensured that the post holder could be supported by the Grants Co-ordinator.

Further information was also provided in respect of the other outstanding recommendations from the Voluntary and Community Sector Task Group.

- Recommendation 6a – It was anticipated that immediately the service was fully staffed this recommendation would be addressed.
- Recommendation 7a – The staff volunteering policy was in the process of being refreshed and would be relaunched at the end of October 2015 as part of the Five Ways of Well Being event that was due to be held.
- Recommendation 8 – Staff volunteering would continue to be promoted and celebrated in publications such as the Oracle (staff) newsletter and as part of the internal communications campaign. Officers also advised Members that there would be a

## Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday, 6th October, 2015

---

workshop for volunteering on 13<sup>th</sup> October as part of the Five Ways of Well Being event, which staff would be encouraged to attend.

- Recommendation 10 – A Voluntary Sector event would be held when the team was fully staffed with the possibility of this being linked to National Volunteering Week.

Members commented that they felt reassured to see that the long term issues were being resolved and that members of the voluntary and community sector still had the opportunity to get support when applying for grant funding. Thanks were given to Officers for maintaining the service during a difficult time.

### **RESOLVED that**

- 1) Recommendations 7 and 8 proposed by the voluntary and Community Sector Task Group be removed from the Recommendation tracker; and**
- 2) the contents of the briefing paper be noted.**

### **42. GAS SAFETY TESTING - UPDATE REPORT**

Following a request at the previous meeting of the Committee, Officers provided Members with an update in respect of the Gas Safety Testing which covered the following:

- Regular updates had been provided to all Members detailing the number of overdue inspections, including a Ward breakdown. As of 30th September 2015 40 remained overdue.
- The Council referred itself to the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) verbally with a follow up in writing. HCA were considering the matter to ascertain whether it represented a breach of consumer standards.
- The matter was also referred to the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) following the issue of a press release and HSE were undertaking an enquiry into the Council's system of carrying out annual gas inspections, including the accumulation of a backlog.
- The HSE would seek to recover their costs for the work undertaken by them, if the Council was found to be in contravention of health and safety law.
- An interim Internal Audit report had been completed and provided, in confidence to the HCA and HSE.

Officers assured Members that since the last report the issue had been dealt with as a priority with additional and dedicated resources being deployed, regular contact with the gas contractor and support from other teams. The Corporate Management Team (CMT) had

## Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday, 6th October, 2015

---

also been provided with regular progress reports. There had already been a comprehensive review of the gas testing schedule/process and all relevant documentation, which had led to a number of measures already being put in place to ensure that this did not happen again.

The Committee was advised that a final report would be made available for Members' consideration once it had been produced. However, at this stage only an interim report had been drafted. The legal team had been consulted and it had been agreed that as the report was both confidential and in an interim form, and as there was further work to be undertaken, Members would not, at this stage, be able to see the report.

Following consideration of the report Members, whilst pleased to see that such swift action had been taken to rectify the matter, expressed disappointment that they were unable to have sight of the interim Internal Audit Report, as it was felt this document would provide vital information to enable them to ascertain how this situation had occurred and make a constructive response. It was highlighted that Members had previously been informed that they could, in theory, be legally responsible for what had happened. Whilst the Committee noted the reasons for not being provided with access to the report, it was suggested that a copy of the document should be made available for the consideration of all Members. Members therefore reiterated their request to have access to the interim internal audit report.

Members also discussed the availability of historic data in order to understand how long the delays had been going on, as this would provide useful background to the report, though it was suggested that such information was likely to form part of the overall report. The Committee was further reminded that some backlog data had already been provided for each ward.

**RESOLVED that**

**the Gas Safety Testing update be noted.**

### **43. OVERVIEW OF THE BUDGET - REPORT**

Officers provided Members with background information to this report, explaining that the process had been revised following concerns which had been raised during the budget scrutiny exercise undertaken for 2015/16. The format of the report brought before Members was that which had been agreed at the previous meeting and provided an opportunity to consider any particular areas to be scrutinised in more detail at future meetings.

## Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday, 6th October, 2015

---

The Chair highlighted a number of areas where there were large variances and suggested that it would be helpful to have explanatory notes for these in order for Members to determine whether further investigation was needed. Those areas included Bereavement Services, Building Control, Community Safety, Council Tax, Business Development, Elections, HR and CMT. Members agreed that where there was a marked difference year on year it would be useful to have an explanation in order to understand the differences.

**RESOLVED that**

- 1) Officers to provide, via email, explanations of the areas where large variances have occurred; and**
- 2) the Budget Scrutiny 2016/17 report be noted.**

**44. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES AND SCRUTINY OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE'S WORK PROGRAMME**

Officers confirmed that there were no updates in respect of Overview and Scrutiny within the Executive Committee minutes from the meeting held on 8th September 2015. A copy of the most recent Executive Work Programme had been tabled at the meeting and Members were given the opportunity to identify any subjects which they felt might be suitable for pre-scrutiny.

**RESOLVED that**

**the Executive Committee Minutes of 8th September 2015 and the latest edition of the Executive Work Programme be noted.**

**45. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME**

The Committee was advised that there were no updates to report in respect of the Committee's Work Programme. However, it was highlighted that the agenda for the meeting on 8th December was particularly long and it would not therefore be appropriate to add any further items to that agenda.

It was confirmed that officers had been approached with a view to moving the Housing Benefits presentation to the January meeting. However, unfortunately the relevant Head of Service was unavailable. It was therefore agreed that the item would remain on the agenda for the December meeting.

# Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday, 6th October, 2015

---

**RESOLVED that**

**the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's Work Programme be noted.**

**46. TASK GROUPS - PROGRESS REPORTS**

Joint Worcestershire Increasing Physical Activity Task Group –  
Redditch Borough Council Representative, Councillor Gareth  
Prosser

Councillor Prosser confirmed that he had met with the Head of Leisure and Cultural Services to discuss the provision of activities by the Council and he had also provided information in respect of Worcestershire County Council. The next meeting of the Group was due to take place on 16th October at County Hall when representatives from Worcestershire County Cricket Club and Worcester Warriors would be interviewed. A further meeting was planned for 21st October when representatives from Worcester Ramblers and the Countryside Greenspace Manager would be interviewed.

It was anticipated that the final report would be presented to the Worcestershire County Council Overview and Scrutiny Performance Board's November 2015 meeting and, as previously noted, presented at the Cabinet's January 2016 meeting.

Leisure Services Options Short Sharp Review – Councillor Jane  
Potter, Chair

Councillor Jane Potter, Chair of the group, confirmed the other Members nominated to serve on the review were Councillors Gay Hopkins, Tom Baker-Price and Paul Swansborough.

The group had held its first meeting and had agreed to send a questionnaire to other Councils to find out how they delivered their leisure services. Any responses to the questionnaire will be discussed at a future meeting. The next meeting was due to be held on 7th October when the group would consider further information about the different service delivery models that were available to the Council. Relevant Officers would be invited to attend future meetings to discuss the governance and funding implications of the different models.

**RESOLVED that**

**the update reports be noted.**

## Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday, 6th October, 2015

---

### 47. CRIME AND DISORDER SCRUTINY PANEL - UPDATE REPORT

Councillor Gareth Prosser, Chair of the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel, confirmed that the Panel had met on 16th September 2015 for its annual meeting. During this meeting Officers had provided a comprehensive update on the work of the Partnership. Members were informed that full details and the minutes of the meeting were available to view on the Council's website.

### 48. HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

In the absence of Councillor Nina Wood-Ford, the Council's representative on the Worcestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Officers informed Members that a meeting had been held on 16<sup>th</sup> September 2015. Members agreed that the minutes of this meeting should be provided when available for information. It was further agreed that if Members wished to raise any issues arising from these minutes this could be done at the next meeting or by contacting Councillor Wood-Ford directly.

The Meeting commenced at 7.04 pm  
and closed at 8.27 pm

**BEREAVEMENT SERVICES – REVIEW OF CREMATION FEES AND CHARGES AND PROPOSED CAPITAL WORKS**

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Cllr Debbie Taylor
Portfolio Holder Consulted	Yes
Relevant Head of Service	Guy Revans
Ward(s) Affected	All
Ward Councillor(s) Consulted	N/A

**1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS**

- 1.1 This report proposes that Cremation fees are increased by 8% per annum for the next 4 years, to ensure that we are placed nearer the average in the national league table of fees and charges, whilst spreading the impact to service users.
- 1.2 It also recommends that the fee structure is altered so that all cremations and burials for residents and non- residents under the age of 18 are free to assist bereaved families who have suffered the loss of a child.
- 1.3 In recognition of the potential issues around funeral poverty, the lower fee for the 8.30am and 9.00am time slots is retained and the existing fee for the 9.30am and 10.15am slots is reduced by 6% in 2016/17 and subsequently has the 8% increase applied.
- 1.4 A programme of capital works is carried out to ensure that the facilities, which were constructed 40 years ago, can continue to operate effectively, can accommodate increased demand and are fit for modern day needs and purpose. And some of the additional income is used to supplement the ongoing cost of these facility improvements.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

The **Executive Committee** is asked to **RECOMMEND** that:

- 1) the cremation fees for 18 years + are increased as per the table at 3.7;
- 2) the fees previously applied to 17 year olds are amended to start at 18 years old for both residents and non-residents for both cremations and burials;
- 3) facility and heating improvements are approved as per the list at paragraph 4.10;
- 4) a sum of £200K in capital funding be added to the existing £144K making a total of £344K to enable a programme of capital works to take place in 2016; and
- 5) a proportion of the increased income from amended fees is used towards repayment of the capital borrowing costs.

**3. KEY ISSUES****Financial Implications**

3.1 The Authority's current position in the national league table of cremation fees and charges shows that in:-

2000: Redditch were 85<sup>th</sup> out of a total of 241 crematoria (35% down the list), with a fee of £250. The basic average fee for the year was £251.72.

2005: Redditch was 144<sup>th</sup> out of a total of 247 crematoria (58% down the list) with a fee of £330. The basic average fee for the year was £336.02.

2010: Redditch was 206<sup>th</sup> out of a total of 256 crematoria (80% down the list) with a fee of £450. The basic average fee for the year was £496.83.

2015: Redditch was 264<sup>th</sup> out of a total of 276 crematoria (96% down the list) with a fee of £540. The average fee for the year was £646.31.

3.2 The current average fee of £540 is therefore £106 lower than the average national fee. If an 8% increase is added in the first year the average cost will be £583 which is still significantly lower than the current national average and, would place us at 238<sup>th</sup> in the current league table. It should be noted however that this is likely to change as other authorities will be increasing their fees annually.

3.3 If we had remained at 85<sup>th</sup> in the table of cremation fees (as we were in 2000) the projected average cost would now be £735 instead of £540.

3.4 For the purpose of comparison the nearby authorities are as follows for 2015:-

- Stourport (Wyre Forest) - £762
- Worcester - £750
- Stourbridge - £696
- Dudley - £696
- Birmingham Yardley - £685
- Wolverhampton - £684
- Solihull - £660
- Walsall - £657
- Birmingham Lodge Hill - £628

3.5 This authority has not increased fees in line with the general increases applied by others over a period of years. It can reasonably be proposed that the fees are brought in to line with comparable authorities and that the potential additional income can be used to support the Council's budgets.



**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**8<sup>th</sup> December 2015

3.6 To date in 2015 the 8.30am and 9.30am slots with the considerably reduced fee have proved popular for certain customers and funeral directors and have had over 50% take up. The 9.30am and 10.15am take up rate is only 35%.

3.7 Tabulated existing and proposed fees as per Recommendation 2.1

	<b>2015/2016</b>	<b>2016/2017</b>	<b>2017/2018</b>	<b>2018/2019</b>	<b>2019/2020</b>
Time slots	As per current fees and charges for 17+	18 years+ (FOC for under 18 as per 1.4)	18 years+ (FOC for under 18 as per 1.4)	18 years+ (FOC for under 18 as per 1.4)	18 years+ (FOC for under 18 as per 1.4)
8.30am 9.00am	£410	£440	£480	£520	£560
9.30am 10.15am	£530	£500	£540	£580	£630
11.00am onwards	£540	£580	£630	£680	£730

3.8 There has been very significant investment within the crematorium resulting in the installation of state of the art technology and associated plant and equipment. This has put the facility at the forefront of the industry and has generated worldwide interest and plaudits in what has been achieved especially with regard to the use of waste heat as part of the mercury abatement process.

3.9 There has however been limited investment in what is a well maintained but ageing structural facility. It has been identified that this may lead to potential unforeseen maintenance issues, possible facility failures and ultimately enforced closures. In the event of such situations occurring it will impact on people in several ways, the detail of which is given below. There will also be a financial impact in terms of loss of income, costly and unplanned repairs, enforced closures, reduction in CAMEO payments (mercury abatement off set payments based on the number of cremations we carry out) as well as the potential for having to make available temporary facilities if necessary. There is therefore a need to invest and support what is a well-known, and highly recommended technical facility and to ensure that the investment so far is not adversely affected by the aging structure and buildings.

3.10 If the recommendations are implemented, it is estimated that additional income in year one will be approximately £52K.

3.11 £16K of the increased income will be used to offset the borrowing costs.

**Legal Implications**

- 3.12 As we provide a cremation service we are legally obliged to meet the requirements of the Cremation Regulations 2008 (in particular Part 2)
- 3.13 We have a Duty of Care to all site users to ensure that both the internal and external facilities are safe which includes understanding the risks and removing or reducing those risks where possible.

**4. Service / Operational Implications**

- 4.1 The crematorium building and office facility were completed in the 1970s and the main building has not seen any major improvements or upgrades in terms of the basic infrastructure and facilities that they provide ie the toilets and visitor waiting area.
- 4.2 The crematorium has seen a major investment of approximately £1 million in terms of the installation of two new cremators, one of which is for oversize coffins, as well as the installation of mercury abatement equipment which has resulted in us being able to transfer waste heat to the Abbey Stadium leisure facility to supplement the existing heating system for the swimming pool.
- 4.3 This major investment did not however include improvements to the catafalque which is not large enough to accommodate the oversize coffins and, when necessary we have to make special arrangements with the relatives of the deceased as we cannot lower the coffin at the end of a service. As a result we believe that some customers are using other authorities who have the necessary facilities to enable a full chapel service including the lowering of the catafalque along with the use of an oversized cremator.
- 4.4 Improvements to the catafalque will require considerable time and expense to cut out the existing supporting wall that forms the catafalque surround and, to then replace the mechanism with an oversized and safe operating system.
- 4.5 The scissor lift that operates the catafalque needs to be replaced and has been highlighted as an issue by Zurich, who are the Councils insurers, in their annual inspection. This issue needs to be addressed and would ideally be done at the same time as the catafalque improvements. To enable this work to take place the wall adjacent to the scissor lift needs to be removed. However the main electrical circuits and the mains cable that feeds the cremators is fixed to the wall. When the work is carried out all the electrical systems will need to be removed and so operation of the building will not be feasible. (*Place Partnership to pay for catafalque works out of existing public buildings capital budgets – estimated £40K+*).

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**8<sup>th</sup> December 2015

---

- 4.6 The majority of electrical supply costs for the site are attributed to the main crematorium and it can therefore be assumed that the cremators and heating are the main consumers of that supply. The under floor heating for the chapel, which is a grid system of wires, has been in-situ since the building was installed and operates on an off peak night time tariff. The efficiency of this system, in term of heat provided against supply consumption, is unknown however its future effectiveness and ability to remain functional is questionable if the catafalque and building works take place.
- 4.7 From the investigation work carried out so far it would appear that the grid wiring for the heating system goes up to and abuts the existing catafalque so, when the works take place to remove the supporting wall, and therefore the immediate flooring that the wall supports, it is highly likely that the heating system will be disturbed/damaged or even potentially made unusable.
- 4.8 Based on the likelihood that the expensive existing system will be damaged there is an opportunity to consider the alternative options. Worcester County Council (now Place Partnership) architects and engineers are therefore examining different ways of heating the building more efficiently and it would appear that there are three options for consideration. Firstly there is a basic electrical heating system, secondly there is a “wet” system which has radiators running from a boiler and thirdly we investigate the possibility of utilising more of the waste heat generated from the cremators.
- 4.9 As a result of consultation events, using external consultants to look at our facilities and functionality as well as talking with the site users and staff, we have identified several issues regarding the current design and condition of the facilities. It is acknowledged that the site and in particular the chapel and main window feature are a positive asset that encourages customers and partners to recommend us to others. It is also acknowledged that we have a state of the art technical facility. We do however accept that even though we have a facility to be proud of it would benefit from some work to bring it more up to modern day expectations. This relates to the general facilities for bereaved families and their mourners which are felt to be no longer sufficient to meet current customer requirements. There are also other operational issues that have been raised such as the unintended mixture and crossing over of those waiting to attend a funeral with those attending a funeral and those leaving a funeral. It is also known that there is a need to provide a more suitable facility and method of accessing and exiting the building more discreetly for the Funeral Directors, clergy and celebrants etc. as current arrangements are insufficient.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**8<sup>th</sup> December 2015

4.10 We have therefore engaged with the Worcester County Council (Place Partnership) architect and engineers to look at a raft of ideas on facility improvements. Their proposals are:-

- Improve the toilet facilities
- Creating a large public waiting area
- Creating a suitable vestry to include a viewing facility i.e. CCTV
- Creating a Funeral Directors room
- Look at building access and disabled access i.e. dropped kerbs, toilets
- Look at safety issues with regard to surfacing i.e. displaced setts on path edges
- Improve the porte cochere to give mourners improved bad weather protection
- Provide a covered walkway to give bad weather protection to those waiting outside
- Replace the window in the Book of Remembrance room
- Review noisy air con units – can they be improved
- Improved disabled access
- Improved and clear signage throughout the site
- Resurfacing of poor footpaths
- Improvements to the lectern i.e. make adjustable, drinks table and catafalque emergency STOP button
- Improvement to the operational staff facilities i.e. drying room, mess room, heating improvements
- Redecoration throughout all facilities
- Review fixtures and fittings i.e. carpets, curtains window frames, blinds, lights, door mechanisms on outer doors
- Bench and bin replacements
- New noticeboards
- Improve and extend the storage and security of the operational compound
- Improved lighting
- Defined and clearly signed smoking areas
- Improved viewing facility from operational room
- Refurbish the main office

## **5. Customer / Equalities and Diversity Implications**

5.1 The most notable impact on our customers is the requirement to close the facility to allow the works to take place. This requires careful project management to minimise the closure period, investigation in to what services may still be feasible during the period of the works, detailed consultation and information programme to include all interested parties and, consideration of what alternatives facilities may be possible on the site i.e. a temporary chapel.

5.2 We must ensure that the facilities and access to the Crematorium site are in accordance with the Equality Act 2010.

## **6. RISK MANAGEMENT**

6.1 There are various potential liability and operational business risks associated with the provision of the service and the appropriateness and integrity of the structural facilities.

6.2 These risks may arise through the inability to provide a service or as a result of claims against the authority for loss of business, personal injury and distress.

6.3 There is a potential risk of alienating customers and partners if the closure is not planned for the most appropriate time i.e. the summer when generally less funerals take place or, the closure is not communicated effectively and the project timetable is not adhered to.

6.4 There is also a risk that we may undo some of the work that has been done with the different faith groups who have defined religious/funeral requirements. We will need to ensure that we discuss the proposed works with them so that we can understand their needs and make suitable arrangements where possible.

6.5 There is a need to plan the closures to minimise impact on customers but also to limit the amount of revenue that will be lost as a result in the short term. This plan will need to identify periods of total site closure, and when cremations are possible even if the chapel is out of use.

6.6 The long term operational risk may result in potential unplanned repair costs, loss of income due to enforced and unplanned closure, distress to families of the bereaved, impact on local businesses and long term reputational damage to the Council if:-

- The catafalque/scissor lift fails
- The under floor heating fails
- We cannot honour commitments/funeral services due to enforced closure
- Health and Safety issues result in being able to use some or all of the site
- We do not look to utilise potential savings from excess heat as this will negate the savings made by the transfer of heat to the Leisure Centre and from what is being created via the PV panels

## **7. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Redditch Crematorium Feasibility Study: Alterations and Refurbishment  
(September 2015)

Pharos League Tables, (Cremation Society of Great Britain).

**AUTHOR OF REPORT**

Name: Carl Walker, Environmental Services Manager

email: [carl.walker@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:carl.walker@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk)

Tel.: 01527 64252 ext 3421

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY  
COMMITTEE**8<sup>th</sup> December 2015**FEES AND CHARGES REVIEW 2016/17**

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Councillor John Fisher, Portfolio Holder for Corporate Management
Portfolio Holder Consulted	Yes
Relevant Head of Service	Jayne Pickering
Wards Affected	All Wards
Ward Councillor Consulted	

**1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS**

To present the proposed fees and charges for 2016/17 for the Council's chargeable services.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee consider the fees and charges as included at Appendix 1 and recommend to the Executive Committee any changes to the fees proposed.

**3. KEY ISSUES**

- 3.1 Comments relating to the individual services are shown in the appendix where the fees and charges have reduced or remained the same.
- 3.2 It is proposed that the fees and charges be increase from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2016, where an invoice has not already been raised covering the last quarter of the financial year or if there is a contractual notice period preventing this.

**Financial Implications**

- 3.3 The Council's Financial Regulation D11 requires an annual review of fees and charges to be undertaken. Traditionally, this review is carried out as part of the budget preparation cycle.
- 3.4 Officers have been asked to review all their Fees and Charges and a general increase of 3% has been applied following approval by Council.
- 3.5 A review has been undertaken of a number of charges to enable officers to understand the link between demand and price. Therefore some prices have reduced / not seen any increase, due to the impact on demand. These include

- Arrow Valley Astro Turf Pitch Hire ( reduction in price)

## OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

8<sup>th</sup> December 2015

- Abbey Stadium Centre memberships ( retain current price)
- Golf charges ( retain current price)
- Land Charges ( retain current price)
- Regulatory Services ( retain current price)

There are a number of charges that have been increased at a different rate to that approved by Council due to officers reviewing these in more detail to enable additional increases that can be evidenced and justified. These are detailed below:

### 3.5.1 Leisure

**Party Events** –Officers have undertaken benchmarking across similar Leisure Centres that are located within a reasonable drive time to our facilities e.g.- Studley , Bromsgrove, Droitwich to enable comparison with the indicate the current price charged by our services in 15/16. For parties the charge is lower than comparable prices within other centres. The charge proposed for 16/17 (5% - 10% increase) will bring the service to a comparison with the average price charged.

**Swimming Lessons** – the rates for swimming lessons remain below other providers in the area. It is therefore proposed that an increase of 5% is applied to this service. There is a current level of demand for the lessons that cannot be met due to difficulties in recruiting teachers and therefore officers are considering other ways of ensuring the service has teachers for the lessons.

**Palace Theatre** – cost per week has increased to reflect the additional staff time to provide appropriate levels of support to the performance organisation

**Allotments** – the allotments with water have been increased to reflect the cost associated with having a standpipe within the individual allotment.

**Community Centres** – there are increases in the charges applicable to private organisations using the Councils facilities to better reflect the rate that would enable the Council to achieve best value from the rental of our facilities. In addition a number of benchmarking exercises have been undertaken to ensure the Council is charging a reasonable rate.

### 3.5.2 Planning and Regeneration

**Building Control** - Improving on efforts to maintain and increase market share, a further reduction in the number of published building control fees is proposed. Increasing numbers of rival private sector firms have used the publication of local authority fees as a vehicle to



## OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

8<sup>th</sup> December 2015

increase their own market share. In 2014 / 2015 a number of more mainstream work categories had their published fees withdrawn in favour of providing site specific quotations. This revised way of working has now bedded in amongst both officers and customers, many of whom are repeat customers and has proven to be beneficial. With the exception of the publication of archiving charges and the optional consultancy based hourly charge, it is now proposed to remove all the remaining published fees. The invitation to the customer to seek a site specific quotation is within the provisions of the Building (Local Authority Charges) Regulations 2010 and allows early contact with the customer to ensure the best possible chance of receiving a building regulations application. These final few work categories amount to around just 5% of fee earning applications. The increase in archiving and optional consultancy is to reflect the true cost to the Council of the administration time in delivering this service.

### 3.5.3 Private Sector Housing

**Lifeline** - installation charges have been increased to more accurately reflect the true cost of the service. The proposed fee of £35.00 is a reflection nearer to the true cost in officer time that it takes to complete an installation visit. There is more emphasis in that visit to profile our customers and find a holistic solution that meets their needs and sign post and refer on residents to other services where appropriate. This takes time and care and the charge remains up to 20% less than some other providers in the region.

3.5.4 **Revenues** – Court costs for Council Tax and Business Rates have to be calculated based on specific guidance on cost recovery and therefore the revised rates reflect this charge.

3.5.5 **Cemetery / Crematorium**- a separate report is included in this agenda item to propose changes to the crematorium charges. In relation to burial fees , it is proposed that the age for a child interment will be until the age of 17 not 16 as in previous years.

3.5.6 **Licensing** – legislation has ruled that taxi drivers should be given the option of a 3 year license and therefore the new proposed fees takes this into account.

### Legal Implications

3.6 A number of statutes governing the provision of services covered by this report contain express powers or duties to charge for services. Where an express power to charge does not exist the Council has the power under Section 111 of the Local Government Act 1972 to charge where the activity is incidental or conducive to or calculated to facilitate

## **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

8<sup>th</sup> December 2015

the Council's statutory function. The details of the powers to levy particular charges may be obtained from the author of this report.

### **Service/Operational Implications**

- 3.7 The fees and charges will be applied to all services with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2016.

### **Customer / Equalities and Diversity Implications**

- 3.8 No implications have been identified.

## **4. RISK MANAGEMENT**

If the Council's fees and charges are not increased at least in line with inflation each year then the level of subsidy will increase which has a direct impact on the level of Council Tax or the Housing Revenue Account.

## **5. APPENDICES**

Appendix 1 – Fees and Charges

## **6. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

There were no background papers identified.

## **AUTHOR OF REPORT**

Name: Kate Goldey, Senior Accounting Technician  
E Mail: [k.goldey@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:k.goldey@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk)  
Telephone: 01527-881208

**Leisure & Cultural Services**

Service Category	charge 1st April 2015 £	% increase / £ increase £	Revised Net total £	VAT to be applied	Proposed charge from 2016 £	Comments
<b>Reddicards</b>		<b>3.00%</b>				
Adult resident	28.00	0.84	24.03	4.81	28.80	
Family resident	38.00	1.14	32.62	6.52	39.10	
Couple resident	34.00	1.02	29.18	5.84	35.00	
Junior resident	20.00	0.60	17.17	3.43	20.60	
Adult non-resident	38.50	1.16	33.05	6.61	39.70	
Junior non-resident	27.00	0.81	23.18	4.64	27.80	
Family non-resident	55.50	1.67	47.64	9.53	57.20	
Adult concession	9.50	0.29	8.15	1.63	9.80	
Junior concession	9.50	0.29	8.15	1.63	9.80	
Family concession	14.00	0.42	12.02	2.40	14.40	
Seniors resident	9.50	0.29	8.15	1.63	9.80	
Student	9.50	0.29	8.15	1.63	9.80	
Disabled	9.50	0.29	8.15	1.63	9.80	
Commercial Block Booking Card	99.00	2.97	84.98	17.00	102.00	
Development Block Booking Card	37.00	1.11	31.76	6.35	38.10	
<b>Abbey Stadium and Kingsley</b>		<b>3.00%</b>				
<b>Senior denotes over 60STN – Subject to NegotiationRC – Reddicard</b>						
<b>SPORTS - INDOOR FACILITIES HIRE OF FULL HALL (40 MINUTES)</b>						
<b>Abbey Stadium/Kingsley - Peak</b>						
Charge	82.00	2.46	70.38	14.08	84.50	
Reddicard	54.50	1.64	46.78	9.36	56.10	
Concession	41.00	1.23	35.19	7.04	42.20	
<b>Abbey Stadium/Kingsley - Off Peak</b>						
Charge	52.50	1.58	45.06	9.01	54.10	
Reddicard	35.50	1.07	30.47	6.09	36.60	
Concession	26.50	0.80	22.75	4.55	27.30	
<b>HIRE OF GYMNASIUM (40 MINUTES)</b>						
<b>Kingsley</b>						
Charge	34.00	1.02	29.18	5.84	35.00	
Reddicard	22.50	0.68	19.31	3.86	23.20	
Concession	17.00	0.51	14.59	2.92	17.50	
<b>Kingsley - Commercial</b>	STN		STN	STN	STN	

**BADMINTON (PER COURT 40 MINUTES)**

<b>Peak</b>					
Charge	12.00	0.36	10.30	2.06	12.40
Reddicard	8.00	0.24	6.87	1.37	8.20
Concession	6.00	0.18	5.15	1.03	6.20
<b>Off Peak</b>					
Charge	8.50	0.26	7.30	1.46	8.80
Reddicard	5.50	0.17	4.72	0.94	5.70
Concession	4.20	0.13	3.61	0.72	4.30

**SQUASH (PER COURT 40 MINUTES)**

<b>Peak</b>					
Charge	9.50	0.29	8.15	1.63	9.80
Reddicard	6.50	0.20	5.58	1.12	6.70
Concession	5.00	0.15	4.29	0.86	5.20
<b>Off Peak</b>					
Charge	8.00	0.24	6.87	1.37	8.20
Reddicard	5.20	0.16	4.46	0.89	5.40
Concession	4.00	0.12	3.43	0.69	4.10

**ABBEY STADIUM-CENTRE MEMBERSHIPS**

Single - Peak	32.00	0.00	26.67	5.33	32.00	A nil increase gives us the opportunity to retain members as other providers are currently offering competitive membership pricing
Single - Off Peak	25.00	0.00	20.83	4.17	25.00	A nil increase gives us the opportunity to retain members as other providers are currently offering competitive membership pricing
Joining Fee	25.00	0.75	21.46	4.29	25.80	
Day Pass / Pay as you go	6.50	0.20	5.58	1.12	6.70	
Exercise to Music Studio Session	4.50	0.14	3.86	0.77	4.60	
Exercise to Music Studio Session (Les Mills)	5.50	0.17	4.72	0.94	5.70	

**TRAMPOLINING & GYMNASTICS – 10 WEEKS**

<b>Abbey</b>					
Charge	67.50	2.03	57.94	11.59	69.50
Reddicard	44.50	1.34	38.20	7.64	45.80
Concession	33.50	1.01	28.75	5.75	34.50

**PARTIES****Bouncy / Sports Castle Parties**

Charge	145.50	10.00%	135.80	27.16	163.00	See report
Reddicard	97.00	9.70	90.53	18.11	108.60	
Concession	73.00	7.30	68.13	13.63	81.80	

<b>JUNIOR NETBALL DEVELOPMENT (Kingsley)</b>			<b>3.00%</b>			
<b>Netball</b>						
Charge	5.00	0.15	4.29	0.86	5.20	
Reddicard	3.50	0.11	3.00	0.60	3.60	
Concession	2.50	0.08	2.15	0.43	2.60	
<b>LEISURE TIME (Abbey)</b>						
Charge	5.00	0.15	4.29	0.86	5.20	
Reddicard	3.20	0.10	2.75	0.55	3.30	
Concession	2.50	0.08	2.15	0.43	2.60	
<b>SWIMMING</b>						
<b>Adult</b>						
Charge	5.00	0.15	4.29	0.86	5.20	
Reddicard	3.20	0.10	2.75	0.55	3.30	
Concession	2.50	0.08	2.15	0.43	2.60	
<b>Junior/Senior</b>						
Charge	5.00	0.15	4.29	0.86	5.20	
Reddicard	3.20	0.10	2.75	0.55	3.30	
Concession	2.50	0.08	2.15	0.43	2.60	
<b>Under 5's</b>	FOC		FOC	FOC		
		<b>5.00%</b>				See Report
<b>Small Wet side party</b>	48.00	2.40	42.00	8.40	50.40	
<b>Large Wet side party</b>	95.00	4.75	83.13	16.63	99.80	
<b>Fun Inflatable Session</b>			<b>3.00%</b>			
Charge	5.00	0.15	4.29	0.86	5.20	
Reddicard	3.20	0.10	2.75	0.55	3.30	
Concession	2.50	0.08	2.15	0.43	2.60	
<b>Ladies Night</b>						
Charge	5.00	0.15	4.29	0.86	5.20	
Reddicard	3.20	0.10	2.75	0.55	3.30	
Concession	2.50	0.08	2.15	0.43	2.60	
<b>Kingsley-Pool Hire</b>	49.00	1.47	42.06	8.41	50.50	
<b>Schools Hire</b>	48.00	1.44	41.20	8.24	49.40	
<b>Junior Swimming Lessons</b>			<b>5.00%</b>			See Report
Charge	62.00	3.10	65.10		65.10	
Reddicard	41.00	2.05	43.05		43.10	
Concession	31.00	1.55	32.55		32.60	
<b>One hour lane Hire</b>			<b>3.00%</b>			
Charge	20.00	0.60	17.17	3.43	20.60	
Reddicard	13.50	0.41	11.59	2.32	13.90	
Concession	10.00	0.30	8.58	1.72	10.30	

<b>Adult Swimming Lessons – 30 mins</b>		<b>5.00%</b>				See Report
Charge	77.50	3.88	81.38		81.40	
Reddicard	51.50	2.58	54.08		54.10	
Concession	38.50	1.93	40.43		40.40	
<b>Abbey- Gala Hire - 3 hour duration</b>	309.00	9.27	265.23	53.05	318.30	See Report
<b>Abbey - Gala Hire - Additional Hour</b>	51.50	1.55	44.20	8.84	53.00	
<b>Abbey - Pool Hire</b>	49.00	1.47	42.06	8.41	50.50	
<b>Hire of Instructor</b>	21.00	0.63	18.03	3.61	21.60	
<b><u>ARROW VALE</u></b>		<b>3.00%</b>				
<b><u>SPORTS - INDOOR FACILITIES HIRE OF FULL HALL (40 MINUTES)</u></b>						
<b>Arrow Vale - Peak</b>						
Charge	62.00	1.86	53.22	10.64	63.90	
Reddicard	41.50	1.25	35.63	7.12	42.80	
Concession	31.00	0.93	26.61	5.32	31.90	
<b>Arrow Vale - Off Peak</b>						
Charge	40.50	1.22	34.76	6.95	41.70	
Reddicard	26.50	0.80	22.75	4.55	27.30	
Concession	20.50	0.62	17.60	3.52	21.10	
<b><u>HIRE OF GYMNASIUM (40 MINUTES)</u></b>						
<b>Arrow Vale</b>						
Charge	34.00	1.02	29.18	5.84	35.00	
Reddicard	22.50	0.68	19.31	3.86	23.20	
Concession	17.00	0.51	14.59	2.92	17.50	
<b>Arrow Vale - Commercial</b>	STN		STN	STN	STN	
<b><u>MOVEMENT &amp; DANCE AREA (40 MINUTES)</u></b>						
<b>Arrow Vale</b>						
Charge	34.00	1.02	29.18	5.84	35.00	
Reddicard	22.50	0.68	19.31	3.86	23.20	
Concession	17.00	0.51	14.59	2.92	17.50	
<b>Arrow Vale – Commercial Hire</b>	STN		STN	STN	STN	
<b><u>BADMINTON (PER COURT 40 MINUTES)</u></b>						
<b>Peak</b>						
Charge	12.00	0.36	10.30	2.06	12.40	
Reddicard	8.00	0.24	6.87	1.37	8.20	
Concession	6.00	0.18	5.15	1.03	6.20	
<b>Off-Peak</b>						
Charge	8.50	0.26	7.30	1.46	8.80	
Reddicard	5.50	0.17	4.72	0.94	5.70	
Concession	4.20	0.13	3.61	0.72	4.30	

**SQUASH (PER COURT 40 MINUTES)**

**Peak**

Charge	9.50	0.29	8.15	1.63	9.80
Reddicard	6.50	0.20	5.58	1.12	6.70
Concession	5.00	0.15	4.29	0.86	5.20

**Off Peak**

Charge	8.00	0.24	6.87	1.37	8.20
Reddicard	5.20	0.16	4.46	0.89	5.40
Concession	4.00	0.12	3.43	0.69	4.10

**TRAMPOLINING & GYMNASTICS – 10 WEEKS**

**Arrow Vale**

Charge	67.50	2.03	57.94	11.59	69.50
Reddicard	44.50	1.34	38.20	7.64	45.80
Concession	33.50	1.01	28.75	5.75	34.50

**SPRINGS GYM (ARROW VALE)**

Induction *(VAT EXEMPT)	22.00	0.66	18.88	3.78	22.70
Pay as you go session	6.00	0.18	5.15	1.03	6.20
Arrow Vale Direct Debit Membership	16.00	0.48	13.73	2.75	16.50
Arrow Vale Memberships with Classes included	20.00	0.60	17.17	3.43	20.60

**ARROW VALE ATP PITCH HIRE**

**One third pitch hire per hour**

Reddicard	32.50	-12.50	16.67	3.33	20.00
Concession	24.50	-9.50	12.50	2.50	15.00

A reduction in price has been trialled as a promotional offer and has been successful. This gives us the opportunity to increase usage as currently the higher price charged is not offering value for money particularly as the pitch is in poor condition and in need of replacement

<b>SPORTS - OUTDOOR FACILITIES</b>		<b>0.00%</b>				
<b>GOLF</b>						
<b>18 hole Adult</b>						
Charge	14.00	0.00%	11.20	2.80	14.00	
Reddicard	11.00	0.00%	8.80	2.20	11.00	
Concession	9.00	0.00%	7.20	1.80	9.00	
<b>9 hole Adult</b>						
Charge	10.50	0.00%	8.40	2.10	10.50	
Reddicard	8.00	0.00%	6.40	1.60	8.00	
Concession	7.00	0.00%	5.60	1.40	7.00	
<b>18 hole Junior</b>						
Charge	9.50	0.00%	7.92	1.58	9.50	
Reddicard	7.00	0.00%	5.83	1.17	7.00	
Concession	6.00	0.00%	5.00	1.00	6.00	
<b>9 hole Junior</b>						
Charge	7.00	0.00%	5.83	1.17	7.00	
Reddicard	4.50	0.00%	3.75	0.75	4.50	
Concession	3.50	0.00%	2.92	0.58	3.50	
<b>TENNIS (PER COURT 1 HOUR)</b>		<b>3.00%</b>				
<b>Adult</b>						
Charge	9.00	0.27	7.73	1.55	9.30	
Reddicard	6.00	0.18	5.15	1.03	6.20	
Concession	4.50	0.14	3.86	0.77	4.60	
<b>Junior (before 5.00 p.m.)</b>						
Charge	6.50	0.20	5.58	1.12	6.70	
Reddicard	4.50	0.14	3.86	0.77	4.60	
Concession	3.50	0.11	3.00	0.60	3.60	
<b>FLOODLIT AREA</b>						
<b>Abbey Stadium – ½ Pitch per hour</b>						
Charge	82.00	2.46	70.38	14.08	84.50	
Reddicard	54.50	1.64	46.78	9.36	56.10	
Concession	42.50	1.28	36.48	7.30	43.80	
<b>Abbey Stadium – with Changing Rooms per 90 mins</b>						
Charge	124.50	3.74	106.86	21.37	128.20	
Reddicard	82.50	2.48	70.81	14.16	85.00	
Concession	62.50	1.88	53.65	10.73	64.40	
<b>NETBALL COURT HIRE</b>						
Charge	35.50	1.07	30.47	6.09	36.60	
Reddicard	24.00	0.72	20.60	4.12	24.70	
Concession	17.50	0.53	15.02	3.00	18.00	

A nil increase gives us the opportunity to retain existing participants and attract new players as other providers are currently offering competitive membership pricing to try to address a national/regional decline in participation



<b>ATHLETICS</b>					
<b>Adult - individual charge</b>					
Charge	6.50	0.20	5.58	1.12	6.70
Reddicard	4.10	0.12	3.52	0.70	4.20
Concession	3.25	0.10	2.79	0.56	3.30
<b>Junior - individual charge</b>					
Charge	3.00	0.09	2.58	0.52	3.10
Reddicard	2.00	0.06	1.72	0.34	2.10
Concession	1.50	0.05	1.29	0.26	1.60
<b>Bromsgrove and Redditch- individual member</b>	1.10	0.03	0.94	0.19	1.10
<b>Bromsgrove &amp; Redditch Athletics Club Events</b>	4,567.00	137.01	3,920.01	784.00	4,704.00
<b>FOOTBALL - ADULT (INC. CHANGING FACILITIES)</b>					
<b>Abbey Stadium/Ipsley/Old Forge/Greenlands</b>					
Charge	82.50	2.48	70.81	14.16	85.00
Reddicard	54.50	1.64	46.78	9.36	56.10
<b>FOOTBALL - JUNIOR (INC. CHANGING FACILITIES)</b>					
<b>Abbey Stadium/Morton Stanley Park/Ipsley/Old Forge/Greenlands/Kingsley</b>					
Charge	42.00	1.26	36.05	7.21	43.30
Reddicard	28.50	0.86	24.46	4.89	29.40
<b>Abbey Stadium/Morton Stanley Park/Ipsley/Old Forge/Greenlands. Without changing facilities.</b>					
Charge	28.00	0.84	24.03	4.81	28.80
Reddicard	18.50	0.56	15.88	3.18	19.10
<b>Small Sided Football</b>					
Charge	14.00	0.42	12.02	2.40	14.40
Reddicard	9.50	0.29	8.15	1.63	9.80
		<b>3.00%</b>			
<b>SPORTS DEVELOPMENT CHARGES</b>					
Adult fitness Sessions	3.00	0.09	2.58	0.52	3.10
Health & Well Being Sessions	2.00	0.06	1.72	0.34	2.10
Curriculum Cost	19.00	0.57	16.31	3.26	19.60
Schools Hire – lunchtime / after school sessions	21.00	0.63	18.03	3.61	21.60
Inclusive Activities	2.00	0.06	1.72	0.34	2.10
PSI Falls Prevention	2.50	0.08	2.15	0.43	2.60
Activity Referral	25.00	0.75	21.46	4.29	25.80
Junior Sports Sessions	3.00	0.09	2.58	0.52	3.10

<b>YOUTH THEATRE CHARGES</b>		<b>3.00%</b>				
<b>10 week terms (Tues &amp; Sat 2 hrs)</b>						
Charge	105.00	3.15	90.13	18.03	108.20	
Reddicard	70.00	2.10	60.08	12.02	72.10	
Concession	34.00	1.02	29.18	5.84	35.00	
<b>10 week terms (Mon 1 hr)</b>						
Charge	52.50	1.58	45.06	9.01	54.10	
Reddicard	35.00	1.05	30.04	6.01	36.10	
Concession	16.50	0.50	14.16	2.83	17.00	
<b>Optional Direct Debit Fee</b>						
Charge	6.00	0.18	5.15	1.03	6.20	
Reddicard	6.00	0.18	5.15	1.03	6.20	
Concession	6.00	0.18	5.15	1.03	6.20	

**Proposed Pricing Structure 2016/17 - Community Centres**

**Function Rate:** A closed or private party booking.

**Voluntary Rate:** A registered charity OR non profitable organisation who provide free access to the service user.

**Pre- School Rate:** Initial rate for pre-school bookings, to be reviewed after 6 months following submission of annual accounts.

**Standard Rate 1:** A new business venture and/or an activity that attracts no more than an average of 15 participants are charged to attend.

**Standard Rate 2:** An organisation or group that charges an attendance fee that attracts between 15-20 participants.

**Standard Rate 3:** An organisation or group that charges an attendance fee that attracts more than 30 participants.

<b>COMMUNITY CENTRES</b>		<b>3.00%</b>				
<b>Batchley - Main Hall (Per Hour)</b>						
Function Rate	17.50	0.53	15.02	3.00	18.00	
Voluntary Rate	9.80	0.29	8.41	1.68	10.10	
Pre-School	10.00	1.00	9.17	1.83	11.00	Increase 10%
Standard Rate 1	23.00	0.69	19.74	3.95	23.70	
Standard Rate 2	26.00	0.00	21.67	4.33	26.00	
Standard Rate 3	27.50	3.50	25.83	5.17	31.00	Increase 12.73%
<b>Oakenshaw</b>						
<b>Main Hall</b>						
Function Rate	17.50	0.53	15.02	3.00	18.00	
Voluntary Rate	12.30	0.37	10.56	2.11	12.70	
Pre-School	13.00	1.00	11.67	2.33	14.00	Increase 7.69%
Standard Rate 1	23.00	0.69	19.74	3.95	23.70	
Standard Rate 2	26.00	0.00	21.67	4.33	26.00	
Standard Rate 3	27.50	3.50	25.83	5.17	31.00	Increase 12.73%
<b>Small Hall</b>						
Function Rate	15.50	0.47	13.30	2.66	16.00	
Voluntary Rate	9.80	0.29	8.41	1.68	10.10	
Pre-School	10.00	1.00	9.17	1.83	11.00	Increase 10%
Standard Rate 1	18.50	0.56	15.88	3.18	19.10	
Standard Rate 2	20.70	0.00	16.56	4.14	20.70	
Standard Rate 3	22.00	2.50	20.42	4.08	24.50	Increase 11.36%
<b>Windmill</b>						
<b>Main Hall</b>						
Function Rate	17.50	0.53	15.02	3.00	18.00	
Voluntary Rate	12.30	0.39	11.17	2.23	12.70	
Pre-School	13.00	1.00	11.67	2.33	14.00	Increase 7.69%
Standard Rate 1	23.00	0.69	19.74	3.95	23.70	

Standard Rate 2  
 Standard Rate 3

**Small Hall**  
 Function Rate  
 Voluntary Rate  
 Pre-School  
 Standard Rate 1  
 Standard Rate 2  
 Standard Rate 3

**Winyates Barn**  
 Function Rate  
 Voluntary Rate  
 Standard Rate 1  
 Standard Rate 2  
 Standard Rate 3

**Winyates Green**  
 Function Rate  
 Voluntary Rate  
 Pre-School  
 Standard Rate 1  
 Standard Rate 2  
 Standard Rate 3

26.00	0.00	20.80	5.20	26.00	
27.50	3.50	24.80	6.20	31.00	Increase 12.73%
15.50	0.47	13.30	2.66	16.00	
9.80	0.29	8.41	1.68	10.10	
10.00	1.00	9.17	1.83	11.00	Increase 10%
18.50	0.56	15.88	3.18	19.10	
20.70	0.00	16.56	4.14	20.70	
22.00	2.50	20.42	4.08	24.50	Increase 11.36%
17.50	0.53	15.02	3.00	18.00	
9.80	0.29	8.41	1.68	10.10	
23.00	0.69	19.74	3.95	23.70	
26.00	0.00	20.80	5.20	26.00	
27.50	2.50	25.83	5.17	31.00	
17.50	0.53	15.02	3.00	18.00	
9.80	0.29	8.41	1.68	10.10	
10.00	1.00	9.17	1.83	11.00	
23.00	0.69	19.74	3.95	23.70	
26.00	0.00	20.80	5.20	26.00	
27.50	3.50	25.83	5.17	31.00	

	Charge 1st April 2016 £	% increase / £ increase £	Revised Net total £	VAT to be applied	Proposed charge from 2017 £	Comments
<b>Palace Theatre</b>						
<b><u>The following Palace price proposals are for 2017-2018 as the theatre books a minimum of 12 months in advance</u></b>						
<b><u>Main Theatre - Fee Per Hour</u></b>						
Performance / conference including 1 technician. Full lighting and sound systems available. Please see the current Technical Specification. MINIMUM OF 8.5 HOURS						
<b>Mon - Thurs</b>						
Cost	132.00	3.96	135.96	0.00	136.00	
Disc. Local Community & charity rate (-15%)	113.00	3.39	116.39	0.00	116.40	
<b>Fri - Sat</b>						
Cost	148.00	4.44	152.44	0.00	152.40	
Disc. Local Community & charity rate (-15%)	126.00	3.78	129.78	0.00	129.80	
<b>Sun &amp; Bank Holidays</b>						
Cost	198.00	5.94	203.94	0.00	203.90	
Disc. Local Community & charity rate (-15%)	169.00	5.07	174.07	0.00	174.10	
4 hour block - Monday to Wednesday daytime hires up to 5pm, Saturday up to 1pm and Monday to Wednesday evenings 6pm to 10pm. Local charity or a community group that is a member of the Air partnership only. Subject to negotion and availibility. 1 member of staff only.	310.00	9.30	319.30	0.00	319.30	
For a public performance add the appropriate hourly rate for technical staff / FOH and additional fees.						
Full week hire (including technical, F.O.H manager, and box office for 1 hour up to the start of each performance), Full lighting and sound systems available. Please see the current Technical Specification. See below for additional fees and charges.						
Up to 6 performances including Sunday get in 9am-6pm, Monday 10am-10:30pm, Tues to Sat performances 6-10.30pm and sat Mat 1 - 5pm (Sat until 11pm for get out). 49 hours of hire.						
Cost Per Week	4,867.00	5.00% 243.35	5,110.35	0.00	5,110.40	
Disc. Local Community & charity rate (-15%)	4,232.00	211.60	4,443.60	0.00	4,443.60	
<b>The Room Upstairs and Bar Lounge (room only, for additional facilities available see below)</b>						
<b>Notes:</b>						
1. Promotion and percentage deal splits to be agreed by Committee and Theatre Manager						
2. Studio and bar hirer must pay a non-refundable payment of 50 % of the hire fee when booking						
3. For all daytime studio and bar bookings please speak to the box office team on (01527) 65203						
4. Additional tech staff show call rate, minimum 4Hrs call						

**The Room Upstairs Fee Per Hour MINIMUM 4 HOURS**

Space Hirer (studio includes use of the sound system)	15.00	0.00	15.00	0.00	15.00	
Studio Performance (Thur, Fre and Sat evenings 5pm to 10:30pm) inc brochure listing, use of sound ad lighting systems. Additional perf. At £45 per performance.			90.00	0.00	90.00	
<b>Arts and performance development activity arrangements are also available. Please contact the Theatre Team To Discuss agreements and availibility</b>		<b>3.00%</b>				
Studio Technician (max 4 hr call)	31.00	0.93	31.93	0.00	31.90	reflects total additional staff cost
WORKSHOP HIRE - per day (Appropriate certification proof must be shown to use the workshop machinery)	118.00	3.54	121.54	0.00	121.50	
Theatre Tours (maximum 25 people per tour) - 1 hour tour	83.00	2.49	85.49	0.00	85.50	

**Notes:**

1. All new hirers must play a non-refundable deposit of 20% of the hire fee when booking
2. For all daytime studio and bar bookings please speak to the box office team on (01527) 65203
3. Additional tech staff show call rate, minimum 4hrs call

**Additional Charges to all performances**

PRS fees (percentage of Net box office takings), unless written notification is provided from PRS then this will be charged (3%)	3.00%	0.00%	3.00%	0.00	3.00%	
Credit Card Charges (percentage of Net box office takings) (3%)	3.00%	0.00%	3.00%	0.00	3.00%	
Customer booking fee at box office (max. of £4 for any one booking)	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	

**Additional charges applicable to all hirer performances**

Marketing Bronze Package (see App 5 Publicity & Advertising form for hirers for further info)	128.75	3.86	106.09	26.52	132.60	
Marketing Silver Package (see App 5 Publicity & Advertising form for hirers for further info)	334.75	10.04	275.83	68.96	344.80	
Marketing Gold Package (see App 5 Publicity & Advertising form for hirers for further info)	412.00	12.36	339.49	84.87	424.40	
The Room Upstairs event Listing in the Theatre Brochure for the relevant season, Includes free web site entry on receipt of your marketing	44.00	0.00	35.20	8.80	44.00	
1 month advert on the big screen in the town (subject to availability)	220.00	0.00	183.33	36.67	220.00	
1000 post out mail shot	495.00	14.85	509.85	0.00	509.90	
A0 display front of building per week (max 4 weeks), FCFS	10.30	0.31	10.61	0.00	10.60	
Banner position front of building per week, FCFS	15.45	0.46	15.91	0.00	15.90	
Local press advertisement charged at cost + administration fee at: 10%						

Sale of merchandise at Theatre premises. (Percentage taken is gross of merchandise takings) 15 %

**Additional Facilities / services available**

Bar Extension after performance	56.00	1.68	57.68	0.00	57.70	
Orchestra replacement. The company must provide at least two staff to aid refitting of the orchestra PIT after the final performance. If this does not happen, the charge here will be included in your Bill per pit section	17.00	0.51	17.51	0.00	17.50	
Additional cleaning fee where premises are not left in a clean and tidy state. per room	23.00	0.69	23.69	0.00	23.70	
Un-blocking of sinks or toilets (per toilet or sink)	43.29	1.30	44.59	0.00	44.60	
Items hired or purchased from a third party on your behalf (Cost + 10%)						
Portable Appliance Testing (PAT), per item	4.50	0.14	4.64	0.00	4.60	
Tea / coffee per head (unlimited drinks per person).	1.80	0.05	1.85	0.00	1.90	
Photo-copying and printing A4 black and white	0.11	0.00	0.11	0.00	0.10	

Photo-copying and printing A4 colour	0.23	0.01	0.24	0.00	0.20
<b>Additional items available for Hire (please check with the Technical department for availability)</b>					
<b>Star Cloth</b>					
Per Day	71.00	2.13	73.13	0.00	73.10
Per Week	207.00	6.21	213.21	0.00	213.20
<b>Black Gauze</b>					
Per Day	36.00	1.08	37.08	0.00	37.10
Per Week	87.00	2.61	89.61	0.00	89.60
<b>White Gauze</b>					
Per Day	36.00	1.08	37.08	0.00	37.10
Per Week	87.00	2.61	89.61	0.00	89.60
<b>Tab Track</b>					
Per Day	34.00	1.02	35.02	0.00	35.00
Per Week	82.00	2.46	84.46	0.00	84.50
<b>Red Tabs</b>					
Per Day	46.00	1.38	47.38	0.00	47.40
Per Week	139.00	4.17	143.17	0.00	143.20
<b>Blue Tabs</b>					
Per Day	46.00	1.38	47.38	0.00	47.40
Per Week	139.00	4.17	143.17	0.00	143.20
<b>Jem Techno Fog Machine</b>					
Per Day	15.00	0.45	15.45	0.00	15.40
Per Week	36.00	1.08	37.08	0.00	37.10
<b>Under-stage Smoke System</b>					
Per Day	39.00	1.17	40.17	0.00	40.20
Per Week	105.00	3.15	108.15	0.00	108.20
<b>Haze Machine</b>					
Per Day	15.00	0.45	15.45	0.00	15.40
Per Week	48.00	1.44	49.44	0.00	49.40
<b>Baby Grand Piano tuning (additional tuning charge at cost)</b>					
Per Day	106.00	3.18	109.18	0.00	109.20
Per Week	311.00	9.33	320.33	0.00	320.30
<b>Portable digital piano</b>					
Per Day	28.00	0.84	28.84	0.00	28.80
Per Week	83.00	2.49	85.49	0.00	85.50
<b>Technics Key Board</b>					
Per Day	22.00	0.66	22.66	0.00	22.70
Per Week	64.00	1.92	65.92	0.00	65.90
<b>Small 1600 to 2400 Lumin Video/ Data Projector</b>					
Per Day	55.00	1.65	57.00	0.00	57.00
Per Week	160.00	4.80	165.00	0.00	125.00
<b>Large Video Projector 5000 lumin + (main house only)</b>					
Per Day	120.00	3.60	125.00	0.00	125.00
Per Week	360.00	10.80	370.00	0.00	370.00
<b>Laptop</b>					
Per Day	83.00	2.49	85.49	0.00	85.50
Per Week	240.00	7.20	247.20	0.00	247.20
<b>Overhead projector (OHP)</b>					
Per Day	10.00	0.30	10.30	0.00	10.30
Per Week	25.00	0.75	25.75	0.00	25.80
<b>Portable folding projector screen (approx 5 feet square)</b>					
Per Day	6.00	0.18	6.18	0.00	6.20

Per Week	18.00	0.54	18.54	0.00	18.50
<b>Flip chart stand (Paper and pens are not provided)</b>					
Per Day	8.00	0.24	8.24	0.00	8.20
Per Week	22.00	0.66	22.66	0.00	22.70
<b>White board</b>					
Per Day	12.00	0.36	12.36	0.00	12.40
Per Week	36.00	1.08	37.08	0.00	37.10
<b>Lectern including microphones and lights</b>					
Per Day	49.00	1.47	50.47	0.00	50.50
Per Week	168.00	5.04	173.04	0.00	173.00
<b>Radio Mics (Up to 4 handheld &amp; 10 lapels)-per microphone-See note 2</b>					
Per Day	21.00	0.63	21.63	0.00	21.60
Per Week	62.00	1.86	63.86	0.00	63.90
<b>Radio Communications packs (up to 3 available) per pack:</b>					
Per Day	5.00	0.15	5.00	0.00	5.00
Per Week	10.00	0.30	10.00	0.00	10.00
<b>Music Stands (each) *</b>					
Per Day	3.00	0.09	3.09	0.00	3.10
Per Week	10.00	0.30	10.30	0.00	10.30
<b>Conductor music stand *</b>					
Per Day	5.00	0.15	5.15	0.00	5.20
Per Week	18.00	0.54	18.54	0.00	18.50
<b>Metro deck staging sections (2 m x 1 m) inc 18" or 1.5m Legs and skirts if requested</b>					
Per Day	11.00	0.33	11.33	0.00	11.30
Per Week	22.00	0.66	22.66	0.00	22.70
<b>1 Metre hand rail section for above Rostra (5 available) (each)</b>					
Per Day	6.00	0.18	6.18	0.00	6.20
Per Week	12.00	0.36	12.36	0.00	12.40
<b>2 Metre hand rail section for above Rostra (3 available) (each)</b>					
Per Day	11.00	0.33	11.33	0.00	11.30
Per Week	22.00	0.66	22.66	0.00	22.70
<b>Curtain Rail</b>					
Per Day	36.00	1.08	37.08	0.00	37.10
Per Week	103.00	3.09	106.09	0.00	106.10

\* Free to use for Disc. Local Community & charity rate hirers

<b>Consumables</b>						
Gaffa Tape	8.00	0.24	8.24	0.00	8.20	
LX tape	1.50	0.05	1.55	0.00	1.60	
PP3 Battery (each)	3.00	0.09	3.09	0.00	3.10	
AA battery (each)	1.20	0.04	1.24	0.00	1.20	
<b>Additional Staffing</b>						
Additional technical staff per hour (minimum 4 hour call)	21.00	0.63	21.63	0.00	21.60	
<b>Notes:</b>	<p>1. Extra consumables for equipment can be supplied at cost plus 10% for administration costs. All equipment will be provided with one container.</p> <p>2. Rechargeable AA batteries suitable for use on Palace Theatre radio microphones and chargers are provided with all Radio Microphones, users must put batteries on charge and return back to the dimmer room after use. Any missing will be charged for at cost + 10%</p> <p>3. Proof of appropriate certification must be shown to use Workshop machinery.</p> <p>4. No equipment must be altered or modified in anyway.</p> <p>5. Any damages to Palace Theatre Property must be paid for and will be re charged to the company at the costs charges to the Palace Theatre including any carriage where necessary.</p>					
	<b>charge 1st April 2015 £</b>	<b>% increase / £ increase £</b>	<b>Revised Net total £</b>	<b>VAT to be applied</b>	<b>Proposed charge from 2016 £</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Forge Mill</b>		<b>3.00%</b>				
<b><u>Admission (individual)</u></b>						
<b>Adult</b>						
Charge	4.90	0.15	4.21	0.84	5.10	
Reddicard	3.95	0.12	3.39	0.68	4.10	
<b>Senior Citizen</b>						
Charge	3.80	0.11	3.26	0.65	3.90	
Reddicard	2.60	0.08	2.23	0.45	2.70	
<b>Child</b>						
Charge	1.65	0.05	1.42	0.28	1.70	
Reddicard	1.00	0.03	0.86	0.17	1.00	
<b>Family -up to 4 people</b>						
Charge	11.10	0.33	9.53	1.91	11.40	
Reddicard	8.80	0.26	7.55	1.51	9.10	
<b>Wednesday ONLY* Non Reddicard holder prices apply</b>	FREE		FREE	FREE	FREE	
<b><u>Groups Bookings</u></b>						
<b>Admission, refreshments and guided tour of one site</b>						
Charge	STN		STN	STN	STN	
Reddicard	STN		STN	STN	STN	
<b>External talks + Costs</b>						
Charge	59.05	1.77	50.68	10.14	60.80	
Reddicard	48.55	1.46	41.67	8.33	50.00	



<b>School Bookings</b>						
Archaeological Activity Centre	37.05	1.11	31.80	6.36	38.20	
Victorian role play	37.05	1.11	31.80	6.36	38.20	
Victoria role play wheel unavailable	37.05	1.11	31.80	6.36	38.20	
FM (history of needle-making	37.05	1.11	31.80	6.36	38.20	
FM (processes & Machinery)	37.05	1.11	31.80	6.36	38.20	
Local History of Redditch	37.05	1.11	31.80	6.36	38.20	
Temporary exhibition with activities	37.05	1.11	31.80	6.36	38.20	
Marketing/Business students	37.05	1.11	31.80	6.36	38.20	
Teacher Led sessions	37.05	1.11	31.80	6.36	38.20	
Special Needs Groups	FREE		FREE	FREE	FREE	
<b>Room Hire</b>						
½ day all Other Groups	45.00	1.35	38.63	7.73	46.40	
All day	75.00	2.25	64.38	12.88	77.30	
<b>Ground Event Hire</b>	STN		STN	STN	STN	
<b>School Bookings remain the same in an attempt to encourage the business to grow - there were small signs of improvements last year and this needs to be sustained before increase can be levied</b>						
<b>Allotment Charges</b>		<b>Various</b>				
<b>Large (&lt;254m2)</b>						
Non Concession Water	76.00	4.00	80.00	0.00	80.00	Reflects Increased Water Charges (5.25 %)
Non Concession No Water	63.00	1.89	64.89	0.00	64.90	
Conession Water	46.00	4.00	50.00	0.00	50.00	Reflects Increased Water Charges (8.7%)
Concession No Water	32.00	0.96	32.96	0.00	33.00	
<b>Medium (&gt;177&lt;254m2))</b>						
Non Concession Water	55.00	3.00	58.00	0.00	58.00	Reflects Increased Water Charges (5.5%)
Non Concession No Water	43.00	1.29	44.29	0.00	44.30	
Conession Water	33.00	3.00	36.00	0.00	36.00	Reflects Increased Water Charges (9%)
Concession No Water	22.00	0.66	22.66	0.00	22.70	
<b>Small (&gt;177m2)</b>						
Non Concession Water	35.00	2.00	37.00	0.00	37.00	Reflects Increased Water Charges (5.7%)
Non Concession No Water	25.00	0.75	25.75	0.00	25.80	
Conession Water	22.00	2.00	24.00	0.00	24.00	Reflects Increased Water Charges (9%)
Concession No Water	13.00	0.39	13.39	0.00	13.40	

**Redditch Outdoor Events & Outdoor Fitness– Hire of Parks and Open Spaces**

**Outdoor Event Space**

**Small Attendance = 0-99**

**Commercial Rates**

Per Hour	46.50	1.40	47.90	0.00	47.90
Per Day	232.50	6.98	239.48	0.00	239.50

**Community Rates**

Per Hour	16.00	0.48	16.48	0.00	16.50
Per Day	80.00	2.40	82.40	0.00	82.40

**Charities / Not For Profit Organisations**

Per Hour	10.50	0.32	10.82	0.00	10.80
Per Day	53.00	1.59	54.59	0.00	54.60

**Fairs & Circuses Min of 3 day Hire Per Day**

	265.00	7.95	272.95	0.00	272.90
--	--------	------	--------	------	--------

**Medium Attendance = 100-499**

**Commercial Rates**

Per Hour	60.00	1.80	61.80	0.00	61.80
Per Day	298.00	8.94	306.94	0.00	306.90

**Community Rates**

Per Hour	21.00	0.63	21.63	0.00	21.60
Per Day	106.00	3.18	109.18	0.00	109.20

**Charities / Not For Profit Organisations**

Per Hour	13.50	0.41	13.91	0.00	13.90
Per Day	66.50	2.00	68.50	0.00	68.50

**Large Attendance = 500-1999**

**Commercial Rates**

Per Hour	73.50	2.21	75.71	0.00	75.70
Per Day	364.50	10.94	375.44	0.00	375.40

**Community Rates**

Per Hour	27.00	0.81	27.81	0.00	27.80
Per Day	159.00	4.77	163.77	0.00	163.80

**Charities / Not For Profit Organisations**

Per Hour	16.00	0.48	16.48	0.00	16.50
Per Day	80.00	2.40	82.40	0.00	82.40

£250 - £1500 Bond Payable

3.00%

<b>Outdoor Fitness Session - Commercial</b>					
<b>Summer Fee (Apr to Sept)</b>					
Commercial Rates Per Day	371.50	11.15	382.65	0.00	382.70
Community Rates Per Day	265.00	7.95	272.95	0.00	273.00
<b>Winter Fee (Oct to Mar)</b>					
Commercial Rates Per Day	159.00	4.77	163.77	0.00	163.80
Community Rates Per Day	80.00	2.40	82.40	0.00	82.40
<b>Annual Fee</b>					
Commercial Rates Per Day	424.50	12.74	437.24	0.00	437.20
Community Rates Per Day	318.50	9.56	328.06	0.00	328.10
<b>Bandstand Hire T/Centre</b>					
Commercial Rates Per Day	Price on application		Price on applicati	0.00	Price on application
Community Rates Per Day	26.00	0.78	26.78	0.00	26.80
Charities / Not For Profit Organisations Per Day	26.00	0.78	26.78	0.00	26.80
<b>Band Stand</b>					
Criteria and eligibility guidance notes attached in events toolkit					
<b>Additional Costs for Outdoor Event Space:</b>					
1 Set up and Clearance charged @ 50% of applicable rate					
2 Any event in excess of 1999 attendees is STN					
<b>Additional Costs for Outdoor Fitness Space:</b>					
1 Set up and Clearance charged @ 50% of applicable rate					
<b>CIVIC SUITE COMMERCIAL CHARGES</b>					
<b>Committee Room 1:</b>					
4 hour minimum - daytime	50.00	1.50	51.50	0.00	51.50
8 hour minimum - daytime and/or evening	66.00	1.98	67.98	0.00	68.00
<b>Committee Room 2/3:</b>					
4 hour minimum - daytime	101.00	3.03	104.03	0.00	104.00
8 hour minimum - daytime and/or evening	143.00	4.29	147.29	0.00	147.50
<b>Council Chamber:</b>					
4 hour minimum - daytime	143.00	4.29	147.29	0.00	147.50
8 hour minimum - daytime and/or evening	234.00	7.02	241.02	0.00	241.00
<b>Full Civic Suite: Monday to Saturday (including servery)</b>					
4 hour minimum - daytime	234.00	7.02	241.02	0.00	241.00
8 hour minimum - daytime and/or evening	424.50	12.74	437.50	0.00	437.50
<b>Full Civic Suite: Sunday - exceptional (including servery)</b>					
4 hour minimum - daytime	266.00	7.98	273.98	0.00	274.00
8 hour minimum - daytime and/or evening	484.00	14.52	498.52	0.00	498.50

**Equipment Hire**

OHP/Screen	21.00	0.63	21.63	0.00	21.60
TV/Video	21.00	0.63	21.63	0.00	21.60
Conferencing Sound System	21.00	0.63	21.63	0.00	21.60
Flipchart stand					
4 hour minimum - daytime	7.00	0.21	7.21	0.00	7.20
8 hour minimum - daytime and/or evening	8.00	0.24	8.24	0.00	8.20

**Other Fees**

Security	Market Rates		Market rates		Market Rates
Retainer	220.50	6.62	227.12	0.00	227.10

**CIVIC SUITE - REFRESHMENT CHARGES**

**Teas and Coffees**

Internal - per cup	0.80	0.02	0.82	0.00	0.80
Commercial - per cup	1.00	0.03	1.03	0.00	1.00

**Planning and Regeneration**

Service Category	charge 1st April 2015 £	% increase / £ increase £	Revised Net total £	VAT to be applied	Proposed charge from 2016 £	Comments
------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------	----------------------	-----------------------------------	----------

**BUILDING CONTROL - VAT AT 20%**

**Explanatory notes:**

1 Before you build, extend or convert a building to which the building regulations apply, you or your agent must submit a Building regulations application. The charge you have to pay depends on the type of work, the number of separate properties, or the total floor area. You can use the following tables with the current charges regulations to work out the charges. If you have any difficulties, please do not hesitate to call us.

**2 The charges are as follows.**

Category A: New domestic homes, flats or conversions etc

Category B: Extending or altering existing homes

Category C: Any other project including commercial or industrial projects etc.

Individually determined fees are available for most projects. We would be happy to discuss these with you if you require.

In certain cases, we may agree that you can pay charges in instalments. Please contact us for further discussions.

**3 Exemptions and reductions in charges.**

- a) If your plans have been approved or rejected, you won't have to pay again if you resubmit plans for the same work which has not started, provided you resubmit with 3 years of the original application date.
- b) You don't have to pay charges if the work will provide access to a building or is an extension to store medical equipment or provide medical treatment facilities for a disabled person. In order to claim exemption, an application must be supported by appropriate evidence as to the nature of the disabled persons disability. In these regulations, a 'disabled person' is a person who is described under section 29(1) of the National Assistance Act 1948 (as extended by section 8(2) Mental Health Act 1959).

**4 You have to pay VAT for all local authority Building Regulation charges, except for the regularisation charge. VAT is included in the attached fees.**

5. Regularisation applications are available for cases where unauthorised building work was undertaken without an application. Such work can only be regularised where the work was undertaken after October 1985 and not within the last 6 months. The Authority is not obliged to accept Regularisation applications. Regularisation application fees are individually determined. Please contact us to discuss regularisation application fees.

6. Reversion applications. Where the control of a building project passes from a third party to the Council a reversion application will be required. Reversion application fees are individually determined.

**Other information:**

1 These notes are for guidance only and do not replace Statutory Instrument 2010 number 0404 which contains the full statement of the law, and the Scheme of Recovery of Fees dated April 2014.

2 These guidance notes refer to the charges that you have to pay for building control services within North Worcestershire.

**Telephone payments are accepted. Please contact the relevant payment centre with your address and card details:**

**Redditch 01527 64252**

**TABLE A: STANDARD CHARGES FOR THE CREATION OR CONVERSION TO NEW HOUSING**

**1,2,3 or More Properties:**

Application

Regularisation

Please Ring for Quote  
Please Ring for Quote

Please Ring for Quote  
Please Ring for Quote

Please Ring for Quote  
Please Ring for Quote

**TABLE B: DOMESTIC EXTENSIONS TO A SINGLE BUILDING**

An increasing number of customers are aware of the obligation for local authority building control to provide project specific fees, which are now provided in virtually

**Garage Conversion to habitable room**

Application  
Regularisation  
Additional

**Extension project**

Application  
Regularisation  
Additional

**All other extensions**

**Loft Conversions**

**Detached garage over**

**Electrical works by non-qualified electrician**

Application  
Regularisation

**Renovation of thermal element**

Application  
Regularisation

**Installing steel beam(s) within an existing house**

Application  
Regularisation

**Window replacment**

Application  
Regularisation

**Installing a new boiler or wood burner etc.**

Application  
Regularisation

Please Contact Us

Please Contact Us  
Please Contact Us

Please Contact Us  
Please Contact Us  
Please Contact Us

Please Contact Us

Please Contact Us

Please Contact Us

Please Contact Us

Please Contact Us

Please Contact Us  
Please Contact Us  
Please Contact Us

Please Contact Us  
Please Contact Us  
Please Contact Us  
Please Contact Us  
Please Contact Us  
Please Contact Us

Please Contact Us  
Please Contact Us

Please Contact Us  
Please Contact Us

Please Contact Us  
Please Contact Us

Please Contact Us  
Please Contact Us

Please Contact Us  
Please Contact Us

Please Contact Us  
Please Contact Us  
Please Contact Us

Please Contact Us  
Please Contact Us  
Please Contact Us  
Please Contact Us  
Please Contact Us  
Please Contact Us

Please Contact Us  
Please Contact Us

Please Contact Us  
Please Contact Us

Please Contact Us  
Please Contact Us

Please Contact Us  
Please Contact Us

Please Contact Us  
Please Contact Us

all cases. It is proposed to continue with provision of site specific fees in accordance with The Building (Local Authority Charges) Regulations 2010 as in previous years, however it is also now proposed to expand this to cover the remaining few fee categories where a fixed fee is currently published.

The number of applications received which fall within these final few categories amounts to around 5% of all applications.

**TABLE C: ALL OTHER WORKS - ALTERATIONS**

£0 +

**For Office or shop fit outs, installation of a mezzanine floor and all other work where the estimated cost exceeds £50,000, please contact the Building Control Office on 01527 881402 for a competitive quote. These charges have been set on the following basis:**

1. That the building work does not consist of, or include innovative or high risk construction techniques and / or duration of the building work from commencement to completion does not exceed 12 months
2. That the design and building work is undertaken by a person or company that is competent to carry out the relevant design and building work. If they are not, the building control service may impose supplementary charges.

**Building Control – Supplementary Charges**

If you are selling a property that has been extended or altered, you need to provide evidence to prospective purchasers that any relevant building work has been inspected and approved by a Building Control Body. That evidence is in the form of a Building Regulations Completion / Final Certificate and / or an Approval or Initial Notice (called the 'authorised documents' in the Home Information Pack Regulations).

Legal entitlement to a Completion Certificate is subject to conditions. In cases where the Council is not told that building work is completed, or the building is occupied without addressing outstanding Building Regulation matters, a certificate is not issued. Despite the best efforts of the Council's Building Control Surveyors, many home owners who undertake building works fail to obtain a Completion Certificate and their application is archived. A fee is payable to re-open archived building regulations applications for the purposes of issuing a completion certificate.

Other charges are payable where we are asked to withdraw a Building Regulations application and refund fees, or asked to re-direct inspection fee invoices. Fees are payable in cleared funds before the release of any authorised documents or other actions listed below.

**ARCHIVED APPLICATIONS**

Process request to re-open archived building control file, resolve case and issue completion certificate  
 Each visit to site in connection with resolving archived building control cases

Please Contact Us

Please Contact Us

Please Contact Us

49.00	1.47	42.06	8.41	50.50
64.00	1.92	54.93	10.99	65.90

**WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS**

Process request	49.00	1.47	42.06	8.41	50.50
With additional fees of.....					
Withdraw Building Notice application where no inspections have taken place	refund submitted fee less admin fee				
Withdraw Building Notice application where inspections have taken place	refund submitted fee less admin fee, less £64 per site visit made				
Withdrawn Full Plans application without plans being checked or any site inspections being made	refund submitted fee less admin fee				
Withdraw Full Plans application after plan check but before any inspections on site	refund inspection fee (where paid up-front) less admin fee				
Withdraw Full Plans application after plan check and after site inspections made	refund any paid inspection fee less admin fee, less £64 per site inspection made				

**RE-DIRECT INSPECTION FEES / ISSUE COPY DOCUMENTS**

Process request to re-invoice inspection fee to new addressee	49.00	1.47	42.06	8.41	50.50
Optional Consultancy Services	Please Contact Us		Please Contact Us		Please Contact Us

**Charges note**

Under the Building (Local Authority Charges) Regulations 2010 local authority building control is not permitted to make a profit or loss. The service is to ensure full cost recovery and no more. Any surplus or loss made against expenditure budgets is to be offset against the following years fees and charges setting. This draft set of fees and charges reflects the surplus income projected to have arisen by the end of 13/14 across the shared service. In addition, the level of competition from the private sector needs to continually defended against therefore it is proposed to curtail both the extent of fee categories published and to make extensive use of the fact that legislation now allows local authorities to offer site specific quotations for building regulations applications. In addition expenditure of the service has reduced since the creation of a shared service resulting in a reduction in the hourly rate charged by the service.



**Community Services**

Service Category	charge 1st April 2015 £	% increase / £ increase £	Revised Net total £	VAT to be applied	Proposed charge from 2016 £	Comments
<b>Private Sector Housing</b>		<b>3.00%</b>				
House Fitness Inspections	108.00	3.24	111.24	0.00	111.20	
Registration of housing in multiple occupation: per occupant - first property	89.00	2.67	91.67	0.00	91.70	
per occupant - subsequent property	77.00	2.31	79.31	0.00	79.30	
Service and Administration of Improvement, per hour + 10% Admin Charge Per Notice	25.00	0.75	25.75	0.00	25.80	Price based on the salary of the employee undertaking the work +10%
Prohibition, Hazard Awareness or Emergency Measures Notices under Housing Act 2004 Actual + 10% admin charge						Price based on the salary of the employee undertaking the work +10%
Enforcement of Statutory Notices, Supervision of Work in Default etc						
<b>Lifeline</b>						
Installation Fee - New Charge (Private & HRA)	22.15	12.85	35.00	0.00	35.00	<b>58% increase.</b> Lifeline one off Installation charge has been increased to more accurately reflect the true cost of the installation and a new way of working with Officer time spent on understanding the holistic needs of the customer. This revised charge is still 20 % lower than neighbouring providers.
Alarms private user pre April 2004 x 52 weeks*	2.55	0.08	2.63	0.00	2.60	
Community Alarm Hire Private/self funder x 52 weeks	3.60	0.11	3.71	0.00	3.70	
Key safes types 1 and 2		10% increase on manufacturers price at the time of purchase				Based on the actual cost of the product + 10% admin fee
Extra pendants - private tenants		10% increase on manufacturers price at the time of purchase				Based on the actual cost of the product + 10% admin fee
Extra pendants - council tenants		10% increase on manufacturers price at the time of purchase				Based on the actual cost of the product + 10% admin fee

\*This is a lifetime set price and cannot be increased

<b>Hire Products</b>						
Hire of smoke alarm per week	1.15	0.03	1.18	0.00	1.20	
CO2 Detector per week	1.15	0.03	1.18	0.00	1.20	
Bogus Caller Panic Button	1.15	0.03	1.18	0.00	1.20	
Flood Detector	1.15	0.03	1.18	0.00	1.20	
Falls Detector	1.15	0.03	1.18	0.00	1.20	
Additional pendant	1.15	0.03	1.18	0.00	1.20	
<b>Dial a Ride Service</b>						
Minibus - single journey	2.30	0.07	2.37	0.00	2.40	
Concessionary fare	1.70	0.05	1.75	0.00	1.80	
<b>Corporate</b>						
Service Category	charge 1st April 2015 £	% increase / £ increase £	Revised Net total £	VAT to be applied	Proposed charge from 2016 £	Comments
		<b>3.00%</b>				
<b>Photocopying per copy</b>						
A4 (black & white)	0.25	0.01	0.26	0.00	0.30	
A4 (colour)	0.40	0.01	0.41	0.00	0.40	
A3 (black & white)	0.35	0.01	0.36	0.00	0.40	
A4 binding	1.80	0.05	1.85	0.00	1.90	
A4 plastic cover	1.30	0.04	1.34	0.00	1.30	
A3 (colour)	0.70	0.02	0.72	0.00	0.70	
A2 (black and white)	0.60	0.02	0.62	0.00	0.60	
A2 (colour)	Variable rate		Variable rate		Variable rate	
A1 (black and white)	1.10	0.03	1.13	0.00	1.10	
A1 (colour)	Variable rate		Variable rate		Variable rate	
A0 (black and white)	1.90	0.06	1.96	0.00	2.00	
A0 (colour)	Variable rate		Variable rate		Variable rate	
<b>Other Corporate Charges</b>						
Copy P60	5.50	0.17	5.67	0.00	5.70	
Replacement ID badge	5.50	0.17	5.67	0.00	5.70	
Attachment of Earnings per deduction	1.10	0.03	1.13	0.00	1.10	

**Customer Access & Financial Support**

Service Category	charge 1st April 2015 £	% increase / £ increase £	Revised Net total £	VAT to be applied	Proposed charge from 2016 £	Comments
<b>Revenues</b>		various				
<b>Court Costs</b>						Costs must be based on actual costs and worked out in accordance with guidance provided + 9% increase
<b>Council Tax</b>						
Summons	50.00	4.50	54.50	0.00	54.50	
Liability Order	27.00	0.81	27.81	0.00	27.80	
Magistrates Court Fee	3.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	3.00	
<b>NNDR</b>						+9% increase
Summons	50.00	4.50	54.50	0.00	54.50	
Liability Order	27.00	0.81	27.81	0.00	27.80	
Magistrates Court Fee	3.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	3.00	
<b>Property Services (all exclusive of VAT)</b>						
Minor Land Sales Request for Information	45.00	1.35	46.35	0.00	46.40	
Minor Land Sales Full Application	330.00	9.90	339.90	0.00	339.90	
Advertising - Estimated Fee	560.00	16.80	576.80	0.00	576.80	
Surveyors Fees - Estimated Fee	450.00	13.50	463.50	0.00	463.50	

**Environmental Services**

Service Category	charge 1st April 2015 £	% increase / £ increase £	Revised Net total £	VAT to be applied	Proposed charge from 2016 £	Comments
<b>Bulky Household Waste</b>		3.00%				
It is proposed that the following charges are trialled for the next year whilst we continue to learn more about the customers' nominal value whilst continuing to improve operational charges would be the same across Bromsgrove and /Redditch						
Bulky collection - single item*	7.75	0.23	7.98	0.00	8.00	
Bulky collection - two items*	15.50	0.47	15.97	0.00	16.00	
Bulky collection - three items* (reduced rate for 3 items)	20.50	0.62	21.12	0.00	21.10	
or 10 Black Bags	20.50	0.62	21.12	0.00	21.10	
Bulky collection - four items or more	Quotation		Quotation		Quotation	
Item inside house or garage	Quotation		Quotation		Quotation	
*Large item (all the items below to be quoted for independently depending on size, and weight and position of collection point).Garden Shed, Piano, Chest Freezer, Large Cookers (Ranges), Green Houses, Hazardous Oils (Special Collections) because of the distance to dispose of them correctly,	Quotation		Quotation		Quotation	
over 10 x Black Bags, Wheels, Tyres and other car parts						
Orange sacks each	1.85	0.06	1.91	0.00	1.90	
<b>MOT</b>						
Class 4 (car)	Set by VOSA		Set by VOSA		Set by VOSA	
Class 7 (van)	Set by VOSA		Set by VOSA		Set by VOSA	
Class 5 vl (minibus)	Set by VOSA		Set by VOSA		Set by VOSA	

VOSA have yet to set a revised charge.

Council have agreed that the workshop can increase fee in line with VOSA charges (rounded down to the nearest whole £) as VOSA change them.

**Supplies Service**

On cost for cash sales	0.27		27.00%	0.00	27.00%
Logs per cubic metre per bag	18.00	0.54	18.54	0.00	18.50

**Crematorium/Cemetery**

<b>Interment</b>					
Full earth interment under 1 year (non resident only)	100.00	3.00	103.00	0.00	103.00
Full earth interment under 1 year (Redditch resident)	No Charge		No Charge	0.00	No Charge
Interment 1 year to 16 years (non resident only)	145.00	4.35	149.35	0.00	149.40
Interment 1 year to 16 years (Redditch Resident)	No Charge		No Charge	0.00	No Charge
<b>Interment 17 years and over*</b>					Proposed 18 years and over
Single Depth	450.00	13.50	463.50	0.00	463.50
Double Depth	450.00	13.50	463.50	0.00	463.50
Interment of cremated remains *	185.00	5.55	190.55	0.00	190.60
Interment of cremated remains - non resident under 16 years	70.00	0.00	70.00	0.00	70.00
Interment of cremated remains (Redditch Resident)	no charge		no charge	0.00	No Charge
<b>Scattering cremated remains in grave or in rose/memorial garden (roll back turf)</b>			80.00	0.00	80.00

**Charges for Burials**

**Exclusive Right of Burial for 75 years**

In adult size grave*	1,200.00	36.00	1,236.00	0.00	1,236.00
In babies grave	240.00	7.20	247.20	0.00	247.20
In child's grave (4 x 2)	255.00	7.65	262.65	0.00	262.70
In ashes grave*	460.00	13.80	473.80	0.00	473.80
Adult size grave purchased in reserve*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ashes Grave purchased in reserve*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

\* No more reserve plots available at Abbey Cemetery. This is because of the need to use existing capacity for people arranging the funeral for someone that has died and therefore need it now.

**Extending Rights in existing grave for 25 years**

In existing full earth grave	400.00	12.00	412.00	0.00	412.00
In child's grave	85.00	2.55	87.55	0.00	87.60
In ashes grave	155.00	4.65	159.65	0.00	159.70
Assignment of the exclusive right of a full earth reserved grave from resident to non -resident	2,400.00	72.00	2,472.00	0.00	2,472.00
Assignment of the exclusive right of a reserved cremated remains plot from resident to non resident	920.00	27.60	947.60	0.00	947.60
Assignment / Transfer of Exclusive Right	40.00	1.20	41.20	0.00	41.20
Scatter in grave (roll back turf)	80.00	2.40	82.40	0.00	82.40
Certified copy of entry in Register of Burials	20.00	0.60	20.60	0.00	20.60
Disinterment of Remains - Cremated Remains	230.00	6.90	236.90	0.00	236.90

**Cemetery Memorials**

Memorial application administration fee	90.00	2.70	92.70	0.00	92.70
Secure unstable memorial	75.00 - 125.00	0.00%	75.00 - 125.00	0.00	75.00-125.00

The interment and exclusive right fee is trebled\* in all cases where the deceased does not have a Redditch address, unless the grave was purchased by the deceased whilst living in Redditch. Where there is a dispute Redditch Borough Council may require the family to provide proof of residence of the deceased.

**Cremation related fees**

Cremation under 16 years (resident only)	No fee	No fee	No Fee	Proposed 17 years and under
Cremation under 1 year (non resident only)	60.00	0.00%	No fee	0.00
Cremation 1 year to 16 years (non resident only)	105.00	0.00%	No fee	0.00
Cremation 17+ years 8.30 am - 9:30am	410.00	33.00	443.00	0.00
Cremation 17+ years 10:00 am	540.00	43.00	583.00	0.00
Weekday scattering of ashes from other Crematoria	55.00	1.65	56.65	0.00
Weekend scattering of ashes from other Crematoria	70.00	2.10	72.10	0.00
Weekday witness scattering of ashes	45.00	1.35	46.35	0.00
Weekend witness scattering of ashes	60.00	1.80	61.80	0.00
Certified extract from Register of Cremations	20.00	0.60	20.60	0.00
Replacement certificate of cremation	10.00	0.30	10.30	0.00
Organist's fee	On Application	On Application	On Application	On Application
Extra Service Time in Chapel	155.00	4.65	159.65	0.00
Use of chapel for burial service of child 16 or under (not RBC Cemeteries)	215.00	6.45	221.45	0.00
Use of Chapel for burial service (RBC Cemeteries)	155.00	4.65	159.65	0.00
Use of Chapel for burial service (not RBC Cemetery) 8.30 and 9.00 am	410.00	12.30	422.30	0.00
Use of Chapel for burial service (not RBC Cemetery) 9.30 and 10.15 am	530.00	15.90	545.90	0.00
Use of Chapel for burial service (not RBC Cemetery) 11.00 am onwards	540.00	16.20	556.20	0.00
Use of chapel for burial service of child 16 or under (RBC Cemeteries)	72.00	2.16	74.16	0.00
Late arrival at Crematorium (only if service runs into next time slot)	155.00	4.65	159.65	0.00
Memorial service where cremation has taken place elsewhere.	250.00	7.50	257.50	0.00

**Caskets**

Wooden cremated remains casket	85.00	2.55	87.55	0.00	87.50
Baby caskets - Size A	POA		POA	POA	POA
- Size B	POA		POA	POA	POA
- Size C	POA		POA	POA	POA

**Wesley music additional options**

CD of chapel service (tbc)	45.00	1.35	46.35	0.00	46.40
DVD of Chapel service (tbc)	55.00	1.65	56.65	0.00	56.70
Webcast of Chapel service (tbc)	65.00	1.95	66.95	0.00	67.00

<b>Memorials</b>					
Book of Remembrance - Name + 1 line	80.00	2.40	68.67	13.73	82.40
Each additional line in the Book	30.00	0.90	25.75	5.15	30.90
Miniature Book of Remembrance - Name + 1 line	70.00	2.10	60.08	12.02	72.10
Remembrance Card - Name + 1 line	35.00	1.05	30.04	6.01	36.10
Additional lines in miniature and cards	25.00	0.75	21.46	4.29	25.80
Crests - Floral depiction	50.00	1.50	42.92	8.58	51.50
- Badge or other	60.00	1.80	51.50	10.30	61.80
<b>Wall Plaques – Internal</b>					
Indoor single (12" x 3") - 5 year lease	160.00	4.80	164.80	0.00	164.80
Indoor single (12" x 3") - 10 year lease	260.00	7.80	267.80	0.00	267.80
Indoor single (12" x 3") - 20 year lease	360.00	10.80	370.80	0.00	370.80
Indoor double (12" x 6") - 5 year lease	260.00	7.80	267.80	0.00	267.80
Indoor double (12" x 6") - 10 year lease	360.00	10.80	370.80	0.00	370.80
Indoor double (12" x 6") - 20 year lease	460.00	13.80	473.80	0.00	473.80
<b>Outdoor Wall Plaques</b>					
5 year lease	180.00	5.40	185.40	0.00	185.40
10 year lease	280.00	8.40	288.40	0.00	288.40
20 year lease	380.00	11.40	391.40	0.00	391.40
Photo or motif	150.00	4.50	154.50	0.00	154.50
<b>Bird Bath Memorial</b>					
<b>5 year lease</b>					
Size 1 - small	180.00	5.40	185.40	0.00	185.40
Size 2	200.00	6.00	206.00	0.00	206.00
Size 3	220.00	6.60	226.60	0.00	226.60
Size 4	240.00	7.20	247.20	0.00	247.20
Size 5 - large	260.00	7.80	267.80	0.00	267.80
<b>10 year lease</b>					
Size 1 - small	280.00	8.40	288.40	0.00	288.40
Size 2	300.00	9.00	309.00	0.00	309.00
Size 3	320.00	9.60	329.60	0.00	329.60
Size 4	340.00	10.20	350.20	0.00	350.20
Size 5 - large	360.00	10.80	370.80	0.00	370.80
<b>20 year lease</b>					
Size 1 - small	380.00	11.40	391.40	0.00	391.40
Size 2	400.00	12.00	412.00	0.00	412.00
Size 3	420.00	12.60	432.60	0.00	432.60
Size 4	440.00	13.20	453.20	0.00	453.20
Size 5 - large	460.00	13.80	473.80	0.00	473.80
<b>Motif</b>	100.00	3.00	103.00	0.00	103.00
<b>Additional inscription on plaque</b>	80.00	2.40	82.40	0.00	82.40
<b>Memorial Plaque extension fee 5 years ONLY</b>	125.00	3.75	128.75	0.00	128.80
 Withdrawn option to extend for 10 and 20 years due to the lack of space and price people will pay					
<b>Purchase of memorial plaque (bronze)</b>	120.00	3.60	123.60	0.00	123.60
<b>Parking Fines PCN's On Street</b>		<b>0.00%</b>			
<b>Set by Statute</b>					
Certain Contraventions	70.00	0.00%	70.00	0.00	70.00
If paid within fourteen days	35.00	0.00%	35.00	0.00	35.00
Other Contraventions	50.00	0.00%	50.00	0.00	50.00

If paid within fourteen days These charges will increase if the charge remains unpaid after the 28 days given on the NTO (Notice to Owner)	25.00	0.00%	25.00	0.00	25.00	
<b><u>Housing Services</u></b>						
Service Category	charge 1st April 2015 £	% increase / £ increase £	Revised Net total £	VAT to be applied	Proposed charge from 2016 £	Comments
		3.00%				
<b><u>Dispersed Units</u></b>						
Water charge - per week	4.70	0.14	4.84	0.00	4.80	
Minimum Charge	12.50	0.38	12.88	0.00	12.90	
Maximum Charge	13.50	0.41	13.91	0.00	13.90	
<b><u>Service Charges</u></b>						
Three Storey Flats*	6.60	0.20	6.80	0.00	6.80	
Woodrow Estate	3.50	0.11	3.61	0.00	3.60	
Evesham Mews	5.75	0.17	5.92	0.00	5.90	
St David's House	25.00	0.75	25.75	0.00	25.80	
Queen's Cottages	25.00	0.75	25.75	0.00	25.80	
Replacement Key Fobs (each)	10.50	0.32	10.82	0.00	10.80	
<b><u>Sheltered Scheme (VAT inclusive)</u></b>						
Use of washing machines	2.30	0.07	2.37	0.00	2.40	
Use of drying machines	1.90	0.06	1.96	0.00	2.00	
Use of guest bedrooms per night	14.00	0.42	14.42	0.00	14.40	
Use of communal lounge	10.50	0.32	10.82	0.00	10.80	
<b><u>St David's House</u></b>						
Heating charge	8.00	0.24	8.24	0.00	8.20	
Water charge	4.00	0.12	4.12	0.00	4.10	
Laundry Charge	6.00	0.18	6.18	0.00	6.20	
<b><u>Mendip House</u></b>						
Gas boiler and cooker F1/B3	8.70	0.26	8.96	0.00	9.00	
Gas boiler and cooker F1/1(B)	10.50	0.32	10.82	0.00	10.80	

**Bredon House**

Gas boiler and cooker F1/1(A)  
 Gas boiler and cooker F1/1(B)  
 Gas boiler and cooker F3/BS  
 Gas boiler and cooker F1/2P

**Malvern House**

Gas boiler and cooker F1/BS  
 Gas boiler and cooker F1/1  
 Gas boiler and cooker F1/2

**Mendip House**

Gas boiler & electric cooker F1/B3  
 Gas boiler & electric cooker F1/1

**Bredon House**

Gas boiler & electric cooker F1/1(A)  
 Gas boiler & electric cooker F1/1(B)  
 Gas boiler & electric cooker F3/BS  
 Gas boiler & electric cooker F1/2P

**Malvern House**

Gas boiler & electric cooker F1/BS  
 Gas boiler & electric cooker F1/1  
 Gas boiler & electric cooker F1/2

**Garage Rents**

Garages  
 Car Ports  
 Non Council Tenants plus VAT

**Rechargeable Repairs****Boarding up a domestic property:**

Minimum charge  
 Maximum charge

**Glazing:**

Minimum charge  
 Maximum charge

**Lock replacement:**

Minimum charge  
 Maximum charge

**Larger repairs (eg door, w/c replacement):**

Minimum charge  
 Maximum charge

**Out of Hours call out**

8.00	0.24	8.24	0.00	8.20
8.00	0.24	8.24	0.00	8.20
8.00	0.24	8.24	0.00	8.20
8.90	0.27	9.17	0.00	9.20
8.10	0.24	8.34	0.00	8.30
8.50	0.26	8.76	0.00	8.80
9.00	0.27	9.27	0.00	9.30
7.40	0.22	7.62	0.00	7.60
9.10	0.27	9.37	0.00	9.40
5.60	0.17	5.77	0.00	5.80
5.70	0.17	5.87	0.00	5.90
5.70	0.17	5.87	0.00	5.90
6.50	0.20	6.70	0.00	6.70
5.80	0.17	5.97	0.00	6.00
5.90	0.18	6.08	0.00	6.10
6.70	0.20	6.90	0.00	6.90
7.95	0.24	8.19	0.00	8.20
3.00	0.09	3.09	0.00	3.10
9.55	0.29	9.84	0.00	9.80
21.50	0.66	22.16	0.00	22.20
Full cost		Full cost		Full cost
45.00	1.35	46.35	0.00	46.40
Full cost		Full cost		Full cost
25.00	0.75	25.75	0.00	25.80
Full cost		Full cost		Full cost
One third		One third		One third
Full cost		Full cost		Full cost
34.00	1.02	35.02	0.00	35.00



<b><u>St Davids House Luncheon Club</u></b>					
Residents	4.00	0.12	4.12	0.00	4.10
Non Residents (Over 60) (inc VAT)	5.00	0.15	5.15	0.00	5.20
All Others (inc VAT)	6.10	0.18	6.28	0.00	6.30
Drinks	0.60	0.02	0.62	0.00	0.60
<b><u>Home Support Service</u></b>					
Weekly well being telephone call	3.80	0.11	3.91	0.00	3.90
Weekly well being home visit	7.25	0.22	7.47	0.00	7.50
Weekly Individual Support visiting service	14.50	0.44	14.94	0.00	14.90
<b><u>Tenants' Support - St David's House/Queen's Cottages</u></b>					
Full Charge	36.00	1.08	37.08	0.00	37.10
<b><u>Landlords References</u></b>					
Landlords References	52.00	1.56	53.56	0.00	53.60

**Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services**

Service Category	charge 1st April 2015 £	% increase / £ increase £	Revised Net total £	VAT to be applied	Proposed charge from 2016 £	Comments
<b><u>Legal Costs</u></b>		<b>3.00%</b>				
Mortgage Redemption Fee	60.50	1.82	51.93	10.39	62.30	
Second Mortgage questionnaire	41.50	1.25	35.63	7.12	42.80	
Surrender of Garage Lease	69.00	2.07	59.23	11.85	71.10	
Discount questionnaire	31.50	0.95	27.04	5.41	32.40	
Leasehold Questionnaire	55.50	1.67	47.64	9.53	57.20	
Notice of Postponement during Right to Buy	23.00	0.69	19.74	3.95	23.70	
Notice of Postponement post Right to Buy	31.50	0.95	27.04	5.41	32.40	
Re-mortgage	54.00	1.62	46.35	9.27	55.60	
Consent for alterations to former Council house/flat	140.00	4.20	120.17	24.03	144.20	
Retrospective Consent for alterations to former Council house/flat	175.00	5.25	150.21	30.04	180.30	
Garden licence - initial administration fee (plus annual fee)	72.00	2.16	61.80	12.36	74.20	
WayLeave Agreement			100.00	0.00	100.00	
Deed of Grant/Easement	341.00	10.23	292.69	58.54	351.20	
* Licence to Assign	341.00	10.23	292.69	58.54	351.20	
* Rent Deposit Deed	341.00	10.23	292.69	58.54	351.20	
* Authorised Guarantee Agreement	341.00	10.23	292.69	58.54	351.20	
* Licence for Alterations	341.00	10.23	292.69	58.54	351.20	
* Licence to Sub-let	341.00	10.23	292.69	58.54	351.20	
* Deed of Variation	341.00	10.23	292.69	58.54	351.20	
* Grant of Lease	446.00	13.38	382.82	76.56	459.40	
* Deed of Surrender	341.00	10.23	292.69	58.54	351.20	
<b>* Please note that each document shall be charged for separately, except where one transaction involves more than two documents, in which case fees will be capped at £750.00</b>						
Tenancy at Will	341.00	10.23	292.69	58.54	351.20	
Renewal of Lease	341.00	10.23	292.69	58.54	351.20	
Minor land sales - legal fees	446.00	13.38	382.82	76.56	459.40	

New head of charge to cover a gap in our Schedule. Charge of £100 reflects work involved

Major land sales - legal fees  
 Diversion of Footpath under Section 257 of the Town & Country Planning Act  
 Freehold reversions - admin fee

Copy of lease (up to 25 pages)  
 Copies of RTB service charges (up to last three years)  
 Extra copies of valuation - S.125 Notice

**Section 106**

Private Owner  
 Each additional unit added (up to a maximum of £1,500) \*  
 100% Affordable housing schemes  
 Deed of Variation \*\*  
 Fee for agreeing a unilateral undertaking

**0.5% of the purchase price, with a minimum charge of £500.00**

1,880.00  
 341.00

56.40  
 10.23

1,613.67  
 292.69

322.73  
 58.54

1,936.40  
 351.20

**Standard photocopying charge for no & size of pages**

467.50  
 58.50  
 877.50  
 333.50  
 333.50

14.03  
 1.76  
 26.33  
 10.01  
 10.01

401.27  
 50.21  
 753.19  
 286.25  
 286.25

80.25  
 10.04  
 150.64  
 57.25  
 57.25

481.50  
 60.30  
 903.80  
 343.50  
 343.50

\* Please note that for complex 106 agreements charges may be calculated based at the Law Society regional rates for legal work to reflect the time taken to complete the negotiations and drafting. Fees calculated under this provision may exceed £1,500 \*\* This new head of charge is required as variations to S106 agreements were rare but are becoming more frequent and this enables the charge to be published and this enables the charge to be published. The rate is the same as that for a similar type of planning agreement, for consistency.

<b>LOCAL LAND CHARGES</b>		<b>0.00%</b>					
<b>Search Type</b>							
Official Certificate of Search (LLC1) only	26.00	0.00%	21.67	4.33	26.00	These charges must be assessed independently. They can't be subject to an automatic annual uplift as this could breach the Local Land Charges Charging Regulations under which they can be set.	
<b>CON29R Enquiries of Local Authority (2007)</b>							
- Residential	85.00	0.00%	70.83	14.17	85.00		
- Commercial	126.00	0.00%	105.00	21.00	126.00		
<b>Standard Search Fee: LLC1 and CON 29R combined</b>							
- Residential	111.00	0.00%	92.50	18.50	111.00		
- Commercial	152.00	0.00%	126.67	25.33	152.00		
<b>CON 290 Optional enquiries of Local Authority (2007)</b>							HMRC has indicated that it may impose a requirement on local authorities to put VAT on CON29 searches from 1st February 2016, although these charges have not been subject to VAT to date.
(Questions 4,5,6,8,9,11,15) per question	12.00	0.00%	10.00	2.00	12.00		
(Questions 7,10,12,13,14,16-21) per question	6.00	0.00%	5.00	1.00	6.00		
(Question 22)	24.00	0.00%	20.00	4.00	24.00		
Extra written enquiries (Refer to Worcestershire County Council for Highways enquiries)	47.00	0.00%	39.17	7.83	47.00		
Each additional parcel of land (LLC1 and CON29R)	22.00	0.00%	18.33	3.67	22.00		
Refresher Search	38.00	0.00%	31.67	6.33	38.00		
Expedited (within 48 hrs)	30.00	0.00%	25.00	5.00	30.00		

**Planning and Regeneration**

Service Category	charge 1st April 2015 £	% increase / £ increase £	Revised Net total £	VAT to be applied	Proposed charge from 2016 £	Comments
<b>DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENTS</b>		<b>3.00%</b>				
<b>Previous Local Plans</b>						
<b>Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.1:</b>						
Written statement and proposals map	10.20	0.31	8.76	1.75	10.50	
<b>Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.2:</b>						
Written statement and proposals map	26.30	0.79	22.57	4.51	27.10	
Inspectors Report (1993 & 1995)	6.00	0.18	5.15	1.03	6.20	
<b>Local Development Framework Documents (LDF)</b>						
<b>Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3:</b>						
Written statement and proposals map	64.40	1.93	55.28	11.06	66.30	
Inspectors Report	31.90	0.96	27.38	5.48	32.90	
Local Development Scheme (LDS)	19.10	0.57	16.39	3.28	19.70	
Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)	19.10	0.57	16.39	3.28	19.70	
Scoping Report for Development Plan Documents	19.10	0.57	16.39	3.28	19.70	

**Monitoring Documents**

Housing Commitments in Redditch Borough since 1 April 1996	31.40	0.94	26.95	5.39	32.30
Housing Completions on Large and Small Sites in Redditch Borough since 1 April 1996	31.40	0.94	26.95	5.39	32.30
Replacement Dwellings Monitoring since 1 April 1996	31.40	0.94	26.95	5.39	32.30
Annual Commitments & Completions on Small Windfall Sites since 1 April 1996	31.40	0.94	26.95	5.39	32.30
Provision of Affordable Housing since 1 April 1996	31.40	0.94	26.95	5.39	32.30
Employment Land Supply in Redditch Borough since 1 April 1996	31.40	0.94	26.95	5.39	32.30
Annual Monitoring Report	31.40	0.94	26.95	5.39	32.30

**Other Documents**

Feckenham Housing Needs Assessment	6.20	0.19	5.32	1.06	6.40
Redditch Housing Needs Assessment	12.50	0.38	10.73	2.15	12.90
Residential Urban Capacity Study	43.00	1.29	36.91	7.38	44.30
Open Space Needs Assessment	43.00	1.29	36.91	7.38	44.30
Schedule of Buildings of Local Interest	30.50	0.92	26.18	5.24	31.40
North West Redditch Master Plan Documents					
- Report	18.50	0.56	15.88	3.18	19.10
- Transport Report Appendix	12.50	0.38	10.73	2.15	12.90
- Landscape Appendix	1.50	0.05	1.29	0.26	1.50

**Supplementary Planning Documents/ Guidance**

Affordable Housing Provision (2000)	18.50	0.56	15.88	3.18	19.10
Encouraging Good Design	18.50	0.56	15.88	3.18	19.10
General Mobility Housing - Design Standards	5.85	0.18	5.02	1.00	6.00
General Mobility Housing - Needs Assessment	3.10	0.09	2.66	0.53	3.20
Employment Land Monitoring (SPG)	18.50	0.56	15.88	3.18	19.10
All new Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's)	18.50	0.56	15.88	3.18	19.10

**Development Management Charges**

High Hedge Complaints	224.00	6.72	192.27	38.45	230.70
-----------------------	--------	------	--------	-------	--------

**Residential Development/Development site Area/Proposed**

1-4 dwellings/0.5ha	289.00	8.67	248.06	49.61	297.70
- Additional meeting (after first three)	115.00	3.45	98.71	19.74	118.50
5-9 dwellings/0.6 - 0.99ha	581.00	17.43	498.69	99.74	598.40
- Additional meeting (after first three)	115.00	3.45	98.71	19.74	118.50
10-49 dwellings/1.0 - 1.25ha	1,160.00	34.80	995.67	199.13	1,194.80
- Additional meeting (after first three)	580.00	17.40	497.83	99.57	597.40
50-199 dwellings/1.26 - 2.0ha	2,320.00	69.60	1,991.33	398.27	2,389.60
- Additional meeting (after first three)	858.00	25.74	736.45	147.29	883.70
200+ dwellings/more than 2ha	3,479.00	104.37	2,986.14	597.23	3,583.40
- Additional meeting (after first three)	1,160.00	34.80	995.67	199.13	1,194.80

**Business Centres****Fax - Outgoing**

UK	0.90	0.03	0.77	0.15	0.90
Europe & Eire	1.60	0.05	1.38	0.27	1.70
North America	1.80	0.05	1.55	0.31	1.90
Other	2.75	0.08	2.36	0.47	2.80

**Fax - Incoming**

	0.60	0.02	0.52	0.10	0.60
--	------	------	------	------	------

**Secretarial**

- minimum charge	10.10	0.30	8.67	1.73	10.40
- charge per hour	12.35	0.37	10.60	2.12	12.70

**Postal Address Facility - per month**

	44.30	1.33	38.02	7.60	45.60
--	-------	------	-------	------	-------

**Telephone Divert:**

Normal - per quarter	113.30	3.40	97.25	19.45	116.70
Gold - per quarter	214.25	6.43	183.90	36.78	220.70

**Photocopying:**

A4 single side	0.10	0.25%	0.08	0.02	0.10
A4 double side	0.15	0.38%	0.12	0.03	0.20
A3 single side	0.25	0.01	0.21	0.05	0.30
A3 double side	0.30	0.01	0.25	0.06	0.30

**Photocopying:**

A4 single side - non tenants	0.20	0.01	0.17	0.03	0.20
------------------------------	------	------	------	------	------

**Conference Room (per hour):**

Rubicon Tenants	10.10	0.30	8.67	1.73	10.40
Rubicon Non Tenants	20.10	0.60	17.25	3.45	20.70
Greenlands Tenants	11.35	0.34	9.74	1.95	11.70
Greenlands Non Tenants	22.65	0.68	19.44	3.89	23.30

**OUTDOOR MARKET RENTS****Stall or flower pitch - no electricity**

## Licensed Traders:

Monday	15.00	0.45	15.45	0.00	15.50
Tuesday	16.50	0.50	17.00	0.00	17.00
Thursday & Friday	16.50	0.50	17.00	0.00	17.00
Saturday	26.00	0.78	26.78	0.00	26.80

## Casual Traders:

Monday	19.00	0.57	19.57	0.00	19.60
Tuesday	21.00	0.63	21.63	0.00	21.60
Thursday & Friday	21.50	0.65	22.15	0.00	22.20
Saturday	33.50	1.01	34.51	0.00	34.50

The current arrangements for the provision of market services are being considered as part of a procurement review

**Van Pitch or food trailer - with electric**

Licensed Traders:

Monday	29.00	0.87	29.87	0.00	29.90
Tuesday	31.50	0.95	32.45	0.00	32.50
Thursday & Friday	33.00	0.99	33.99	0.00	34.00
Saturday	39.50	1.19	40.69	0.00	40.70

Casual Traders:

Monday	37.50	1.13	38.63	0.00	38.60
Tuesday	41.00	1.23	42.23	0.00	42.20
Thursday & Friday	42.50	1.28	43.78	0.00	43.80
Saturday	52.00	1.56	53.56	0.00	53.60

**Seasonal discounts for all licensed stall holders/licensed van pitches will be applied at the rate of 15% in January, February and March to all the above rents**

**Regulatory Services**

Service Category	charge 1st April 2015 £	% increase / £ increase £	Revised Net total £	VAT to be applied	Proposed charge from 2016 £	Comments
		0.00%				
<b>TAXI LICENSING</b>						
- Hackney Carriage Vehicle Licence per annum ( charge excludes vehicle testing)	258.65	0.00%	258.65	0.00	258.65	
- Hackney Carriage Driver's Licence - 1 Year	56.85	1.70	58.55	0.00	58.60	
- Hackney Carriage Driver's Licence - 3 Year			144.00	0.00	144.00	New 3 year license per legislation
- Private Hire Operator's Licence - 1 Year						
- (1 vehicle)	164.00	0.00%	164.00	0.00	164.00	
- per each additional vehicle	16.40	0.00%	16.40	0.00	16.40	
- Private Hire Operator's Licence - 5 Year (1 Vehicle)			624.00	0.00	624.00	New 3 year license per legislation
- Private Hire Vehicle Licence per annum (charge excludes vehicle testing)	258.65	0.00%	258.65	0.00		
- Private Hire Driver Licence - 1 Year	56.85	1.70	58.55	0.00	58.60	
- Private Hire Driver Licence - 3 Year			144.00	0.00	144.00	New 3 year license per legislation
- Dual Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Driver's Licence - 1 Year	83.00	0.00%	83.00	0.00	83.00	
- Dual Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Driver's Licence - 3 Year			200.00	0.00	200.00	New 3 year license per legislation
- Knowledge test	20.00	0.00%	20.00	0.00	20.00	
- Administration Charge - new applications	35.00	0.00%	35.00	0.00	35.00	
- Transfer of plate - per transfer	47.00	1.00	48.00	0.00	48.00	
- Replacement Vehicle Plates	18.70	1.30	20.00	0.00	20.00	
- Replacement Driver's Badge (card)	11.00	0.00%	11.00	0.00	11.00	
- Amendment to paper licence - eg change of address	10.50	0.00%	10.50	0.00	10.50	
- DVLA Enquiry - Electronic	5.50	0.00%	5.50	0.00	5.50	
- DVLA Enquiry - Paper	10.50	0.00%	10.50	0.00	10.50	
- CRB Disclosure	50.00	0.00%	50.00	0.00	50.00	

**GENERAL LICENSING****Licensing Act 2003**

- Annual Street Trading Consent - Food - Initial - per annum	1,418.00	0.00%	1,418.00	0.00	1,418.00
- Annual Street Trading Consent - Food - Renewal - per annum	1,301.00	0.00%	1,301.00	0.00	1,301.00
- Annual Street Trading Consent - Non Food - Initial - per annum	1,183.00	0.00%	1,183.00	0.00	1,183.00
- Annual Street Trading Consent - Non Food - Renewal - per annum	1,064.00	0.00%	1,064.00	0.00	1,064.00
- Animal Boarding - Initial	110.00	3.00	113.00	0.00	113.00
- Animal Boarding - Renewal	110.00	3.00	113.00	0.00	113.00
- Animal Boarding - Vet fees/Animal welfare visit if applicable charged at cost	Recharged at cost		Recharged at cost		Recharged at cost
- Dog Breeding - Initial	110.00	3.00	113.00	0.00	113.00
- Dog Breeding - Renewal	110.00	3.00	113.00	0.00	113.00
- Dog Breeding - Vet fees/Animal welfare visit if applicable charged at cost	Recharged at cost		Recharged at cost		Recharged at cost
- Dangerous Wild Animals - Initial	175.00	5.00	180.00	0.00	180.00
- Dangerous Wild Animals - Renewal	175.00	5.00	180.00	0.00	180.00
- Dangerous Wild Animals - Vet fees/Animal welfare visit if applicable charged at cost	Recharged at cost		Recharged at cost		Recharged at cost
- Pet Shops - Initial	110.00	3.00	113.00	0.00	113.00
- Pet Shops - Renewal	110.00	3.00	113.00	0.00	113.00
- Pet Shops - Vet fees / Animal welfare visit if applicable charged at cost	Recharged at cost		Recharged at cost		Recharged at cost
- Riding Establishments	170.00	5.00	175.00	0.00	175.00
- Riding Establishment - Vet fees / Animal welfare visit if applicable charged at cost	Recharged at cost		Recharged at cost		Recharged at cost
- Control of Sex Establishments	979.00	0.00%	979.00	0.00	979.00
- Zoo - Initial	110.00	3.00	113.00	0.00	113.00
- Zoo - Renewal	110.00	3.00	113.00	0.00	113.00
- Zoo - Vet fees/Animal welfare visit if applicable charged at cost			Recharged at cost		Recharged at cost

**Acupuncture, Tattooing, Ear Piercing and Electrolysis**

- Premises	125.00	0.00%	125.00	0.00	125.00
- Practitioners	82.00	0.00%	82.00	0.00	82.00

**Scrap Metal Dealers Act 2013**

- Site Licence (New)	290.00	0.00%	290.00	0.00	290.00
Per Additional Site	150.00	0.00%	150.00	0.00	150.00
- Collectors Licence (New)	145.00	0.00%	145.00	0.00	145.00
- Site Licence (Renewal)	240.00	0.00%	240.00	0.00	240.00
Per Additional Site	150.00	0.00%	150.00	0.00	150.00
- Collectors Licence (Renewal)	95.00	0.00%	95.00	0.00	95.00
- Variation of Licence	65.00	0.00%	65.00	0.00	65.00
- Copy of Licence (if lost or stolen)	25.00	0.00%	25.00	0.00	25.00



<b>ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH</b>					
<b><u>Dog Warden</u></b>					
- Penalty (statutory fee)	25.00	0.00%	25.00	0.00	25.00
- Kennelling Fee - £12 per day or part day	12.00	0.00%	12.00	0.00	12.00
- Admin charge	10.00	0.00%	10.00	0.00	10.00
- Levy for out of hours	30.00	0.00%	30.00	0.00	30.00
- Repeat offence levy	25.00	0.00%	25.00	0.00	25.00
<b>GAMBLING FEES</b>					
<b><u>Premises Licence Fees - Discretionary</u></b>					
<b><u>Bingo Premises</u></b>					
- Grant	2,128.00	0.00%	2,128.00	0.00	2,128.00
- Annual Fee	626.00	0.00%	626.00	0.00	626.00
- Variation	1,064.00	0.00%	1,064.00	0.00	1,064.00
- Transfer	730.00	0.00%	730.00	0.00	730.00
- Application for Provisional Statement	2,128.00	0.00%	2,128.00	0.00	2,128.00
- Licence Application (Provisional Statement Holders)	730.00	0.00%	730.00	0.00	730.00
- Copy of Licence	25.00	0.00%	25.00	0.00	25.00
- Notification of Change	50.00	0.00%	50.00	0.00	50.00
- Re-instatement Fee	730.00	0.00%	730.00	0.00	730.00
<b><u>Adult Gaming Centre</u></b>					
- Grant	1,216.00	0.00%	1,216.00	0.00	1,216.00
- Annual Fee	626.00	0.00%	626.00	0.00	626.00
- Variation	626.00	0.00%	626.00	0.00	626.00
- Transfer	730.00	0.00%	730.00	0.00	730.00
- Application for Provisional Statement	1,216.00	0.00%	1,216.00	0.00	1,216.00
- Licence Application (Provisional Statement Holders)	730.00	0.00%	730.00	0.00	730.00
- Copy of Licence	25.00	0.00%	25.00	0.00	25.00
- Notification of Change	50.00	0.00%	50.00	0.00	50.00
- Application by Re-instatement	730.00	0.00%	730.00	0.00	730.00
<b><u>Family Entertainment Centre</u></b>					
- Grant	1,216.00	0.00%	1,216.00	0.00	1,216.00
- Annual Fee	578.00	0.00%	578.00	0.00	578.00
- Variation	626.00	0.00%	626.00	0.00	626.00
- Transfer	608.00	0.00%	608.00	0.00	608.00
- Application for Provisional Statement	1,216.00	0.00%	1,216.00	0.00	1,216.00
- Licence Application (Provisional Statement Holders)	608.00	0.00%	608.00	0.00	608.00
- Copy of Licence	25.00	0.00%	25.00	0.00	25.00
- Notification of Change	50.00	0.00%	50.00	0.00	50.00
- Application by Re-instatement	596.00	0.00%	596.00	0.00	596.00
<b><u>Betting Premises (excluding tracks)</u></b>					
- Grant	1,817.00	0.00%	1,817.00	0.00	1,817.00
- Annual Fee	364.00	0.00%	364.00	0.00	364.00
- Variation	908.00	0.00%	908.00	0.00	908.00
- Transfer	727.00	0.00%	727.00	0.00	727.00
- Application for Provisional Statement	1,817.00	0.00%	1,817.00	0.00	1,817.00
- Licence Application (Provisional Statement Holders)	727.00	0.00%	727.00	0.00	727.00
- Copy of Licence	25.00	0.00%	25.00	0.00	25.00

- Notification of Change	50.00	0.00%	50.00	0.00	50.00
- Application by Re-instatement	730.00	0.00%	730.00	0.00	730.00
<b><u>Betting Premises (Including Tracks)</u></b>					
- Grant	1,817.00	0.00%	1,817.00	0.00	1,817.00
- Annual Fee	364.00	0.00%	364.00	0.00	364.00
- Variation	908.00	0.00%	908.00	0.00	908.00
- Transfer	727.00	0.00%	727.00	0.00	727.00
- Application for Provisional Statement	1,817.00	0.00%	1,817.00	0.00	1,817.00
- Licence Application (Provisional Statement Holders)	727.00	0.00%	727.00	0.00	727.00
- Copy of Licence	25.00	0.00%	25.00	0.00	25.00
- Notification of Change	50.00	0.00%	50.00	0.00	50.00
- Application by Re-instatement	730.00	0.00%	730.00	0.00	730.00
<b><u>Temporary Event Use Notice</u></b>					
- Grant	304.00	0.00%	304.00	0.00	304.00
- Copy of Licence	15.00	0.00%	15.00	0.00	15.00

**GAMBLING ACT PERMIT FEES - STATUTORY****Licensed Premises Gaming Machine Permit**

- Grant	150.00	0.00%	150.00	0.00	150.00
- Existing operator grant	100.00	0.00%	100.00	0.00	100.00
- Variation	100.00	0.00%	100.00	0.00	100.00
- Transfer	25.00	0.00%	25.00	0.00	25.00
- Annual Fee	50.00	0.00%	50.00	0.00	50.00
- Change of name	25.00	0.00%	25.00	0.00	25.00
- Copy of Permit	15.00	0.00%	15.00	0.00	15.00

**Licensed Premises Automatic Notification Process**

- Grant	50.00	0.00%	50.00	0.00	50.00
---------	-------	-------	-------	------	-------

**Club Gaming Permits**

- Grant	200.00	0.00%	200.00	0.00	200.00
- Grant (Club Premises Certificate holder)	100.00	0.00%	100.00	0.00	100.00
- Existing operator grant	100.00	0.00%	100.00	0.00	100.00
- Variation	100.00	0.00%	100.00	0.00	100.00
- Renewal	200.00	0.00%	200.00	0.00	200.00
- Renewal (Club Premises Certificate holder)	100.00	0.00%	100.00	0.00	100.00
- Annual Fee	50.00	0.00%	50.00	0.00	50.00
- Change of Name	100.00	0.00%	100.00	0.00	100.00
- Copy of Permit	15.00	0.00%	15.00	0.00	15.00

**Club Machine Permits**

- Grant	200.00	0.00%	200.00	0.00	200.00
- Grant (Club Premises Certificate holder)	100.00	0.00%	100.00	0.00	100.00
- Existing operator grant	100.00	0.00%	100.00	0.00	100.00
- Variation	100.00	0.00%	100.00	0.00	100.00
- Renewal	200.00	0.00%	200.00	0.00	200.00
- Renewal (Club Premises Certificate holder)	100.00	0.00%	100.00	0.00	100.00
- Annual Fee	50.00	0.00%	50.00	0.00	50.00
- Copy of Permit	15.00	0.00%	15.00	0.00	15.00
- Change of Name	25.00	0.00%	25.00	0.00	25.00
- Transfer of Permit	25.00	0.00%	25.00	0.00	25.00

**Family Entertainment Centre Gaming Machine Permit**

- Grant	300.00	0.00%	300.00	0.00	300.00
- Existing operator grant	100.00	0.00%	100.00	0.00	100.00
- Change of name	25.00	0.00%	25.00	0.00	25.00
- Renewal	300.00	0.00%	300.00	0.00	300.00
- Copy of Permit	15.00	0.00%	15.00	0.00	15.00

**Prize Gaming Permits**

- Grant	300.00	0.00%	300.00	0.00	300.00
- Existing operator grant	100.00	0.00%	100.00	0.00	100.00
- Change of name	25.00	0.00%	25.00	0.00	25.00
- Renewal	300.00	0.00%	300.00	0.00	300.00
- Copy of Permit	15.00	0.00%	15.00	0.00	15.00
- Transitional Application Fee	100.00	0.00%	100.00	0.00	100.00

**Small Lottery Registration (set by legislation)**

- Grant	40.00	0.00%	40.00	0.00	40.00
- Annual fee	20.00	0.00%	20.00	0.00	20.00

**FEE LICENSING 16-17 STATUTORY**

**Premises Licence and Club Premises Certificate**

**Non- Domestic rateable value of premises**

		0.00%			
BAND A	0 - 4,300	0.00%	0 - 4,300	0.00	0 - 4,300
BAND B	4,301 - 33,000	0.00%	4,301 - 33,000		4,301 - 33,000
BAND C	33,001 - 87,000	0.00%	33,001 - 87,000		33,001 - 87,000
BAND D	87,001 - 125,000	0.00%	87,001 - 125,000		87,001 - 125,000
BAND E	125,001 and over	0.00%	125,001 and over		125,001 and over

**New applications and variations**

BAND A	100.00	0.00%	100.00	0.00	100.00
BAND B	190.00	0.00%	190.00	0.00	190.00
BAND C	315.00	0.00%	315.00	0.00	315.00
BAND D	450.00	0.00%	450.00	0.00	450.00
BAND E	635.00	0.00%	635.00	0.00	635.00

**Annual Fee**

BAND A	70.00	0.00%	70.00	0.00	70.00
BAND B	180.00	0.00%	180.00	0.00	180.00
BAND C	295.00	0.00%	295.00	0.00	295.00
BAND D	320.00	0.00%	320.00	0.00	320.00
BAND E	350.00	0.00%	350.00	0.00	350.00

Property not subject to non-domestic rates will fall into Band A. Properties, which have not yet been constructed will fall into band C.

Those premises which fall into Band 'D' will be subject to two times the amount of fee payable as outlined above, whilst those premises which fall into Band 'E' will be subject to three times the amount of fee payable, **if they are used exclusively or primarily for the carrying on of the retail of alcohol for consumption on the premises**, i.e. large public houses.

**Large Events**

An additional fee will be charged where the maximum number of persons exceeds 5000 at a licensable event. Please contact the Licensing Section for further details.

**Exemptions**

Church Halls, Community Halls, Village Halls, or other similar building etc. are exempt from paying any fees for a premises licence authorising **ONLY** the provision of regulated entertainment. If the retail of alcohol is to be included in the Premises Licence, the full fee will be payable as outlined above.

No fees are payable by an educational institution, such as a school or a college (whose pupils/students have not attained the age of 19) for a premises licence authorising **ONLY** the provision of regulated entertainment providing that is for and on behalf of the educational institution.

Application for copy of licence or summary on theft, loss etc.	10.50	0.00%	10.50	0.00	10.50
Notification of change of name or address (holder of premises licence)	10.50	0.00%	10.50	0.00	10.50
Application to vary the Designated Premises Supervisor	23.00	0.00%	23.00	0.00	23.00
Application to transfer a premises licence	23.00	0.00%	23.00	0.00	23.00
Interim authority notice following death etc. of licence holder	23.00	0.00%	23.00	0.00	23.00
Application for making of a provisional statement	315.00	0.00%	315.00	0.00	315.00
Application for copy of certificate or summary on theft, loss etc.	10.50	0.00%	10.50	0.00	10.50
Notification of change of name or alteration of club rules	10.50	0.00%	10.50	0.00	10.50
Change of relevant registered address of club	10.50	0.00%	10.50	0.00	10.50
Temporary Event Notices	21.00	0.00%	21.00	0.00	21.00
Application for copy of licence on theft, loss etc. of temporary event notice	10.50	0.00%	10.50	0.00	10.50
Application for copy of licence on theft, loss etc. of personal licence	10.50	0.00%	10.50	0.00	10.50
Notification of change of name or address (Personal Licence)	10.50	0.00%	10.50	0.00	10.50
Notice of interest in any premises	21.00	0.00%	21.00	0.00	21.00
Minor variation application	89.00	0.00%	89.00	0.00	89.00

Should you need assistance in determining which level of fee you are required to pay, please contact the Licensing Section on (01527) 881473 or (01527) 881626.

Alternatively email - [licensing@bromsgrove.gov.uk](mailto:licensing@bromsgrove.gov.uk)

In all cases, cheques must be made payable to 'Bromsgrove District Council'

**Premises Licences & Club Premises Certificates Fees**  
**Licensing Act 2003**

The fees for applications for new licenses, or variations are set according to the rateable value of the premises to be licensed

**Band:**

**A (0 - 4,300)**

Initial Fee	100.00	0.00%	100.00	0.00	100.00
Annual Charge	70.00	0.00%	70.00	0.00	70.00

**B (4,301 - 33,000)**

Initial Fee	190.00	0.00%	190.00	0.00	190.00
Annual Charge	180.00	0.00%	180.00	0.00	180.00

**C (33,001 - 87,000)**

Initial Fee	315.00	0.00%	315.00	0.00	315.00
Annual Charge	295.00	0.00%	295.00	0.00	295.00

**D (87,001 - 125,000)**

Initial Fee	450.00	0.00%	450.00	0.00	450.00
Annual Charge	320.00	0.00%	320.00	0.00	320.00

**E (125,001 & over)**

Initial Fee	635.00	0.00%	635.00	0.00	635.00
Annual Charge	350.00	0.00%	350.00	0.00	350.00

For premises whose business is mainly alcohol-related (not Registered Clubs) fees for Premises in Band D and E are as follows

**D(x2) (87,001 - 125,000)**

Initial Fee	900.00	0.00%	900.00	0.00	900.00
Annual Charge	640.00	0.00%	640.00	0.00	640.00

**E(x2) (125,001 & over)**

Initial Fee	1,905.00	0.00%	1,905.00	0.00	1,905.00
Annual Charge	1,050.00	0.00%	1,050.00	0.00	1,050.00

**Personal Licence (For 10 Years)**

	37.00	0.00%	37.00	0.00	37.00
--	-------	-------	-------	------	-------

**Temporary Event Notice (Per Notice)**

	21.00	0.00%	21.00	0.00	21.00
--	-------	-------	-------	------	-------

0.00%



# Overview & Scrutiny

## Leisure Services Options Short, Sharp Review

December 2015



[www.redditchbc.gov.uk](http://www.redditchbc.gov.uk)





## CONTENTS

	Page Number
Chair's Foreword	2
Summary of Recommendations	3
Introduction/Background Information	5
Chapter 1: External Service Provision	9
Chapter 2: Working in Partnership	17
Chapter 3: Council Services	20
Conclusion	22
Appendix 1 - Terms of Reference	23
Appendix 2 - Witnesses	26
Appendix 3 - Timeline of Activities	27
Appendix 4 – Blank Template Questionnaire	28
Appendix 5 – Declarations of Interest	30
Appendix 6 – Table: Service Delivery Models	31

**Membership of the Task Group**

Councillors Jayne Potter (Chair), Tom Baker-Price, Gay Hopkins and Paul Swansborough.

**Completed**

December 2015

**Contact**

Further copies of this report are available on request from:

Address: Overview and Scrutiny Team, Democratic Services, Redditch Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH

Email: [scrutiny@redditchbc.gov.uk](mailto:scrutiny@redditchbc.gov.uk)

**FOREWORD**

Our leisure and cultural services, including the Palace Theatre and Forge Mill Needle Museum, are a great credit to Redditch and provide very useful and interesting amenities for our residents.

However a large subsidy is currently required from the taxpayer to maintain these services which may lead to cuts being necessary in the near future as a result of the national economic situation. It was with this in mind that we wanted to investigate what other Councils have done in order to maintain services, and in many cases improve them.

We sent a simple questionnaire to a number of Councils and were very pleased with the quantity and quality of responses that we received. This led to us visiting Chase Leisure Centre where we met representatives of Cannock Chase District Council and also meeting with the Leader of Tamworth Borough Council. At Cannock, where an external trust delivers leisure services, we were overwhelmed by the quality and variety of services they now offer. Chase Leisure Centre now works closely with MacMillan Nurses, Clinical Commissioning Groups and many other public agencies to help their residents lead more healthy and fulfilling lives.

All the Councils we contacted had made considerable savings in the region of a minimum of £200,000-£300,000 per year and were able to maintain or improve rather than cut services. We therefore came to the conclusion that the status quo in Redditch is not an option but that we must seek to secure services for our residents and hopefully improve them by working with an outside organisation.

I would like to thank the members of the group namely, Gay Hopkins, Tom Baker-Price and Paul Swansborough for their help, support and enthusiasm, as well as Jess Bayley, Democratic services Officer, who has worked hard to help us establish the facts and liaise with members of other Councils. I would also like to acknowledge the generosity of those Councils which responded and in particular Cannock Chase and Tamworth Councils who went above and beyond by giving us their time and detailed advice.



**Councillor Jayne Potter,  
Chair of the Leisure Services Options Short, Sharp Review**

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS****CHAPTER 1: EXTERNAL SERVICE PROVISION****Recommendation 1**

**The Council should enter into a procurement process for an external provider to run the following services:**

- **The Abbey Stadium**
- **Forge Mill Needle Museum**
- **The Palace Theatre (including the Palace Youth Theatre)**
- **Pitcheroak Golf Course**

**Financial Implications:** The group have been advised that it could cost the Council £75,000 to undertake a competitive tendering process to procure an external provider to manage Council leisure services. This figure was also detailed in the Options Appraisal report considered by Members in July 2015. There may also be additional costs, in terms of officer time in relation to the procurement process which are difficult to calculate as it would be dependent on the time involved (Members have been advised it could take between 12 months to two years to complete this process).

The group is contending that significant financial savings could be secured in the long-term if this recommendation is implemented, though it is not possible to provide any figures as this would be dependent on the content of the final contract. This could include efficiency savings and capital investment from an external service provider in leisure facilities within the Borough. If a charitable trust secures a contract with the Council additional savings may be achieved in relation to VAT, though there could potentially be costs arising from business rates which at the time of writing remain to be clarified in the Comprehensive Spending Review.

(Further detailed information relating to the financial implications of this recommendation is provided in the report).

**Legal Implications:** The Council would need to conduct this procurement process in accordance with European procurement rules. The Legal Services team would need to be involved in helping to negotiate a contract on behalf of the Council. This approach to service delivery also has clear governance implications for the Council. These are addressed in the report. Depending on the outcomes of this process staff would need to be transferred to an external service provider via TUPE transfer and this would have financial implications, particularly with regard to pension arrangements.

**CHAPTER 2: WORKING IN PARTNERSHIP****Recommendation 2**

**Redditch Borough Council should consult with Bromsgrove District Council about whether Arts Development (including Events) and Sports Development can be included in the procurement process referred to in Recommendation 1. Both Councils would need to make a decision about whether this would be appropriate.**

**Financial Implications:** There are no direct financial implications to consulting with Bromsgrove District Council regarding this proposal except in terms of officer time. However, Members are contending that if Arts Development and Sports Development could be included within the procurement process referred to in Recommendation 1 above further efficiency savings could be achieved by both Councils in the long-term.

**Legal implications:** The Arts and Events team and Sports Development are both shared services. Consequently both Councils would need to make a decision in support of outsourcing these services if they were to be included within the procurement process referred to in Recommendation 1 above. Members are asked to note that if one Council supported inclusion of these shared services in the procurement process and the other Council did not approve this proposal there would be very complex legal issues, relating to shared services, TUPE transfer of staff and maintaining services for the Council that did not support the proposal, which would take time and resources to resolve.

**Recommendation 3**

**The Council should enter into discussions with RSA Academy Arrow Vale and Tudor Grange Academy Redditch concerning future operating arrangements for Arrow Vale Sport Centre and Kingsley Sport Centre.**

**Financial Implications:** There are no direct financial implications in relation to entering into discussions with RSA Academy Arrow Vale and Tudor Grange Academy Redditch except in terms of Officer time.

**Legal implications:** There are no direct legal implications to this recommendation. Members of the group believe that no changes to Council services that might impact on the future operating arrangements at Arrow Vale Sports Centre and Kingsley Sports Centre should be considered without the Council first entering into discussions with the respective schools.

**CHAPTER 3: COUNCIL SERVICES**

The group recognises that there are a small number of the Council's leisure and cultural services that are not directly affected by these recommendations. The group believes that these services should continue to be delivered by the Council at this time. The reasons why Members reached this conclusion are detailed in Chapter Three of the report.

## INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND INFORMATION

### Background

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee launched a Task Group review of the Abbey Stadium in 2013. Following consideration of the findings from this review it was agreed by the Executive Committee in June 2014 that:

- a) the Council should explore the options for a leisure trust to manage some or all of its facilities, including the Abbey Stadium; and
- b) the Overview and Scrutiny Committee should be given the opportunity to pre-scrutinise any final business case relating to the future operation of some or all of the Council's leisure facilities, including the Abbey Stadium, prior to its submission to the Executive Committee.

In April 2015, following discussions of progress in relation to this matter, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed that an item on the Executive Committee's Work Programme, the *Review of Operation of Leisure Services*, should be subject to detailed pre-decision scrutiny. (This report outlined initial findings from an options appraisal of leisure service delivery at the Council). Discussions about this report took place at three consecutive Overview and Scrutiny Committee meetings in June and July 2015.

At a meeting of the Executive Committee on 14th July 2015 Members considered the options appraisal. During this meeting Members agreed that further work by Officers was required prior to a decision on the future delivery of leisure and cultural services being taken. The findings from this further work are currently scheduled to be considered by the Executive Committee in January 2016.

In this context the Overview and Scrutiny Committee concluded that a more detailed scrutiny review, focusing on the future delivery of leisure services by the Council, would be helpful. A decision was taken to launch this exercise as a Short, Sharp Review to ensure that Members could complete their investigations by the end of the calendar year in time for any approved recommendations to be built into the Council's budget.

There were a number of key objectives to this review (to view further detail about the group's terms of reference please refer to Appendix 1):

- To consider the general requirements of a number of different models of service delivery which could be used to provide the Council's leisure and cultural services (the list of service delivery models considered by the group corresponded with the different models listed in the *Review of Operation of Leisure Services* report published in July 2015). The full list of models considered by the group can be viewed in Appendix 1.
- To review the financial implications for the Council of all of the service delivery models.
- To assess the implications of each model for the quality of services.
- To consider the governance arrangements that would apply in relation to each model.
- To consult with other local authorities about the operational models that they have adopted for the delivery of leisure and cultural services.

- To identify suitable delivery models for the Council's leisure and cultural services (including considering whether different delivery models might be suitable for different elements of leisure and cultural services).

### Evidence Gathering

The group gathered evidence from a variety of sources during the course of the review. Information about the various different service delivery models was obtained from a number of written reports. In particular Members found the following reports useful:

- *Alternative Service Delivery Models: Discussion Document* (Grant Thornton, May 2015).
- *Responding to the Challenge: Alternative Delivery Models in Local Government* (Grant Thornton, January 2014).
- *Local Authority Sport and Recreation Services in England: Where Next?* (The Association of Public Service Excellence – APSE, October 2012).
- *Spreading Their Wings: Building a Successful Local Authority Trading Company* (Grant Thornton, 2015).

The group's conclusions regarding each of the service delivery models that they rejected and the reasons why they concluded that those models would not be suitable in Redditch are outlined at Appendix 6.

Information was also requested from Council Officers about the current financial costs involved in managing the Council's leisure and cultural services and the governance arrangements that would need to be put in place if the Council was to adopt alternative models of service delivery. This information was provided in both a written form and verbally during a number of interviews. The evidence included a detailed breakdown of the financial costs involved in maintaining the Council's leisure and cultural services together with the income that had been accrued from these services over the past three years.

At the start of the review Members agreed that it would be essential for the group to consult with other local authorities. The group was keen to learn about the service delivery models that had been adopted by other Councils, the rationale for adopting those models and the impact that this had had both in terms of service quality and on local authority finances. A decision was taken to dispatch questionnaires to the lead Officer and relevant Portfolio Holder at 19 local authorities. This comprised 15 authorities which were selected on the basis of the comparability of services and demographics to Redditch Borough Council at the time the questionnaires were sent and four Councils selected on the basis of close geographical proximity to the Borough. A total of 12 Councils returned completed questionnaires of which 11 are listed in the acknowledgements in Appendix 2 (one Council requested that their identity remain anonymous which has been respected in this report).

The information provided in the completed questionnaires was very useful and helped to inform the group's final recommendations. On the basis of these responses additional information was requested from three Councils.

- A visit was undertaken to Chase Leisure Centre in Cannock Chase, Staffordshire, where representatives of Cannock Chase District Council and Wigan Leisure and Culture Trust (WLCT) kindly provided the group with a tour of the building and advice about working with an external service provider.

- An interview was held with Councillor Danny Cook, Leader of Tamworth Borough Council, concerning the approach the authority has adopted to delivering leisure and cultural services within their Borough.
- Written information was provided about the unique operational arrangements in place at Newcastle-Under-Lyme Borough Council to manage their community centres.

Members would particularly like to thank these three Councils for their advice and support during the course of this review. The evidence they provided helped the group to clarify a number of points and to identify actions that they felt should be taken to enhance the delivery of leisure and cultural services within Redditch Borough.

### Local Considerations

Currently a large range of leisure and cultural services, which are discretionary services, are directly managed by the Council (some of which are shared with Bromsgrove District Council). These include:

- Leisure centres, including the Abbey Stadium, Arrow Vale Sports Centre and Kingsley Sports Centre
- Sports development
- Arts development
- Events, such as the bonfire night and Morton Stanley Festival
- Community centres
- Allotments
- The Palace Theatre
- Forge Mill Needle Museum and Bordesley Abbey
- Pitcheroak golf course
- Parks and open spaces, including Arrow Valley Park and Morton Stanley Park
- Play areas
- Business development services, including the room bookings system, marketing and sponsorship and facilities management

The estimated net direct costs to the Council of delivering leisure and cultural services in 2015/16 are £1.5 million. This excludes the costs of support services (also known as enabling services), indirect costs and borrowing costs. The group also did not ask Officers to provide financial details for the costs of delivering Business Development services, such as the room booking service, because they determined at an early stage that these services were integral to the operation of the Council and should therefore continue to be delivered in house.

When considering alternative models of service delivery Members have been advised that only direct costs should be taken into account. The estimated gross expenditure for 2015/16 on leisure and cultural services is approximately £4 million, with £2.5 million generated in income across the leisure services that the Council delivers.

Throughout the review Members were mindful of the significance of leisure and cultural services to a number of the Council's priorities. In particular, these services are relevant to two of the Council's strategic purposes; "provide good things for me to do, see and visit" and "help me to live my life independently (including health and activity)". The group was keen to ensure that any actions proposed in their recommendations enhanced the Council's ability to meet these objectives.

In addition, the Council, as a member of the Redditch Partnership, remains committed to tackling health inequalities. Members of the group are aware that through participation in leisure and cultural services residents can be assisted with addressing health problems related to obesity as well as provided with helpful support in relation to any mental health difficulties they may experience. The group was keen to ensure that any actions they proposed enabled the Council to continue to meet the needs of the local community in this respect.

When discussing potential recommendations the group considered key objectives that Members felt the Council should attempt to achieve in future in respect of leisure and cultural services. This took into account both local priorities as well as the increasingly challenging economic environment in which local government operates.

- A need to ensure that good quality leisure and cultural services are provided to residents living in the Borough
- A desire to make sure that leisure and cultural services remain sustainable
- The benefits for the Council of achieving efficiency savings

The group's final recommendations were informed by these considerations as their vision for the future of leisure and cultural services in the Borough.





the *Local Authority Sport and Recreation Services in England: Where Next?* report (APSE, 2012) it was noted that “...two thirds of local authorities (have) observed a shift from the role of ‘provider’ to ‘facilitator’ since 1997 and within the next five years, two-thirds perceive the core remit of sports services being one of ‘facilitator’ or ‘enabler’”. In the majority of these reports the report authors had noted that local authorities often have arranged for a leisure trust, either an existing leisure trust operating across multiple authorities or a new local leisure trust, or, less frequently, for a private company to deliver leisure services on the Council’s behalf.

This pattern of external service provision was mirrored in the arrangements in place at the Councils which completed questionnaires for the consideration of the group. In total 11 of the 12 Councils consulted by the group confirmed that at least some of their leisure and cultural services were delivered by another organisation, sometimes alongside other leisure services which the Council continued to deliver directly. A variety of service delivery models had been adopted by these Councils including working with an external leisure trust, having a contract with a private sector company, services delivered by a bespoke local leisure trust and delivery of specific services by a local voluntary sector group. Furthermore, the choice of which services to outsource to an external service provider varied; at some local authorities all leisure and cultural services were managed by an external provider whilst at other Councils only specific services were delivered by another body, most commonly leisure centres.

A number of key benefits arising from service provision by another (non-Council) service provider were highlighted by these Councils:

- Increases in participation in physical activities. In some cases this had been achieved because the Council had set specific targets within their contracts which the external service provider had to meet.
- The ability to retain services. A number of Councils commented that leisure and cultural services would not have been sustainable if the Council had continued to deliver them directly due to budget pressures.
- External providers specialising in leisure and cultural services could focus on direct delivery of those services without having to address the additional distractions that impact on Council staff, such as attending Committee meetings. Typical of this view was the Council that commented “...in terms of services the Trust is a single focus organisation and is therefore at liberty to market the services and facilities much more effectively than...another Council department.”
- Councils which had opted to work with an existing leisure trust or private company specialising in delivering leisure services frequently noted that the quality of local services benefitted from the expertise of these organisations.
- In many cases services and equipment had been updated, partly due to requirements in leisure contracts, though also in cases where the service provider specialised in delivering additional activities that had not previously been explored by the Council.
- In every case Councils reported that they had been able to achieve significant efficiency savings as a result of working with an external service provider.
- The range of benefits arising from working with an external service provider were best summarised by one local authority respondent: “A well-established external operator is best placed to ensure the leisure offer is keeping up with the changing landscape to ensure that it remains relevant and meeting the aspirations of the community. There are economies of scale with large operators providing significant levels of strategic management support which a Council is unable to as well as being able to share best practice across contracts as opposed to working in isolation.”

In the majority of cases the Councils that completed the group's questionnaire commented that they would adopt the same approach again if the choice arose. Indeed, in a number of cases the Councils had recently reached new agreements with external organisations and trusts regarding the future delivery of services based on their previous positive experience. However, some respondents did suggest that the Council should be cautious when considering whether to establish a new leisure trust to deliver leisure and cultural services. It was suggested that a new trust could be expensive to establish and might represent a financial risk in an already competitive leisure services market.

### Finances

One of the main benefits of working with an external service provider that was highlighted by the other Councils in their responses were the financial savings that had been achieved. The level of savings varied according to the terms of the contracts that had been negotiated by the Council. In some cases Councils had set targets for efficiency savings in their contracts. In other cases lower efficiency savings were anticipated though significant capital investment from the external provider had been agreed in contract negotiations. Specific figures in terms of efficiency savings are not quoted here out of respect for commercial sensitivities. However, it can be confirmed that efficiency savings reported to the group varied from £350,000 per year to £2.2 million over a period of three years.

The local authorities also highlighted a number of additional financial advantages from working with an external service provider:

- By working with an external service provider the financial risks to the Council involved in delivering leisure services, particularly in leisure centres, could be reduced: *“By outsourcing the operational management to an external operator, the Council has transferred significant financial risk for the day to day running of the centres to the operator.”*
- Councils working with an external leisure trust or with a private company benefited from sharing overheads with other customers in relation to covering the costs of back office functions such as Human Resources.
- The transfer of relevant employees under TUPE arrangements had led to a reduction in expenditure at those Councils on the staff payroll. As staff wages and associated costs represent a relatively large part of local authority expenditure this had led to savings for the Council over time.
- The transfer of staff had also led to a reduction in demand for back office functions at the local authorities. Councils had responded to this in various ways, including by negotiating target budget reductions with the managers of effected back office functions in order to avoid the need for redundancies.
- Some Councils reported that there would always be certain leisure services that would need a local authority subsidy to continue to be provided due to a variety of reasons, including limited market appeal or local competition. However, where Councils were working with an external service provider the level of subsidy that was required from the local authority had fallen significantly.
- Councils working with either a bespoke local leisure trust or an external leisure trust, particularly those Councils which had been working with a trust for some time, reported advantages in terms of reduced VAT and business rate payments.

Members investigated VAT exemptions for trusts in some detail as they recognised that this could have implications for the Council's choice of appropriate service delivery

model. The group has been advised by Officers that leisure trusts are eligible for exemptions on some payments which were not applicable to local authorities. For example, whilst the Council charges VAT for certain leisure service activities, which is included within the fees and charges for those activities, a trust is exempt from paying VAT on these activities. Trusts do have to pay VAT on certain supplies and services which, unlike the Council, they cannot reclaim from HMRC. However, Officers have advised that the income from sport activities for which trusts do not have to pay VAT is higher than expenditure on supplies and services and therefore on balance a trust could secure savings from VAT exemptions when running Council leisure services. Officers have advised that, depending on the level of services that might be included within a contract, this could equate to savings of £45,000 – £50,000.

Business rates were also investigated by the group in detail as again Members understood that significant savings in this respect could influence the Council's choice of service delivery model. Currently business rates for Council buildings, including leisure facilities, constitute a relatively high financial cost for the Council. For example the group has been advised that the Abbey Stadium alone is subject to business rates of £130,000. At present there is a mandatory 80 per cent reduction in business rates for charitable organisations (including trusts), with the remaining 20 per cent of business rates subject to discretionary policies at the local authority level. The 80 per cent of reduced business rates have tended to be covered by the Government resulting in significant savings from business rates for local authorities that have adopted a trust model of service delivery to date. However, Members have been advised that the Government is in the process of changing the national Business Rate Scheme. Clarification about the implications of these changes is anticipated in the Comprehensive Spending Review on 25th November 2015. However, Officers have advised that there is the possibility that in future local authorities will be expected to cover 100 per cent of any reduced business rates available to charitable organisations.

At the time of writing this was all subject to speculation. The group would therefore urge the Executive Committee to obtain further clarification from Officers on this point as soon as it can be made available and feel that this potential development should be taken into account as part of any discussions about changes to the Council's approach to service delivery. However, based on this information and on the significant level of efficiency savings achieved by Councils working with both leisure trusts and private sector companies Members agree that the Council should be open to entering into a contract with either a trust or a private company to deliver leisure and cultural services in the Borough.

The group is aware that the estimated cost of £75,000 for the proposed procurement process would represent an additional budget pressure which would need to be incorporated into the Medium Term Financial Plan. However, Members are contending that these costs would be offset in the long-term by the efficiency savings and potentially capital investment that could be secured from working with an external service provider.

### Contract Terms

There are legal considerations to address when negotiating a contract. The contract negotiations would need to be conducted in accordance with part 15 of the Constitution: Contract Procedure Rules (which are currently in the process of being updated). According to the latest version of the rules available, published in November 2011, any procurement for goods and services which exceed the EU Procurement Thresholds, (£173,934 or works exceeding £4,348,350) the Council has to follow full EU Public

Procurement Directives. This essentially means that more complex procedures need to be followed than for standard procurement processes, potentially adding to the timeframes required to complete the process.

Many of the Councils that completed the group's questionnaire provided some useful, practical advice with regard to contracting out services. The key issues highlighted by these Councils for the group's consideration were:

- Service delivery arrangements need to meet the needs of people living in Redditch, particularly the most vulnerable.
- The benefits of reflecting on the unique selling points of leisure and cultural services in Redditch and of making sure that service delivery arrangements are suitable for these services. In particular Members were advised that assumptions should not be made that arrangements successfully in place in another district would necessarily suit Redditch.
- The Council should be flexible over options for service delivery and assess both the strengths and weaknesses of each service independently as well as collectively when making decisions: *"...be careful looking at one delivery model for all Leisure / Heritage / Culture Services. You may miss opportunities by a blinkered approach. Take each service as standalone, and then look for natural synergies before deciding one model is best."*
- Members were advised that there was a need for the Council to be realistic about the length of time and resources required to arrange for alternative models of service delivery to be introduced at the Council. Estimates on the length of time required varied between 12 months and two years. Any savings arising from new approaches to delivering services would also, consequently, be delayed until the whole contract negotiation process has been completed.
- The need to engage with affected staff and Trades Unions throughout the process and to be open and honest with employees about potential outcomes.
- Any changes to service delivery need to be based on detailed planning and have an evidence basis. In some cases Councils had based their decisions about service delivery on the findings contained in an options appraisal report or a bespoke local review of leisure services.

The group was also advised that the Council could detail particular objectives within any contract. This would help to ensure that any existing features of leisure and cultural services considered to be non-negotiable could be retained in the event of a new service provider assuming responsibility for the delivery of services. The group notes that this could include the following features (this is intended to provide a hypothetical list of examples rather than a definitive list of requirements which the group believes would need to be identified by senior Officers in consultation with the Executive Committee):

- A requirement for the Reddicard to be recognised at facilities operated by an external service provider on behalf of the Council in order for eligible residents to continue to be able to pay fees and charges at a concessionary level
- Free swimming provision for customers aged under 16 or over 60 years old
- Performance targets in respect of participation in physical activities
- Requirements to work in partnership with particular local partner organisations on specific projects

However, the group has been advised that the Council needs to be cautious about attempting to exert too much control over any external provider awarded a contract as this could be counterproductive. *"It is essential that the operator has the autonomy over*

*significant elements of the services and that the Council does not seek to unduly control this flexibility.*” For example, a controlling approach could prevent an external service provider from introducing projects and activities that had successfully attracted customers at leisure centres they manage in other parts of the country. In a worst case scenario organisations might be deterred from bidding in the procurement process or from offering favourable terms, both financially and in terms of the services that could be provided to customers.

### Governance

The group recognises, however, that the Council will want to retain some influence over service delivery in the Borough. For this reason Members considered potential governance arrangements as part of the review.

Members were advised that Council representatives, which could include elected Councillors, could be appointed to the board of a trust (if a trust secures a contract to deliver the Council’s leisure services). However, there are strict rules regarding the composition of a trust board; representation is usually calculated on a ratio basis of 2:11 in favour of more external representatives than Council representatives. The more Council representatives that are appointed to a board the more external representatives have to be appointed to achieve this balance, which can make it difficult for a board to operate effectively.

The group has been advised that it is more likely that the Council will retain influence over service delivery, regardless of what type of service provider is successful in the procurement process, through contract management arrangements. Frequently a requirement of contracts negotiated with an external service provider is that representatives of the organisations will meet with relevant officers from the Council to discuss performance. The frequency of these meetings can be negotiated but provide opportunities for both parties to raise any concerns about service risks or to discuss new developments. The Council can use these meetings as an opportunity to scrutinise services. Direct Member involvement with an external provider could be limited. At some Councils the relevant Portfolio Holder was invited to attend meetings between officers and representatives of the service provider to discuss service targets and any challenges. However, Members were advised that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, which holds local decision makers to account, would have limited opportunities to require representatives of an external service provider to attend Committee meetings. Instead, the Committee would need to focus on holding the service to account through Council Officers responsible for managing and monitoring the contract with the external service provider.

### Staffing implications

The group understands that the actions they are proposing in this recommendation will have clear implications for staff employed by the Council to deliver leisure and cultural services. Staff would need to be transferred in accordance with the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006 (also known as TUPE). This transfer would be subject to negotiations with the external service provider but Members would expect staff to be entitled to maintain current terms and conditions when transferred. The group would also urge senior Officers to engage with staff and Trades Unions throughout this process, through regular briefings, to ensure that staff understand and are engaged with the process.

Members have been advised that pensions can be one of the most complex areas for Councils and external providers to resolve during contract negotiations. Staff who are part of the local government pension scheme would retain the right to remain in that scheme. The Council would need to cover any deficit in terms of employer pension contributions up to the point at which the staff transferred and the service provider could expect to cover pension contributions from the date of transfer. However, Members have also been advised that every three years actuaries review pensions and this can lead to a change in the pension contribution required from the employer. The Council might then have to increase contributions to cover the deficit for the years preceding the staff transfer. There may also be a requirement for an increase on the contributions for staff for their years of service after they have transferred to the new service provider. Cover for this additional contribution would need to be discussed with the external service provider during contract negotiations; in some instances the local authority has covered these increases whilst in other cases alternative arrangements have been agreed. The group has been advised that in order to negotiate pensions effectively the Council should also consult with Worcestershire County Council, as the lead for local government pensions in the county, at an early stage in the process.

The group are keen to clarify that their proposals are in no way intended as a criticism of existing staff and they recognise that staff work incredibly hard. In many cases without this hard work the Council would be subsidising leisure and cultural services at a much higher level. However, in the current economic circumstances the group is contending that the Council cannot continue to deliver these services directly. Furthermore, Members believe that staff will have greater opportunities for career development working for an external service provider and will have more flexibility to work on new ideas and initiatives that the Council lacks the resources to support.

#### Local Considerations

The Council currently has contracts with two external service providers for Pitcheroak Golf Course; one for the café on the site and the other for provision of golf services. In both cases these contracts are due to expire in October 2016. Members have been advised that the golf course can be included in the services listed in this recommendation as management of this contract could be novated to an external service provider.

During the review Members discussed the possibility of managing Forge Mill Needle Museum and the Palace Theatre in a separate manner due to the bespoke status of these facilities and their importance to the cultural heritage of the Borough. However, Members found that a number of Councils had similar services which had been successfully incorporated into external trust arrangements with other leisure facilities. The group feels that this approach, of combining more facilities into a package of services managed by an external service provider, would help the Council to achieve greater efficiency savings overall as overheads and expertise will be shared across all the services. For this reason the group is proposing that Forge Mill Needle Museum and the Palace Theatre should be included in the procurement exercise.

#### Conclusion

Members feel that it would be best for the Council to enter into a competitive tendering process to procure an external provider to deliver the Council's services. A variety of bodies could apply to take part in this procurement process including existing leisure trusts, private sector companies and voluntary sector groups. The group has not

specified a target service provider as Members feel that there should be flexibility available for organisations to bid to take part in the procurement process if they are interested in doing so.



**CHAPTER 2: WORKING IN PARTNERSHIP**

There are a number of leisure and cultural services and facilities that the Council currently delivers in partnership with other organisations. The group believes that there are opportunities available to enhance these services, potentially through their inclusion in the procurement process referred to in recommendation 1 above. However, Members recognise that the Council should not act unilaterally without first consulting with relevant partner organisations. They are therefore proposing that the Council should enter into dialogue with partner organisations regarding two separate matters, as detailed in Recommendations 2 and 3 below.

<b>Recommendation 2</b>	<b>Redditch Borough Council should consult with Bromsgrove District Council about whether Arts Development (including Events) and Sports Development can be included in the procurement process referred to in Recommendation 1. Both Councils need to make a decision about whether this would be appropriate.</b>
<b>Financial Implications</b>  <b>Legal Implications</b>	<p>There are no direct financial implications to consulting with Bromsgrove District Council regarding this proposal except in terms of officer time. However, Members are contending that if Arts Development and Sports Development could be included within the procurement process referred to in Recommendation 1 above further efficiency savings could be achieved by both Councils in the long-term.</p> <p>The Arts and Events team and Sports Development are both shared services. Consequently both Councils would need to make a decision in support of outsourcing these services if they were to be included within the procurement process referred to in Recommendation 1 above. Members are asked to note that if one Council supported inclusion of these shared services in the procurement process and the other Council did not approve this proposal there would be very complex legal issues, relating to shared services, TUPE transfer of staff and maintaining services for the Council that did not support the proposal, which would take time and resources to resolve.</p>

In recent years Redditch Borough Council has entered into a number of shared services with other local authorities. This includes the Arts and Events and Sports Development teams which are shared with Bromsgrove District Council. Under shared service arrangements one Council acts as the host authority, though costs are shared and services are delivered across the two authority areas.

During the course of the review Members discovered that Arts Development and Sports Development services were delivered in a variety of ways by different Councils. Some local authorities had outsourced these services to an external service provider whilst other Councils continued to deliver these services directly. There is therefore no single best practice approach to delivering these services.

However, the group believes that locally it would be appropriate to include both of these shared services in the procurement process referred to in Recommendation 1 above for the following reasons:

- The services would benefit from the expertise of external service providers and this could lead to improvements in terms of the quality of the services that are delivered.
- It would provide members of both teams with greater flexibility than in a local authority environment to innovate and to participate in new initiatives.
- Staff will also be provided with more opportunities for career development if they are working for an external service provider.
- Members are contending that greater efficiency savings could be achieved, by both Redditch Borough Council and Bromsgrove District Council, if these services were to be included in a procurement process with a larger number of other leisure and cultural services.

The group has not consulted with Bromsgrove District Council as part of this review. Therefore discussions need to be held with Bromsgrove Members before any action can be taken to change the current approach to delivering the Arts, Events and Sports Development services. Subject to the Executive Committee approving this recommendation Officers will need to initiate discussions with Bromsgrove District Council with a view to determining whether Bromsgrove would agree to outsource both shared services to an external provider. Reports would also need to be presented for the consideration of the Executive Committee in Redditch and Cabinet in Bromsgrove in due course to obtain formal approval to outsource these services to an external service provider.

There is the possibility that, whilst Redditch Members might agree to include these services in a procurement process, elected Members at Bromsgrove District Council may reject this proposal in favour of the Council continuing to deliver these services directly. Officers have advised that this would have very complex legal implications because Arts and Events and Sports Development are shared services. In particular, consideration would need to be given to how to continue to deliver services in both locations, which staff to TUPE transfer to an external service provider and which to retain in Bromsgrove. This would take considerable time and resources to resolve, particularly as the Council has not withdrawn from a service shared directly with Bromsgrove before and there is no precedent which can therefore be followed.

Ideally, the group would have preferred to include Arts Development, Events and Sports Development in the list of services detailed under Recommendation 1. If both Councils do endorse this proposal Members agree that Arts Development, Events and Sports Development should be included in the list of services offered in the procurement process. To provide an opportunity for this to occur Members are urging Officers to progress discussions with Bromsgrove District Council and to bring forward reports on this subject to both the Executive Committee in Redditch and the Cabinet in Bromsgrove for consideration as soon as possible.

<b>Recommendation 3</b>	<b>The Council should enter into discussions with RSA Academy Arrow Vale and Tudor Grange Academy Redditch concerning future operating arrangements for Arrow Vale Sport Centre and Kingsley Sport Centre.</b>
<b>Financial Implications</b>  <b>Legal Implications</b>	There are no direct financial implications in relation to entering into discussions with RSA Academy Arrow Vale and Tudor Grange Academy Redditch except in terms of Officer time.  There are no direct legal implications to this recommendation. Members of the group believe that no changes to Council services that might impact on the future operating arrangements at Arrow Vale Sports Centre and Kingsley Sports Centre should be considered without the Council first entering into discussions with the respective schools.

Redditch Borough Council currently manages two sports centres located at local high schools; Arrow Vale Sports Centre, located at RSA Academy Arrow Vale, and Kingsley Sports Centre, located at Tudor Grange Academy Redditch. The Council contributes to the costs of managing the facilities, including a proportion of the business rates. During the day the facilities available at these centres can be used by school pupils. Outside school hours the facilities can be accessed by external customers.

Members agree that in the current economic climate, and at a time when other leisure services are in the process of being examined, it would be timely to review the future operating arrangements for these two sports centres. It is possible that by introducing alternative service delivery models at these centres improvements to the quality and range of services might occur as well as financial savings for both the Council and schools. However, Members recognise that the Council cannot proceed unilaterally in determining what changes, if any, could be made to operational arrangements at the sports centres. The schools will clearly have an interest in this subject.

The group is therefore proposing that the Council should enter into discussions with the two schools to consider appropriate future operational arrangements at Arrow Vale and Kingsley Sports Centre. They are not specifying any alternative arrangements that they feel should be considered to allow for flexibility in the discussions between the Council and the schools.

**CHAPTER 3: COUNCIL SERVICES**

The group recognises that there are a small number of leisure and cultural services currently provided by the Council that are not directly affected by their recommendations. This includes:

- Allotments.
- Business support services, such as civic suite room bookings and sponsorship of the roundabouts in Redditch.
- Community Centres and Meeting Rooms.
- Parks and open spaces (including the Arrow Valley Countryside Centre).
- Playgrounds.

Members of the group agree that these services should continue to be delivered directly by the Council at this time.

There are a number of reasons why Members concluded that these services should not be outsourced to an external service provider:

- A number of these services manage and maintain assets that are important to the wider community. In some cases the Council has developed long-standing and multi-layered working relationships with different local groups in relation to these services and the group did not want to undermine this positive work.
- Some of these services, particularly the business support services, are integral to the operation of core internal services at the Council. For example the room booking system provides essential support to the local Democratic process by ensuring that appropriate room facilities are available for Committee meetings.
- Members were concerned that there was a limited commercial market in respect of many of these services and that this would make it difficult for a trust or private company to enhance these services.
- Few of the Councils consulted by the group appear to have included these services within their contracts with external service providers.
- During the course of the review the group obtained limited evidence with regard to parks, open spaces, playgrounds and allotments. Members wanted to ensure that any recommended changes to service provision had an evidence basis, in line with good practice in scrutiny. For this reason they did not feel that any recommendations could be proposed about these facilities at this stage.
- The group was impressed by the approach that Newcastle-Under-Lyme Borough Council had adopted to working with local community groups to maintain community centres, following a thorough review. This has been achieved as a result of the Council working directly with Local Management Committees, comprising a range of volunteers from local groups. Members are keen for a similarly innovative, community focused approach to be implemented in Redditch Borough by the Council.
- The Arrow Valley Countryside Centre is subject to an existing contract with an external service provider. This contract is not due to expire until November 2021 and Members do not feel that it would be appropriate to novate management of this contract to an external service provider during this period.

Whilst the group feels that no changes should be made to the delivery model for these services at this time Members would suggest that this should not preclude the Council considering changes in the future. The group is aware that new opportunities to deliver services differently may emerge over time and Members are suggesting that Officers

and the Executive Committee should investigate all such options as and when they arise in case this could lead to benefits for local residents. Members also suggest that if the economic challenges facing local government further intensify the Council may need to review all services to ensure that in future they are delivered as efficiently as possible. It is therefore possible that the ways in which these services are delivered in future may have to change.

**CONCLUSION**

The Leisure Services Options Short, Sharp Review group have completed a detailed review of a complex subject in a relatively short space of time. This was necessary to ensure that their findings could be taken into account as part of the Council's budget setting process in 2016/17 and that any approved proposals could start to be implemented in a timely manner.

In the current economic climate the group does not feel that the status quo, in terms of direct delivery of leisure and cultural services by the Council, is sustainable. Members want to ensure that good quality services continue to be delivered in the Borough at the same time as making financial savings. The group has concluded that this can only be achieved if the Council enters into a contract with an external provider to deliver those services.

The future delivery of leisure and cultural services in the Borough of Redditch has been the subject of debate for the past 18 months and Officers and members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee have separately reviewed this subject in some detail. Members believe that it has reached a point where a decision needs to be made about the future approach that the Council should adopt to delivering these services. The group therefore commends their report to the Executive Committee and urges them to endorse these recommendations.

**APPENDIX 1**  
**Scrutiny Proposal Form**

(This form should be completed by sponsoring Member(s), Officers and / or members of the public when proposing an item for Scrutiny).

**Note:** The matters detailed below have not yet received any detailed consideration. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee reserves the right to reject suggestions for scrutiny that fall outside the Borough Council's remit.

Proposer's name and designation	Councillor Potter	Date of referral	01/09/15
Proposed topic title	Leisure Services Options Short, Sharp Review		
Link to national, regional and local priorities and targets	<p>Redditch Borough Council Strategic Purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide good things for me to do, see and visit.</li> <li>• Help me live my life independently (including health and activity).</li> </ul> <p>Redditch Sustainable Community Strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health inequalities - with particular focus on smoking, obesity alcohol/drugs, and mental health.</li> </ul>		
Background to the issue	<p>The Overview and Scrutiny Committee launched the Abbey Stadium Task Group in 2013/14, which focused on improvements that could be made to the venue. In response to the findings in this review the Executive Committee agreed that the Council should explore options for all or some of the Council's leisure and cultural services to be managed by a trust. External consultants were subsequently tasked with undertaking an options appraisal in relation to the future operation of the Council's leisure services. The findings of this options appraisal together with a report from officers have been the subject of detailed pre-scrutiny in recent months. Overview and Scrutiny Members therefore have significant background knowledge in respect of this subject.</p> <p>On 14th July 2015 the Executive Committee considered the options appraisal, an officer overview of the findings in this appraisal and points raised by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Based on all of the information that had been provided the Executive Committee concluded that further work was required prior to a decision on the future delivery of leisure and cultural services.</p> <p>I feel that an Overview and Scrutiny Short, Sharp Review</p>		

	<p>could make a valuable contribution in relation to this additional work. Scrutiny Members can gather extra evidence which Officers may not have the time or resources to obtain. We can also provide a fresh and objective perspective and I believe we could really help the Council to identify a suitable way forward in relation to this matter. Good scrutiny can help the Council and this is what I aim to do through this exercise.</p> <p>The future operation of the Council's leisure and cultural services is an important matter for the Council to address. The final decision on this matter could have significant financial implications for the Council as well as improving the offer for residents. There could also potentially be implications for staff, depending on the decision that is made. It would therefore be best to ensure that a well informed decision is made on this subject as soon as possible so that staff can appreciate the position moving forward.</p> <p>As part of the review I am suggesting that Members should consider different operating models for the delivery of leisure and cultural services. However, I am not proposing that the group consider the option of delivering services in house as I believe that Officers are in a better position to consider this option due to their expertise. I am also not proposing that the Council consider retaining a streamlined service as I think that this could be achieved through service transformation which the Council is already working on and therefore I do not think further investigation of this would add any value.</p>
<p>Key Objectives Please keep to SMART objectives (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Timely)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) To consider the general requirements of the following different options in terms of future operational arrangements for leisure and cultural services. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• External delivery by an external leisure operator or existing trust;</li> <li>• Creation of a new leisure trust.</li> <li>• Commissioning/outsourcing parts of leisure and cultural services.</li> <li>• A local authority trading company (Teckal).</li> <li>• A joint delivery vehicle (public).</li> <li>• A joint delivery vehicle (private).</li> <li>• A mutual delivery model.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2) To review the financial implications for the Council of all of the delivery models.</li> <li>3) To assess the implications of each delivery model for the quality of services delivered to the customer.</li> <li>4) To consider the governance arrangements that would apply in relation to each model.</li> </ol>



	<p>5) To consult with other local authorities about the operational models that they have adopted for the delivery of leisure and cultural services.</p> <p>6) To identify suitable delivery models for leisure and cultural services. This should include considering whether different delivery models may be suitable for different elements of leisure and cultural services.</p>
<p>How long do you think is needed to complete this exercise? (Where possible please estimate the number of weeks, months and meetings required)</p>	<p>The aim is to complete this review by December 2015. This should ensure that the findings of the group and any recommendations, if approved, can be taken into account in advance of the Council's budget being set for the following year in February 2016.</p> <p>Any findings would need to be available in a timely manner order to be taken into account by Officers undertaking additional work as requested by the Executive Committee in July 2015. It is for this reason that I am proposing that a Short, Sharp Review of this subject should be undertaken rather than a full Task Group investigation.</p>

**Please return this form to: Jess Bayley or Amanda Scarce, Democratic Services Officers, Redditch Borough Council, Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH**

**Email: [jess.bayley@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:jess.bayley@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk) / [a.scarce@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:a.scarce@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk)**

**APPENDIX 2**  
**Acknowledgements**

The group would like to thank the following Councils for returning completed copies of their questionnaire:

- Cannock Chase District Council
- Gloucester City Council
- Malvern Hills District Council
- Newcastle-Under-Lyme Borough Council
- Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council
- Rushmoor Borough Council
- Stevenage Borough Council
- Stratford-on-Avon District Council
- Tamworth Borough Council
- Wychavon District Council
- Wyre Forest District Council

Thanks are also extended to the following individuals who provided evidence and invaluable support during the course of the review:

- Councillor Danny Cook, Leader of Tamworth Borough Council
- Ray Cooke, Leisure Services Manager.
- Mike Edmonds, Head of Commissioning, Cannock Chase District Council
- Clare Flanagan, Legal Services Manager
- Robert Foster, Head of Leisure and Cultural Services, Newcastle-Under-Lyme Borough Council
- John Godwin, Head of Leisure and Cultural Services
- Sue Hanley, Deputy Chief Executive
- Julie Heyes, Business Development Manager
- Tony McGovern, Managing Director, Cannock Chase District Council
- Paul McLaughlin, Estates Team Leader – North, Place Partnership Limited.
- Councillor Christine Mitchell, Portfolio Holder for Culture and Sport, Cannock Chase District Council.
- Jayne Pickering, Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Resources
- Councillor Amelia Rout, Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Leisure, Culture and Localism, Newcastle-Under-Lyme Borough Council.
- Terry Simms, General Manager, Chase Leisure Centre (and Wigan Leisure and Culture Trust - WLCT).
- Dave Wheeler, Leisure Services Manager

**APPENDIX 3**  
**Timeline of Activities**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Task Group Activity</b>
22 September 2015	Consideration of the group's terms of reference and agreeing key evidence to consider during the review.
7 October	Scrutinised the content of <i>Alternative Service Delivery Models</i> , a report by Grant Thornton.
13 October	<p>Considered questionnaire feedback from other local authorities and scrutinised the content of the following reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Responding to the Challenge: Alternative Delivery Models in Local Government</i>, (Grant Thornton, 2014).</li> <li>• <i>Spreading their Wings: Building a Successful Local Authority Trading Company</i> (Grant Thornton, 2015).</li> <li>• <i>Local Authority Sport and Recreation Services in England: Where Next?</i> (The Association for Public Service Excellence – APSE – 2012).</li> </ul>
19 October	Consideration of the current financial costs involved in delivering the Council's leisure and cultural services and interview with the Leisure Services Managers.
3 November	Interview with the Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Resources to discuss the financial implications of using different models of service delivery as well as current income from the Council's Leisure and Cultural Services. A further interview was also held with the Legal Services Manager to discuss governance arrangements for particular service delivery models.
10 November morning	Visit to Chase Leisure Centre, Cannock Chase, Staffordshire and interview with representatives of Cannock Chase District Council.
10 November evening	Interview with Councillor Danny Cook, Leader of Tamworth Borough Council.
18 November	Finalising the group's recommendations.

**APPENDIX 4**  
**Template Questionnaire (Blank Copy)**  
**Redditch Leisure Services**  
**Councillors' Scrutiny Review**

A group of Councillors in Redditch are currently reviewing the model of service delivery used by Redditch Borough Council to provide leisure and cultural services to local residents. As part of the review the Councillors are keen to hear from representatives of other local authorities about how leisure services are delivered in other parts of the country.

The Councillors involved in this review do not have any decision making powers. However, based on the evidence they gather they can make recommendations to local decision makers.

Name and Council: \_\_\_\_\_

1) Does your Council use any of the following models to deliver leisure and cultural services?  
(Please delete any options that do not apply to your Council.)

- a) An external leisure trust
- b) A bespoke local leisure trust
- c) Private company (commissioning arrangement)
- d) Voluntary sector body (commissioning arrangement)
- e) A local authority trading company (Teckal)
- f) A joint delivery vehicle
- g) A mutual delivery model
- h) Delivered directly by Council staff
- i) Other (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

2) Why did your Council choose this model of service delivery?

3) When did your Council introduce this model of service delivery?

4) What services are provided using this model of service delivery?

- 5) Has your Council made financial savings by adopting this approach to service delivery? If so please could you provide a rough estimate of the savings achieved?

- 6) What have been the benefits for residents of delivering services in this manner?

- 7) Would you adopt this service model again if you were making a choice about the future of leisure and cultural services at your Council? (Please briefly outline the reasons for your answer). If your answer to this question is no please explain which alternative delivery model you would now choose and why.

- 8) Is there anything else you would like to add for our consideration?

The Councillors may, based on your answers, contact you to discuss your responses further. Please indicate below whether you would be happy to be contacted by deleting the answer that does not apply to you in the box below.

Yes I'd be happy to be contacted / No – please do not contact me further

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

**Return Address:** Please return completed copies of this survey by Friday 9th October 2015 to:

Jess Bayley, Democratic Services Officer, Democratic Services,  
Redditch Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch B98 8AH

Email: [scrutiny@redditchbc.gov.uk](mailto:scrutiny@redditchbc.gov.uk)

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL



making  
a  
difference



[www.redditchbc.gov.uk](http://www.redditchbc.gov.uk)

**APPENDIX 5**  
**Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Jane Potter declared an other disclosable interest during the review as a member of the board of governors at Tudor Grange Academy Redditch. This declaration relates specifically to the group's third recommendation.

**Appendix 6: Leisure Services Options Short, Sharp Review: Service Delivery Models Rejected by the Group**

<b>Service Delivery Model</b>	<b>Financial Implications</b>	<b>Governance Implications</b>	<b>Service Implications</b>	<b>Reasons Rejected by the Group</b>
Bespoke new leisure trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members have been advised it could cost £150,000 to set up a new trust. This may be an optimistic estimate as the options appraisal considered by Members in July 2015 suggested the set up costs could be as much as £250,000.</li> <li>• Savings of £40,000 - £50,000 on VAT may be achieved.</li> <li>• Previous significant financial savings from business rates might no longer be applicable, depending on the outcomes of the Comprehensive Spending Review in November 2015.</li> <li>• Staff would need to be TUPE transferred across to the trust which has associated financial implications, particularly in relation to pensions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council representatives can be appointed to a trust board.</li> <li>• Appointments can only be made on a ratio of 2:11 in favour of more external appointees than Council representatives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Services would continue to be delivered by existing staff managed by a new leisure trust.</li> <li>• It is likely that the quality of services would remain the same if no new expertise was to be introduced.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members were concerned about the significant financial investment required to establish a new leisure trust.</li> <li>• The group, whilst recognising the hard work and commitment of existing staff, feel that a new leisure trust would not be able to access the expertise of an established leisure trust or company.</li> <li>• Members felt that forthcoming changes to business rates in particular may make the financial viability of this model for the Council compared to existing service provision questionable.</li> <li>• Respondents to the group's survey cautioned against the Council establishing a new leisure trust: "...single district trusts are now at huge risk..."</li> <li>• Officers have suggested that whilst efficiency savings might be achieved this would be significantly less than if the services were to be outsourced to an existing trust or company which could achieve economies of scale through shared back office functions.</li> </ul>

Service Delivery Model	Financial Implications	Governance Implications	Service Implications	Reasons Rejected by the Group
Local Authority Trading Company (Teckal)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to the Grant Thornton report: <i>Spreading Their Wings: Building a Successful Local Authority Trading Company</i> most local authority trading companies receive a working capital loan initially.</li> <li>• Staff would need to be TUPE transferred across to the trust which has associated financial implications.</li> <li>• Teckal exemption status enables a local authority company to secure Council contracts without competition. This provides the company with a chance to get established in the market.</li> <li>• In order to remain eligible for Teckal status a local authority trading company must be a wholly owned subsidiary of the Council. At least 80 per cent of services must be for the Council.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council representatives must be appointed to the board of the company.</li> <li>• The Council must retain control of the company so in some places where a Teckal has been established to deliver local authority services Council representatives have been awarded double votes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Profits generated by the company can be reinvested in the services delivered by the company.</li> <li>• Grant Thornton have reported in <i>Alternative Service Delivery Models</i> that there is the potential to improve the quality of services, subject to changes in working culture.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members were advised that only one Council at the time of writing had adopted this model of service delivery to provide leisure services (though it has also been used to deliver other Council services across the country). The group was concerned that as a consequence it was difficult to learn lessons from other Councils about this approach to delivering leisure services.</li> <li>• Members were concerned about the potential need for a working capital loan in the initial stages which they considered too risky for the Council to support in the current economic climate.</li> <li>• Members were also concerned to learn in the Grant Thornton report <i>Spreading Their Wings: Building a Successful Local Authority Trading Company</i> that local authority trading companies are under no obligation to appoint the same external auditor, to have an internal audit service or to report to a Council's Audit Committee.</li> <li>• Also in this report Members were concerned to find out that some local authority trading companies have failed mainly due to; poor leadership, lacklustre business planning, limited Council support, unrealistic budget assumptions and targets.</li> </ul>



Service Delivery Model	Financial Implications	Governance Implications	Service Implications	Reasons Rejected by the Group
Mutual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The mutual body can potentially reduce costs by operating in a commercial manner.</li> <li>Staff would need to be TUPE transferred to the mutual body, which has financial implication.</li> <li>Grant Thornton have reported in the report <i>Alternative Service Delivery Models</i> that there is the potential that efficiency savings could take time to achieve.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council would have limited control over services.</li> <li>Accountability would potentially be managed through contract management.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grant Thornton have reported in <i>Alternative Service Delivery Models</i> that there is the potential to improve the quality of services, subject to changes in working culture.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members were concerned that this model of service delivery would not provide the opportunity for the Council to learn from the expertise of established external service providers.</li> <li>The group was not convinced that this model of service delivery would achieve efficiency savings as quickly as needed in the current challenging economic environment for local government.</li> </ul>
Joint Delivery Vehicle (Public)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Risks and financial investment is shared with other public bodies in a joint venture.</li> <li>Grant Thornton have reported in <i>Alternative Service Delivery Models</i> that savings of approximately 10 – 15 per cent could be achieved in 18 months using this model.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Control would be shared between the public bodies involved in the joint delivery vehicle.</li> <li>Some accountability would potentially be achieved through contract management.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expertise can be shared with other service professionals used to delivering services in a public sector environment which could lead to improvements in service quality.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The group was concerned that in the current highly competitive leisure services market the Council would struggle to attract another local authority to work in partnership on this type of venture.</li> <li>Members noted that the Grant Thornton report <i>Alternative Service Delivery Models</i> listed this model as being typically used for Highways services. They were keen for the Council to adopt a model that was more commonly associated with delivery of leisure and cultural services.</li> </ul>

<b>Service Delivery Model</b>	<b>Financial Implications</b>	<b>Governance Implications</b>	<b>Service Implications</b>	<b>Reasons Rejected by the Group</b>
Joint Delivery Vehicle (Private)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risks and financial investment is shared with a private sector provider.</li> <li>• This model can benefit from an element of profit share.</li> <li>• Cost reductions can be up to 10 to 20 per cent in 12 to 18 months together with investment from the private sector according to Grant Thornton's <i>Alternative Service Delivery Models</i> report.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council would have limited control over services if this model is adopted</li> <li>• Some accountability would potentially be achieved through contract management.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expertise can be shared with the private sector which could lead to improvements in service quality.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members were concerned to learn that this model of service delivery is more typically used for Finance and Housing Repairs Services. They were keen for the Council to adopt a model that was more commonly associated with delivery of leisure and cultural services.</li> </ul>



www.redditchbc.gov.uk

# EXECUTIVE

## Committee

13th October 2015

### MINUTES

**Present:**

Councillor Bill Hartnett (Chair), Councillor Greg Chance (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Juliet Brunner, Brandon Clayton, John Fisher (during Minute No.'s 42 to 49), Mark Shurmer, Debbie Taylor and Pat Witherspoon

**Officers:**

Derek Allen, Clare Flanagan, Sue Hanley, Kath Manning, Jayne Pickering and Judith Willis

**Committee Officers:**

Debbie Parker-Jones

#### 40. APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Yvonne Smith.

#### 41. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

#### 42. LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Work Programme

It was noted that the following reports, which had originally been listed on the Work Programme for consideration at the meeting that evening, had been deferred to either the 15th December 2015 or a later meeting:

- Housing Business Case;
- Fees and Charges;
- Provision of Disabled Car Parking Spaces within Council-Owned Housing Area;
- Reorganisation and Change Policy;
- Update on Medium Term Financial Plan;
- Health and Safety Policy – Contractor Security;
- Contractor Safety Policy; and
- Lone Working Policy.

.....  
Chair

**EXECUTIVE**

## Committee

13th October 2015

---

Report Updates – Energy Efficiency Fund

Officers tabled some updates to this report, for consideration at Agenda Item 6.

**43. MINUTES****RESOLVED that**

**the minutes of the meeting of the Executive Committee held on 8th September 2015 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.**

**44. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

The Committee received the minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 1st September 2015.

It was noted that there were no recommendations to consider.

**RESOLVED that**

**the minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 1st September 2015 be received and noted.**

**45. CREATION OF A NEW ENERGY EFFICIENCY FUND FOR HOMEOWNERS IN REDDITCH**

The Committee received a report which summarised proposals to use existing resources to launch a new Energy Efficiency Fund to help homeowners in Redditch improve the energy efficiency of their properties, helping them to heat their homes more affordably and reliably and also producing carbon savings.

Officers tabled the following report amendments, all of which were agreed by Members:

- an amendment to recommendation 3 for the scheme to be reviewed six months after its launch;
- addition of a paragraph at 3.8 of the report to read: "The scheme is for homeowners in Redditch. Council tenants should seek help with energy efficiency by contacting staff at their Locality Housing Office.";
- deletion of the references to assisting with energy efficient light fittings and bulbs contained in the first section of the list of measures at Appendix 1 and in paragraph 3.9 of the report; and

# EXECUTIVE

## Committee

13th October 2015

---

- an addition to the first section of the list of measures in Appendix 1, with reference to the financial support available, that a household financial criterion of £250 would apply towards the costs of works for those households in receipt of qualifying benefits. Those households earning below the average Redditch household income would automatically be making their own financial contribution.

Introducing a financial contribution requirement to the scheme would ensure that the Council's scheme mirrored the approach undertaken within the current Affordable Warmth element of the Energy Company Obligation (ECO), where a minimum £250 contribution was required for broken boilers. Where Redditch residents could benefit from existing ECO funding streams, Act on Energy would help them access such assistance. The Council's energy efficiency scheme would provide support for those households which did not qualify for such funding streams, to prevent them from falling into further difficulty.

Introducing a financial contribution for all households benefitting from the Energy Efficiency Fund to resolve broken boilers should enable the Council to focus on those households which did not qualify for assistance from other schemes. This approach would also maximise the effectiveness of the scheme in terms of the number of households which could be supported.

Officers stressed that the Council was not trying to replace the current energy efficiency options which existed outside of the Council, and that the Fund would only be used where there were no other available options or where people were in crisis. The Head of Community Services would have discretion to consider applications which fell outside of the normal criteria where 'exceptional circumstances' applied. Officers felt that they would learn from the first six months of implementation of the scheme and that a review of the scheme after that stage would therefore be pertinent.

### **RESOLVED that**

- 1) an Energy Efficiency Fund for homeowners in Redditch be launched and delivered between November 2015 and November 2018;**
- 2) authority be delegated to the Head of Community Services to finalise the inclusion of the Energy Efficiency Fund within the existing Service Level Agreement (SLA) with Act on Energy; and**

**EXECUTIVE**

Committee

13th October 2015

---

- 3) authority be delegated to the Head of Community Services to finalise details of the approved scheme and, in consultation with the Portfolio Holders for Housing and the Local Environment, to make minor amendments to the scheme and review the scheme six months after it is launched.

**RECOMMENDED that**

**the remaining £17k Warmer Worcestershire capital grant funds be transferred to fund the revenue schemes detailed in the report.**

**46. CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION STRATEGY**

Members were asked to endorse the county-wide Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) Strategy 2015-17, and to consider how the Council could contribute to its achievement. It was noted that the Executive Committee could resolve on this matter, which was not apparent from the report recommendation.

Officers highlighted the key elements of the Strategy and explained that the CSE Pathway was unique as it allowed for the reporting of non-child specific concerns, for example where there were concerns in relation to particular premises rather than individuals.

Members noted the work being undertaken by the Council as detailed at paragraph 3.12 of the report, and the roles that the Redditch Partnership and North Worcestershire Community Safety Partnership and Tasking Group would play in this.

Given the importance of the subject matter and the national issues which had emerged in recent times, Members felt that all councillors should be strongly encouraged to attend safeguarding training as part of their annual training programme. It was noted that a copy of the Strategy had also been placed in the political group rooms for Members' information.

**RESOLVED that**

**the Worcestershire Child Sexual Exploitation Strategy 2015-2017 and the Council's contribution as outlined in paragraph 3.12 of the report, be endorsed.**

# EXECUTIVE

## Committee

13th October 2015

---

### 47. MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN 2016/17 - 2018/19 - BUDGET ASSUMPTIONS

The Committee considered a report, for recommendation to full Council, which set out the budget assumptions to be used in preparing the detailed 2016/17 budget and provisional budgets for 2017/18 and 2018/19. A typographical error in the report recommendation was noted, which should have referred to the assumptions detailed in paragraph 3.7 and not 3.5 of the report.

Officers highlighted the key aspects of the report and advised that a number of recommendations from the Council's External Auditors, Grant Thornton, would be addressed by ensuring that robust assumptions and a transparent planned approach was undertaken when setting the budget.

Members had previously agreed that the following principles would be the focus of the Medium Term Financial Plan:

- reduce enabling costs;
- identifying waste and removing this from the system and its associated costs; and
- design new systems for delivery to meet customer demand.

Officers clarified that enabling costs covered anybody who did not deliver a front line service to the public, from supervisor level upwards.

Members noted that the budget forecast had been based on a number of assumptions, known levels of expenditure and anticipated levels of resources. Final confirmation of the assumptions would not be known until December, when the Council would receive details of the Provisional Funding Settlement from central government. Officers explained the most significant risks to the budget projections and stated that whilst it was known that the Council would lose £1.5m of government funding over the next 3 years, it was not yet known whether the cuts would be front-loaded.

#### **RECOMMENDED that**

**the revenue assumptions detailed in paragraph 3.7 of the report be incorporated into the budget setting process.**

### 48. MINUTES / REFERRALS - OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE, EXECUTIVE PANELS ETC.

There were no additional referrals for the Committee to consider.

# **EXECUTIVE**

Committee

13th October 2015

---

**49. ADVISORY PANELS - UPDATE REPORT**

It was noted that a Planning Advisory Panel meeting had taken place earlier that evening and that the next meeting was planned for December.

**RESOLVED that**

**the report be noted.**

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm  
and closed at 7.48 pm

.....  
Chair



# EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE LEADER'S WORK PROGRAMME

7 December 2015 to 31 March 2016

(published as at 10<sup>th</sup> November 2015)



This Work Programme gives details of items on which key decisions are likely to be taken by the Borough Council's Executive Committee, or full Council, in the coming four months. "Key Decisions" are ones which are likely to:

- (i) result in the Council incurring expenditure, foregoing income or the making of savings in excess of £50,000 or which are otherwise significant having regard to the Council's budget for the service or function to which the decision relates; or
- (ii) be significant in terms of its effect on communities living or working in the area comprising two or more wards in the Borough;
- (iii) involve any proposal to cease to provide a Council service (other than a temporary cessation of service of not more than 6 months).

If you wish to make representations on the proposed decision you are encouraged to get in touch with the relevant report author as soon as possible before the proposed date of the decision. Contact details are provided. Alternatively you may write to the Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services, The Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH or e-mail: [democratic@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:democratic@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk)

The Executive Committee's meetings are normally held at 7pm on Tuesday evenings at the Town Hall. They are open to the public, except when confidential information is being discussed. If you wish to attend for a particular matter, it is advisable to check with the Democratic Services Team on (01527) 64252, ext: 3257 to make sure it is going ahead as planned. If you have any other queries, Democratic Services Officers will be happy to advise you. The full Council meets in accordance the Council's Calendar of Meetings. Meetings commence at 7.00pm.

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Councillor Bill Hartnett, Portfolio Holder for Community Leadership and Partnership  
Councillor Greg Chance, Portfolio Holder for Planning, regeneration, Economic Development and Transport  
Councillor John Fisher, Portfolio Holder for Corporate Management  
Councillor Yvonne Smith, Portfolio holder for Community Safety and Regulatory Services  
Councillor Mark Shurmer, Portfolio Holder for Housing  
Councillor Debbie Taylor, Portfolio Holder for the Local Environment  
Councillor Pat Witherspoon, Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Tourism  
Councillor Juliet Brunner  
Councillor Brandon Clayton

Decision including Whether it is a key Decision	Decision Taker Date of Decision	Details of Exempt information (if any)	Documents submitted to Decision Maker / Background Papers List	Contact for Comments
Job Evaluation <b>Key:</b> No	Executive 7 Dec 2015 Council 7 Dec 2015		Report of the Executive Director, Finance and Resources	Jayne Pickering, Executive Director, Finance and Resources Tel: 01527 881207
Provision of Disabled Car Parking Spaces within Council-Owned Housing Areas <b>Key:</b> Yes	Executive 15 Dec 2015		Report of the Head of Housing Services	Jayne Bough, Housing Services Manager Tel: 01527 64252 ext 3825
Reorganisation and Change Policy <b>Key:</b> No	Executive Not before 15th Dec 2015 Council 25 Jan 2016		Report of the Head of Transformation and Organisational Development	Deb Poole, Head of Business Transformation and Organisational Development Tel: 01527 881256
Update on the Medium Term Financial Plan <b>Key:</b> No	Executive 15 Dec 2015		Report of the Executive Director, Finance and Resources	Jayne Pickering, Executive Director, Finance and Resources Tel: 01527 881207
Finance Monitoring Quarter 2 - July - September 2015 <b>Key:</b> No	Executive 15 Dec 2015		Report of the Executive Director Finance and Corporate Resources	Jayne Pickering, Executive Director, Finance and Resources Tel: 01527 881207

Decision including Whether it is a key Decision	Decision Taker Date of Decision	Details of Exempt information (if any)	Documents submitted to Decision Maker / Background Papers List	Contact for Comments
Nomination of Asset of Community Value - the Eagle Public House, Evesham Road, Redditch <b>Key:</b> No	Executive 15 Dec 2015		Report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration	Ruth Bamford, Head of Planning and Regeneration Tel: 01527 64252 ext 3219
Fees and Charges <b>Key:</b> No	Executive 15 Dec 2015 Council 25 Jan 2016		Report of the Executive Director Finance and Resources	Sam Morgan, Financial Services Manager Tel: 01527 64252 ext 3790
Housing Business Case <b>Key:</b> No	Executive 15 Dec 2015 Council 25 Jan 2016		Report of the Head of Housing Services	Liz Tompkin, Head of Housing Tel: 01527 64252 ext 3304
Purchase of Crossgates House <b>Key:</b> Yes	Executive 15 Dec 2015	Potential exempt information relating to financial details	Report of the Head of Customer Access and Financial Support	Amanda de Warr, Head of Customer Access and Financial Support Tel: 01527 64252
Review of Pay Enhancements for Leisure Assistants <b>Key:</b> No	Executive 15 Dec 2015	Potential exempt information relating to individuals	Report of the Head of Leisure and Cultural Services	Dave Wheeler, Leisure Services Manager Tel: 01527 64252 ext 3313

Decision including Whether it is a key Decision	Decision Taker Date of Decision	Details of Exempt information (if any)	Documents submitted to Decision Maker / Background Papers List	Contact for Comments
Housing Revenue Account, rent and capital 2016-17 <b>Key:</b> No	Executive 15 Dec 2015 Council 25 Jan 2016		Report of the Head of Housing Services	Liz Tompkin, Head of Housing, Sam Morgan, Financial Services Manager  Emma Cartwright, Housing Performance and Database Manager Tel: 01527 64252 ext 3304, Tel: 01527 64252 ext 3790  Tel: 01527 64252 ext 3994
Matchborough Centre Redevelopment - consultation <b>Key:</b> No	Executive 15 Dec 2015		Report of the Head of Housing and Regeneration	Emma Newfield, Planning Officer Tel: 01527 597031
Health and Safety Policy - Contractor Security <b>Key:</b> No	Executive Not before 12th Jan 2016 Council Not before 25th Jan 2016		Report of the Head of Business Transformation and Organisational Development	Becky Talbot, Human Resources and Development Manager Tel: 01527 64252 ext 3385
Contractor Safety Policy <b>Key:</b> No	Executive Not before 12th Jan 2016 Council Not before 25th Jan 2016		Report of the Head of Business Transformation and Organisational Development	Becky Talbot, Human Resources and Development Manager Tel: 01527 64252 ext 3385

Decision including Whether it is a key Decision	Decision Taker Date of Decision	Details of Exempt information (if any)	Documents submitted to Decision Maker / Background Papers List	Contact for Comments
Review of Operation of Leisure Services <b>Key:</b> No	Executive 14 Jul 2015 Council 27 Jul 2015 Executive Not before 12th Jan 2016		Report of the Head of Leisure and Cultural Services Back ground paper - Independent Consultant's report on options for the future management arrangements Report of the Deputy Chief Executive	Sue Hanley, Deputy Chief Executive and Executive Director (Leisure, Environmental & Community Services) Tel: 01527 64252 ext 3601
Lone Working Policy <b>Key:</b> No	Executive Not before 12th Jan 2016 Council Not before 25th Jan 2016		Report of the Head of Business Transformation and Organisational Development	Becky Talbot, Human Resources and Development Manager Tel: 01527 64252 ext 3385
Borough of Redditch Plan no.4 - Modifications <b>Key:</b> No	Executive 8 Mar 2016 Council Not before 4th Apr 2016		Report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration	Emma Baker, Development Plans Manager Tel: 01527 64252 ext 3034
Applying Article 4 directions to The Council's schedule of locally listed buildings <b>Key:</b> Yes	Executive Not before 8th Mar 2016		Report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration	Emma Newfield, Planning Officer Tel: 01527 597031
Tenancy Policy <b>Key:</b> No	Executive		Report of the Head of Housing	



# Overview & Scrutiny

Committee

8th December 2015

## WORK PROGRAMME

(Report of the Chief Executive)

Date of Meeting	Subject Matter	Officer(s) Responsible for report
<b>ALL MEETINGS</b>	<b>REGULAR ITEMS</b>	<b>(CHIEF EXECUTIVE)</b>
	Minutes of previous meeting  Consideration of the Executive Committee Work Programme  Consideration of Executive Committee key decisions  Call-ins (if any)  Pre-scrutiny (if any)  Task Groups / Short, Sharp Review Groups - feedback  Committee Work Programme	Chief Executive  Chief Executive  Chief Executive  Chief Executive  Chief Executive  Chief Executive
	<b>REGULAR ITEMS</b>  Update on the work of the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel.  Quarterly Tracker Report	Chair of the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel  Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service

# Overview & Scrutiny

Committee

8th December 2015

	<p><b>REGULAR ITEMS</b></p> <p>Updates on the work of the Worcestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee</p> <p>Bi-Annual Monitoring Report – Redditch Sustainable Community Strategy</p>	<p>Redditch Borough Council representative on the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee</p> <p>Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service</p>
<b>OTHER ITEMS - DATE FIXED</b>		
<b>8th December 2015</b>	Bereavement Services Review of Crematorium Fees and Charges and Proposed Capital Works – Pre-Scrutiny	Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service
<b>8th December 2015</b>	Fees and Charges – Pre-Scrutiny	Relevant lead Director
<b>8th December 2015</b>	Leisure Services Options Short, Sharp review – final report	Councillor Potter
<b>8th December 2015</b>	Medium Term Financial Plan - Presentation	Relevant lead Director
<b>8th December 2015</b>	Review of Operation of Leisure Services – Pre-Scrutiny	Relevant lead Director
<b>5th January 2016</b>	Housing Revenue Account Rent and Capital Report – Pre-Scrutiny	Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service
<b>5th January 2016</b>	Overview and Scrutiny Recommendation Tracker	Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service



# Overview & Scrutiny

Committee

8th December 2015

<b>5th January 2016</b>	Update on the Medium Term Financial Plan	Relevant lead Director
<b>16th February 2016</b>	Medium Term Financial Plan – Consideration of Executive Committee’s budget recommendations	Relevant lead Director
<b>1st March 2016</b>	Local Strategic Partnership – Monitoring Update Report	Relevant lead Director
<b>1st March 2015</b>	Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report	Councillor Potter
<b>12th April 2016</b>	Overview and Scrutiny Recommendation Tracker	Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service
<b>OTHER ITEMS – DATE NOT FIXED</b>		
	Housing Benefits - Presentation	Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service
	Tackling Obesity Task Group - Feedback	Councillor Potter

