



Notice of meeting of

Decision Session - Executive Member for City Strategy

To: Councillor Steve Galloway (Executive Member)

Date: Thursday, 28 January 2010

Time: 4.00 pm

Venue: The Guildhall, York

AGENDA

Notice to Members – Calling In

Members are reminded that, should they wish to call in any item on this agenda, notice must be given to Democracy Support Group by:

10.00 am on Wednesday 27 January 2010 if an item is called in before a decision is taken, or

4.00pm on Monday 1 February 2010 if an item is called in after a decision has been taken.

Items called in will be considered by the Scrutiny Management Committee.

Written representations in respect of items on this agenda should be submitted to Democratic Services by 5.00pm on Tuesday 26 January 2010.

1. **Declarations of Interest**

At this point Members are asked to declare any personal or prejudicial interests they may have in the business on this agenda.

- 2. Minutes** (Pages 3 - 10)
To approve and sign the minutes of the last Decision Session held on 5 January 2010.

3. Public Participation - Decision Session

At this point in the meeting, members of the public who have registered their wish to speak at the meeting can do so. The deadline for registering is **5:00pm on Wednesday 27 January 2010.**

Members of the public may register to speak on:-

- an item on the agenda;
- an issue within the Executive Member's remit;
- an item that has been published on the Information Log since the last session.

Note: No information reports have been published since the last session.

4. Revenue Budget Estimates 2010/11 - City Strategy

(Pages 11 - 24)

This report is part of the consultation on the 2010/11 budget process. The report provides details of proposed growth and savings within the City Strategy Directorate. Full details of the budget will be considered by Executive on 16th February 2010 and then Budget Council on 25th February 2010.

5. Revenue Budget 2010/11 - City Strategy Fees and Charges (Pages 25 - 34)

This report advises the Executive Member of the proposed fees and charges for the City Strategy portfolio for the financial year 2010/11 and the anticipated increase in income which they will generate.

6. Any other business which the Chair considers urgent under the Local Government Act 1972

Democracy Officer:

Name: Jill Pickering

Contact details:

- Telephone – (01904) 552061
- E-mail – jill.pickering@york.gov.uk

For more information about any of the following please contact the Democracy Officer responsible for servicing this meeting

- Registering to speak
- Business of the meeting
- Any special arrangements
- Copies of reports

Contact details are set out above

This page is intentionally left blank

About City of York Council Meetings

Would you like to speak at this meeting?

If you would, you will need to:

- register by contacting the Democracy Officer (whose name and contact details can be found on the agenda for the meeting) **no later than 5.00 pm** on the last working day before the meeting;
- ensure that what you want to say speak relates to an item of business on the agenda or an issue which the committee has power to consider (speak to the Democracy Officer for advice on this);
- find out about the rules for public speaking from the Democracy Officer.

A leaflet on public participation is available on the Council's website or from Democratic Services by telephoning York (01904) 551088

Further information about what's being discussed at this meeting

All the reports which Members will be considering are available for viewing online on the Council's website. Alternatively, copies of individual reports or the full agenda are available from Democratic Services. Contact the Democracy Officer whose name and contact details are given on the agenda for the meeting. **Please note a small charge may be made for full copies of the agenda requested to cover administration costs.**

Access Arrangements

We will make every effort to make the meeting accessible to you. The meeting will usually be held in a wheelchair accessible venue with an induction hearing loop. We can provide the agenda or reports in large print, electronically (computer disk or by email), in Braille or on audio tape. Some formats will take longer than others so please give as much notice as possible (at least 48 hours for Braille or audio tape).

If you have any further access requirements such as parking close-by or a sign language interpreter then please let us know. Contact the Democracy Officer whose name and contact details are given on the order of business for the meeting.

Every effort will also be made to make information available in another language, either by providing translated information or an interpreter providing sufficient advance notice is given. Telephone York (01904) 551550 for this service.

যদি যথেষ্ট আগে থেকে জানানো হয় তাহলে অন্য কোন অর্ধাতে তথ্য জানানোর জন্য সব ধরনের চেষ্টা করা হবে, এর জন্য দরকার হলে তথ্য অনুবাদ করে দেয়া হবে অথবা একজন দোআবী সরবরাহ করা হবে। টেলিফোন নম্বর (01904) 551 550।

Yeteri kadar önceden haber verilmesi koşuluyla, bilgilerin terümesini hazırlatmak ya da bir tercüman bulmak için mümkün olan herşey yapılacaktır. Tel: (01904) 551 550

我們竭力使提供的資訊備有不同語言版本，在有充足時間提前通知的情況下會安排筆譯或口譯服務。電話 (01904) 551 550。

اگر مناسب وقت سے اطلاع دی جاتی ہے تو ہم معلومات کا ترجمہ مہیا کرنے کی پوری کوشش کریں گے۔ ٹیلی فون (01904) 551 550

Informacja może być dostępna w tłumaczeniu, jeśli dostaniemy zapotrzebowanie z wystarczającym wyprzedzeniem. Tel: (01904) 551 550

Holding the Executive to Account

The majority of councillors are not appointed to the Executive (40 out of 47). Any 3 non-Executive councillors can 'call-in' an item of business from a published Executive (or Executive Member Decision Session) agenda. The Executive will still discuss the 'called in' business on the published date and will set out its views for consideration by a specially convened Scrutiny Management Committee (SMC). That SMC meeting will then make its recommendations to the next scheduled Executive meeting in the following week, where a final decision on the 'called-in' business will be made.

Scrutiny Committees

The purpose of all scrutiny and ad-hoc scrutiny committees appointed by the Council is to:

- Monitor the performance and effectiveness of services;
- Review existing policies and assist in the development of new ones, as necessary; and
- Monitor best value continuous service improvement plans

Who Gets Agenda and Reports for our Meetings?

- Councillors get copies of all agenda and reports for the committees to which they are appointed by the Council;
- Relevant Council Officers get copies of relevant agenda and reports for the committees which they report to;
- Public libraries get copies of **all** public agenda/reports.

City of York Council

Committee Minutes

MEETING	DECISION SESSION - EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR CITY STRATEGY
DATE	5 JANUARY 2010
PRESENT	COUNCILLOR STEVE GALLOWAY (EXECUTIVE MEMBER)

61. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were invited to declare at this point in the meeting any personal or prejudicial interests they might have in the business on the agenda. No interests were declared.

62. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the last Decision Session – Executive Member for City Strategy, held on 1 December 2009 be approved and signed by the Executive Member as a correct record.

63. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

It was reported that there had been 3 registrations to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme. Details of these speakers are set out under the individual agenda items.

64. WESTMINSTER ROAD AREA CONSULTATION AND SURVEY RESULTS

The Executive Member considered a report which brought to his attention the key results of the vehicle surveys and questionnaire carried out in relation to the through traffic in the Westminster Road area. The survey and questionnaire had been carried out following the introduction of the Water End Cycle Scheme.

He reported that the following additional representations and information had been included in the republished agenda:

- comments of the four Member Task Group of the Economic and City Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee supporting closure of the road to through traffic
- comments of 3 residents of Westminster Road
- details of comparative traffic volumes for similar roads in the area and referred to additional correspondence received from Cllr Scott also in support of point closure and the reintroduction of the filter lane at Water End.

Officers confirmed that the speed limit proposals were unlikely to influence traffic levels but that the results of the surveys would be considered as part of any future evaluation of the Water End cycle scheme.

Representations in support of point closure of Westminster Road were received from a local resident. He referred to the detrimental impact of through traffic on the residential road since the nearby cycle scheme had been implemented. He confirmed that these issues had been raised with local Councillors, the Ward Committee and Officers. He stated that the increase in traffic was affecting residents well being and quality of life as the road was being used as a 'rat run' and that the only effective solution would be point closure.

Representations were also received from another Westminster Road resident who confirmed that he had spoken to the Task Group and that residents were looking for a lasting solution to the traffic problems in the area. He stated that residents had seen a 97% increase in through traffic since the changes at Water End which had resulted in a deterioration in their environment. He requested the Executive Member to support Option A for the making of a Traffic Regulation Order to close both Westminster Road and Greycliffe Drive as residents felt that this problem would only get worse.

Councillor King, as one of the Ward Members, referred to the points raised by Cllr Scott. He stated that following two very well attended public meetings the majority of local residents had requested closure of Westminster Road. He did however question the inclusion of Greycliffe Drive residents in the survey. He went on to state that a traffic flow survey before and after the works at the Water End junction would have been useful. He stated that the Executive Member had a duty to resolve these problems and he requested a point closure of the road.

Councillor Pierce, spoke as an individual member of the Task Group. He confirmed that he neither supported nor opposed the introduction of a 20mph speed limit as this limit would be self-enforcing. He pointed out that any point closure would have a knock on effect at the Water End junction and that he felt the only option was to increase the capacity of this junction.

The Executive Member confirmed that there was clearly a division of opinion on what if anything should be done to ease problems in the Westminster Road area. The questionnaire results did however indicate strong and widespread support for a 20mph speed limit. He stated that he had previously indicated that an examination of the Water End junction would be undertaken when the revised layout had been in operation for a suitable period of time and that Officers would be reporting back on this in Spring 2010. He went on to point out that the traffic volumes on Westminster Road were relatively low when compared to similar routes in the City.

Consideration was then given to the following options:

- A. To begin processing a Traffic Regulation Order to close Westminster Road and Greycliffe Drive at their Water End junctions. Whilst this option was not recommended due to the lack of a significant majority of local residents in favour of such proposals, it should be noted that if this option was considered appropriate to proceed with then this would involve further consultation with all affected local residents on any firmed up proposal. Any subsequent objections to the proposals during the Traffic Regulation Process would have to be brought back to a future Decision Session for consideration before any action could be taken to close either road.
- B. To carry out further investigations into the use of road narrowings and / or chicanes to discourage through traffic. This was not a recommended option as support from local residents for such measures was low.
- C. To implement a 20mph zone for the area. This was a recommended option as there was general support demonstrated from the local residents and the reduced speeds brought about by existing traffic calming features justify lowering the speed limit – though it should be noted that this is unlikely to have a significant impact on the volume of through traffic.
- D. To note the outcome of the traffic surveys and questionnaire and take no further action at this time. But, that the results be considered as part of any future evaluation of the Water End cycle scheme. This is a recommended option because these 2 matters are linked.

RESOLVED: That the Executive Member for City Strategy agrees:

- i) To implement a 20mph zone for the area.
- ii) To note the outcome of the traffic surveys and questionnaire and take no further action at this time on introducing a point closure.
- iii) That the results of the survey be also considered as part of any future evaluation of the Water End cycle scheme.
- iv) That the Police be requested to monitor the junctions in this area with a view to addressing any examples they may find of inappropriate driver behaviour.¹

REASON: As the lower speeds due to the traffic calming justify the introduction of a lower speed limit.

As the options of closing the area to through traffic does not have support from a significant

proportion of the local community that would be affected by a closure.

As the options of investigating the use of chicanes and road narrowings are not well supported by local residents.

Action Required

1. Implement 20mph zone and request Police to monitor junctions.

AB

65. SCHOOL TRAVEL PLANNING PROCESS AND THE ASSOCIATED 'SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL' INITIATIVE

Consideration was given to a report, which outlined the work that had been undertaken by the Council in partnership with schools to increase the number of journeys being made to school by sustainable modes of transport. The report also reviewed the associated 'safe routes to school' initiatives, which had been identified as part of the travel planning process.

The Executive Member confirmed that both Cllrs Merrett and Potter were broadly in support of the proposals and that Cllr Merretts additional comments would be dealt with by Officers outside the meeting.

Officers referred to Annex A of the report which showed an example map of school postcode plots and confirmed that the inner circle showed those properties within a 5 minute walk of a school and the outer circle those with within a 10 minute cycle ride.

The Executive Member expressed concern about the profile that schools gave to their school travel plans and information on their websites. He stated that he hoped schools would in future give travel plans a higher profile as walking and cycling were healthier options.

RESOLVED: That the Executive Member for City Strategy agrees to:

- i) Note the content of the report.
- ii) Note that officers will review the Census data, submitted in January 2010 to create a priority list of schools who will be specifically targeted in 2010/11. A further report will be brought to a future meeting to determine the priority list.¹
- iii) Encourage staff and school governors to continue to engage with the school travel planning process to increase the percentage of journeys made to school by sustainable modes and specifically to

make available publicly, for example via their internet web sites, individual school travel plans and performance monitoring information.

- iv) With the agreement of the affected schools, also provide information on individual travel plans on the Councils web site. ².

REASON: The travel planning process will only affect staff and student modal shift with the engagement of the whole school community.

Action Required

- | | |
|--|----|
| 1. Report back to future meeting on priority list. | AB |
| 2. Include travel plans on web site following necessary agreement. | AB |

66. PETITION FROM HOLGATE RESIDENTS CALLING ON FIRST YORK TO AMEND THE NOS. 5 BUS ROUTE

Consideration was given to a report, which considered a petition presented to the Council earlier in the year, which called on the Council to make representations to alter the route taken by the number 5 bus service through central York and onto Monks Cross (rather than Strensall). The petition had requested that the service travelled via Stonebow and not St Leonard's Place and reverted to the route used by the former number 16 which incorporated the Holly Bank Loop.

The Executive Member reported receipt of an additional representation from a local resident in support of the alteration of the route, details of which had been set out in the republished Annex. He stated that the Council had worked hard to ensure that a bus service link was sustained to the Holly Bank area and now that the service had settled down he felt that any change could result in further inconvenience to a significant number of users.

RESOLVED: That the Executive Member for City Strategy agrees to:

- i) Note the content of the petition.
- ii) Take no further action on the routing of this bus service. ¹.

REASON: A number of bus services connect with route 5 from Acomb at both the railway station and on Blossom Street offering a good level of interchange. Officers will continue to work with bus operators to develop the level of service to this part of York.

Action Required

1. Inform lead petitioner of decision.

AB

**67. A19 FULFORD ROAD CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS -
CONSIDERATION OF A PETITION**

The Executive Member considered a report, which related to receipt of a petition to Council, regarding proposed improvements at the northern end of Main Street, Fulford and which sought a decision as to if and how the scheme should be amended to address the issues raised.

The Executive Member reported receipt of additional comments from the Local Member who indicated support for the Officers recommendation with a dropped kerb and tactile crossing whilst still retaining the important appearance of the Fulford Road conservation area. Cllrs D'Agorne and Potter supported the narrowing of the entrance to the Fulford Park estate.

Officers displayed plans showing the widths of road access points in the vicinity onto Fulford Road.

A representative of Fulford Parish Council referred to the proposed works at the Fulford Park junction and to earlier agreement to negotiate on these proposals as no full agreement had been reached. She referred to problems encountered at this junction, close to the adjacent busy doctors surgery and to problems that would result from the narrowing of the entrance.

Officers confirmed that lengthy consultations had been undertaken on all these issues and that the excessive crossing distance at Fulford Park had been identified in the original Safety Audit. They stated that North Yorkshire Police also supported the narrowing of the road.

The Executive Member pointed out that these were relatively minor issues in the context of the overall scheme and that there could be an opportunity to narrow the width of this exit at a later date if problems were identified.

He then considered the following options for the entrance to Fulford Park:

- Option 1 is to retain the existing layout but provide dropped kerb tactile crossings on or close to the pedestrian desire lines.
- Option 2 is to amend the scheme as originally proposed to cater for the needs of pedestrians whilst still maintaining suitable vehicular access.

RESOLVED: That the Executive Member for City Strategy agrees to:

- i) Note the contents of this report.
- ii) Implement Option 1, described in Annex A, to retain the existing layout but provide dropped

kerb tactile crossings on, or close to, the pedestrian desire lines for the entrance to Fulford Park ¹.

- iii) The amended areas of green surfacing as shown on lines are a key element of the scheme.
- iv) Advise Fulford Parish Council that they should either accept one of the standard design shelters to replace the existing shelter at the Fulford Park bus stop or use their own / Ward Committee funding to refurbish the existing shelter. ².

REASON: To improve conditions along this section of the corridor whilst addressing the concerns of Councillor Keith Aspden and local residents.

Action Required

- 1. Arrange to undertake agreed works. DW
- 2. Advise Parish Council of decision. DW

68. BOOTHAM - CYCLIST CROSSING FACILITY

Consideration was given to a report which advised the Executive Member of the results of further investigations into the possible installation of traffic signals at the junction of Bootham/St Mary's/Bootham Park Hospital to provide a priority crossing over Bootham for cyclists. The report highlighted problems with the previous proposal to fully signalise all traffic movements at the junction and detailed the alternative solutions that had been explored.

The Executive Member confirmed that no additional comments or representations had been received on these proposals. He acknowledged that, partly for aesthetic reasons and partly because of costs, the original more extensive signalisation scheme had not found to be practical. He confirmed that the 'parallel' crossing scheme appeared to have more general support and provided an option for less confident cyclists.

The Executive Member considered the following options:

- Option One – progress the “parallel” crossing scheme proposal shown in Annex D through more detailed design and public consultation.
- Option Two – develop one of the alternative scheme options in Annex C in preference to the parallel crossing.
- Option Three – abandon plans to provide an improved cycle crossing facility at this location.

RESOLVED: That the Executive Member for City Strategy agrees to:

- i) Note the officer advice that the main problems, associated with the previous full junction signalisation proposal detailed in paragraphs 5 and 6, are that the:
 - o Necessary listed building and planning consents to alter the Bootham Park Hospital entrance gates are unlikely to be obtained;
 - o High estimated cost for this option brings into question whether the scheme provides good value for money and could be justified.
- ii) In-principle approval for the alternative option shown in Annex D of the officer report. This involves the installation of a signal controlled 'parallel crossing' for both pedestrians and cyclists at a location between the existing pelican and the entrance to Bootham Park Hospital.
- iii) Authorise Officers to undertake further detailed design, and public consultation, on the scheme shown in Annex D, with the outcome to be reported to a future Decision Session meeting for a decision on implementing the scheme.¹

REASON: Officers consider that these proposals will provide significant improvements for cyclists, as they address a difficult crossing point over a major road on a strategic cycle route. The proposed measures would also make a significant contribution towards the aims of the Council as a Cycling City.

Action Required

1. Undertake detailed design and consultation on scheme and report back to future meeting.

TB

Cllr Steve Galloway, Executive Member for City Strategy
[The meeting started at 4.00 pm and finished at 4.40 pm].



Decision Session
Executive Member for City Strategy

28 January 2010

Joint Report of the Director of City Strategy and the Director of Resources

Revenue Budget Estimates 2010/11 – City Strategy

Purpose of Report

1. This report presents the 2010/11 budget proposals for City Strategy. It includes:
 - the revenue budget for 2010/11 (Annex 1) to show the existing budgets
 - the cost of pay and price increases, increments and settlement of pay and grading appeals for the portfolio
 - proposals for budget service pressure costs and savings options for the portfolio area (Annexes 2 and 3)
 - fees and charges proposals (see separate report for details)
2. Budget Council will be held on 25 February 2010 and will make decisions on the overall budget for the Council. In order to facilitate the decision making process the Executive are meeting on 16 February 2010 to consider the preferences identified by the individual portfolio Executive Members and the results of the consultation exercise.
3. The City Strategy Executive Member is therefore asked to consider the budget proposals included in this report and identify the preferences (after considering the proposals in annexes 2 and 3) which will be considered by the Executive as part of the consultation exercise. The Executive Member is invited to provide comments on the budget proposals in this report.

Background

4. The Council's 2010/11 budget is being developed within the constraints of an extremely challenging financial climate. An extensive transformational programme has begun which will promote efficient delivery of services whilst at the same time ensuring funding is available for investment in key areas across the Council.
5. The 2009/10 revenue budget monitoring process has identified areas of activity that currently have insufficient capacity to deal with the increased demands on those services. In addition consideration has been given to the Council's top priorities, and the need to ensure that key front line areas of activity, particularly those in respect of adults and children, can continue to be provided. From this analysis, specific areas of investment will be proposed within the Council's 2010/11 budget, in particular within the following areas :

- Adult Social Care
- Children's Social Care
- Waste Management

- 6 The proposed budget for 2010/11 reflects the need to direct investment into these areas in order that planning and monitoring of service delivery and improvement can take place against an adequate resourcing platform.
- 7 In addition, the Council recognises that adequate provision needs to be created within the budget to ensure that the continuing financial impact of the economic downturn can be contained effectively. Following detailed review of economic pressures both on front line services and the Council's Treasury Management function, it is proposed that in the region of £3m will be set aside within the budget to contain the impact of these pressures.
- 8 In order to create the financial capacity to enable adequate investment in these priority areas the budget strategy has been based around certain key financial management principles. A fundamental maxim of the strategy is that Directorates have been made clearly responsible for the robust and effective self-management of their existing financial resources and that restraint has been expected in putting forward for additional growth in budget to be funded corporately.
- 9 Directorates have been expected to contain their net expenditure within clearly defined and strictly enforced cash limits with a clear expectation that Directorates self manage all non-exceptional budget pressures within this cash limit. These pressures include the anticipated cost of the pay award and any incremental increases due in year. Explicitly linked to self-management within defined cash limits has been the requirement for directorates to demonstrate the re-allocation of budgets in order to contain internal financial pressures.
- 10 As part of the development of the budget, the Council's transformation programme has also been robustly reviewed in view of the need to create capacity to invest in priority areas. A realistic acceleration of efficiency savings will be included within the corporate budget proposals in order to ensure that the additional financial capacity introduced in this budget is based around a challenging but realistic approach to driving out efficiency savings across the organisation. However, it must be stressed that achievement of these efficiencies will not be easy to deliver, but they are essential in order to deliver investment into priority areas. The scale and pace of the transformation process in coming years will be critical to the Council maintaining financial stability. In addition, clearly with the future pressures on public spending, combined with known forecast increased pressures in children's care, adult care, and waste management, the Council will face the need to both achieve significant transformational change, and review the overall type and level of service provision in coming years.
- 11 The key issues within City Strategy has been the impact of the economic downturn on planning and parking income as well as pressures on concessionary fares. It is however recognised that reviews of service activity need to take place in order to develop and implement mitigation plans that

will constrain the impact of these financial pressures.

- 12 The Director of Resources' report '2010/11 Budget Strategy and Medium Term Financial Planning 2011/12 to 2013/14' was adopted by the Executive on 15 December 2009. This paper is the result of ongoing work against this agreed framework.
- 13 The Local Government Finance settlement for 2008/09 included indicative figures for 2010/11 to enable the Council to consider future budget issues. The provisional settlement for 2010/11 gives an increase in formula grant of £1.090m, an increase of 2.51%.

Budget Proposals for City Strategy

- 14 A summary of the budget proposals is shown in Table 1 below. Further details on each individual element are presented in the subsequent paragraphs. The annexes also contain other potential growth and savings items which at this stage are not being recommended to Members.

Table 1 - Summary of Budget Proposals

	Para. Ref	£'000
Base Budget 2009/10	15	4,992.7
Allocation for pay increases	16	74.8
Allocation for price increases	17	61.2
Service Pressure proposals (Annex 2)	18	1,668.0
Previously agreed non recurring growth – impact on 2010/11	19	31.0
Savings proposals (Annex 3)	21-23	-1,716.0
Proposed Budget 2010/11		5,111.7

Base Budget (£4,993k)

- 15 This represents the latest budget reported to Members, updated for the full year effect of decisions taken during 2009/10, e.g. supplementary estimates. The breakdown of the base budget is shown in annex 1.

Pay Inflation (£+75k)

- 16 These calculations are based on a pay increase for APT&C of 1%. The negotiations for the 2010/11 settlement have not yet started, although there is pressure from the Treasury that increases are kept to a minimal level.

Price Inflation (+£61k)

- 17 The budget proposes that, due to the underlying low rate of inflation, there is a general price freeze on most budgets. The amount allowed for price inflation is to fund known price increases, e.g. contract payments.

Service Pressures (+£1,668k)

- 18 A range of options for service pressure proposals has been considered and in view of the overall available resources it is proposed that only those proposals shown in Annex 2 are included as the preferred options for City Strategy. The proposals put forward are the result of a rigorous assessment process, which included looking at the risk to customers and staff, legislative requirement, proven customer demand and the Council's corporate objectives.

Previous years Non-Recurring Growth continuing into 2010/11 (£+31k)

- 19 Council previously approved the additional cost City of York Council was incurring holding onto land options relating to the Waste PFI project. This cost will continue into 2010/11.

Contingency Items

- 20 Members should note that there are potential expenditure pressures that may materialise in 2010/11 but which are not yet certain or not quantifiable at this stage. There are a number of income shortfalls across the Directorate that have been identified primarily as a result of the economic downturn. The issues are listed in Table 2 below. The Executive will decide on 16 February 2010 whether or not to set a general contingency for 2010/11.

Table 2 - Contingency Issues for 2010/11

	£'000
Contingency Issues for 2010/11	
Reduced income as a result of Economic Downturn	
Car Parking Income	250
Planning Income	200
Building Control Income	100
Section 38 Income	80
Yorwaste Dividend	130
Total	760

Savings Proposals (-£1,716k)

- 21 Members will be aware that the 2009/10 budget savings were significant and that all Directorates are operating within a tight financial environment. In seeking to achieve savings for the 2010/11 budget Directorates have examined budgets with a view to identifying savings that have a minimum impact on the services provided to the public, customers and the wider Council and are not already included in the blueprints for More For York. Instead they have concentrated on initiatives that:

- improve quality and efficiency
- take advantage of ongoing service and/or Best Value reviews
- generate income

- address budgetary underspends
- improve cash flow and interest earnings
- generate savings from the technical and financial administration functions of the Council

22 In addition to the initiatives listed above the price increases and list of savings also include proposals to increase fees and charges (see also section below). Generally these are in line with inflation, but this is varied by directorates as they are affected by national constraints/requirements.

23 Annex 3 shows the full list of savings proposals for the City Strategy portfolio.

Fees and Charges

24 The details of the proposed fees and charges for the services provided by this portfolio are set out in a separate report. Where fees and charges increases are being set above the inflation requirement they have been included in Annex 3.

Consultation

25 This paper forms part of the Council's budget consultation. The other streams being undertaken include a public consultation leaflet circulated city wide (results should be known by mid-January), a public meeting where participants debated savings and growth proposals attended by the Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive, and a further session with the business communities of the city.

Options

26 As part of the consultation process the Executive Member is asked for their comments or alternative suggestions on the proposals shown in Annexes 2 and 3.

Analysis

27 All the analysis is provided in the body of the report and the annexes.

Corporate Priorities

28 The budget represents the opportunity to reprioritise resources towards corporate priority areas. Key examples of this happening within this portfolio area are:

- proposals to freeze car park charges and introduce further discounts for low emission vehicles will support both thriving city and sustainable city agendas.
- Growth for the concessionary fares scheme supports sustainable city by encouraging public transport
- Review of speed limits will support targets relating to the safer city.

Implications

29 The implications are:

- Financial - the financial implications are dealt with in the body of the report.
- Human Resources – the savings proposals identified relate to the reduction of upto 6 posts across the directorate of which one post is vacant. Where requested HR has been involved in the development of the budget proposals and has worked with local managers to identify the HR implications of the proposals. HR implications will be managed in accordance with established council change management procedures.
- Equalities – an equalities impact assessment has been undertaken to support the budget process. This has not flagged any significant equalities issues.
- Legal - there are no legal implications to this report.
- Crime and Disorder - there are no specific crime and disorder implications to this report.

Risk Management

30 Key reporting mechanisms to Members on budget matters will continue to be through mid-year monitoring reports and the final Revenue Outturn report for the year. The format/timing of these reports has recently been considered by the Council's Management Team but as a minimum they will report on forecast out-turn compared to budgets and will also address the progress made on investments and savings included within the budgets.

31 The budget setting process always entails a degree of risk as managers attempt to assess known and uncertain future events. This year has demonstrated the difficulty of achieving this. As with any budget the key to mitigating risk is prompt monitoring and appropriate management control. As such updated figures and revised corrective actions will be monitored via Directorate Management Teams, Corporate Management Team and the monitor reports during the year.

Recommendations

32 The Executive Member is invited to consider whether the budget proposals are in line with the Council's priorities.

33 The Executive Member is invited to provide comments on the budget proposals for savings and growth which have been prepared by Officers and contained in this report, which are intended to form part of the Council's budget to be considered by the Budget Executive on 16 February 2010.

- 2010/11 Base budget as set out in paragraph 15;
- Service Pressure proposals as set out in Annex 2;
- Savings proposals as set out in Annex 3;

Reason : As part of the consultation for the City Strategy 2010/11 budget

Contact Details

Authors:

Patrick Looker
City Strategy Finance Manager
551633

Chief Officers responsible for the report:

Bill Woolley
Director of City Strategy
Tel: 1330
Ian Floyd
Director of Resources
Tel: 551100

Specialist Implications Officer(s) None

Wards Affected: *List wards or tick box to indicate all* **All** ✓

Background Working Papers

Budget Working Papers held in City Strategy Finance

Equalities Impact Assessment held in City Strategy Finance

Annexes

Annex 1 - 2010/11 Base Budget

Annex 2 - Service Pressure Proposals

Annex 3 - Savings Proposals

This page is intentionally left blank

CITY STRATEGY**SERVICE PLAN****SUMMARY**

<u>Detailed Expenditure</u>		<u>Cost Centre Expenditure</u>	
DETAIL	2010/11 Base Budget £'000	COST CENTRE	2010/11 Base Budget £'000
Employees	8,062	City Development & Transport	3,645
Assets & Premises	376	Planning	1,633
Transport	149	Directorate Mgt & Support	(285)
Supplies And Services	2,618		
Miscellaneous	680		
Recharges	5,329		
Capital Financing	1,395		
Concessionary Fares	4,726		
GROSS EXPENDITURE	23,335		
Income	(18,342)		
NET EXPENDITURE	4,993	NET EXPENDITURE	4,993

This page is intentionally left blank

CITY STRATEGY
SERVICE PRESSURES

Annex 2

Ref	Brief Description	Net Cost 2010/11 £(000)	One- Off
CSTRCOR1	<u>Concessionary Fares</u> The delivery of the concessionary fare scheme for anyone over the age of 60 years and for persons with a disability that meet set criteria in order to qualify for a pass. The additional funding required covers the budget shortfall in 2009/10 (£420k) inflation and increased usage £380k and the costs of increased take up from tokens (£100k). Note that these increased costs will be offset by savings and additional grant.	900	
CSTRCOR2	<u>Waste PFI procurement budget:</u> The council is undertaking a joint procurement exercise with NYCC for a waste processing facility to reduce the amount of waste landfilled. This is important due to the need to avoid increasing landfill tax liabilities and potential LATS penalties. There are ongoing costs from the procurement, primarily legal and financial consultants, as the preferred bidder is appointed and a commercial contract is drawn up. Current estimates of CYC's contribution for the procurement is £200k.	200	
CSTRG01/02	<u>Staffing Cost increases</u> Cost of increments across the Directorate (£179k) and Pay and Grading appeals (£103k)	282	
CSSTRG06	<u>Companion Passes</u> Extension of the eligibility of companion passes has been accepted by the Concessionary Fares Partnership. This has been estimated to have a small additional cost for the council.	35	
CSSTRG07	<u>Environment Agency Levy</u> The EA are looking to increase the council levy from £33k to £49k in 2010/11. The 50% increase is to fund flood prevention measures across the Yorkshire and Humber area.	16	
CSSTRG08	<u>Cycle Training Income</u> The council historically has enjoyed income levels from providing training courses to cycle trainers from other Local Authorities. This income stream is no longer providing significant revenue.	15	
CSTRN02	<u>Local Development Framework</u> There are still significant costs to completing the Local Development Framework process. The budget to support the initiative is only set to March 2010. It is proposed to use the anticipated one-off final year award of Planning Delivery Grant (see below) to fund the programme for 2010/11. The largest costs to be incurred relate to the examinations of the core strategies and Area Action Plans. A new approach to York North West will have to be considered with the preparation of new and revised planning briefs and frameworks.	180	✓
CSSTRN03	<u>Speed Limit Review</u> Budget to allow review of appropriate speed limits across the city.	15	✓
CSSTRN05	<u>Car Parking Initiatives</u> To purchase 4 new parking ticket machines in selected car parks to accept credit and debit card payments.	25	✓

Recurring Bids Total**1,448****One-off Bids Total****220**

This page is intentionally left blank

Savings Proposals

City Strategy		Net Cost 2010/11 £(000)	One- Off
Ref	Brief Description		
CSCOR01	<u>Concessionary Fare Reimbursement Reduction</u> Anticipated savings arising from a reduced reimbursement rate paid to operators from 1st Dec 2009.	-612	
CSCOR02	<u>Concessionary Fare Additional Special Grant</u> Anticipated additional grant from Department for Transport for supporting concessionary fares in 2010/11. This element combined with CSCOR01 will fund the growth pressure.	-288	
CSTRS01	<u>Vacancy Factor 2.5%</u> Introduction of a vacancy factor to most staffing areas across the Directorate will result in a reduction in budget totalling £175k.	-175	
CSTRS02	<u>Review of RESPARK Charges</u> Review of charges for RESPARK charges resulting in an increased charge for high emission vehicles (£110). It is proposed to freeze charges for standard permits at £93 and widen the eligibility for low emission vehicles (£44) to include VED bands A-C.	-10	
CSTRS03	<u>Savings across Land Charges budget</u> Reduced costs in transmission fees and other supplies and services to fund additional staffing costs leaving service a non profit area.	-19	
CSTRS04	<u>Secretarial Services Restructure</u> A restructure of the management support service structure in Autumn 2009 resulted in the deletion of one post from the team.	-15	
CSTRS05	<u>Development Control Restructure</u> Restructure of the planning team resulting in the split of teams into Major and Other applications rather than the current geographic split. This will result in a number of posts being deleted as workload reduces. It is likely also to result in the reduction of one area planning sub-committee.	-130	
CSTRS06	<u>Contribution re Park & Ride City Centre Support</u> Review of Park & Ride support arrangements undertaken within council and bus operator resource.	-15	
CSTRS07	<u>Reduction in Transport Planning Initiatives</u> A 20% reduction in transport educational campaigns. The reduction would be for promotions seen as 'soft' measures.	-40	
CSTRS09	<u>Anticipated Additional Concessionary Fare Grant</u> The growth of £900k required for concessionary fares can be funded from a reduction in the reimbursement rate to operators and a first call on the additional grant assumed from the government. There remains a further £82k which can be offered as a saving.	-82	
CSTRS11	<u>Car Parking Initiatives</u> Rolling out improved technology (ticket machines that accept debit / credit cards) and redesignating Esplanade car park as a short stay car park is expected to increase income yields. Proposal also to increase maximum permitted length of stay at short stay car parks.	-60	
CSTRS12	<u>Park & Ride additional income</u> Proposal to maximise value from the Park & Ride licence fee including potential 10p fare increase for return trip.	-50	
CSTRS12	<u>Housing & Planning Delivery Grant</u> Assumed additional grant from Department of Communities and Local Government from Year 3 of the Housing and Planning Delivery Grant (£365k compared to £145k budget). This saving will fund one-off growth proposals.	-220	✓

Total Recurring Savings**-1,496****Total One-Off Savings****-220**

This page is intentionally left blank



**Decision Session for Executive Member for
City Strategy**

28 January 2010

Report of the Director of City Strategy and Director of Resources

REVENUE BUDGET 2010/11 – CITY STRATEGY FEES & CHARGES**Summary**

1. This report advises the Executive Member of the proposed fees and charges for the City Strategy portfolio for the financial year 2010/11 and the anticipated increase in income which they will generate. The Annex to the report sets out the detail of the individual charges.

Background

2. The fees and charges for City Strategy are complex and varied. Some are controlled by regulation, some by national guidelines and others by market forces or the cost of administering the service. In the City Strategy Revenue budget report elsewhere on the agenda, the Executive Member is advised of the effect on the service of budget reductions. The level of fees and charges has been set against this background of severe financial constraint and service reductions. Income from fees and charges is a key factor in setting budgets and totals approximately £9.5 million for the City Strategy portfolio. In ensuring a balanced budget, it is therefore essential that income is at least maintained, if not improved.

Proposals

3. In most cases it is proposed to increase charges in line with inflation. More detail is provided for proposals relating to parking below.

Residents Parking

4. Residents parking schemes allow residents and visitors to park near their property. The council recovers the costs of administration and enforcement of residents parking schemes through charges for permits. For 2010-11 it is proposed to leave the charges unchanged. However, the number of vehicles qualifying for the discount rate will increase by including vehicles in DVLA defined Band C, as well as Bands A and B.
5. For 2011/12 there will be a full review of permit charges taking account of vehicle emissions and size. A report considered by the Executive on 19th January 2010 considered extending the number of vehicles qualifying for

discount as well as increasing the fees paid by vehicles in DVLA Bands J, K, L and M. Vehicles in the middle range are likely to see little or no increase. The fees and charges schedule in the annex is based on the decision made by the Executive.

Car Parking

6. The current budget for parking income totals £5.8 million and is therefore very important to the overall budget.
7. Car park charges have been relatively stable for a number of years. There has been no change in charges at short-stay car parks since 2005/06 and the cost to residents in standard stay car parks has increased by only 10p per hour since 2004/05.
8. Given the current economic climate it is proposed to freeze all car parking charges at short stay and standard stay car parks and all on-street tariffs. The current 70p per hour tariff at Foss Bank car park is also proposed to be frozen.
9. It is proposed however to make a number of minor alterations in response to comments from residents and traders. It is proposed to re-designate Esplanade car park to short stay from standard stay in an attempt to increase turnover at this popular car park. It is also proposed to roll out the investment in improved car park ticket machines that will enable payment by either debit or credit cards. This will follow the trial of new machines in operation at Piccadilly.
10. It is also proposed to widen the 50% discount for season ticket pass prices to be in line with changes to the RESPARK scheme ie include vehicles in low emission bands A, B or C.

Consultation

11. This paper forms part of the Council's budget consultation. The other streams being undertaken include a public consultation leaflet circulated city wide (results should be known by mid-January), a public meeting where participants debated savings and growth proposals attended by the Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive, and a further session with the business communities of the city.

Options

12. The Executive Member is asked for comments or alternative suggestions on the fees and charges proposals shown in the Annex.

Analysis

13. All the analysis is provided in the body of the report and the annexes

Corporate Priorities

14. Fees and Charges proposals are a key element of the Council's budget process. Where fees can increase above inflation to provide savings this can free up resources to deal with key council priorities. The use of discounted prices for short cars and those with low emissions assists in the sustainable city corporate priority.

Implications

Financial

15. The financial implications are dealt with in the body of the report.

Other Implications

16. There are no Human Resources, Equalities, Legal, Crime and Disorder or Information Technology, Property or Other implications to this report

Risk Management

17. The budget for city strategy is supported by income from fees and charges totalling £9.5m. Fees and charges levels are therefore of major significance in ensuring a balanced budget is set especially since the income generated is often dependent on external factors such as housing market, general economic climate. The income from fees and charges will continue to be monitored as part of the budget monitoring cycle.

Recommendations

18. The Executive Member is invited to provide comments on the fees and charges proposals for consultation for 2010/11 contained in this report.

Reason: As part of the consultation for the 2010/11 budget setting process.

Contact Details

Author:

Patrick Looker
Finance Manager
City Strategy
Tel No 01904 551633

Chief Officers Responsible for the report:

Bill Woolley
Director of City Strategy

Ian Floyd
Director of Resources

Report Approved Date 18 January 2010

Specialist Implications Officer

There are no specialist implications

Wards Affected:

All

For further information please contact the author of the report.

Annex – Fees and Charges Proposals 2010/11

Parking Tariffs from 1st April 2009

a) Off-Street Car Parks

Note			Daytime Charges (0800 - 18:00)						Evening	24 hour	
			< 30 Mins	Upto 1 hr	1-2 Hours	2-3 Hours	3-4 Hours	4-5 Hours	Over 5 hours	6.00pm to 08.00am	Charge using mobile phone
Short Stay	1	Resident	N/A	£1.70	£3.40	£5.10	£6.80	£8.50		free	
		Non-Res	N/A	£2.00	£4.00	£6.00	£8.00	£10.00		£2.00	
Standard Stay	2	Resident	N/A	£1.10	£2.20	£3.30	£4.70	£6.00	£10.00	free	£10.00
		Non-Res	N/A	£1.70	£3.40	£5.10	£7.10	£9.00	£10.00	£2.00	£10.00
Foss Bank	3		70p per hour								
Bishopthorpe Rd	3		N/A	£0.20	£0.40	£0.60					
East Parade	3		£0.20	£0.40	£3.40	£5.10	Parking for over 2 hours is only allowed after 3pm.				

Note 1 - Bootham Row, Castle and Piccadilly (Piccadilly closes at 6:30pm and so there is no evening charge)

Note 2 - Castle Mills, Esplanade, Haymarket, Marygate, Monk Bar, Nunnery Lane, Peel Street, St. Georges, Union Terrace. The £10 (over 5 hours fee) allows parking until 8am the next day.

Castle Mills closes at 8:30pm and charges only apply till 8:00pm, Peel Street - charges only apply on Mon - Sat from 8:30 - 18:00. Sunday is free.

Note 3 - There are no resident discount or evening charges at Foss Bank, Bishopthorpe Road or East Parade. The charges only apply until 18:00. Foss Bank closes at 18:00.

b) Coach Parking

	Summer (1/4/09 - 31/10/09)			Winter (1/11/10 - 31/3/11)	
	<1 Hour	<3 Hours	Over 3 hrs	<1 Hour	Over 1 Hr
Union Terrace and St George's Field Coach Parks	£5.00	£8.00	£11.00	£5.00	£8.00

c) On Street Parking

			Daytime Charges				Evening	Streets Included
			< 30mins	<1 Hour	1-2 Hours	2-3 Hours	6.00pm to 08.00am	
Standard Rate	4	Resident	N/A	£1.70	£3.40	£5.10	free	Carmelite St, Dundas Street, Lawrence Street, Lord Mayor's Walk, North Street, Palmer Lane, Piccadilly, Skeldergate, Tanner's Moat, The Crescent, Toft Green, Walmgate.
		Non-Res	N/A	£1.70	£3.40	£5.10	£2.00	
Micklegate	4 & 5	Resident	£0.20	£0.40	£3.40	£5.10	free	
		Non-Res	£0.20	£0.40	£3.40	£5.10	£2.00	
Priory Street	4 & 5	Resident	N/A	£1.50	£3.40	£5.10	free	
		Non-Res	N/A	£1.50	£3.40	£5.10	£2.00	
City Centre Footstreets		Resident					free	Blake St, Duncombe Place, Fossgate, Goodramgate, Lendal, Piccadilly, St Deny's Road, The Stonebow, Walmgate.
		Non-Res					£2.00	
Respark Shared Use Areas		Non-Permit Holders	N/A	£0.60				

Note 4 - There is no resident discount available on-street except that parking after 6pm is free for residents. Parking for over 2 Hours is only allowed after 3pm

Note 5 - No charges on Sundays between 8am and 1pm in Micklegate and Priory Street

d) On-Street Parking for large vehicles

	< 2 Hours	2- 5 Hours	5-12 Hrs	Market Traders with Permit
Foss Islands Road	£3.30	£5.00	£8.00	£1.60

Proposed Parking Tariffs from 1st April 2010

a) Off-Street Car Parks

Note			Daytime Charges (0800 - 18:00)							Evening	24 hour
			< 30 Mins	Upto 1 hr	1-2 Hours	2-3 Hours	3-4 Hours	4-5 Hours	Over 5 hours	6.00pm to 08.00am	Charge using mobile phone
Short Stay	1	Resident	N/A	£1.70	£3.40	£5.10	£6.80	£8.50	£1.70 per additional hour	free	
		Non-Res	N/A	£2.00	£4.00	£6.00	£8.00	£10.00	£2 per additional hour	£2.00	
Standard Stay	2	Resident	N/A	£1.10	£2.20	£3.30	£4.70	£6.00	£10.00	free	£10.00
		Non-Res	N/A	£1.70	£3.40	£5.10	£7.10	£9.00	£10.00	£2.00	£10.00
Foss Bank	3		70p per hour								
Bishopthorpe Rd	3		N/A	£0.20	£0.40	£0.60	Maximum stay of 3 hours			free	
East Parade	3		£0.20	£0.40	£3.40	£5.10	Parking for over 2 hours is only allowed after 3pm.				

Note 1 - Bootham Row, Esplanade, Castle and Piccadilly (Piccadilly closes at 6:30pm and so there is no evening charge)

Note 2 - Castle Mills, Haymarket, Marygate, Monk Bar, Nunnery Lane, Peel Street, St. Georges, Union Terrace. The £10 (over 5 hours fee) allows parking until 8am the next day.

Castle Mills closes at 8:30pm and charges only apply till 8:00pm, Peel Street - charges only apply on Mon - Sat from 8:30 - 18:00. Sunday is free.

Note 3 - There are no resident discount or evening charges at Foss Bank, Bishopthorpe Road or East Parade. The charges only apply until 18:00. Foss Bank closes at 18:00.

b) Coach Parking

	Summer (1/4/10 - 31/10/10)			Winter (1/11/10 - 31/3/11)	
	<1 Hour	<3 Hours	Over 3 hrs	<1 Hour	Over 1 Hr
Union Terrace and St George's Field Coach Parks	£5.00	£8.00	£11.00	£5.00	£8.00

c) On Street Parking

			Daytime Charges				Evening	Streets Included
			< 30mins	<1 Hour	1-2 Hours	2-3 Hours	6.00pm to 08.00am	
Standard Rate	4	Resident	N/A	£1.70	£3.40	£5.10	free	Carmelite St, Dundas Street, Lawrence Street, Lord Mayor's Walk, North Street, Palmer Lane, Piccadilly, Skeldergate, Tanner's Moat, The Crescent, Toft Green, Walmgate.
		Non-Res	N/A	£1.70	£3.40	£5.10	£2.00	
Micklegate	4 & 5	Resident	£0.20	£0.40	£3.40	£5.10	free	
		Non-Res	£0.20	£0.40	£3.40	£5.10	£2.00	
Priory Street	4 & 5	Resident	N/A	£1.50	£3.40	£5.10	free	
		Non-Res	N/A	£1.50	£3.40	£5.10	£2.00	
City Centre Footstreets		Resident					free	Blake St, Duncombe Place, Fossgate, Goodramgate, Lendal, Piccadilly, St Deny's Road, The Stonebow, Walmgate.
		Non-Res					£2.00	
Respark Shared Use Areas		Non-Permit Holders	N/A	£0.60				

Note 4 - There is no resident discount available on-street except that parking after 6pm is free for residents. Parking for over 2 Hours is only allowed after 3pm

Note 5 - No charges on Sundays between 8am and 1pm in Micklegate and Priory Street

d) On-Street Parking for large vehicles

	< 2 Hours	2- 5 Hours	5-12 Hrs	Market Traders with Permit
Foss Islands Road	£3.30	£5.00	£8.00	£1.60

FEES AND CHARGES 2010/11**PARKING SERVICES - SCHEDULE OF SEASON TICKET CHARGES**

		2009/10		Proposed Charge £	Increase Over 2009/10 %
		Current Charge £			
Annual Season Ticket	Discount vehicle rate	£497.50		£497.50	0.00%
	Standard rate	£995.00		£995.00	0.00%
Monthly Season Tickets					
Standard Stay car parks	Discount vehicle rate	£50.00		£50.00	0.00%
	Standard rate	£110.00		£110.00	0.00%
Weekly Season Tickets Preferential phone rate only					
Standard Stay car parks	Discount vehicle rate	£20.00		£20.00	0.00%
	Standard rate	£44.00		£44.00	0.00%
Contract Parking (Bulk) *					
Foss Bank - Annual		£300.00		£300.00	0.00%
Contract Parking (City Centre Resident 24 hour)					
Foss Bank - Monthly	Discount vehicle rate	£30.00		£30.00	0.00%
	Standard rate	£60.00		£60.00	0.00%
Foss Bank - Annual	Discount vehicle rate	£325.00		£325.00	0.00%
	Standard rate	£650.00		£650.00	0.00%
Surface - Monthly	Discount vehicle rate	£25.00		£25.00	0.00%
	Standard rate	£55.00		£55.00	0.00%
Surface - Annual	Discount vehicle rate	£288.00		£288.00	0.00%
	Standard rate	£635.00		£635.00	0.00%
Frequent User Pass					
Non-Resident - Annual	Standard rate	£120.00		£120.00	0.00%
	Discount Rate	£60.00		£60.00	0.00%
Non Resident - Quarter	Standard rate	£40.00		£40.00	0.00%
	Discount Rate	£20.00		£20.00	0.00%
Resident - Quarter	Standard rate	£21.00		£21.00	0.00%
	Discount Rate	£10.50		£10.50	0.00%

Note

Discount vehicle rate means a vehicle 2.7m or less in length OR a low emission vehicle within the DVLA defined BAND A, B or C

* ie 10 or more purchased at the same time

FEES AND CHARGES SCHEDULE 2010/11

ANNEX

Note : Vat is chargeable at the appropriate rate

SERVICE		2009/10	2010/11 Standard Charge		2010/11 Discounted Rate*		2010/11 Premium Rate**	
		Current Charge £	Proposed Charge £	% Increase %	Proposed Charge £	% Increase %	Proposed Charge £	% Increase %
		Parking Services						
Special Control Permit	-Standard *	93.00	93.00	0.0%	44.00	0.0%	110.00	new
	Quarterly charge *	29.00	29.00	0.0%	13.63	0.0%	34.30	new
Special Additional Permit	-Standard *	93.00	93.00	0.0%	44.00	0.0%	110.00	new
	Quarterly charge	29.00	29.00	0.0%	13.63	0.0%	34.30	new
Business Permit *		335.00	335.00	0.0%	157.50	0.0%		
Guest House Authorisation Card		335.00	335.00	0.0%				
Multiple Occupancy Permit *		134.00	134.00	0.0%	63.00	0.0%		
Landlord's Permit *		134.00	134.00	0.0%	63.00	0.0%		
Household Permit	-Standard *	93.00	93.00	0.0%	44.00	0.0%		
	Quarterly charge *	29.00	29.00	0.0%	13.63	0.0%		
	-Second	142.00	142.00	0.0%				
	Quarterly charge	45.75	45.75	0.0%				
	-Third	296.00	296.00	0.0%				
	Quarterly charge	80.50	80.50	0.0%				
	-Fourth	592.00	592.00	0.0%				
	Quarterly charge	155.50	155.50	0.0%				
Visitor	-Standard	1.10	1.10	0.0%				
	-Concessionary	0.20	0.20	0.0%				
Doctors Permit *		44.50	44.50	0.0%	21.00	0.0%		
Discretionary (R37) Permit *		44.50	44.50	0.0%	21.00	0.0%		
Day use R37 Permit	- Standard	1.10	1.10	0.0%				
	- Charities	0.20	0.20	0.0%				
Authorisation Card without Permit		2.50	2.50	0.0%				
Property Renovation Permit	- Quarterly *	93.00	93.00	0.0%	44.00	0.0%		
	- Daily *	2.30	2.30	0.0%	1.05	0.0%		
Commercial Permit *		465.00	465.00	0.0%	269.00	0.0%		
Commercial Permit (Specific Zone) *		120.00	120.00	0.0%	56.50	0.0%		
Replacement Permit Respark	First Replacement	Amount remaining on Permit	Amount remaining on Permit					
	Second Replacement	124.00	124.00	0.0%				
	- Concessionary	40.00	40.00	0.0%				
Replacement Minster Badge	First Replacement	5.00	5.00	0.0%				
	Second Replacement	5.00	5.00	0.0%				

* discount available for vehicles 2.7m or less in length or a low emission vehicle within DVLA defined Band A, B or C.

** additional charge for high emission vehicles within DVLA band J,K,L or M.

FEES AND CHARGES SCHEDULE 2010/11**ANNEX**

Note : Vat is chargeable at the appropriate rate

SERVICE	2009/10	2010/11	
	Current Charge £	Proposed Charge £	Increase Over 2009/10 %
Transport and Highway Fees and Charges			
Highways Adoption Fees	7% of Scheme Costs	7% of Scheme Costs	n/a
Checking Developers Plans	£500 + 1% of estimated works	£500 + 1% of estimated works	n/a
Scaffold & Hoarding licences			
Initial consent and 1 month permission	49.00	50.00	2.0%
Each additional month or part thereof	28.00	29.00	3.6%
Skip licence	23.00	24.00	4.3%
Fee for dealing with unlicensed skip	33.00	34.00	3.0%
Cherry picker licences	49.00	50.00	2.0%
Building materials on highway licence	£6 per day (or part)	£6 per day (or part)	0.0%
Vehicle Crossing Fees - Flat Fee	42.00	43.00	2.4%
Road Closures (exc VAT and advertising costs) (Non-Commercial Events Exempt)	330.00	340.00	3.0%
Temporary Waiting Restrictions	120.00	123.00	2.5%
Brown Sign Applications	240.00	250.00	4.2%
Pavement Cafe Licences	486.00	498.00	2.5%
General Solicitor Highway Enquiries			
Simple	60.00	62.00	3.3%
Medium	80.00	82.00	2.5%
Complex	162.00	166.00	2.5%
Approval consent for House Builder signs	230.00	235.00	2.2%
Rental charge for House Builder signs on street furniture	£15 per month (or part) per sign	£15 per month (or part) per sign	Nil
NRSWA (Set Nationally)			
Section 50 Licence Administration	200.00	200.00	Nil
Special Permission Inspections	200.00	200.00	Nil
Utility sample fee	50.00	50.00	Nil
Investigatory/ Third Party	68.00	68.00	Nil
Defect fee	47.50	47.50	Nil
Special Permissions	£750 or 6%	£750 or 6%	Nil
Dial and Ride			
- Single (pass holder)	1.75	1.75	0.0%
- Return (pass holder)	0.90	0.90	0.0%
- Return (pass holder)	3.50	3.50	0.0%
- Return (pass holder)	1.75	1.75	0.0%

FEES AND CHARGES SCHEDULE 2010/11**ANNEX**

Note : Vat is chargeable at the appropriate rate

SERVICE	2009/10	2010/11	
	Current Charge £	Proposed Charge £	Increase Over 2009/10 %
Road Safety			
Children			
Pre Basic Cycle Training Level 1	£2.50 / child	£2.50 / child	Nil
Basic Cycle Training Level 2	£12 / child	£12 / child	Nil
Advanced Cycle Training Level 3	£6 / child	£6 / child	Nil
Adults			
1:1 adult training (first hour)	£16 / adult	£16 / adult	Nil
1:1 adult training (2 hours)	£22 / adult	£22 / adult	Nil
Pedestrian Training			
School training by class (nb 2 x 1.5hr classes replace 3 x 1 hr classes)	25.00	25.00	Nil
External Trainer Training	£400 / person	£400 / person	Nil
<u>Planning fees and charges</u>			
Land Charges			
Basic search - over the counter	84.00	85.00	1.2%
Basic search - electronic	84.00	85.00	1.2%
Business search	155.00	157.00	1.3%
Optional enquiries	40.00	40.00	0.0%
Additional enquiries	20.00	20.00	0.0%
Personal search (set by government)			
Planning Register	tbc	tbc	Nil
Highway Register	tbc	tbc	Nil
Building Control			
Letter of confirmation }			
Completion Certificates }	32.00	33.00	3.1%
Approvals }			
Naming & Numbering			
1 - 2 units	26.00	27.00	3.8%
3 - 10 units	52.00	53.00	1.9%
10 - 100 units	104.00	107.00	2.9%
Over 100 units	156.00	160.00	2.6%
Development Control			
Pre-application advice	35.00	36.00	2.9%
Discharge of planning conditions (non-householder)	87.00	89.00	2.3%
Discharge of planning conditions (householder)	26.00	27.00	3.8%
Copies of S106 Agreements	41.00	42.00	2.4%
Other			
Tree Preservation Orders	32.00	33.00	3.1%
Historic Environment Record consultation <50ha	75.00	75.00	0.0%
Historic Environment Record consultation >50ha	150.00	150.00	0.0%
Sites & Monuments Record search	32.00	33.00	3.1%