

By: Paul Carter, Leader of the Council
Nick Chard, Cabinet Member for Finance
Peter Gilroy, Chief Executive
Lynda McMullan, Director of Finance

To: Cabinet - 8 February 2007

Subject: Medium Term Plan 2007-10 (Incorporating the Budget and Council Tax Setting for 2007-08) – Update

Classification: Unrestricted

File Ref:

Summary: This report updates the Draft Medium Term Plan 2007-10, published on 22 January, with more recent information. The new information consists of:

1. The final Local Government Finance Settlement figures announced by central Government on 18 January 2007.
2. The final tax bases agreed by the Kent District Councils as at 31 January 2007.
3. The surplus or deficits announced on the District Councils' Collection Funds as at 31 January 2007.
4. A draft summary of the outcomes of debate on the Medium Term Plan and Draft Revenue and Capital Budgets for 2007-08 following discussion at the following meetings, as shown as Appendix B: (to follow)
 - Communities Policy Overview Committee on 26 January 2007;
 - Environment and Regeneration Policy Overview Committee on 29 January 2007;
 - Corporate Services Policy Overview Committee 30 January 2007
 - Adult Services Policy Overview Committee on 1 February 2007;
 - Cabinet Scrutiny Committee on 2 February 2007 and 7 February 2007 (Oral report);
 - Children, Families and Education Policy Overview Committee on 6 February 2007 (Oral report).
5. Business Consultation Forum on 6 February 2007 (Oral report).
6. The Budget Consultation meeting with Trade Union and Professional Body Association representatives on 7 February 2007 (Oral report).

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Kent County Council published its Medium Term Plan 2007-10 (incorporating the Budget and Council Tax Setting for 2007-08) for consultation on 22 January 2007, in line with the agreed process.
- 1.2 However there were three main areas of potential change which are now dealt with in this update:
 - Central Government announced the Final Settlement on Thursday 18 January, which replaces the information received at Provisional Settlement on 28 November. This provides KCC with the final Formula Grant figure for 2007-08. KCC will receive unchanged grant in 2007-08 compared with the provisional Settlement.
 - District Councils are obliged by legislation to calculate and notify their preceptors of their tax base by 31 January. KCC's calculation of council tax depends upon the number of Band D equivalent properties (or "taxbase") within its area.
 - District Councils must also calculate and notify their preceptors of any surplus or deficit on their Collection Funds. This amount is shared on a pro rata basis between all preceptors and must be used when calculating the Council's overall budget and council tax requirement.
- 1.3 It should also be borne in mind that income due under the Local Authority Business Growth Incentive Scheme (for which we have provided for budgeted income of £3.2 million) has yet to be confirmed by Central Government.

2. CONSULTATION

- 2.1 KCC has carried out extensive consultation on the Vision for Kent. This has helped to identify service priorities and has been a key influence in setting out the key targets for action for Towards 2010. The fourth Annual Report (covering 2005-06) was presented to County Council on 22 June 2006.
- 2.2 The annual budget process provides formally for consultation with the public, Trade Unions, the Business community, opposition members and professional organisations. Meetings with business leaders and meetings with staff representatives took place on 6 and 7 February respectively (Oral Report), whilst Policy Overview Committees considered the budget proposals during the week beginning 22 January. Feedback from the Policy Overview Committees was reported to Cabinet Scrutiny on 2 February, where overall budget strategy was considered. Feedback from the Policy Overview Committees is provided in Appendix B to this report (to follow).
- 2.3 This year, the Council ran two public consultation workshops in November. These all day events invited a representative sample of resident council tax payers to consider spending issues facing the county and possible council tax increases for the forthcoming year. This year, participants were invited to set their own level of council tax within a budget model. That budget model was developed and presented as a "game" but was closely modeled on real pressures facing the council.
- 2.4 Formal feedback has been received from market research firm MORI on KCC's study of public attitudes to expenditure priorities and Council Tax levels. The Executive summary, which has previously been considered by the Informal Member Group on Budgetary Issues, is attached at Appendix A.

3. FINAL SETTLEMENT

- 3.1 The final Local Government Finance Settlement was announced by central Government on Thursday 18 January. There are no changes from the position reported to Cabinet on 4 December.
- 3.2 Details of the final Settlement for KCC, as compared to the provisional Settlement are as follows:

Component	Provisional Settlement 2007-08 £m	Final Settlement 2007-08 £m	Change from Provisional Settlement £m
Relative Needs	219.354	219.354	0.000
Relative Resource	-138.356	-138.356	-0.000
Central Allocation	145.834	145.834	0.000
Floor Damping	1.853	1.853	-0.000
External Funding	228.685	228.685	-0.000

- 3.3 KCC's final Settlement for 2007-08 has not changed compared to the provisional Settlement. No Amending Report has been proposed for 2006-07.
- 3.4 It should be noted that the headline change to the base assumption means that the increase in grant remains just a nominal 2.7%, the floor funded minimum. After taking into account capital expenditure to be supported by supported borrowing, and inflation, the effective change is minus 5.3%.

4. SURPLUS / DEFICIT ON COLLECTION FUNDS

- 4.1 District Councils must calculate any surplus or deficit on their Collection Funds. These most frequently arise when the District Council over or under performs against its projected level of tax collection. This amount is shared on a pro rata basis between all preceptors and affects the council tax calculation.
- 4.2 Information now received from the districts indicates an overall surplus of Collection Funds, of which KCC's share of £1.505m is payable in 2007-08. This surplus is slightly down from last year's £1.692m, and means an additional £1.505m is available to the Council. It must be borne in mind that these are annual, one off figures and both surpluses and deficits can arise on the collection funds. Any spending of the surplus declared from previous years should therefore only be considered available to fund one off actions.

5. TAX BASE

- 5.1 KCC's calculation of council tax depends upon the number of equivalent Band D properties (or "taxbase") within its area. District councils are obliged by legislation to notify its preceptors of this figure by 31 January.
- 5.2 The actual figure notified by District Councils is 530,548.32. This includes the tax base changes arising from the reduction in discounts which district councils were able to make from April 2004 in relation to second homes. The taxbase also includes the impact of the additional taxation capacity from the districts' discretion to reduce the discount granted on empty properties. Overall this means the tax base is 1.1% higher in 2007-08 than in 2006-07.

TABLE 2 – TAXBASE USED FOR TAX SETTING					
Band D equivalents	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
Ashford	40,497.98	41,972.10	43,206.80	43,736.00	44,533.00
Canterbury	48,803.00	49,371.00	50,186.00	50,603.00	50,904.00
Dartford	30,964.24	31,501.77	32,117.49	32,434.30	32,874.94
Dover	37,160.31	37,590.97	38,771.34	39,030.59	39,483.81
Gravesham	33,462.41	33,674.02	33,953.37	34,134.99	34,765.31
Maidstone	54,825.60	55,806.90	56,304.70	56,754.80	57,738.10
Sevenoaks	48,203.90	48,398.47	48,697.76	48,914.04	49,187.56
Shepway	37,887.69	38,585.35	38,890.06	38,965.06	39,125.37
Swale	43,327.08	43,964.13	44,403.95	45,148.28	45,772.01
Thanet	43,829.00	44,559.21	44,533.82	45,261.76	45,600.57
Tonbridge & Malling	44,246.14	44,908.12	45,356.60	46,071.78	46,709.13
Tunbridge Wells	42,067.30	42,454.35	43,092.19	43,646.73	43,854.52
Total	505,274.65	512,786.39	519,514.08	524,701.33	530,548.32
% increase	1.2	1.5	1.3	1.0	1.1

6. SUMMARY

6.1 In summary, the following changes have been made since the draft Medium Term Plan was published on 22 January 2007:

- Final Grant Settlement for 2007-08;
- Tax Base notification by districts;
- Overall tax surplus from district Collection Funds payable to KCC.

6.2 There is an additional one off £1.505m available to KCC as a result of the Collection Fund surplus. This should be allocated as follows:

- Increased spending on highways of £1.505m for targeted one off enhancement and improvements.

6.3 The additional tax yield of £0.579m, from a higher than anticipated taxbase, and updated calculations of precepts by other bodies (minus £0.035m of expenditure) should be reflected as follows:

- Funding the additional costs of the reward package for staff as agreed by Personnel Committee on 1 February 2007, which incorporates a 2% pay increase plus enhanced benefits for many of our lower paid staff £0.614m.

6.4 Overall, the effect of the changes described in this update, is that policy proposals are unchanged from those published on 22 January, and the KCC element of the council tax increase for 2007-08 is 4.95%.

6.5 The revised calculation of the proposed Council Tax for 2007-08 is as follows:

TABLE 3 - CALCULATION OF COUNCIL TAX	
	£000
Budget Requirement 2006-07	709,958
Spending increase (net of adjustments)	31,771
Budget requirement 2007-08	741,729
Financed from:	
Formula Grant	- 228,685
Council Tax collection surplus	- 1,505
Precept requirement from Council Tax	511,539
Divided by tax base (Band D equivalent)	530,548.32
Basic Amount	
Tax rate for Band D property 2007-08	964.17
Tax rate for Band D property 2006-07	918.72
Increase - £	45.45
- %	4.95%

- 6.5 The final position on the Children, Families and Education Directorate in relation to the estimated Dedicated Schools Grant will be subject to the remaining recommendations from the Schools Forum. The recommendations on this need to be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Education and School Improvement.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 Cabinet are asked to endorse the following proposals for submission to County Council on 22 February 2007:

- (a) the Revenue Budget proposals for 2007-08;
- (b) the budget requirement of £741,729,000;
- (c) a total requirement from Council Tax of £511,539,000 to be raised through precept to meet the 2007-08 budget requirement;
- (d) a Council Tax as set out below, for the listed property bands;

Council Tax Band	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£	642.78	749.91	857.04	964.17	1,178.43	1,392.69	1,606.95	1,928.34

being a 4.95% increase over 2006-07;

- (e) the Capital Investment proposals, together with the necessary use of borrowing, revenue, grants, capital receipts, renewals and other earmarked capital funds and external funding subject to approval to spend arrangements;
- (f) the Prudential Indicators as set out in Appendix B of the Medium Term Plan.

7.2 Cabinet is also asked to endorse the following recommendations to County Council: the revenue and capital proposals as presented for:

- (i) Education and School Improvement;
- (ii) Children and Family Services;
- (iii) Adult Services;
- (iv) Environment, Highways and Waste;
- (v) Regeneration and Supporting Independence;
- (vi) Communities;
- (vii) Health;
- (viii) Corporate Support;
- (ix) Policy and Performance;
- (x) Finance.

7.3 That final recommendations in relation to the Dedicated Schools Grant be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Education and School Improvement.

Background documents:

Autumn Budget Statement – Cabinet 18 September 2006

Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement 2007-08 – 28 November 2006

Budget 2007-08 and Medium Term Plan 2006-07 to 2008-09: Update on Provisional Local Government Settlement (28 November 2006) – Cabinet 4 December 2006

KCC consultation response to Provisional LG Finance Settlement – 5 January 2007

Draft budget 2007-08 and Draft Medium Term Plan 2007-10 (incorporating the Budget and Council Tax Setting for 2007-08) – Cabinet 22 January 2007.

Appendix A - Budget and Council Tax Consultations in Kent 2007/08

Key findings from discussion days
held on Saturdays 16 and 30 September
2006 for Kent County Council



September 2006

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Engaging local people as 'members of KCC's Cabinet' for the day'

The central objective of KCC's two discussion days on Saturday 16 and 30 September 2006 was to engage 'ordinary' residents in something akin to the process which the Council has to undertake when setting its 2007/08 budget.

Residents generally claim to know little about the complexities of councils' budgets – their concerns are with council tax levels and services, not generally the linkages between them. Budget consultation therefore risks engendering unconsidered views, uninformed by the range of statutory obligations, demographic changes, social needs, financial management and other issues which councils need to consider. This was the challenge which the discussion days sought to meet.

Participants were first invited to articulate, unprompted, their views and concerns about living in Kent and the services provided by the Council. After being briefed by the Council on the issues facing the county and the nature of its budget, participants were made *'members of KCC's Cabinet for the day'*, being set to work in small groups (by age) on a budget modelling task – to consider whether more or less money should be spent on a range of twenty-two specific services across four broad themes (Children, Families and Education; Adult Services; Environment & Regeneration; Communities), or whether council tax should reduce or increase as a result.



They were told that they should assume that council tax would increase by 3.0% in any event to meet unavoidable inflationary pressures and nationally-set obligations. Any increase or reduction in expenditure they proposed would therefore be in addition to, or would be taken away from, this assumed level of council tax increase. This 'trade off' discussion was informed by Council representatives acting as 'expert witnesses', who briefed participants about the detail of each service area.

The 53 participants attending the two days were as good a non-self selecting cross section as can be achieved, recruited at random, face-to-face (quotas were set to ensure a broad demographic representativeness - for gender, age, social class, work status, and district council area), in residents' own homes.

None had participated in qualitative work before; they had not been conditioned by previous consultations or engagement with the Council (e.g. as panel members); they represented a great range of life experience, both positive and negative. None knew the subject matter beforehand (this would have conditioned them). They were not at all, therefore, the same people as would normally contact their councillor, attend a public meeting, or participate in the Council's consultations.

Ultimately the budget modelling exercise was a game, but one which replicated – inevitably simplistically – the kind of process undertaken by local authorities. Participants understood that, in real life, councillors take a range of other evidence into account, along with statutory obligations and further consultations. Rather, the exercise was intended to find out what was important for residents, how this related to their experience and attitudes, and how they traded off their priorities with the need to pay, through the council tax, for the choices they make.

There was much in common between the budgets set by our 'cabinets'

A number of broad themes emerged from our six 'cabinets'. They had much in common with the outcomes from the November 2005 discussion days on the 2006/07 budget. The cabinets' budget decisions also reflected the priorities which participants had identified before the budget modelling in their pre-discussion questionnaire (see appendix 3a). In their pre-discussion questionnaire, participants identified the following services as the most important for KCC, in order: social care (for older people and vulnerable groups), education (mainly primary and secondary education), roads and pavements, waste management, public transport and youth facilities. During the discussions, the allocation of priorities remained broadly the same.

For the most part, the budget options put before the 'cabinets' reflected these priorities. But their budget decisions illustrated what was most important *within* each of these priorities. A few budget options generated a general consensus, with additional expenditure agreed across all groups:

(i) **Social care.** This was key to all groups. All agreed some additional expenditure for the options for increased spend on *'looked after' children*, where demand has increased and more unmet need has been uncovered, by far the biggest budget option put forward. On average each cabinet agreed £1.7m of the £2.4m put forward. Some groups edged increases down in some areas, and some actually topped up the options they were given, but all saw this as one of the most important of the areas under discussion.

All groups also agreed all the options concerned with enabling elderly people to live at homes. All six cabinets agreed the £0.6m put forward for *home adaptations*, a very clear, easily understandable, way of enabling people to stay in their own homes. Five out of six groups also agreed the funding for *new occupational therapists* and new members of *staff to visit lonely older people*.

This clear emphasis on social care seems to us to be an important communication issue for the Council - ensuring that residents generally understand that this is where a lot of their council tax goes. People can generally comprehend the impact of medical and demographic changes on social need.

(ii) **Support for schools** was focused in all groups on *the primary sector*, which they thought was important in its own right, would improve the quality of children moving into the secondary sector, and was most in need of improvement. Support was particularly focused, in some groups, on primary school *teaching assistants*. Indeed, two 'cabinets' switched some of the money suggested for primary teachers to teaching assistants. All six groups supported supplementing the primary schools' direct schools grant, in five cases for the full £1.2m suggested. Support for *secondary schools*, in contrast, was muted, with only one group agreeing the full £1.2m suggested. This was based partly on the perception that the sector needed 'to put its house in order' to deal with discipline etc, but also because the sector as a whole was not so much in need as additional funding as the primary sector.

The other aspect of education which was almost unanimously supported was for the *Specialist Teaching Service*. Five out of six groups supported the additional support for children with special educational needs and one older group - which had a number of participants with family SEN experience - actually decided to agree an amount higher than that suggested. Additional *Joint Commissioning Team* support, on the other hand, was not generally agreed.

(iii) **Roads and pavement maintenance**. There was no specific budget option for this service. But there was the opportunity to double the number of county lengthsmen. The concept of lengthsmen was not familiar to most participants, but five out of six groups supported additional funding for this service. In addition, one older group agreed an additional £1m for road and pavement maintenance though this was not an option put to them. Indeed, discussions held before the budget modelling exercise showed a general concern across the board regarding roads and pavement maintenance, and the road system in general. Traffic congestion and inadequate provision for parking were also raised, unprompted, though they seemed to be local, rather than county-wide, problems.

(iv) **Waste management** is a high priority, and five out of six groups agreed funding for the appointment of *four fly-tipping enforcement teams* (£0.3m). In 2005 participants had been offered, and had agreed, expenditure on waste management and recycling. From the discussions, and the list of most important services identified by participants at the start of the day, we suspect that a similar option this year would again have been agreed. However, participants were instead offered the opportunity to support a publicity campaign to increase awareness of the need to reduce waste (£0.3m). This was completely rejected by five out of six groups, partly because they thought that the media could do it cheaper and more effectively, but mostly because it was tied up with dissatisfaction with the way in which district councils across the county collect waste and recyclables in an inconsistent and (compared with participants' experience in other countries) less-than-effective way.

(v) **Young people.** All five groups who discussed this option agreed extra expenditure for *community youth tutors* and *grants to youth centres*, averaging £0.8m compared with the £1m suggested. And four out of five agreed support to supplement the *Kent Drug and Alcohol Action Team*.

Four or five out of six 'cabinets' agreed additional spend for a number of further areas¹

(i) **Grants to clubs.** Like last year, some groups saw *grants to sports clubs* as a kind of proxy for youth provision (e.g. where they had concerns about existing services) and community engagement - and reflected their concerns about disappearing playing fields, green sites, etc. This was agreed by three of the five groups which discussed the issue, the same proportion who agreed additional funding for grants to *arts societies*.

(ii) **Community safety.** Only a minority of participants were familiar with *community wardens*, but they tended to be highly supportive of them, with the exception of the younger participants, whose views were more polarised. All but one of the five groups who discussed this issue voted additional funds for the service. Participants were even less familiar with *handy vans* and *home safe vans*. They were more in favour of the former, additional funding for which was agreed by four of the five groups which discussed it.

The areas which were not at all supported were the same as in 2005

In a minority of other services, **groups made different budget decisions** (although there remained some commonality in their thinking). These sometimes reflected the particular interests of the groups. Participants were at best ambivalent towards additional expenditures on some aspects of education (new teachers for secondary schools and new staff for Joint Commissioning Team), adult services (increasing benefits take-up), environment and regeneration (improvement to socially necessary but uneconomical public transport, improvement to parks and public rights of ways, grants to town and parish councils), and community (grants to promote sport and cultural activities).

In two cases, no group (or just one group) agreed to any additional expenditure - *increasing archive office* opening hours and a *campaign to reduce waste* - precisely the two issues which were not supported by any groups in our 2005 discussion days. And for similar reasons. They were not persuaded of the need or demand for the former. And they thought the latter was a lot of money for something which other people (e.g. the media) could take the lead on (and where they expected a better performance from their district council).

¹ or at least three in the case of the 'Communities' tranche of options which the Ashford middle 'cabinet' did not have time to consider.

The pre- and post- discussion questionnaires show that participants were reluctant to reduce the current service provision. When unsure, most participants preferred to keep the service provision at its current level, rather than making cuts. The post-discussion questionnaire showed that museums and galleries, and adult and community learning, were the only services on which the majority of participants agreed to spend less. For all other services, participants asked for the provision to remain the same or to increase.

Some broadly-held principles underpin these 'decisions'

(i) **Participants did not claim to know much about the Council and its services before attending the discussion day.** Three quarters of participants felt that they knew little or nothing about how the Council makes decisions on spending. By the end of the day, however, 80% felt well informed (half of whom felt 'very informed'). As participants became more informed, so their views about the big picture evolved. At the start of the day, twenty two felt that council tax was too high for the services that the Council provides, reducing to twelve by the end. While at the start of the day just one participant felt that council tax was too low for the services it provides, this increased to five by the end of the day. Twenty eight ended the day feeling that council tax was about right.

(ii) Associated with this, at the start of the budget discussions, most **views were largely guided by a detachment from the Council** and the concept of communal responsibility. There was a feeling at that stage that the Council should not do everything and a preference for small-scale, community-based initiatives. There was a wish in all groups, apart from this year in the younger groups, to keep council tax low, coupled with a scepticism that more money meant better services.

(iii) However, following discussion, most participants judged that **most services should be protected wherever possible.** Where savings can be made they should be, but generally only if there is no reduction in service provision.

(iv) Just as we found in 2005, **participants understood the relationship between service areas**, and generally did not wish to store up problems for the future - they would invest now to save later. For example, emphasis was given to primary education not just because of their views about the respective quality of primary and secondary provision overall, but because they felt that it was at the earlier age that you have most effect on outcomes.

(v) They also recognised the inter-relationship between service providers both within and without KCC - **the need for co-ordinated approaches** to youth provision, social care, crime reduction etc.

(vi) **The way participants responded to their 'KCC cabinet' roles varied according to their age.** While the younger groups were less engaged, and relatively cavalier about council tax, the older groups took the exercises in a considered manner. But all participants, having no knowledge of the detail, responded in the light of their own experience, or that of their family and friends, or what they had read.

(vii) This might lead one to think that views would be transient. This may be the case on the *detail* - and if an alternative set of budget options had been put before them, there may have been a different set of outcomes. But the evidence from the four KCC discussion days held this year and last year is that this is not the case. As indicated above, **there was a great deal of commonality between this budget 'decisions' and last year's.** This may imply that the underlying values may be more deep-seated. Indeed, one older participant gently chided us in their post-discussion questionnaire for the implications of setting break-out groups on the basis of age: *'Generation groups don't necessarily favour more spending on their own age group. For example, older people may favour spending on the young and very young.'*

(viii) **There is much pride in the county and many of the older participants did not all feel comfortable about the changes taking place in Kent** - high housing development, problems with infrastructure including water supply, the perceived downside of its links with the continent - fast road and rail links through the county. For the older groups, but not the younger, immigration and asylum were also an issue. Many were keen to protect Kent as the county they loved and were brought up in.

By the end of the day, all 'cabinets' opted for a net increase in council tax of 4.8%-5.0%

This increase was intended to meet statutory obligations and a range of service improvements. Although at the beginning of the day the majority of participants had felt that council tax was too high for the services the Council provides, at the end most of them had accepted some increase in council tax, providing that the money is being spent on the issues which are important to them.

And participants engaged well with the experience

With the exception of the Maidstone younger group, which found the exercise uniquely hard (in our experience), participants generally found the experience rewarding and interesting:

It was fun – discussions with different types of people about things I never before considered about the Council. Very useful.

Female, 18-30, East Kent

Very useful, well conducted, thoroughly enjoyable and educational. I am very glad I came.

Male, 55+, East Kent

Cabinets' 'decisions'

CHILDREN, FAMILIES, EDUCATION	KCC budget option	Sum agreed (average across all groups)
	£m	£m
Three secondary school teachers per district	1.2	0.3
Two primary school teaching assistants per district and 18 new primary school assistants	1.2	1.1
New books for schools (£1,000 per primary school)	0.5	0.2
Sports equipment and encouraging children in sport (£1500 to each school)	0.9	0.4
Extra staff:		
- for the Specialist Teaching Service and	0.6	0.5
- for each Joint Commissioning Team	0.6	0.2
Social services:		
- 12 staff to cope with referrals and	0.4}	1.7
- cost of 'looking after children in care above affordable level'	2.0}	
SUB-TOTAL	7.4	4.4
ADULT SERVICES		
Three new occupational therapists per district	1.2	0.7
Two new staff per district to visit older people, lonely and on their own	0.6	0.4
Home adaptations	0.6	0.6
Encouraging benefit take-up	0.5	0.2
SUB-TOTAL	2.9	1.9
ENVIRONMENT AND REGENERATION		
Improvements to 20 county parks and 6,900km rights of way	0.6	0.2
10 more county lengthsman	0.3	0.23
Reduce Waste Campaign	0.3	0.08
Grants to parish councils	0.3	0.08
Increase regularity of some socially necessary bus and public transport services	0.5	0.25
Appointment of four new fly-tipping enforcement teams	0.4	0.3
SUB-TOTAL	2.4	1.14
COMMUNITIES		
Two new community wardens per district	0.8	0.44
Two new handy vans	0.2	0.1
Two new Home Safe vans	0.2	0.06
Three new staff to the Kent Drag and Alcohol Action Team (KDAAT)	0.1	0.08
Libraries		
- more books	0.7	0.23
- increase archive opening hours	0.15	0
Community Youth Tutors and grants to youth clubs	1.0	0.78
Sports:		
- Five grants of £2,500 per district for local clubs	0.15	0.1
- Three additional staff members to help prepare for Olympics	0.1	0.02
Forty grants of £5k to arts organisations	0.2	0.16
SUB-TOTAL	3.6	2.0
GRAND TOTAL	16.3	9.5
SUMMARY		
Total proposed expenditure from options		9.5
Additional expenditure proposed (road maintenance)		0.2
TOTAL PROPOSED EXPENDITURE		9.7
Resultant council tax increase		2.0%
Unavoidable council tax increase		3.0%
TOTAL COUNCIL TAX INCREASE		5.0%

Appendix B – Summary of discussions at meetings

To follow.