

PROPOSAL FOR PRIORITY ADDITION TO MTFP

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <u>Service Grouping:</u> Planning | | <u>Head of Service:</u> Carol Straughan |
| <u>Reference Number:</u> | | <u>Service Manager Responsible:</u> Barry Jackson |
| <u>Description:</u> Core funding of Planning Services | | |
| <u>Background:</u> Due to the impact of the credit crunch, the number of planning applications received in the first 2 quarters this year compared to the same time last year has dropped by 18% and income by 22%, mainly on the householder category. However it is very difficult to predict what income levels will be in the current climate, with, for example, £100K received in July and £44K in September. The loss of income does leave a significant deficit in the overall budget, with no means of making up this shortfall from other sources, as house building levels mean that the authority does not qualify for significant levels of HPDG either. | | |
| <u>What will be delivered:</u> Maintain the correct staffing levels to reflect the changing economic circumstances and deliver a first class regulatory service and the additional duties planning officers are expected to perform/provide, particularly with regards to the delivery of the LDF and the robust evidence base required to make it sound. Pre-application advice and discharging conditions are a prerequisite to good development and quality regeneration schemes in the borough. | | |
| <u>Consequences of not proceeding:</u> Potential of not achieving high standards of performance with regards to NI157 with regards to the determination of planning applications or being able to deliver the LDS with the associated raft of background documents required to provide the ensure it is sound and robust. This would effect the local area agreement which these form a part of, any future corporate assessment, and potential for additional HPDG. Recruiting and retaining staff has been a major issue for Planning Services that to loose staff at the point when the section is almost fully staffed and stable could mean that we are unable to respond when the market recovers | | |
| <u>Linkages:</u> CPA Response Council Plan Mori Response Statutory Obligation VFM Other e.g. Gershon | Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes/No Yes/No | <u>How this proposal provides the above linkages:</u> Form part of LAA indicators, NI 157 LDF is the spatial policy element of the SCS Aids the regeneration of the borough, in jobs, green space etc Regulatory service |
| <u>Details of any consultation undertaken</u> Interim Chief Executive Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Transport Finance Manager | | |

Please complete Financial details overleaf

PROPOSAL FOR PRIORITY ADDITION TO MTFP

Financial Details

| | Memo Current Year 2008/09 £'000 | 2009/10 £'000 | 2010/11 £'000 | 2011/12 £'000 |
|------------------------------|---|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Expenditure | | | | |
| Income | | | | |
| Use of Managed Surplus | | | | |
| MTFP Funding Required | | 150 | 150 | 150 |

At end of MTFP Funding:-

Will Service end? No
Will Service be self funded No
Or
Will further MTFP be required? Yes

Service Manager

Carol Straughan_____

Finance Manager

Corporate Director

PROPOSAL FOR PRIORITY ADDITION TO MTFP

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <u>Service Grouping:</u> Development & Neighbourhood Services | | <u>Head of Service:</u> Mike Robinson |
| <u>Reference Number:</u> TS2 REV | | <u>Service Manager Responsible:</u> Bill Trewick |
| <u>Description:</u> Funding for the National Concessionary Travel Scheme within Stockton-on-Tees Borough | | |
| <u>Background:</u> The English National Concessionary Travel Scheme (ENCTS) is a statutory scheme whereby bus operators have to be reimbursed for journeys made by pass holders. The take up of the concession now exceeds 82% of those eligible and the number of journeys made has increased significantly. Additionally, average fares have increased as the ENCTS allows cross boundary travel beyond the Tees Valley. In addition to the number of journeys increasing significantly, higher fuel and wage prices are indicating operational costs increasing by a minimum of 15%. | | |
| <u>What will be delivered:</u> In order to comply with statutory legislation, the Council is obliged to administer the scheme and its associated cost. It will enable all residents above the age of 60 and those registered disabled to qualify for free local bus travel anywhere in England. | | |
| <u>Consequences of not proceeding:</u> The Council has no powers to reduce the concession or introduce charges, other than for lost passes. It can only withdraw the local enhancement enabling travel before 9.30am on weekdays, which is unlikely to have a significant effect on costs as many pass holders will simply travel later. | | |
| <u>Linkages:</u> CPA Response Council Plan Mori Response Statutory Obligation VFM Other e.g. Gershon | Yes/No Yes/No Yes/No Yes/No Yes/No Yes/No Yes/No | <u>How this proposal provides the above linkages:</u> NI 177 Local bus and light rail passenger journeys originating within the Authority area NI 175 as Boroughbus Sustainable Community Strategy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health & Wellbeing • Economic Regeneration & Transport • Older Adults • Stronger Communities |
| <u>Details of any consultation undertaken</u> Current scheme for 2008/09 and proposed 2009/10 scheme is operated jointly with MBC, R&CBC and HBC. | | |

Please complete Financial details overleaf

PROPOSAL FOR PRIORITY ADDITION TO MTFP

Financial Details

| | Memo Current Year 2008/09 £'000 | 2009/10 £'000 | 2010/11 £'000 | 2011/12 £'000 |
|------------------------------|---|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Expenditure | | | | |
| Income | | | | |
| Use of Managed Surplus | | | | |
| MTFP Funding Required | | 275 | 275 | 275 |

*2008/09 scheme managed within DfT grant. MTFP required over and above DfT grant for 2009-12. Surveys of average fares, industry inflation figures and growth in trips to date indicate that an increase in costs of 15% may be expected. The minimum increase of 15% results in additional costs of £465K. The likely increase will be near 20%. Savings in the current years budget and MTFP within the con fares area will be utilised to bridge the gap between budget and estimated costs. The revised MTFP funding requirement is therefore £275k per annum.

At end of MTFP Funding:-

Will Service end? No
Will Service be self funded No
Or
Will further MTFP be required? Yes

Service Manager

_ Richard McGuckin _

Finance Manager

Corporate Director

PROPOSAL FOR PRIORITY ADDITION TO MTFP

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <u>Service Grouping:</u> DNS | <u>Head of Service:</u> Mike Batty, Head of Community Protection |
| <u>Reference Number:</u> CP2 | <u>Service Manager Responsible:</u> N/A |

Description: Contribution to cost of additional Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs)

Background:
Up until 2006/07 Cleveland Police provided 24 PCSOs in Stockton-on-Tees. In 2007/08 the Council contributed £250k towards 2 year increase of 31 PCSOs to a new total of 55. This figure was achieved, following a programme of recruitment, by April 2008. It is now understood that the Home Office and Cleveland Police Authority will continue their contribution into 2009/10 and beyond.

What will be delivered: Continued record levels of visible uniformed presence on the streets, including PCSOs attached to the 26 named Ward / Neighbourhood Policing Teams, and 10 PCSOs deployed as Ward / Neighbourhood Support Team.

Consequences of not proceeding:

Likely reduction in PCSO numbers to at maximum 48 by end of 2009/10.

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <u>Linkages:</u> CPA Response Council Plan Mori Response Statutory Obligation VFM Other e.g. Gershon | Yes Yes Yes No Yes No | <u>How this proposal provides the above linkages:</u> } NI7 perceptions of ASB (LAA indicator) } NI 21 Dealing with local concerns about ASB and crime by the local council and police. } NI 24 Satisfaction with the way the police and local council dealt with ASB } NI 25 Satisfaction of different groups with the way the police and local council dealt with ASB } NI 27 Understanding of local concerns about ASB and crime by the local council and police } NI 41 Perceptions of drunk or rowdy behaviour as a problem } NI 195 Improved street and environmental cleanliness Record levels in confidence in policing Council contribution represents about 15% of total costs |
|---|--|--|

Details of any consultation undertaken

ASB identified as top priority in Community Safety consultation programme summer 2007 (based on 4,000 responses)

Please complete Financial details overleaf

PROPOSAL FOR PRIORITY ADDITION TO MTFP

Financial Details

| | Memo Current Year 2008/09 £'000 | 2009/10 £'000 | 2010/11 £'000 | 2011/12 £'000 |
|------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Expenditure | 125* | 125 | 125 | 125 |
| Income | - | *75 | - | - |
| Use of Managed Surplus | - | - | - | - |
| MTFP Funding Required | - | 50 | 125 | 125 |

* provided from previous headroom allocation

At end of MTFP Funding:-

Will Service end? Yes - in part see above
Will Service be self funded No
Or
Will further MTFP be required? Yes

Service Manager _____

Finance Manager _____

Corporate Director _____

PROPOSAL FOR PRIORITY ADDITION TO MTFP

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <u>Service Grouping:</u> Housing: Benefits | | <u>Head of Service:</u> Julie Nixon |
| <u>Reference Number:</u> <u>HB01</u> | | <u>Service Manager Responsible:</u> Linda Stephenson- Benefit Manager |
| <u>Description:</u> Housing and Council tax Benefit- reduction in administration grant and resource allocation shortfall. | | |
| <u>Background:</u> The DWP have introduced year on year administration grant cuts of 5%. A MTFP bid last year was sufficient to cover the shortfall for 2008/9 and 2009/10. However there was no indicative figure for 2010/11, and it was considered prudent to await further information. It is now clear that there will be further cuts in 2009/10 and 2010/11 with Stockton's proportion of the national "pot" reduced because of shifts in the national caseload pattern. Workload is increasing due to the current economic climate. | | |
| <u>What will be delivered:</u> Housing and Council Tax benefit service will be maintained at the current level- judged as "Excellent" in the 2008 CPA assessment. | | |
| <u>Consequences of not proceeding:</u> Costs per transaction at Stockton are in the lowest 10% in the CIPFA benchmarking club. There is no scope for efficiencies which would not cause a significant deterioration in service, resulting in backlogs of work and delays of over 3 months in processing claims. Part of the DWP benefit payment subsidy is based on service quality- delays will mean a cut a subsidy of up to £260,000 | | |
| <u>Linkages:</u> CPA Response Council Plan Mori Response Statutory Obligation VFM Other e.g. Gershon | Yes Yes/No No Yes Yes Yes/No Yes/No | <u>How this proposal provides the above linkages:</u> Benefit block of CPA- maintaining standards Statutory service Delays in processing would result in further subsidy loss. |
| <u>Details of any consultation undertaken</u> | | |

Please complete Financial details overleaf

PROPOSAL FOR PRIORITY ADDITION TO MTFP

Financial Details

| | Memo Current Year 2008/09 £'000 | 2009/10 £'000 | 2010/11 £'000 | 2011/12 £'000 |
|------------------------------|---|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Expenditure | | | | |
| Income | | | | |
| Use of Managed Surplus | | | | |
| MTFP Funding Required | 0 | 34 | 151 | 231 |

At end of MTFP Funding:-

Will Service end? No
Will Service be self funded No
Or
Will further MTFP be required? Yes

Service Manager

Linda Stephenson

Finance Manager

Corporate Director

PROPOSAL FOR PRIORITY ADDITION TO MTFP

| | | |
|---|-----|---|
| <u>Service Grouping:</u> Waste Management | | <u>Head of Service:</u> Jamie McCann |
| <u>Reference Number:</u> | | <u>Service Manager Responsible:</u> Stuart Bargewell |
| <u>Description:</u> Waste Disposal Contract, Change of Law / landfill tax / RPI | | |
| <u>Background:</u> The current Waste Disposal Contract that Stockton Borough Council has with Sita UK Ltd provides for the contractor to be recompensed by the contracted Local Authorities for any change in legislation that has a financial impact on their company. There has been a change in legislation that affects the amount of business rates that Sita are charged, which has resulted in a significant increase to the Rateable Value of their premises. SITA have received transitional rate relief since 05/06. The full effect of the rate increase which is a legitimate charge can be passed on to the client. This is the case from 2009/10. SITA are not making a claim for any back money already paid out by them in respect of increased rates. In addition to this the gate fee Sita charge is based on RPI plus the effect of Landfill Tax, which is likely to be around 5.5%. | | |
| <u>What will be delivered:</u> The continuation of a waste disposal facility | | |
| <u>Consequences of not proceeding:</u> SBC would be in Breach of Contract. | | |
| <u>Linkages:</u> | | <u>How this proposal provides the above linkages:</u> |
| CPA Response | Yes | The Council will be in breach of the terms and conditions of the Waste Disposal Contract and any alternative disposal facility would inevitably be a landfill site. It would also impact on the neighbouring authorities that share the Energy from Waste facility under a joint contract. Key government targets for the recovery of waste of 53% by 2010 and the target of 47% of municipal waste sent to landfill would not be met. Furthermore the cost of landfill tax is set to rise by £8.00 per tonne until at least 2010 making it far more expensive than the Energy from Waste route. The financial cost of breaching this contract these additional costs |
| Council Plan | Yes | |
| Mori Response | No | |
| Statutory Obligation | No | |
| VFM | Yes | |
| Other e.g. Gershon | No | |
| <u>Details of any consultation undertaken</u> Advice taken from Legal Services regarding the validity of SITA claim has been confirmed. Negotiations to be held with SITA re flexibilities available for payment. Discussions taken place at monthly Waste Management Group Meetings | | |

Please complete Financial details overleaf

PROPOSAL FOR PRIORITY ADDITION TO MTFP

Financial Details

| | Memo Current Year 2008/09 £'000 | 2009/10 £'000 | 2010/11 £'000 | 2011/12 £'000 |
|------------------------------|---|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Expenditure | 0 | | | |
| Income | | | | |
| Use of Managed Surplus | | | | |
| MTFP Funding Required | 0 | 200 | 200 | 200 |

At end of MTFP Funding:-

Will Service end? No
Will Service be self funded No
Or
Will further MTFP be required? No

Service Manager

Finance Manager

Corporate Director

PROPOSAL FOR PRIORITY ADDITION TO MTFP

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <u>Service Grouping:</u> D&NS (Housing) | | <u>Head of Service:</u> Julie Nixon |
| <u>Reference Number:</u> | | <u>Service Manager Responsible:</u> Stephen Shaw |
| <u>Description:</u> Voluntary Sector Support Fund (VSSF) - a contribution to this block-fund that supports 11 of the Borough's key voluntary sector organisations delivering services throughout the Borough. | | |
| <u>Background:</u> IN 2008/9 the VSSF is being augmented with £123k of transitional funding from the Communities Fund. This allocation ends in March 2009 meaning that the total VSSF fund will be reduced by 22% in 2009/10 and subsequent years. This is a critical period for the Borough Voluntary Sector Organisations and an additional investment now would be timely. It has been recognised that the core funding needs to be reviewed and that importantly the process needs to involve the third sector. Catalyst, the third sector infrastructure organisation in the Borough will taking a lead role in negotiating with the sector working alongside the Council. The review was originally to have taken place in this financial year but has been delayed to enable Catalyst to become established as the voice of the sector. A report is to be presented to Renaissance early in 2009 which identifies the proposed process of review and should be concluded by June 2009. The sector will then have clarity and certainty about long term funding and can plan on that basis hence the need to extend the top up funding. | | |
| <u>What will be delivered:</u> The funding will be used by the care funded voluntary sector agencies delivering services throughout the borough. This will broaden and add quality to the core offer of these vital partners who collectively are contributing to the majority of key outcomes within the Sustainable Community Strategy. | | |
| <u>Consequences of not proceeding:</u> A direct reduction (22% in financial terms) in the quality and diversity of offer amongst these organisations. As the credit crunch deepens the services of these organisations is more relevant and pressured than ever. Stockton District Advice & Information Service for instance are dealing with increasing numbers of anxious people in serious debt and facing mortgage defaults and the threat of repossession. | | |
| <u>Linkages:</u> CPA Response Council Plan Mori Response Statutory Obligation VFM Other e.g. Gershon | Yes/No Yes/ No Yes/No Yes/No Yes/No Yes/No Yes/No | <u>How this proposal provides the above linkages:</u> As described above the collective effort of the core funded organisations is contributing directly to the achievement of the Council and Sustainable Community Strategy. |
| <u>Details of any consultation undertaken</u> Consultation ongoing with all the core funded organisations | | |

Please complete Financial details below

PROPOSAL FOR PRIORITY ADDITION TO MTFP

Financial Details

| | Memo Current Year 2008/09 £'000 | 2009/10 £'000 | 2010/11 £'000 | 2011/12 £'000 |
|------------------------------|---|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Expenditure | 553 | 559 | 565 | 570 |
| Income | 123 (grant) | 0 (no grant) | 0 | 0 |
| Use of Managed Surplus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MTFP Funding Required | 0 | 123 | | |

At end of MTFP Funding:-

Will Service end? ~~Yes~~/No
Will Service be self funded Yes - An additional investment of SBC resources will allow Catalyst, the developing strategic body for the third sector in Stockton, to bid for and secure inward investment to make up the shortfall within the VSSF.

Service Manager

Stephen Shaw

Finance Manager

Corporate Director

PROPOSAL FOR PRIORITY ADDITION TO MTFP

| | |
|--|--|
| <u>Service Grouping:</u> CESC | <u>Head of Service:</u> Covers Adults and Childrens Services |
| <u>Reference Number:</u> | <u>Service Manager Responsible:</u> Various |
| <u>Description:</u> CESC Demand Pressures (On Going) and Estimated Growth on Demand | |
| <p><u>Background:</u></p> <p>Services continue to experience severe pressure from the increasing number, cost and complexity of care needs for young people and adults. On going pressures are being absorbed in the current year within the service groupings managed surplus but this position is unsustainable into 2009/10. The £600k on-going demand pressures reflect the full year effect of existing placements and direct payments in place at the current time. There are also likely growth pressures which, although extremely difficult to predict, based on trends over the last few years it is considered essential to set £575k aside in 2009/10 with further substantial increase across the following two years. These pressure reflects a number of factors, e.g.increasing numbers of looked after children, local demographic change with an increasingly ageing population; longer survival rates of those with severe disabilities; an increasing prevalence of complex behavioural, mental health, and learning disability needs; increasing expectations of families and carers for access to comprehensive care packages, particularly as young people move into adulthood, fewer savings than expected through CHC (Continuing Health Care) arrangements, high growth in direct payments expenditure. Additional resources will enable this pressure to be addressed at a number of levels by ensuring the most appropriate specialist placements can be procured to meet assessed needs and enable access to direct payments / personalised budgets to provide more choice and control for service users and carers.</p> | |
| <p><u>What will be delivered:</u></p> <p>Continued choice and control for service users. More service users able to access community based support and to sustain their independence. Significant impact on key performance indicators in national framework, including those identified as areas for development through the annual performance assessment: overall health and wellbeing; support for long-term conditions; achieving independence; self-directed support; delayed transfers of care; timeliness of care packages; provision of support to exercise choice and control to live independently; access to services; reducing health inequalities</p> | |
| <p><u>Consequences of not proceeding:</u></p> <p>Failure to deliver against key national and local priorities for increased choice, control and independence for service users. Risk to sustaining current star rating in annual performance assessment and CAA. Continued over-reliance on high cost, out of borough provision for specialist residential care needs and danger of failing to meet statutory duties of care for assessed needs. Failure to provide for increasing demand on services arising from demographic change.</p> | |

Please complete Financial details overleaf

PROPOSAL FOR PRIORITY ADDITION TO MTFP

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p><u>Linkages:</u> CPA Response Council Plan Mori Response Statutory Obligation VFM Other e.g. Gershon</p> | <p>Yes Yes No Yes Yes No</p> | <p><u>How this proposal provides the above linkages:</u></p> |
| <p><u>Details of any consultation undertaken</u></p> | | |

Financial Details

| | Memo Current Year 2008/09 £'000 | 2009/10 £'000 | 2010/11 £'000 | 2011/12 £'000 |
|------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Demand Pressures (On- | | 600 | 600 | 600 |
| Estimated Growth Demand | | 575 | 925 | 1275 |
| Use of Managed Surplus | | | | |
| MTFP Funding Required | | 1,175 | 1,525 | 1,875 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| <p><u>At end of MTFP Funding:-</u></p> | |
| Will Service end? | No |
| Will Service be self funded | No |
| Or | |
| Will further MTFP be required? | Yes |

Service Manager _____

Finance Manager _____

Corporate Director _____

PROPOSAL FOR PRIORITY ADDITION TO MTFP

| | | |
|---|-----|--|
| <u>Service Grouping:</u> CESC | | <u>Corporate Director:</u> Jane Humphreys |
| <u>Reference Number:</u> | | <u>Service Manager Responsible:</u> |
| <u>Description:</u> Safeguarding Children | | |
| <u>Background:</u> Over the past four years, there has been a significant increase in the number of children in the Safeguarding System and a record number of Looked After Children. The number of children with child protection plans has increased from 137 in 2005/6 to 200 at present and with 19 child protection conferences this month this could rise again to 231. In addition at this moment in time the authority has 234 children looked after, previously this figure had been in the region of around 200. Over the past six years, the number of Social Workers has increased from 32 to 37.3. Despite this increase it has been a struggle to meet demand and as a consequence Saturday overtime and recruiting Agency Staff have been introduced to try and address demand. Even with this increase in resources, demand continues to rise. Following recent guidance from Ofsted, the Health Care Commission and HMIC and, taking into account the increase in demand referred to above, an assessment has been undertaken that suggests additional staffing resources are required. | | |
| <u>What will be delivered:</u> It is proposed to separate the ongoing casework functions and duty functions by creating a new duty team which will respond to all new work coming into the division, this will release capacity within the Integrated Service Areas to address unallocated work and the more rigorous requirements of Ofsted and the DCSF. Increased supervision by Managers and improved quality and the ability to deal with the increasing number of cases by the appointment of a practice manager, six social workers and an admin support worker. | | |
| <u>Consequences of not proceeding:</u> Failure to ensure compliance with the expectations of the Haringey JAR findings and recommendations | | |
| <u>Linkages:</u> | | <u>How this proposal provides the above linkages:</u> |
| CPA Response | No | |
| Council Plan | Yes | |
| Mori Response | No | |
| Statutory Obligation | Yes | |
| VFM | No | |
| Other e.g. DCSF / | Yes | |
| <u>Details of any consultation undertaken</u> | | |

Please complete Financial details overleaf

PROPOSAL FOR PRIORITY ADDITION TO MTFP

Financial Details

| | Memo Current Year 2008/09 £'000 | 2009/10 £'000 | 2010/11 £'000 | 2011/12 £'000 |
|------------------------------|---|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Expenditure | | 300 | 300 | 300 |
| Income | | 300 | 300 | 300 |
| Use of Managed Surplus | | | | |
| MTFP Funding Required | | 0 | 0 | 0 |

At end of MTFP Funding:-

Will Service end? No
Will Service be self funded Yes
Or
Will further MTFP be required? No

Service Manager _____

Finance Manager _____

Corporate Director _____

PROPOSAL FOR PRIORITY ADDITION TO MTFP

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| <u>Service Grouping:</u> Resources | | <u>Corporate Director:</u> Julie Danks | |
| <u>Reference Number:</u> | | <u>Service Manager Responsible:</u> Paul Hutchinson | |
| <u>Description:</u> Increased unit prices in gas & electricity supply to council's admin buildings | | | |
| <u>Background:</u> There have been a number of significant increases in unit prices of both gas & electricity in last eighteen months resulting in a budget shortfall of £80k for the cost of heat, light & power supply to the council's main admin buildings. The pressures in respect of 2008/9 are being funded from Managed Surplus, however this is not sustainable. | | | |
| <u>What will be delivered:</u> Heat, light & power can continue to be provided to the council's main admin buildings at the best market rate available without creating financial pressures on the other running costs of those buildings | | | |
| <u>Consequences of not proceeding:</u> This pressure is unavoidable and based on current energy costs will be incurred. If funding were not allocated then this would impact on the ability to maintain and operate the buildings to the required standards. | | | |
| <u>Linkages:</u> Statutory Obligations | | <u>How this proposal provides the above linkages:</u> There are statutory obligations regarding heating, lighting and state of repair of staff accommodation | |
| Details of any consultation undertaken | | | |

PROPOSAL FOR PRIORITY ADDITION TO MTFP

Please complete Financial Details overleaf

Financial Details

| | Memo Current Year 2008/09 £'000 | 2009/10 £'000 | 2010/11 £'000 | 2011/12 £'000 |
|------------------------------|---|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Expenditure | 422 | 422 | 422 | 422 |
| Income | 342 | 342 | 342 | 342 |
| Use of Managed Surplus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>MTFP Funding Required</u> | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 |

At end of MTFP Funding:-

Will Service end? Yes / No
Will Service be self-funded? Yes / No
or
Will further MTFP be required? Yes / No

Service Manager

Finance Manager

Corporate Director