

EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL COMMITTEE MINUTES

Committee: Finance and Performance Management Cabinet Committee **Date:** Monday, 21 November 2011

Place: Council Chamber, Civic Offices, High Street, Epping **Time:** 6.30 - 8.50 pm

Members Present: Councillors G Mohindra (Chairman), Mrs M McEwen, J Philip, Mrs P Smith and Mrs L Wagland

Other Councillors: Councillors R Bassett, Ms R Brookes, K Chana, Mrs D Collins, D C Johnson, J Knapman, A Lion, Mrs C Pond, D Stallan, G Waller and C Whitbread

Apologies: -

Officers Present: D Macnab (Acting Chief Executive), J Gilbert (Director of Environment and Street Scene), A Hall (Director of Housing), R Palmer (Director of Finance and ICT), P Maddock (Assistant Director (Accountancy)), E Higgins (Insurance & Risk Officer), S Tautz (Performance Improvement Manager), A Hendry (Democratic Services Officer) and G J Woodhall (Democratic Services Officer)

Also in attendance: M Stevenson and R Holmes

20. WEBCASTING INTRODUCTION

The Chairman reminded everyone present that the meeting would be broadcast live to the Internet, and that the Council had adopted a protocol for the webcasting of its meetings.

21. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest pursuant to the Council's Code of Member Conduct.

22. MINUTES

Resolved:

(1) That the minutes of the meeting held on 26 September 2011 be taken as read and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

23. REVENUE INCOME OPTIMISATION

The Acting Chief Executive introduced a report on Revenue Income Optimisation.

The Acting Chief Executive reported that in July 2011, the Council had commissioned PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) to undertake an exercise to identify options for the generation of increased revenue income. This exercise was funded by and part of Improvement East's Efficiency Challenge for 2011/12 and was carried out using PwC's 'Revenue Income Optimisation' (RIO) methodology. This sought to identify opportunities for new or increased income generation and possibilities for improved structures for fees and charges. In attendance at the meeting were Mark Stevenson,

a Director from PwC, and Richard Holmes, the PwC Consultant who had undertaken the study at the Council.

Mark Stevenson stated that the RIO project had identified a number of business case opportunities which could deliver increased revenue income for the Council. The relatively low number of possible opportunities identified had been recognition of the work that the Council had already undertaken in relation to the 'selling' of services and expertise to its partners, in securing external funding, and in ensuring cost recovery in specific service provision. Additional opportunities raised through the RIO exercise were being reviewed to determine whether anticipated business benefits were realisable, and these might further increase overall levels of income if implemented.

It was highlighted that PwC had undertaken over 40 similar exercises across the country, and that the exercise was not simply one of trying to squeeze as much money as possible from residents. The annual Fees and Charges report was highlighted as good practice by the Council but that the current income from fees and charges represented only 8% of the Council's annual expenditure; this was low by the standards of the other Councils in the CIPFA benchmarking group. Three principal business cases had been identified as possible opportunities for additional revenue generation, these were:

- (a) Advertising and Sponsorship:
 - Council's website;
 - Council's vehicle fleet;
 - Prime locations throughout the District where the land was owned by the Council; and
 - Sponsorship of events and services.

- (b) Off-Street Car Parking:
 - Restructuring the Council's existing tariffs;
 - Removing free parking on Saturdays, the pre-Christmas period, Sundays and other Bank Holidays;
 - Introduction of parking charges for Blue Badge holders; and
 - Development of other businesses within the Council's car parks, e.g. car washes.

- (c) Solar Photovoltaic Energy Generation:
 - Installation of renewable energy initiatives throughout the Council's operational properties.

The Cabinet Committee welcomed the report but was disappointed that the prospective income identified within the report was not more significant, although it was accepted that this could be because the Council had already made progress in identifying all available sources of income. In respect of advertising and sponsorship, there were significant initial costs involved in some of the suggestions, but the inclusion of advertising on the Council's website could be an initial low risk project for the Council to pursue and the proposed new website had been designed to facilitate appropriate advertising. With regard to Solar Photovoltaic (PV) energy generation, the report indicated a 14-year payback period for this project, which would be difficult to justify with the Council about to accept approximately £190million of debt for the Housing Revenue Account (HRA). In addition, the Government had recently altered the Feed In Tariff subsidy element of Solar PV schemes, which had made it less attractive to pursue, so it was suggested that the proposed scheme should be reviewed at a later date.

The Cabinet Committee acknowledged that significant additional income could be generated by the Council's car parks, however the District's residents valued the free parking currently provided by the Council (Saturdays, pre-Christmas period, Sundays and Bank Holidays). The car parking tariff had not been radically altered for a number of years now, and it was accepted that this should be kept under review, however it was felt that this could not be justified at the current time with the economic pressures faced by residents and local businesses. It was suggested that additional sophisticated market research should be undertaken around the issue of car parking to understand the needs of both residents and traders, and how the charges could be structured to benefit local businesses by increasing turnover within the car parks. The Housing Portfolio Holder highlighted that the Council should take legal advice before applying off-street parking charges to holders of blue badges, although this was not currently being proposed by the Council. The Portfolio Holder for Safer, Greener and Highways reassured the Cabinet Committee that car park charges would not be substantially altered without careful consideration and consultation.

It was noted that the report did not elaborate upon the revenue streams employed by other Councils, or some of the income streams currently enjoyed by the Council, such as Building Control and Country Care. It was pointed out that if fees and charges were not increased then this would equate to a 5% decrease in real terms due to the effects of inflation. The Cabinet Committee agreed that the report was useful and would maintain the Council's focus on its income streams in the future through the production of an 'Income Plan'.

Recommended:

- (1) That the report on the recent Revenue Income Optimisation exercise undertaken by Pricewaterhouse Coopers be noted;
- (2) That the preferred approach to each of the following possible revenue generation options identified by Pricewaterhouse Coopers be agreed in principle:
 - (a) the introduction of advertising or sponsorship on the Council's website
 - (b) the introduction of advertising or sponsorship on the Council's fleet of vehicles;
 - (c) the investigation of opportunities for the expansion and development of the Council's car parks; and
 - (d) the investigation of other business opportunities for the Council's car parks;
- (3) That a further report regarding the implementation of the options identified in recommendation (2) above be made at the Cabinet Committee's next scheduled meeting on 16 January 2012, at which the members of the Finance & Performance Management Scrutiny Panel would be invited to attend;
- (4) That the preferred approach to each of the following possible revenue generation options also identified by Pricewaterhouse Coopers be further examined in the future:
 - (a) the introduction of advertising or sponsorship on the Council's land and property assets;
 - (b) the introduction of advertising or sponsorship on billboards at prime locations in the ownership of the Council;

- (c) the introduction of advertising on lamp columns and CCTV columns managed by the Council;
 - (d) the introduction of sponsorship for events and services; and
 - (e) the development of existing advertising sources; and
- (5) That all other possible revenue generation options identified by Pricewaterhouse Coopers as part of their Revenue Income Optimisation exercise, particularly in relation to increased car parking charges, not be considered at the current time.

Reasons for Decision:

To consider all of the possible identified opportunities for the generation of increased revenue income and revised fees and charges, as part of the budget setting process for 2012/13.

The Cabinet Committee balanced the benefits from increased revenue and income with the needs of local residents and businesses when considering all the potential opportunities.

Other Options Considered and Rejected:

To implement all the options identified by Pricewaterhouse Coopers in their report, however some of these would conflict with the needs of residents and businesses within the District.

To not implement any of the options identified by Pricewaterhouse Coopers, however the Council had already identified some of the options proposed.

24. MID YEAR TREASURY REPORT

The Director of Finance & ICT presented the mid-year progress report on Treasury Management and Prudential Indicators for 2011/12, which was a requirement of the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management and covered the treasury activity for the first half of 2011/12.

The Director reported that during the first half of the year: the Council had rephased its capital programme with £1.1million moving out of 2011/12 and some moving into future years; the Council had remained debt free and no borrowing had occurred; the average net investment position has been approximately £54.6million; and there had been no breaches on any of the prudential indicators. It was noted that the Council's banker, NatWest, had fallen below the minimum credit criteria for investments by the Council during the first half of the year. It was proposed that the Council gave approval to reduce the minimum long term rating criteria from A+ (or equivalent) to A- (or equivalent) to allow the Council to continue to use the NatWest bank for short term liquidity investments.

The Cabinet Committee was informed that the Audit & Governance Committee had been satisfied with the report at its meeting ten days earlier, and it was felt that the use of NatWest as the Council's bank was of little risk while it remained in public ownership, despite the recent fall in its credit rating.

In response to questions from the Members present, the Director commented that there was no real risk from using a bank scored at A-, and there would be costs associated with the Council moving its accounts to another Bank. The reality of the marketplace was that there was little interest in running local authority bank accounts; NatWest and the Co-Operative Bank monopolised the market, and the Co-Operative Bank's credit rating was worse than NatWest's.

The Cabinet Committee noted the advice from the Council's Treasury Management Consultants, Arlingclose, that the minimum rating for long-term investments could be reduced to A- (or equivalent) but felt that this should only be applied to the Council's banker, NatWest, and only while it remained in the ownership of the UK Government.

Recommended:

(1) That the management of the risks associated with the Council's Treasury Management function during the first half of 2011/12 be noted; and

(2) That the change in strategy to reduce the minimum long-term rating from A+ (or equivalent) down to A- (or equivalent) specifically only for the use of the Council's bank, NatWest, and only while it remains in the ownership of the UK Government be recommended to the Council for approval.

Reasons for Decision:

To comply with the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management.

To ensure that the continued use of NatWest by the Council as its banker did not contravene the Council's own Treasury Management Strategy.

Other Options Considered and Rejected:

To not comply with the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management.

To move the Council's Bank Account to another provider, however the other major player in the market had a credit rating that was worse than NatWest.

25. CORPORATE RISK UPDATE

The Senior Finance Officer (Risk & Insurance) presented a report regarding the quarterly updating of the Corporate Risk Register.

The Senior Finance Officer stated that the Corporate Risk Register had been considered by both the Risk Management Group on 17 October and the Corporate Governance Group on 19 October. The reviews had identified a number of amendments to the Corporate Risk Register. In addition, the Cabinet Committee at its meeting on 20 June 2011 had requested a review of a number of different risks concerning the East of England Plan, Gypsy & Traveller Provision, Business Continuity Management and the expenditure of Capital Receipts on non revenue generating assets.

As a result of the review, Risk 4, 'East of England Plan – Unable to agree a joined up plan', had been deleted whilst Risk 3 had been revised as 'Potential Difficulty producing Local Plan to timetable' and scored as significant likelihood, critical impact (C2). There was an increased possibility of the Council facing planning appeals and increased costs awards if the Local Plan was not completed on time. Risk 29, 'Gypsy Roma Traveller Provision', had been revised and scored as significant likelihood,

critical impact (C2), which had put it above the tolerance and an action plan had been prepared. Risk 8, 'Business Continuity Management', had been updated to reflect the results of the recent exercise, and the likely level of debt for risk 33, 'Reform of Housing Revenue Account', had been amended from £200million to £190million. Updates had been made to the Further Action sections for risks 17, 'Capital Receipts spent on non revenue generating assets', and 27, 'Shortfall in key income streams' whilst the rating for risk 20, 'Collapse of Key Contract', had reduced to significant likelihood, critical impact (C2) as both the Waste Management and Leisure Management contracts had been recently extended.

Recommended:

- (1) That the deletion of risk 4, 'East of England Plan – Unable to agree joined up Plan', be agreed;
- (2) That the review and re-naming of risk 3, 'Potential difficulty producing Local Plan to timetable', be agreed;
- (3) That the review of risk 29, 'Gypsy Roma Traveller Provision', by the Risk Management Group and the Corporate Governance Group and their conclusion that the score should be increased to 'Significant Likelihood, Critical Impact' (C2) be agreed;
- (4) That the Consequences for risk 8, 'Business Continuity Management', be updated following the recent exercise;
- (5) That the Effectiveness of Control and Required Further Action for risk 17, 'Significant Amounts of Capital Receipts spent on Non Revenue Generating assets' be updated;
- (6) That the Further Management Action for Risk 27, 'Shortfall in Key Income Streams', be updated following the recent Pricewaterhouse Coopers study;
- (7) That the review of risk 20, 'Key Contract collapses or service levels deteriorate', by the Risk Management Group and the Corporate Governance Group and their conclusion that the score should be decreased to 'Significant Likelihood, Critical Impact' (C2) be agreed;
- (8) That risk 33, 'Reform of Housing Revenue Account', be updated to reflect the Council's likely level of debt being £190million;
- (9) That the current tolerance line on the risk matrix be considered satisfactory and not be amended; and
- (10) That, incorporating the above agreed changes, the amended Corporate Risk Register be recommended to the Cabinet for approval.

Reasons for Decision:

It was essential that the Corporate Risk Register was regularly reviewed and kept relevant to the threats faced by the Council.

Other Options Considered and Rejected:

To suggest the inclusion of further risks or amend the rating of existing risks if necessary.

26. INSURANCE UPDATE

The Senior Finance Officer (Risk & Insurance) presented a report on Insurance Performance Monitoring.

The Senior Finance Officer reminded the Cabinet Committee that the Council had entered into a five-year agreement with Zurich Municipal in June 2005. A new three-year agreement had been signed with Zurich Municipal in June 2010, and there was an option to extend the agreement for a further two years in 2013. The Council's excess level had been increased from £500 to £5,000, which had generated a saving of £69,030 per annum on the insurance premiums. Claims trends were monitored regularly and an analysis had been presented in terms of open and closed claims for Motor, Property and Casualty insurance over the previous five years. Casualty claims were further analysed to show those closed claims that had been repudiated or paid. This had shown that only for Casualty claims in 2010/11 had Zurich Municipal paid out more in claims than they had received in premiums, and that the decision to increase the Council's excess to £5,000 had generated accumulated savings of £181,005 over the previous five years.

The Senior Finance Officer added that the Council had entered into a new three-year agreement with Zurich Municipal on 30 June 2010, on the basis of the current levels of excess. The agreement included an option to extend the contract for a further two years after the initial period and it was intended to open negotiations in January 2012 with Zurich Municipal. Following the initial three-month trial period, the Council had continued to handle the insurance claims for Uttlesford District Council; this arrangement was assisted through insurance cover for both councils being provided by Zurich Municipal. From April 2011, the Council had extended its service to provide answers to underwriting queries for Uttlesford, and the arrangement had generated income of £18,000 per annum.

The Director of Finance & ICT reassured the Cabinet Committee that Zurich Municipal had been the cheapest bid during the previous tender process, although they were only interested in being the Council's sole provider and had not offered individual policies. The Council was actively seeking to extend its insurance service to other Councils.

Resolved:

- (1) That the Insurance trends and statistics for the previous five years be noted;
- (2) That the savings achieved from the increase in the public liability excess during the period 2005/06 to 2010/11 be noted; and
- (3) That the continuation of the Council handling insurance claims and underwriting queries for Uttlesford District Council be noted.

Reasons for Decision:

An Internal Audit report had recommended that annual reports should be presented to the Cabinet Committee to monitor the trends in claims and whether the increase in public liability excess to reduce insurance premiums had continued to generate savings for the Council.

Other Options Considered and Rejected:

To reduce the Council's public liability excess, however this would result in an increase in the insurance premium.

27. FEES & CHARGES

The Assistant Director (Accountancy) presented a report on the setting of fees and charges for 2012/13.

The Assistant Director stated that the Medium Term Financial Strategy, which had been presented as part of the Financial Issues paper at the previous meeting, had shown a need to identify savings of £300,000 for the General Fund were required by the Medium Term Financial Issues paper for 2012/13. Whilst the majority of the savings required had already been identified, one option to help achieve this target would be to increase the fees and charges levied by the Council for various different services. In some cases, there was no scope for the Council to increase certain fees and charges as these were set by the Government.

In relation to specific fees and charges, the Assistant Director reported that it was intended not to increase the fees for Local Land Charges as the situation was still uncertain following the introduction of the Local Land Charges (Amendment) Rules 2010. It was proposed not to increase the fees for the Hackney Carriage Operators and Vehicle Licences either, as well as the fee for conducting MOT tests by Fleet Operations. It was also felt that the fees and charges levied for services such as New Horizons, Sports Development and Lifewalks provided by the Office of the Deputy Chief Executive should also not be increased, on account of the health benefits for those residents that participated. Pre-application charges for major planning applications were proposed to be increased by 5%, whilst the fees levied for trade waste would remain the same provided that SITA did not increase their fees to the Council.

It was proposed to increase the majority of Housing fees by 5.2%, with a higher increase for heating charges at sheltered housing schemes to enable the Council to set charges at a sufficient level to reclaim the cost to the Council next year. The Housing Portfolio Holder emphasised that to continue to charge for heating in sheltered housing schemes at the current levels would cost the Council approximately £56,000 from next year. Some housing charges were proposed to remain the same, particularly in relation to Telecare charges, and some housing charges were proposed to be reduced in 2012/13.

The Cabinet Committee felt that residents and traders would welcome the parking fees being retained at their current levels, however, it was possible that these fees might have to rise at some point in the future. The Cabinet Committee felt that a number of the fees and charges should not be increased, given the current economic conditions faced by residents and local traders.

Recommended:

(1) That the fees and charges levied for Council Services in 2012/13 be set at the levels as Appendix 1 of the report, with the exception of:

(a) Bulky household waste collections to remain the same as 2011/12; and

(b) trade waste collections to remain the same as 2011/12, provided Sita UK did not increase their fees to the Council;

- (2) That the fees and charges for Housing related services in 2012/13 be set at the levels detailed in Appendix 1 to these minutes;
- (3) That the fees and charges for the following services remain unchanged for 2012/13:
 - (a) off street pay and display car parking;
 - (b) Local Land Charges;
 - (c) MOT tests provided by Fleet Operations; and
 - (d) the services provided by the Community & Culture section within the Office of the Deputy Chief Executive, such as New Horizons, Sports Development and Lifewalks;
- (4) That the fees and charges for pre-application discussions concerning major planning applications be increased by 5%; and
- (5) That the remaining fees and charges for 2012/13 as set by outside bodies or controlled by statutory regulation be noted.

Reasons for Decision:

To agree changes to fees and charges as part of the annual budget process.

Other Options Considered and Rejected:

In areas where the Council had discretion on the level of fees and charges it could set, there were a number of other possible percentage increases that could be applied, which would help to reduce the level of savings required in order to set an acceptable budget.

28. Q2 FINANCIAL MONITORING

The Assistant Director (Accountancy) presented the Quarterly Financial Monitoring Report for the period April to September 2011, which provided a comparison between the original profiled budgets for the period and the actual expenditure or income as applicable. The report provided details of the revenue budgets – both the Continuing Services Budget and District Development Fund – as well as the capital budgets, including details of major capital schemes.

The Assistant Director highlighted some of the issues arising from the Council's budget monitoring. Investment interest levels were above expectations as there had been an average of £4million more invested than expected. Building Control income was expected to generate a surplus for the year, whilst income from the MOT tests carried out by Fleet Operations was slightly down. The introduction of the Local Land Charges (Amendment) Rules 2010 had led to a reduction in income compared to previous years, but the income to date this year had been better than expected. The Salaries schedule was underspent by £413,000, whilst the Housing Repairs Fund was underspent by £767,000.

The Assistant Director stated that income and expenditure was broadly in line with, or slightly better than, expectations. The budgets were in the process of being reviewed

as part of the 2012/13 budget setting exercise, and the outturn reports would be adjusted to reflect any changes during the year.

Resolved:

(1) That the Quarterly Financial Monitoring Report for the period April to September 2011 regarding the revenue and capital budgets be noted.

29. GROWTH LISTS FOR CSB & DDF

The Assistant Director (Accountancy) presented a report concerning the first draft of the General Fund Continuing Services Budget and District Development Fund schedules for 2012/13, along with an update on the budget process and the savings achieved to date.

The Assistant Director advised the Cabinet Committee that the Council was still at an early stage of the budget preparation process and the figures would be further refined before the final budget was published. The savings required for 2012/13 identified in the Medium Term Financial Strategy had been achieved, and any further savings identified would contribute towards the savings targets for 2013/14 and 2014/15. It was acknowledged that the emphasis would be on savings, but some growth in the Continuing Services Budget was inevitable, particularly relating to pension deficit payments. The full schedules for the Continuing Services Budget and District Development Fund had been attached to the report as annexes, and represented best estimates at the current time. These would be further refined as the budget setting process continued.

The Assistant Director concluded by stating that £6,000 of savings had been previously identified within the Chairman's budget in error, and that this had now been re-instated. The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Economic Development stated that this was the first step in the budget setting process, and reminded all present the Portfolio Holders had not yet had a chance to review the lists in detail.

Resolved:

(1) That the draft Continuing Services Budget (CSB) and District Development Fund (DDF) schedules for 2012/13 be noted.

30. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

It was noted that there was no other urgent business for consideration by the Cabinet Committee.

CHAIRMAN

Minute Item 27

Fees and Charges 2012/13 – HOUSING RELATED SERVICES

| Service | 2012/13 | 2011/12 | VAT |
|--|---|---|---|
| Communal Halls: Pelly Court Hall, Epping Oakwood Hill Hall, Loughton Barrington Hall, Loughton | £9.45 per hour £177.50 per annum £7.65 per session | £9.45 per hour £177.50 per annum £7.65 per session | |
| Hire of Halls for Elections | £81.30 per day | £77.30 per day | |
| Guest Rooms - Sheltered Housing | £8.25 per person per night | £7.85 per person per night | Y |
| Dispersed Alarms: Alarm units (alarm & monitoring) Smoke Detectors Additional Pendants Flood Detector Fall Detector Carbon Monoxide Detector Extreme Temperature Sensor Pressure Mat Pull Cord Installation Bogus Caller Button | } } } } } Now covered by } Telecare Packages } (see below) } } } } } | £179.50 per annum £44.85 per annum £40.30 per annum £48.50 per annum £62.60 per annum £63.80 per annum £62.00 per annum £61.30 per annum £65.75 per annum £47.00 per annum | (#) Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y |
| Telecare Packages - Alarm and up to 4 sensors (Monitoring only) | £95.30 per annum | £95.30 per annum | Y |
| Telecare Packages – Monitoring of additional sensors (per sensor) | £10 per annum | - | Y |
| Monitoring of alarms for other organisations (per speech module) | £95.35 per annum | £95.35 per annum | Y |
| Large Button Telephone | £20.50 per telephone | £20.50 per telephone | |
| Communal heating charge in sheltered housing | £3.60 per week | £2.40 per week | |
| Leasehold Vendors' Enquiries | £130.85 per enquiry | £124.40 per enquiry | Y |
| Certificates of Buildings Insurance – Leaseholders | £41.65 per copy | £39.60 per copy | Y |
| Hardstandings | £28.35 per annum | £28.35 per annum | Y |
| Scooter Stores: Rental Electricity | £3.70 per week £1.90 per week | £3.70 per week £1.80 per week | |
| Dishonoured cheques | £25 per cheque | £10 per cheque | |
| Homeless Hostel Accommodation: One room: <i>Room charge</i> <i>Heating charge (Personal)</i> <i>Heating Charge (Communal)</i> | £43.00 per week £8.15 per week £8.65 per week | £40.90 per week £12.00 per week £12.70 per week | |

| | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|--|---|
| Two rooms: | | | |
| Room charge | £67.10 per week | £63.80 per week | |
| Heating charge (Personal) | £14.35 per week | £21.10 per week | |
| Heating Charge (Communal) | £11.90 per week | £17.50 per week | |
| Three rooms: | | | |
| Room charge | £90.40 per week | £85.95 per week | |
| Heating charge (Personal) | £18.10 per week | £26.60 per week | |
| Heating Charge (Communal) | £14.25 per week | £20.95 per week | |
| Chalet: | | | |
| Room charge | £78.30 per week | £74.45 per week | |
| Heating charge (Personal) | £16.35 per week | £21.10 per week | |
| Heating Charge (Communal) | £11.90 per week | £17.50 per week | |
| Bed and Breakfast Accommodation: | | | |
| Single Room | £33.32 per night | £43.70 per night | |
| Double Room | £48.87 per night | £50.55 per night | |
| Mortgage references | £38.10 per enquiry | £36.20 per enquiry | Y |
| Requests for covenant approval | £60.85 per request | £57.85 per request | Y |
| Licences for vehicular access across housing land | £101.30 per annum | £96.30 per annum | |
| Condition surveys to respond to Party Wall Act Notices | £68.80 per Notice | £65.40 per Notice | Y |
| Copies of Structural Reports on RTB Properties | £34.15 per report | £32.45 per report | Y |
| Replacement Door Entry and Suited Keys | £12.80 per key | £12.20 per key | Y |
| Garage rents: | | | |
| Tenants | £7.90 per week | £7.90 per week | |
| Non-tenants | £7.90 per week | £7.90 per week | Y |
| Small Land Sales Valuation Charge | £334 per sale | £318 per sale | Y |
| File Copying Charge | £10 per request | £10 per request | Y |
| Valuation & Legal Charge – Re-sale of RTB Property within 5 years or Sale of RTB Property to EFDC within 10 Years | £336 per application | £320 per application | Y |
| Consideration of Right to Re-purchase Former RTB Property within 10 years of Original Purchase | £58.45 per application | £55.55 per application | Y |
| Careline Service to Home Group for Wickfields sheltered housing scheme, Chigwell: | £221 per annum per speech module | £210 per annum per speech module | Y |
| Caring And Repairing in Epping Forest (CARE) fees for disabled facilities grants (DFGs) | 15% of works cost | 15% of works cost (from 1 September 2011) | Y |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| <p>Licensing of qualifying houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) ^(#)</p> <p>(a) 3 storey HMO with up to 5 units of accommodation</p> <p>(b) Additional units of accommodation</p> | <p>£630 per licence</p> <p>£58 per each additional unit of accommodation</p> | <p>£600 per licence</p> <p>£55 per each additional unit of accommodation</p> | |
| <p>Sewerage charges for individual sewerage systems</p> | <p>Increase all charges by 5.2%</p> | <p>Various charges at 15 separate locations, affecting around 60 properties</p> | |

(#) The majority of recipients of Telecare packages are over 60 years of age and have been given VAT exemptions. However, some do pay VAT on their charges.

This page is intentionally left blank