

	REPORT TO CABINET TO BE HELD ON 16 FEBRUARY 2016	
	Key Decision	YES
	Forward Plan Ref No	
Corporate Priority: Meets all Corporate Priorities	Cabinet Portfolio Holder	Cllr Helen Mallory

REPORT OF: DIRECTOR NE – 16/52

WARDS AFFECTED: ALL

SUBJECT: DRAFT FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2016 – 2026

RECOMMENDATION (S):

That Cabinet:

- (i) Note the outcome of the final Local Government Finance Settlement;
- (ii) Note that following an increase in the referendum threshold announced in the final Local Government Finance Settlement the recommended level of Council Tax increase for a Band D equivalent property in 2016/17 is £5.00 (2.37%) for this Council, rather than the 1.99% increase previously reported;
- (iii) Note the feedback from the budget consultation;
- (iv) Reject a funding bid from Create Arts Development Ltd on the basis of it being unaffordable given the Council's current financial position;
- (v) Note the updated Treasury Management Strategy for 2016/17, with the principal amendments being:
 - Increased maximum investment limit per individual Local Authority from £5 million to £7 million;
 - Increased maximum investment limit for Nationwide Building Society from £5 million to £7 million;

- Introduction of a third tier of building societies, with a credit rating of A-Long Term and F1 Short Term, with a maximum investment limit of £2.5 million;
- Inclusion of Police and Fire Authorities on the Council's lending list, with a maximum investment limit per individual Authority of £2 million;
- Increased maximum Group lending limit from £7 million to £10 million;
- Increased maximum Group investment limit for nationalised banking institutions from £7 million to £15 million;
- Inclusion of the Municipal Bonds Agency as a source of borrowing.

That Cabinet Recommend to Council:

- (vi) The approval of the Financial Strategy, specifically:
- the Revenue Budget for 2016/17;
 - a Council Tax increase of £5 for a Band D property (2.37%);
 - the Capital Budget and proposed new schemes for 2016/17;
 - the optimum levels of reserves and use of reserves in 2016/17;
 - the Treasury Management Strategy and Prudential Indicators.
 - the Council's Pay Policy Statement contained, as required under Section 38 (1) of the Localism Act 2011;
- (vii) The fees and charges administered by the Council's Environment and Regulation service, as itemised in Appendix C, which will come into effect on 1 April 2016;
- (viii) That responsibility for the acceptance of a four-year settlement be delegated to Cabinet.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION(S):

Full Council must approve the 2016/17 budget and associated Council Tax level and fees and charges, which are incorporated within the Financial Strategy, at its meeting on 26 February 2015.

HIGHLIGHTED RISKS:

That the Council does not set a robust budget in 2016/17 or over the medium to long term.

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Council's Financial Strategy comprises a 5-year revenue plan and a 10-year capital plan. These plans are reviewed annually and the Council's

revised Strategy for 2016-2026 will be presented to Full Council for approval in February.

- 1.2 The key proposals for the revenue budget were presented to Cabinet at its meeting on 19 January 2016. These included the proposed revenue budget, including investment in priority areas, efficiency and other savings proposals, and associated Council Tax increases.
- 1.3 Cabinet were asked to agree that officers enter into a period of consultation on the budget proposals, in advance of the Financial Strategy being presented to Full Council in February 2016.
- 1.4 Under legislation the Council's Environment and Regulation service can charge for certain services. All fees require Council approval, with the exception of scrap metal dealer and collector fees, which can be approved by Cabinet.
- 1.4 The purpose of this report is to:
 - Set out the draft Financial Strategy; which includes the proposed budget and Council Tax levels for 2016/17 as endorsed by Cabinet in January, the Treasury Management Strategy, Prudential Indicators and Pay Policy;
 - Summarise any changes made to the draft capital and revenue budget proposals since they were presented to Cabinet in January;
 - Summarise the feedback received on the draft budget proposals in the period of consultation; and
 - Set out the Council's Environment and Regulation service charges for 2016/17.

2. CORPORATE AIMS/PRIORITIES AND THE COMMUNITY PLAN

- 2.1 The proposals set out in this report impact on all the Council's Corporate Aims and Priorities.

3. BACKGROUND AND ISSUES

3.1 THE FINANCIAL STRATEGY

- 3.1.1 The draft Financial Strategy is attached at **Appendix D** to this report. **A completed, finalised version of this Strategy will be presented to Full Council for approval in February; however, the content in the final version will not change significantly.**
- 3.1.2 The Strategy incorporates the draft revenue and capital budget proposals endorsed by Cabinet at its January meeting, along with the Treasury

Management Policy, Reserves and Balances recommendations, Prudential Indicators and Pay Policy for 2016/17.

3.2 REVENUE BUDGET PROPOSALS

- 3.2.1 At the time of presenting the revenue budget report in January the savings target stood at £2.047 million. The savings identified at that time totalled £1.608 million and the budget proposed a £270k draw from the General Fund Reserve therefore in order to set a balanced budget £169k savings still needed to be identified.
- 3.2.2 Since presenting the report in January the following adjustments have been made to the budget; increasing the savings shortfall to £196k:
- Budgetary growth of £12k has been included to reflect additional staffing resources of 22.5 hours per week within the elections service;
 - £5k reduction in the savings from a review of licensing;
 - Reduction in the saving from Scarborough Museums Trust £10k;
- 3.2.3 Directors Team have reviewed the budget shortfall and propose that the following savings options be included within the final budget to bridge the current funding gap:
- £120k savings from transformational change;
 - £35k additional rental income from a new development at Whitby Harbour;
 - £19k additional rental income from new kiosks at Whitby Harbour;
 - £12k net income for the administration of Freedom of Information requests for the CCG (total income is £22k but £10k additional costs will be incurred to administer the additional work associated with the achievement of this income);
 - £10k from the additional funding set out in the final LGFS announcements (see below for further details).
- 3.2.4 The January budget report detailed that a review of TIC provision across the Borough may identify savings in 2016/17. A separate report on this Cabinet meeting's agenda covers the proposals in regards to TIC provision. Although the report shows that the review will ultimately result in the achievement of savings it is dependent on achieving a full year of the estimated rental income across the sites. As the sites have not yet been marketed is in uncertain whether these savings will be achieved in 2016/17 in their entirety therefore they have not been included within the budget proposals. Any savings achieved in 2016/17 will be used to fund the one-off costs associated with the TIC review rather than those costs being drawn from the Investment Fund.
- 3.2.5 The inclusion of the additional funding sources and savings set out in paragraph 3.2.3 will enable the Council to set a balanced revenue budget in 2016/17.

3.3 THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE SETTLEMENT

- 3.3.1 The provisional Local Government Finance Settlement (LGFS) was announced to Parliament on 17 December 2015. The budget proposals reported to Cabinet in January reflected the provisional figures.
- 3.3.2 The final LGFS for 2016/17 was announced on 8 February 2016, and identified the following additional resources that which will affect the Council's allocations:
- Transitional grant - £150m per year in 2016/17 and 2017/18 for those authorities with the largest reductions in RSG (i.e. high tax base / low need authorities); and
 - Rural Services Delivery Grant (RSDG) - increased from £20m to £80.5m in 2016/17;
- 3.3.3 The announcement also increased the spending power of district councils by allowing them to increase Band D Council Tax by up to £5, rather than the previous 2% referendum threshold.
- 3.3.4 Despite receiving allocations for the transitional grant and Rural Services Delivery Grant the Council's benefit from these additional resources is minimal; being £2k and £20k respectively in 2016/17. The option to increase Council Tax by £5 for a Band D property will generate an additional income of £29k in 2016/17.
- 3.3.5 Documentation received from CIPFA indicates that there has clearly been a considerable lobbying effort by many authorities following the provisional LGFS allocations, particularly by rural councils and those with high tax bases. All of the measures announced in the final settlement shift funding and spending power towards higher tax base (affluent) authorities and/or rural authorities. Unfortunately this Council does not meet either of these criteria.
- 3.3.6** Analysis shows that 108 authorities will actually see an increase in their Core Spending Power in 2016/17 (i.e. Council Tax income plus LGFS and New Homes Bonus funding) compared to a 3% reduction for this Council, demonstrating that once again the Council has fared particularly badly through the Settlement process. **As a comparator Ryedale and Hambleton benefited by £452k and £470k respectively in the final settlement from increases in their RSDG and transitional grant compared to Scarborough's additional £22k allocation and their core spending power in 2016/17 will increase by 6.6% and 9.3%.**
- 3.3.7 The offer of a four-year settlement was repeated in the LGFS announcements, but no further information has been released. Authorities now have until Friday 14 October to apply for the offer, though further details are awaited. It is uncertain at this stage whether the offer will need to be accepted by Full Council, therefore to ensure that the October deadline can be achieved in line with the Council's scheduled meetings it is recommended that the approval for this decision be delegated to Cabinet, should the final proposals allow.

3.3.8 The Council's draft budget proposals identified that an Investment Fund of £589k would be created within the 2016/17 budget to fund the upfront investment in schemes that will deliver budget savings in future years. Examples of such investment include, but are not limited to, the creation of additional kiosks at Whitby Harbour, investment required for the review of TIC provision, the creation of an MOT test centre at Dean Road Depot and the review of public conveniences. Indicative costings for some of these schemes have been pulled together since the draft budget report was presented and it has become apparent that the fund will not be sufficient to cover the cost of all of the required investment. In addition further investment may need to be made to deliver the £120k transformation savings which have now been included in the savings proposals for 2016/17. It is therefore proposed that, to reduce the need to borrow monies and maximise future year savings, any additional funding received through the final settlement be used to increase the Investment Fund.

3.3.9 The table below summarises the additional funding received in the Final Settlement and its proposed use:

Rural Services Delivery Grant	£20k
Transitional Grant	£2k
Council Tax income	£29k
Additional Funding announced in the Final 2016/17 Settlement	£51k
Amount required to set a balanced budget	(£10k)
Additional contribution to Investment Fund	(£41k)
Remaining funding	-

3.4 CAPITAL BUDGET

3.4.1 The capital budget proposals remain in line with the draft proposals presented to Cabinet in January.

3.5 CONSULTATION FEEDBACK

3.5.1 In January Cabinet agreed that Officers should enter into a period of consultation on the draft budget proposals. The consultation methods adopted for the budget have been as follows:

- All Members were invited to attend Members Forums, which set out the detailed budget proposals.
- A web based consultation page was established to allow people to provide feedback and details of the consultation.
- The Council's resident's panel have been informed of the Council's budget proposals, giving them the opportunity to provide feedback.

- Details of the budget consultation were circulated to Council employees.
- A presentation was given to the Council's Resources Overview and Strategy Committee

3.5.2 133 responses were submitted via the web based budget consultation page.

3.5.3 The key opinions and queries noted from the feedback are attached at Appendix A.

3.6 **Create Arts Developments Ltd**

3.6.1 As part of the 2015/16 budget consultation several Members raised concerns that no funding had been identified for the Create Arts Developments Agency to make up for its loss of core funding from the Arts Council England. Amongst other things the organisation provides Arts Development support for the Council and runs the Coastival festival. Officers had discussions with Create about their future and as a consequence Create had reviewed their position and concluded that a one off payment of £36k in 2015/16 would provide the necessary resource to ensure Create was sustained during 2015/16 and Coastival 2016 could be delivered.

3.6.2 Create also reported that they were actively seeking alternative sources of funding and working with other local arts organisations to examine ways of working in partnership to meet the future challenges around sustainability facing all arts organisations.

3.6.3 On 3 February 2016, the Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee received a report and presentation from Create outlining their activities in the current and previous years, and how they had used the Council's grant to support the arts in the Borough. According to the report, the Council's funding has leveraged a predicted £196,800 turnover for 2015/16 which would not have been possible otherwise. This leverage equates to an extra £5.46 for every pound of the grant.

3.6.4 Since the loss of its core funding, Create has been developing a new business model based on attracting one-off funding for particular projects and diversifying its income streams. However, this work is still ongoing as Create looks to establish a business model which can be sustained over the long term. Create has now made a request that the Council provides further financial support in 2016/17. The scrutiny committee applauded Create's efforts in generating such value from the Council's grant aid for the benefit of the Borough, and recommended that Cabinet consider continue providing funding to Create to support its different areas of activity including the Coastival festival as part of the draft Financial Strategy 2016/17.

3.6.5 The Create grant was funded from a one-off rebate from Scarborough Museum Trust's annual contract price in 2015/16. The anticipated rebate from the Trust in 2016/17 is expected to be £50k, however this reduction has already been factored into the Council's budget therefore is not available to

support the Create grant in 2016/17. Given the Council's precarious financial position going forward, the already high levels of spend on discretionary cultural services (the Council's spend on cultural and related services is 99.6% higher than the UK average) and the need to identify savings in excess of £2.4million to balance the 2017/18 budget it is proposed that Create's funding request be denied.

3.7 COUNCIL TAX

- 3.7.1 At the time of writing the draft budget proposals the Government had set a 2% Council Tax referendum threshold for this Council. In light of this threshold and the severe funding pressures faced by the Council the draft budget report recommended a Council Tax increase of 1.99% for 2016/17. The report set out that this would be this Council's first Council Tax increase since 2010 and that the increase would raise an ongoing revenue stream for the Council of £153k per annum. The Council consulted on this level of increase.
- 3.7.2 The Final LGFS announcements recognised the high levels of funding cuts imposed on district councils over the spending review period and the financial pressure it would place them under. To aid district councils the LGFS announcements increase the referendum limit for all district councils to the higher of 2% or £5 for a Band D property for all years of the four year spending review period (to 2020). A £5 increase on the Council's Band D charge in 2016/17 equates to a 2.37% increase. The government's indicative spending power figures issued alongside the LGFS assume that districts will apply the higher Council Tax threshold limits where relevant.
- 3.7.3 The Council has not increased its Council Tax levels since 2010. Given the funding pressures faced by the Council and the particularly high levels of funding cuts faced over the spending review period it is felt that the Council has little choice than to apply the higher threshold to its Council Tax levels to gain the benefit of an increased Council Tax revenue stream.
- 3.7.4 The table below sets out the current Scarborough Borough Council element of the Council Tax levy by band, the levy by band for the previously proposed 1.99% increase and the levy by band for the new £5 threshold.

Band	2015/16	1.99% Increase		2.37% (£5) increase	
	£	2016/17 £	Increase £	2016/17 £	Increase £
A	140.87	143.68	2.81	144.21	3.34
B	164.35	167.63	3.28	168.24	3.89
C	187.83	191.57	3.74	192.28	4.45
D	211.31	215.52	4.21	216.31	5.00
E	258.27	263.41	5.14	264.38	6.11
F	305.23	311.31	6.08	312.45	7.22
G	352.18	359.20	7.02	360.52	8.34

H	422.62	431.04	8.42	432.62	10.00
---	--------	--------	------	---------------	-------

- 3.7.5 The table shows that the increase for an average Band C tax payer in this Borough will equate to £4.45 (8.5p per week) compared to the levy applied in 2015/16. The new 2.37% charge will increase a Band C tax payers levy by 71p for the year compared to the previously proposed increase of 1.99%.
- 3.7.6 The application of the £5 referendum threshold will increase the Council's available resources by £29k in 2016/17. Although the consultation assumed a Council Tax increase of 1.99% as opposed to 2.37% it should be noted that 66% of respondents agreed that the Council should apply a Council Tax increase in 2016/17.

3.8 RESERVES

- 3.8.1 Appendix F of the Financial Strategy sets out the Council's proposed optimum ranges for its levels of reserves and balances. These ranges have been maintained at 2015 levels and all reserves are within their predetermined optimal ranges.

3.9 PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2016/17

- 3.9.1 Local Authorities are required under Section 38(1) of the Localism Act 2011 to prepare and publish a Pay Policy Statement. The Statement must articulate the Council's policy towards the pay of the workforce, particularly those regarded on high pay and the lowest paid employees.
- 3.9.2 Each Local Authority is an individual employer in its own right and has the autonomy to make decisions on pay that are appropriate to local circumstances and which deliver value for money for local taxpayers. The provisions of the Act do not seek to change this or to determine what decisions on pay should be taken, but they do require individual employing Authorities to be more open and transparent about their policies in relation to pay and how decisions are made in this regard.
- 3.9.3 Section 40 of the Act requires Authorities, in developing their Pay Policy Statement, to have regard to any guidance published by the Secretary of State. This includes the Communities and Local Government Guidance on Openness and Accountability in Local Pay and the Code of Recommended Practice for Local Authorities on Data Transparency. The requirement to establish and publish a policy covering pay arises from the Hutton Review of Fair Pay published in March 2011, which made recommendations for promoting pay fairness in the public sector by tackling disparities between the highest and lowest paid in the public sector.
- 3.9.4 The Act requires that Pay Policy Statements are produced annually and are considered by Full Council. Any subsequent amendments referred to in the Policy should also be considered by Full Council. The Pay Policy Statement contained within the Financial Strategy in many ways reflects the Council's current policies and practices governing workforce pay issues, which have

been brought together in this Pay Policy Statement and will be kept under constant review.

3.10 Treasury Management

3.10.1 The Council has an Investment Strategy which has been implemented over many years to maximise the return on the investment of funds whilst having regard to the security of investment; thus achieving optimum performance commensurate with the level of risk. It is stressed that whilst maximising income is the aim, the first priority is the preservation of the capital value invested.

3.10.2 To minimise the counterparty risk that exists a spread of investments is required together with a maximum investment limit at any one time with any one of the Institutions on the Council's counterparty list. In addition, as the ownership of financial institutions is complex and so that the Council is not over-exposed to 'ownership risk' a maximum Group investment limit has been implemented. This provides an extra layer of security to minimise the investment exposure.

3.10.3 To provide the Council with a greater degree of flexibility in terms of the number of counterparties and the investment capacity with each one, a review of the minimum credit criteria and the maximum investment limits applicable has been conducted with the principal amendments being:

- Increased maximum investment limit per individual Local Authority from £5 million to £7 million;
- Increased maximum investment limit for Nationwide Building Society from £5 million to £7 million;
- Introduction of a third tier of building societies, with a credit rating of A- Long Term and F1 Short Term, with a maximum investment limit of £2.5 million;
- Inclusion of Police and Fire Authorities on the Council's lending list, with a maximum investment limit per individual Authority of £2 million;
- Increased maximum Group lending limit from £7 million to £10 million;
- Increased maximum Group investment limit for nationalised banking institutions from £7 million to £15 million.

4. CONSULTATION

4.1 See section 3.5

5. ASSESSMENT

5.1 The headline proposals set out in the Financial Strategy remain largely unchanged, apart from the amendments set out in this report. The draft proposals are as follows:

Revenue

- A Council Tax increase of 2.37%, leading to a Council Tax requirement for 2016/17 of **£7,989,615**;
- Proposed efficiencies/savings totalling **£1,788,101**;
- The balancing of the budget will rely on a **£270k contribution from the General Fund Reserve**;
- £180k mainstream budget provision for increased contributions towards essential and priority capital investment and borrowing costs;
- The creation of a one-off **£630k 'Investment Fund'** to invest in schemes that will drive forward future revenue budget savings;
- Additional **one-off funding of £369k in 2016/17 for the following areas**: £10k corporate training programme, £250k for building works at Scarborough Spa, £25k for a Destination Marketing System, £30k for repairs to South Bay Underground Car Park, £32k towards a one-off increase in Open Air Theatre running costs, £5k contribution towards a bus service in Filey, and £17k for a new box office for the Open Air Theatre;

Capital

- Proposed capital expenditure in 2016/17 as follows :-
 - **Vehicle and Equipment Replacement** (£1.189 million vehicle replacement; £117k equipment replacement; £189k IT equipment)
 - **Planned Infrastructure Works** (£100k replacement lighting columns, £642k for Robin Hoods Bay Coast Protection works, £3 million for Eskside Wharf stabilisation works)
 - **Statutory Requirements** (£685k Disabled Facilities Grants)
 - **Asset Management** (£1.14 million for Scarborough Spa)
 - **Other** (£4 million for the Futurist redevelopment, £387k for Pindar All Weather Pitch, £400k for Cemetery provision, £80k for Whitby shelters, £250k for harbour dredging equipment)
- A capped budget of £3m will be earmarked for Coast Protection schemes in the Council's financial plans; funded from anticipated capital receipts and borrowing. £77k of this budget will be committed in 2016/17 towards the Robin Hoods Bay Coast Protection scheme and the remaining £2.923m will be included in future year Financial Strategies. A Coast Protection Strategy recognising this capped budget will be developed during 2016/17, noting that the Scarborough Spa scheme is the first priority;

Reserves

- All reserve ranges are deemed to be adequate

Policies

- Treasury Management Policy Statement

- Prudential Indicators and Minimum Revenue Provision Policy
- The Chief Finance Officers Statutory Statement, which Council are asked to note and endorse the comments contained within.
- The Council's Pay Policy Statement.

6. IMPLICATIONS

6.1 Policy

There are no policy implications arising from this report. An equalities impact assessment will be undertaken on all savings proposals included within the Financial Strategy.

6.2 Legal

It should be noted that under the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976, once approval is obtained for proposed fees covering taxi/private hire vehicles and private hire operators only, the Council must submit a public notice in a local newspaper to advertise its intention to charge the specified fees. The Council must then allow 28 days for receipt of representations/objections. If no representations are received then the taxi and private hire vehicle and operator fees come into effect. Where representations are received the Council must then consider them and make a final decision on the fee levels.

6.3 Financial

The financial implications are set out in detail throughout the report and appendices to this report.

6.4 Staffing Implications

Any staffing changes resulting from the budget proposals will be closely managed and consultation will take place with Trade Unions. The Council has a strong commitment to try to minimise the impact on staff and number of compulsory redundancies by utilising natural wastage and providing some training for staff to support this.

6.5 Environmental Implications

There may be environmental implications associated with the savings proposals to delete the post of the recycling and waste education officer. The impact is however expected to be minimal and the position will be closely monitored by reviewing recycle levels.

There may be environmental implications associated with the deletion of the Seamer Carr Wetland Officer post, as the habitat creation work undertaken by this post will reduce. It is however hoped that some of the work will be absorbed by other Council officers and external partners.

There could be environmental implications associated with the charging of garden waste. Any such implications were set out in the specific Cabinet report associated with the project.

Planning Implications, Crime and Disorder Implications, Health and Safety implications,

I have considered whether implications arise from this report and am satisfied that there is no identified implication that will arise from this decision for this Council.

Nicholas Edwards

**Nicholas Edwards
Head of Finance & Asset Management**

Author: Kerry Metcalfe

Telephone No: 01723 383542

E-mail address: kerry.metcalfe@scarborough.gov.uk

FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

Budget Consultation 2016/17

- Q1** A Council Tax increase of 1.99% is proposed for 2016/17. This will be this Council's first increase since 2010 and will generate an additional £156,000 per year to fund and help maintain Council services. Do you agree that the Council should increase Council Tax for 2016/17: (please tick one box only)

	Yes	%
Yes	88	66.7%
No	44	33.3%
	132	1.0

- Q2** The Council currently has an uncommitted General Fund Balance of £2,469,000. This reserve is available to meet potential future funding shortfalls and contingencies. Having a reserve in place provides the Council with a financial buffer.

The Council is drawing £270,000 from this fund in 2016/17 to balance its budget and this will reduce the uncommitted balance to £2,199,000. This represents less than 2.6% of the Council's gross expenditure budget for 2015/16

Do you agree that the Council should use £270,000 of its General Fund balance to support the 2016/17 budget and delay the implementation of some savings until future years?

	No.	%
Yes	115	86.5%
No	18	13.5%
	133	1.0

Any Comments:

Money in the bank (the General Fund) will be useful further down the line perhaps. A small rise in Council Tax once in a while seems totally reasonable to me.

Why spend 100,000 on Pindar All weather Pitch when it is no longer managed by SBC?

Using general funds to balance budgets is appropriate. There is no need to Increase Council tax twice. Parish precept increases account for that. Borough and Parish councils should work together and agree increases so that tax payers are not double taxed. Reduce the number of councillors receiving paid allowances. In fact, only pay Borough and County councillors expenses. Councillors should be unbiased and serve all members of their constituency, not just those who share the same political party. If councillors did not receive an allowance it would mean only people living in an area would be willing to put themselves forward for election. This would be excellent for communities. The council needs to reinvest income from the Open Air Theatre, car parking, etc. to help balance its books. That has not been mentioned in this proposal.

Stop spending money on the spa

You spend too much on mundane things. You need to get together with all authorities in North Yorkshire and cut your costs. We are paying for massive needless duplication of functions across the entire county.

I feel a council tax increase is necessary to maintain essential council services

FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

<p>The continual prop up of the OAT is not the job of the council. The OAT could balance it's books by reducing prices and getting full audiences!</p>
<p>Money should stop being spent on the OAT and the Spa and instead invested, together with the £4m budgeted, to renovate the Futurist, not knock it down for a roller coaster, which will have limited long term marketability</p>
<p>If savings cannot be made on the general out goings then more cuts should be made preferably where the largest out going is, at a guess I would say in the transport area</p>
<p>By raising council tax but also cutting services and introducing new or increasing charges is a lose-lose situation for council tax payers. It is compulsory to pay council tax yet residents have no control over the expenditure. This consultation seems merely an explanation of what has already been decided.</p>
<p>Scarborough has many households whose budgets have not increased over the last 5 years particularly pensioners who we have a lot of !</p>
<p>The Council should raise more revenue from Council Tax payers who have ironically benefited from a 6 year "holiday" and seen local services cut to the bone with more to come.I suggest a general rise of 4% to make up some of the centrally imposed shortfall but SBC will have to consult again as to how that increase in CT will be apportioned.It is not clear whether SBC will be required by Central Govt to hold a "referendum" as was the case in previous years.I note that Central Govt's offer of a 4year settlement to 2020 lacks any detail !!!!.I believe that the General Fund Balance should be left alone as it is insufficient as it is and a CT rise of 4% will go some way to offset the need to diminish reserves even further.</p>
<p>A tax increase of 1.99% is a minimal amount, which should be affordable by everyone who is a council tax payer.</p>
<p>Please do not allow flamingoland to build an unwanted and unnecessary rollercoaster which will cost taxpayers over £2 million when we have a proposal from a businessman to renovate the futurist theatre not costing the taxpayer anything!! As business owners and proud residents of Scarborough we really want the futurist to be brought back to it's former glory.</p>
<p>1.99 increase should be prioritised for important frontline services. The council should show good faith by reducing ceremonial costs e.g. mayors car and allowances. The public should not be sacrificing should the council members not also make sacrifice for unnecessaries.</p>
<p>Any funds drawn from the General Fund Balance should be allocated for a specific use no justt for general spending</p>
<p>I agree to an increase in Council Tax but find it disgusting that the Council is now going to charge to empty the garden bins. It should be one or the other but not both</p>
<p>I think cuts should be made to the number of councillors - why do we need 2 councillors for a constituency? Cuts to overall staffing should be made. Note there is a 1% wage increase included in the budget - why when we are all facing cuts to services? If we have to fund this increase in wages then cuts to staffing need to be made to pay for it.</p>
<p>How has the General Fund been funded and utilised in the past? Removing 11% of it seems short-sighted - surely the same pressures will apply next year, etc.</p>
<p>This is a sham. The real budget issues are barely or not mentioned Why are you (we) paying for the waterpark loan that benefits whatever xxxx companies are now called? Why are we clearing the Futurist when Flamingoland benefits? Why are we paying for the OAT still? You sacked Councillor xxxxx for losing £10,000s, xxxxx has lost £100,000s of thousands. Why are we paying for the Tour of Yorkshire, we don't benefit- as the Tour deYorkshire bailouts showed. Businesses might- charge them. How much do we pay the Art Gallery- and Museum- their staff wages are to die for and their free wine parties are the best nights in the Tory calendar. How much does the pomp and buns cost. The mayor's parties are another good night in the Tory calendar. If we sacked the councillors and got less amateur finance department officers we could do something with any rise, until then I'd be better burning my money</p>
<p>I disagree with any expenditure on the Futurist other than to update it.It is far better than the Spa, and more accessible.</p>
<p>Sack the deadwood. The whole council is top heavy, with high earners who do very little. Refurb. the Futurist which will surely cost less than the £4m to demolish it.</p>

FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

I disagree with an overall increase of 1.99% and feel that this burden should be felt only by households in the top brackets of Council Tax

Obviously, no one likes paying council tax, especially those of us on a fixed income, and I wonder if there might be a way of finding some sort of relief for certain people. At the moment there is only council tax benefit, which isn't available if you have a little money saved. Overall, though, raising this tax seems to be the fairest solution. It's a huge chunk out of savings, and being the prudent type I would ask if there is no other way. Again, though, use it if it's needed.

It should use an extra £156000 or of the uncommitted General Fund to allow no tax increase. Until the number of Councillors are reduced, saving on expenses etc, council tax payers of Scarborough should not have to pay another penny.

Q3

Do you agree with the savings that have been identified by the Council which are outlined in Appendix A?

	No.	%
Yes	94	75.2%
No	31	24.8%
	125	1.0

If not, which ones do you think the Council should not implement?

I do not think that an increase in dependency on automated systems should be used at the cost of face to face contact.

Should review non discretionary services

The Furturist Theatre should be saved

Scrapping TIC face to face public access in favour of electronic I could not find Appendix 3 - only Appendix A and B

I need to read A3 first

Stop propping up the OAT, it has the potential to balance its own books.

Demolition of the Futurist

it

The savings should be made on your present out goings not on projected planning for the simple reason these are going to have to be done and should be sooner rather than later pindar all weather pitch and new booking office for oat.

The Filey bus service needs support as we have many elderly people who rely on this to get to local shops post office etc.

The reduction to the contribution to the Museums Trust. The Trust does essential work in providing cultural benefits which a civilised community needs.

The council should not be spending 4million on the old Fururist site the councils success with similar projects are poo

Rationalisation of Senior posts greater consideration should be given to shared roles between the 6 Borough/district Councils of North Yorks. Having duplicate senior officers across the County is no longer viable or justifiable and as such represents real efficiency savings. Increases in car parking presumably includes the discriminatory parking tax levied on some of the Borough's residents but not all. There is no justification for this tax to be imposed on some residents other than a cynical and relatively easy revenue earner for the Council.

FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

<p>The open air theatre should be self financing, productions should finance improvements. Pindar all either pitch should be financed by the users either wholly or in part</p>
<p>Generally I agree with the savings but the above inflation increase in charges to harbour users is not a saving but a price increase. This unfairly discriminates against a particular group of facility users</p>
<p>Tourism plays a major role in the economic viability of the SBC region notwithstanding the area of the North York Moors National Park which falls within the borough of Scarborough. To this end the savings identified for the Street Scene services and the TIC`s should not be implemented.</p>
<p>closure of whitby tourist information centre</p>
<p>£70 penalty for failing to identify change of circumstances. Many of the savings appeared to be based on vague plans for efficiencies. Given the historical and current capability to be efficient, these are somewhat dubious. There doesn't appear to be a clear plan published on how these might be achieved. Reducing localised support percentage for council tax will simply hit those struggling to afford current rates and then the council will spend an unspecified amount on pursuing non payment. Admin fee for memorial benches seems rather at odds with the concept of memorialising. Perhaps offer an alternative option such as plaques or sponsored capital items that carry no fee? Online ((e.g. calendar, remittances etc) fails to take into account the number of people, particularly older and vulnerable who do not have IT access. Charging for collection of garden waste likely to increase cost of clearing fly tipping. For example, the majority of my garden waste comes from lea ves dropped by trees on adjacent council owned land. I am not inclined to pay for this and feel it would be reasonable to move the leaves back onto the council land. Housing associations will inevitably end up footing the cost of poorly maintained gardens. Public conveniences - access to facilities is a fundamental human need, they are already in a poor state, friends visiting from Germany were horrified at the lack of public washrooms and the sanity of those available. If publish washrooms are to be reduced then the council needs to make provision through incentivising retailers to allow use of their restrooms. Otherwise thus becomes discriminatory or disabled and older shoppers/visitors. Reduction of litter buns in a tourist area seems ridiculous and surely increases costs elsewhere? Or do the council simply expected charities and beach clean teams to pick up the slack free of charge? Fee for use of playing fields - when local groups are already struggling to run and there are so few resources in the community for residents, particularly on low income, this is disgraceful for the paltry sum that may be raised! Winter parking should remain free. Many residents make use of this and pop out to retailers/café's, particularly on weekends. I certainly wont be having a coffee and reading the paper in the watermark and walking on the beach if parking charges are applicable. Reduction in voluntary sector grants - Not likely to make a huge difference given the already poor level of support provided by the council. As someone working for a charity, we support YOUR residents with no funding from you or NYCC and yet council services frequently refer to us. The voluntary sector in this area is in huge difficulty yet remains unsupported by the council. Perhaps when more of us disappear and the council has to foot the cost of providing urgent support, the picture will become clearer??</p>

FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

Reduction of funding to Scarborough Museums Trust - very short-sighted and an easy target. The HR post at an FTE of £3,260 seems a bit trivial. With staff overheads (NI, Pensions, building costs, etc.) this looks like about 1 day a week. Surely there are greater savings to be made with the main administration functions. Although the Garden Waste scheme is estimated to raise £100k, this is a guess. What about the likely additional charge for landfill due to the number of people stopping using their brown bins. And even fly-tipping removal? Also, surely the savings will rise next year as I thought that the charge to existing residents was £18 this year and £38 next year? Increase in car parking charges and the introduction of winter charges - how has this figure been arrived at? I imagine less people will visit as a result and go to Monks Cross instead. It will just cause me to park in side streets where there is no charge.

Futurist. Buyer should pay

New box office for OAT not necessary.

The Filey bus service should not be heavily subsidised The borough does not subsidise other services as much as this. fairness has to be seen to be done.

Bus services... the bus companies around here charge a fortune. The tax payer should not be subsidising them! If they lowered prices, more people would use public transport. It's a vicious circle they're in now, putting up fares making less people use it, making fares go up even more.

how can you justify cutting voluntary sector grants cull some of the councilors and executives you will have plenty of savings then

Q4

Do you agree with the options being reviewed to balance the current £169,000 funding shortfall?

	No.	%
Yes	94	74.6%
No	32	25.4%
	126	1.0

If not, which one(s) do you think the Council should not implement?

I need to read A3

The OAT should reduce its prices and get full audiences. That would make more money and produce a better experience for both audience and acts.

Demolition of the Futurist

It is vital the smaller towns of Whitby and Filey keep their TIC provision. Filey has now no sports facilities since the POOL closed. What exactly is the council providing in Filey? We are Council taxpayers too!. Once again we have to make cuts to fund Scarborough! The sheer amount of money lost on the OAT is shocking and the TIC's are to be lost as a consequence? The Tourist industry which is so vital will lose much needed promotion. A shortsighted view when visitor numbers are increasing. Visitors to Filey especially are older and not internet able. Total misconception and manipulation of figures to deem everything is going digital. Look at improved ways to increase profit long term instead of mothballing a much needed resource.

any short fall should be made up by reducing the current out goings

filey bus service

FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

It is important to support the tourist industry in the three towns, so TIC provision should be improved not decreased. It is hoped that transformational change will not lead to over-reliance on internet communications. Not everyone has a computer or is computer literate.
Insufficient detail and clarity as to what/where the savings are to be made
Removal of Tourism Services in Whitby
Not enough detailed provided, particularly in communication to make an informed choice.
I am slightly concerned about a move from face-to-face to electronic.
Do not close TIC and no to buildings of sheds on pier road
The TICs should not be closed. This is a prime tourist area and a reduction in facilities is not appropriate. The council should look at ways to increase the income from these TICs e.g. sponsorship, advertising, sale of goods
I agree with the options that focus on "Back Office" services but do not agree with the options that concern those services that will directly effect the general public and tourists.Such as the reduction in the Street Scene and TIC budgets.
You should not implement the first two. I do not know what you have in mind for kiosks on harbour land. The scale of Whitby's tourism industry fully warrants a continuing face to face tourist information facility. Tourism is a quarter of the Whitby economy. The TIC is in the right place where it is, because that is where all streams of tourists converge. The discussions with Whitby Town Council and Whitby and District Tourism Association should continue. The Council should facilitate any proposals which may emerge from private and town interests to maintain the TIC in its present form and make a going concern of it. The Council should effect savings by withdrawing from face to face provision, leaving that to others. Beyond that, it should not seek to extract the maximum rent from the site, but set a rent which allows a new organisation to breathe
as above
I think that these savings and further savings closer to home should be made as detailed below. There are too many managers and councillors/
What options? It just lists 3 possible areas eg A review of TIC provision across all 3 towns. This doesn't tell us anything to really comment on (what is TIC anyway?). Surely another way to look at this is 'Can we reduce our capital expenditure?' eg £4,000,000 for the Futurist development. This is clearly an estimate and a 4% reduction in this ludicrous figure would meet the £169k shortfall. £1,200,000 on vehicles! Is this really essential? Why not spread it over 2 years and 'save' £600,000.
It is fantasy accounting. Look at the real accounts and make proper savings.
Cabins on Whitby wharf- just how much does the council expect to raise from these? Are they going to have formidable rents that make them unpractical?
The additional car parking fees at Whitby marina are excessive when the increase in mooring fees are brought into consideration.The accumulated multiplied increases over the past five years, are out of line with other increases. Kiosks on harbour lands are a good idea but will decrease the parking for boat owners. Have the kiosks instead of increasing parking fees for boat owners on reduced land space.

FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

If you have said that you would prefer that some of the savings proposals identified in the budget proposals should not be implemented please answer the following question: The Council is required to set a balanced budget and therefore if some of the savings are not implemented then others need to identified. Do you have any suggestions as to how the Council could save money and / or increase income?
Cut pay to chief executives, directors etc.
Save money by: Fewer councillors. Remove automatically paid allowances. Reinvest income
Cut councillors wages and expenses to levels similar to normal employment. Pay them minimum wage like rest of us
You spend too much on IT. Use open source software and cut the costs dramatically. No need for Microsoft licenses. Relocate public facing services to a central datacentre and manage it remotely. No need for expensive WAN links then. If you don't know how to do it get some expert help.
Reduce the number of Cllrs. Stop wasting money looking at the futurist and just sell it to someone for a pound, if it is a site worth buying someone will buy it or take it on, (you are wasting tax payer money trying to do up the site or knock it down, someone else will make the money.
get rid of the market and open air venue. get rid of the tourism department and all TIC's, why does the Council need to do this the businesses in town that benefit from this service should found it directly
close all departments that don't make money or bring money into the council. Stop collecting council Tax give this to NYCC in fact merge with NYCC and cut jobs that are no longer needed along with cllrs.
Don't spend £4m on knocking down a building which, over the years, has brought millions of visitors to the town
Hold to account the directors/managers who have allowed such massive losses of taxpayer money on the OAT!
Reduce the number of ward councillors thereby saving on the allowances and expenses which they can claim.
Lot of house holds have sean little
As stated above the 6 District/Borough Councils and North Yorks need to stop prevaricating and get on with harmonising the management structures and the way services can be better delivered across boundaries which will generate real savings/economies of scale to local residents. Cabinet and SBC need to examine services they can bid to run in other areas in order to secure income streams.
The council has been mismanaged for years. All the empty properties need letting out. When you Google corupt councils Scarborough comes up why?
Don't spent 4 million on the futurist, waste of cash, sell it or a £1
The Council could reduce the amount of the current prime TIC building a smaller TIC/ Customer Services team would require allowing the remainder of the building could then be leased off. This service is essential to the town of Whitby.

FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

<p>Development of income raised potential at poorly used sites such as the mere, Efficiency in use of staff... e.g. at a recent meeting, 4 SBC employees attended where only 1 was needed. Use of public transport and budget accommodation for all travel. Grant the sale of the futurist to a developer who will fund the demolition cost. Abolish the contract for the mayors car and driver. Surely the mayor is able to drive himself. This should be an active community role rather than a ceremonial handshake position. Income generation through out of town facilities e.g. near Morrisons for multiplex cinema, bowling, restaurants, shopping centre. There are few effective large savings to be made so the council must greater funds.</p>
<p>The council should let its open spaces, often in prime locations, for businesses to set up and derive income from them. Look for sponsorship from business.in exchange for publicity Identify surplus/underused land owned by the council and sell or rent it out.</p>
<p>The figure of £4 million pounds allocated for the development of the Futurist Site seems to have been plucked from mid air. Surely the shortfall of £169,000 could be taken from the £4 million sum. It represents less than five percent of the allocation</p>
<p>The last thing I would wish is to damage SMT. However the Council paid SMT £516,000 in their last financial year, a figure inflation proofed for the next 25 years in exchange for 120 events a year under a service level agreement. 120 events a year is a ridiculous burden on the Trust. The Trust needs to focus on visitors and visitor income.</p>
<p>cut back on big salary supervisory cut back on final salary pensions which are unaffordable now to the council tax payer</p>
<p>To spend £4m on clearing the Futurist site and making the cliff safe so that Flamingland/xxxxx can buy the land and be GIFTED part of the park for £1m surely is false economy and cannot be justified with a loss to the taxpayer of £4m.. The Futurist could be a going concern if refurbished at considerably less cost and could be sustainable from all year round shows, bands, comedy and plays etc... This iconic theatre could be made beautiful and would be more cost effective. Not all attractions have to be contemporary. As previously stated a reduction in the number of Councillors a we do not need 2 for wards and some wards could be joined and overseen by one councillor. This would further increase the savings on costs of telephony lines, Ipad contracts and general expenses. Are there any further executive posts which can be done away with? It appears we have had a £90k per annum deputy chief exec who has been such an asset to the council that she is not to be replaced. An extra 1% on the council tax for local benefit only. On the proviso that this is managed effectively. All cuts and savings rely on good management which could be improved.</p>
<p>See my answer above - don't spend as much on the capital projects. How is the Council prepared to spend £4,000,000 on the Futurist site when in previous years it only contributed £200k per annum. What is the likely sale price of the site? £1,200,000 on vehicles! Is this really essential? Why not spread it over 2 years and 'save' £600,000.</p>
<p>Become efficient, you are not.</p>
<p>Revise the park and ride bus route, to stop on South Cliff and Falsgrave, creating a circular route for the 64 route. This could then be used by more working people, and bring in more income. Rent out the Park and Ride car park for Drive in Cinema. Put the TIC back into town where it can serve the people- there are plenty of empty shops!!! Reduce the shop rents to encourage more traders. Fully convert St Mary's area into a carpark, with people's park, seats and play area- and stop trying to get supermarket builds on that site. Just to name a few ideas!!!!!!!!!!!!</p>

FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

The costs the council pays to certain companies are a joke. I believe every contract should be reviewed and reduced across the board.

Cut the number of councillors by a third, pay them a fixed allowance of no more than the current average, this will cut that part of the expenditure by a third.

Q5 Do you agree with the Council allocating one-off funding to the following priorities?

	Number	%	
· Corporate Training programme for managers and supervisors to further develop management skills - £10,000	Yes	52	41.3%
	No	74	58.7%
		126	1.0

	Number	%	
· Building works at Scarborough Spa and Whitby Pavilion for unforeseen repair works at the sites - £250,000	Yes	108	83.1%
	No	22	16.9%
		130	1.0

	Number	%	
· Tourism Destination Marketing System to provide a fully integrated e-tourism solution - £25,000	Yes	69	53.9%
	No	59	46.1%
		128	1.0

	Number	%	
· Repairs to South Bay Underground Car Park to rectify defects to the main supporting beams to ensure that areas of the facility do not have to be closed off - £25,000	Yes	117	91.4%
	No	11	8.6%
		128	1.0

	Number	%	
· Increase in running costs for Open Air Theatre in 2016/17 following the agreement of a five year contract with an external operator. The cost of running the venue will reduce in each of the subsequent four years of the contract - £32,000	Yes	69	53.5%
	No	60	46.5%
		129	1.0

	Number	%	
· Contribution towards the running costs of a Filey Bus Scheme for a third and final year - £5,000	Yes	93	71.5%
	No	37	28.5%
		130	1.0

	Number	%	
Conversion of the shelter near the entrance to the Open Air Theatre into a Box Office to improve its location and visibility - £17,000	Yes	61	46.9%
	No	69	53.1%
		130	1.0

APPENDIX A

FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

Creation of an Investment Fund to progress schemes requiring upfront investment but that will result in the achievement of future year budget savings to be progressed - £589,000	Number		%	
	Yes	91		71.1%
	No	37		28.9%
		128		1.0

Do you agree with the Council allocating one-off funding to the following priorities

· Robin Hoods Bay Coast Protection Scheme for a phased replacement of the wall to ensure continued protection for the village from coastal erosion- £77k]	No.		%	
	Yes	126		96.2%
	No	5		3.8%
		131		1.0

· Regeneration of the Futurist site - £4,000,000	No.		%	
	Yes	49		37.1%
	No	83		62.9%
		132		1.0

· Stabilisation works at Eskside Wharf - £1.5m	No.		%	
	Yes	109		85.8%
	No	18		14.2%
		127		1.0

· Scarborough Spa asset management works (primarily roof repairs)- £1.14m	No.		%	
	Yes	94		71.8%
	No	37		28.2%
		131		1.0

· Replacement of Pindar all-weather pitch - £100k	No.		%	
	Yes	71		55.0%
	No	58		45.0%
		129		1.0

Increased Cemetery provision in Filey, Whitby and Scarborough as current provision is nearing capacity - £400k	No.		%	
	Yes	115		88.5%
	No	15		11.5%
		130		1.0

FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

Q7

Given the severe constraints to the Council's budgets, do you agree that the Council should cap its Coast Protection spend at £3m to ensure that the costs remain affordable?

	No.	%
Yes	82	65.6%
No	43	34.4%
	125	1.0

Comments
I think you could look towards East Riding for ideas to save money on Parks and Gardens. - Roundabouts have coloured glass artwork on them, and thus removing the need for continuing maintenance by gardeners etc. - Also I noted whilst in Beverley in the run up to Christmas, they had really nice artificial 'pop up type' Christmas trees. Would this work out cheaper than buying, installing and decorating real trees every year? - Is there also plants which could be planted in our gardens which wouldn't need to be pulled up and replaced every couple of months or so, ie rose bushes or similar that would need minimal tending? May be easy maintenance plants which are often referred to on gardening programmes and exhibition displays. Although I appreciate we are a tourist destination, I think we could still achieve a great vision and attraction for tourists without what appears to me such labour intensive practices.
The futurist should be committed to private enterprise, the site should be sold and money invested. Government should be required to fund all coastal erosion costs, not a local authority. After all the coast is part of the country, it just happens to be in North Yorkshire. The proposals seem to be the best that can be done under the present world wide downturn, and the need for this government to rebalance its books is a priority. Unfortunately those people on a fixed income may think any new proposals that specify cuts or shortages in funding will be somewhat disheartened and feel very hard done by.
none
Do not demolish the futurist site, sell it to buyers that want to buy it, therefore no £4,000,000 to spend and the sale of the site makes a big difference to the final statement
Only that we all, that is residents, all have to draw our belts in in the economic climate, so should councils.
No more money should be spent on the open air theatre that has cost us so much already. The same applies for the Futurist and £4 million to redevelop the site is not acceptable.
The Futurist site shambles could have been avoided and might still be salvaged with a completely new approach - the Flamingo Land situation leaves more questions than answers. Why should the town throw more money after bad at the Open Air Theatre for so few concerts and many of those running at a loss, when it could have had a top class venue at the Futurist. After all the money poured down the drain at the Spa yet the roof still needs work and more money spent - unbelievable.

FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

<p>The proposed saving of £60K from Scarborough Museums Trust seems very small for an organisation that has declared a surplus well in excess of that figure for a number of (consecutive) years according to the charity commission website. Also the use of SBC funds to support the private operators of the OAT, SIV and in part the futurist does seem to be appropriate given the current climate.</p>
<p>The Futurist : Must wait till financial conditions arde easier than now. That SBc is employing the best in financial controllers, i.e. Quantity Surveyors for every proposed building scheme. That SBC is giving due consideration to the salary levels of Senior Management.....</p>
<p>The £4m for Futurist regeneration should be for the restoration and renovation of the theatre and keeping it as a focal point in the scheme, not the demolition and stabilisation of the land to please those that received bribes (sorry donations) from flamingoland</p>
<p>Spending £4million to sort the Futurist site out is a complete joke. Flamingoland should be paying. If they cannot afford it, sell the site to another developer. Best value for the taxpayer must be obtained. Why are we paying £1.5million to repair Eskdale Wharf? This was a dredging accident and should be covered by insurance. The Spa is costing a couple of million a year to maintain. Find another solution for this building. This could be spent elsewhere to benefit the local economy. This is not good value for money for the taxpayer.</p>
<p>I do not agree with the council spending four million on the demolition and associated ground works on the futurist site. The private company should contribute at least half if not all of the associated costs. Why are we accepting one million off them to then spend four million of tax payers money to carry out the cliff stabilization? The potential new attraction is unlikely I feel to bring tourists flooding in to Scarborough anyway.</p>
<p>As I have previously stated I am against any more input by the council into the OAT. This has had time enough to make a profit, not a loss every year. If the price of tickets were reduced to a more affordable level, the capacity would fill, giving a much better experience for both performer and viewer, and would no doubt increase, not decrease the budget.</p>
<p>Why when the Spa is run by a private company are you allocating funds for roof repair surely this should have been sorted out in the tenancy agreement that the tenant pays for repairs and maintenance</p>
<p>Increase the amount of money from £3 million to spend on coast protection, do not cap this</p>
<p>It would not be wise to limit coast protection spend, 3 million is not much cash in construction terms</p>
<p>There needs to be a full open consultation on the Futurist.</p>
<p>I think that generally the proposed budget 2017/17 has taken into account the idea of ensuring critical services would be prioritised. That the question of planning, organising, motivating both staff and service users, there would be effective, efficient and economic controlling and coordinating, paying maximum attention to discipline when Council's employees are carrying out their duties.</p>

FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

<p>In some cases my answer would have been Don't Know or Sometimes. Just being offered Yes or No is unsatisfactory. Not enough detailed explanation is given in the appendices. For example, £4,000,000 for redevelopment of the Futurist site is meaningless unless a breakdown is given. It is hard to believe that SBC would be able to spend £4,000,000 in one financial year 2016/17 on the Futurist site. It is annoying that yet more money is required for the Spa and the underground car park as work was carried out relatively recently at both these sites. I do support the extra work at the Spa but it does seem endless. In general I found the information vague and I felt that much of it is more contingency planning than actual intention to complete the proposals in 2016/17.</p>
<p>Yes I see you are advertising 3 jobs on your website I just cannot understand why these people are needed at £32,000 salary This is where our money is going Think long and hard before spending our money</p>
<p>If the quality of the borough's assets and infrastructure are kept high. Then visitors will be attracted to the area, without the need of extra spending on promoting Tourism. Too often the area has given too much funding to this sort of thing with little benefit to the local region. Other areas of Yorkshire have done much better out of these schemes. It is the quality that counts not the promotions.</p>
<p>there should be no financial investment on the regeneration of the futuristsit site before ,a wider and more open consultation. in view of the potential value of this site,for the council to consult further with the public on this important matter. such actions would show the council to be more open and democratic</p>
<p>Priority should be given for the re-generation of the Futurist as an all year round venue to attract more visitors to the area out of season.</p>
<p>I am against the closure of TIC's as they are vital to both Scarborough and Whitby. Whitby relies on tourism and I would suggest that yes the current tic office is far too big but if the Endeavour Wharf project goes ahead and there is a visitor centre as in current plans then that is an ideal place for a smaller but manned tic to be located. I think the coastal defences are vital to the area and we can't afford to cut budgets to sacrifice our coastline which is shrinking at a pace and needs whatever money can be afforded and which can bring in external funding sources.</p>
<p>Re the Open Air Theatre: The climate in this country is not suitable for Open Air Theatres and I consider this is throwing good money after bad as it is running at a loss and will always continue to do so.Is there any real need for a new box office? just a waste of money in my view. Why are we spending 4 m pounds on the futurist site for the purchaser when they should be clearing and stabilising it at their own expense as is the norm for any buyer of land. ie if you sell a building for developing that should be the end of your responsibilities. Who will be responsible for any probable landslip or building damage caused by demolition and excavations, it should be the buyer but it looks like it will be SBC.It would be cheaper to develop the Futurist but SBC seem obsessed with demolition against the majority of the residents. We need a theatre large enough to take the big acts it used to have.</p>
<p>The same areas of the Council seem to continue to deliver savings, surely technology can be used to reduce running costs of say planning or elections.</p>

FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

I think all works to protect the coast line should be kept as future tourism depends on our coast line being accessible and available for everyone, tourists and residents. niche projects don't benefits all residents but without our coast line and heritage buildings there is nothing for the visitors to see and do. The Spa building is not as accessible as it used to be and needs an overall rather than repair. It is outdated as the Futurist was. 21st century visitors and residents need modern attractions to keep them coming back but they also need the views our coast line is famous for. Protect that and provide modern entertainment.

No cap on coastal defence, you don't know what will be needed in the future. All our major towns are on the coast and need protecting and this is going to cost more than 3 million. Why limit coastal defence to 3 million when when you want to spend 4 million on the futurist white elephant project, that will only benefit business by gifting them a site to use. Maybe you should give the 4 million to coastal defence that protects 1000's of house, tax payers homes. Yes the environment agency offer grant for coastal defence but this is being used for flooding and coastal defence may be forgotten. Remember people come to the seaside towns to be by the sea safely protected they don't come to go to the futurist. You need to get your priorities right and offer as much money as is needed to maintain our defences.

It seems a tab simplistic to try and cap coastal defence spending without a clear understanding of what is or may be required in the future, no evidence has been provided as to why a cap should be in place. It sounds like accountants are trying to control what they don't understand

The council must be seen to take a new approach to it's own internal management, both in terms of cost saving but also to restore some faith in the community that we do not have a council that cares more about their own pockets and petty politics than the community which is struggling and divided. Use council resources to generate income whether by leasing buildings for weddings/ leveraging existing assets. Genuinely consult and listen to the community, be clear and honest with residents. Put the people ahead of the politics, for example, the recent decision to stand a council member against xxxxx for mayor. This was a political play and had nothing to do with the benefits to the local community that would have been brought by having a genuine public servant for mayor, similarly to that which was seen when xxxxx was mayor. Actions such as these foster resentment and a lack of respect for the intentions of our councillors.

I do not agree with the figure of £4,000,000 being allocated to Futurist redevelopment. I believe that this is, in the first stages, an excessive amount and should not be greater than the proposed cap relating to Coastal Defence of £3,000,000. This seems to me to be a misguided mixture of priorities, but that is a personal opinion!.

Instead of allocating £4 million to the redevelopment of the Futurist site it should be sold off with restrictions on the purchaser as to the uses it can be put. If this is nor possible then delay or phase the spend. This one item of expenditure dominates the capital expenditure budget and whilst it may be desirable is it really such a priority in these straightened times?

It is reassuring to note the work that has gone into identifying those ares where savings can be made. However rather than identifying lots of areas with minor savings why not revisit the £4 million allocated for the Futurist redevelopment and the£ 1.14 million allocated to the Scarborough Spa asset management works and trim their budgets so as to cancel the £169,000 budget shortfall. Why is no there mention of any financial contribution to SBC from York Potash?

FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

<p>£4 million on the Futurist Theatre looks to be of doubtful value and practicality. Though considered desirable in Scarborough Town, has it not outlived its purpose? Meanwhile Whitby Piers which have lasted 200 years, now need to be set up for the next 200. The ticket we are told is £10 million. One good storm and Whitby will be 'Dawlished'. The cost of repair will be hugely greater. There appears to be no provision or sign in this budget that SBC will tackle the project. If you have £4 million for the Futurist, it would be better to bank it to deal with the Whitby Piers or indeed any other fundamental infrastructure</p>
<p>more needs to be done on running repair work everywhere instead of waiting until items have to be renewed at extortunate cost with expensive consultation excercises</p>
<p>If a person takes over the running cost of a premises then if we ar not getting a profit that person should stand repairs and maintenance of said premises. We cannot keep sustaining premises that do not make us a profit. Either sell them off or take over the running completely.</p>
<p>As I have said in the sections above, a lot can be done to meet the shortfall of £169k. This is a miniscule amount in the context of the overall expenditure of the council. They should look at the big ticket items like the Futurist redevelopment and the Whitby Wharfe. These together are estimated at £5.5m. A 3% reduction in these estimates would save the required amount.</p>
<p>Do a proper consultation. this is an insult to Tax payers.</p>
<p>IF council tax goes up, then I strongly object to proposed cost to consumer for brown bins to be emptied. Personally I use neither the Spa nor the OAT, so should my money be maintaining them? It seems the same as a recent argument that only people who have brown bins should pay to have them emptied.</p>
<p>Instead of using the 4 million knocking the futurist down use it to repair it and make it work it a great place for visitors to go and great for live entertainment.</p>
<p>Look at the costs of some of these schemes! A Joke. I think the public should be consulted more on each cost with a breakdown so we can see where this money is being wasted and what the council are being ripped off with</p>
<p>lay off your executives and any councilors who do not have the time to do their jobs also any that have excess expenses, at next election lower the wage</p>
<p>Having read through the appended list's I think that at a stroke you could save the council four million pounds be deleting the Futurist item as keeping the theatre would be a better option than demolition at an unknown amount and then no guaranteed revenue from the cleared site. I along with a lot of the population of Scarborough judging by messages on Facebook and other internet sites strongly object to the four million pounds allocated to Futurist, this amount will not cover demolition costs and as I understand it the sale of the cleared site would not reimberse the council to cover this outlay, it would cost a lot less to up date the theatre and continue to run it as a benefit and long term asset for Scarborough. The demolition of this much loved and unique building would make Scarborough a laughing stock in the theatre world. There has to be ways of raising funds by grant applications to help to keep The Futurist as a theatre and I understand that there has been offers from various sources to take over the running of the theatre, Scarborough needs this building for it's capacity seating in ALL weathers and for quality shows.</p>

FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

I have answered the questions on the basis of "What must be done", "What should be done" and "What could be done". Clearly anything to do with prevention of natural disasters related to coastal erosion is "a must". Having been a professional practitioner in Management development and Training, including LG, I believe in it. The current standard of management within the Council is not great, but it can be alleviated by recruiting much better qualified and experienced management in the first place, that is where Training and Development are required and "should be done". Also a "value for money" assessment needs to be made. We would all like to know precisely what does the present CEO do to justify his extortionate salary? What has he achieved for the betterment of the people of Scarborough during his presence in the job? What difference would the public notice if this particular CEO was not there? Of course it would save we Council Tax Payers £130,000+ per annum. As to expenditure on places of entertainment, this seems to be disproportionate at best and grossly partisan at worst. For instance you can spend £1m on the roof of the Spa, but £1m on the roof of the Futurist has always been considered unaffordable for years. It is clear that this roof has deteriorated exponentially with the number of years it has been neglected. Hence it will now take £1m to renovate. It is becoming very clear from the members of the public, (and let us not forget that is where most of the Council's money is coming from) that they want money spending on renovating and regenerating the Futurist, yet you can find £4m in the budget to demolish it, for what clearly is the betterment of a Private Enterprise company who is getting our money offered on a plate. Has anybody looked at the legality of that? - "State aided Private Enterprise". courtesy of the Council Tax payers of Scarborough. As for the Open Air Theatre, looking at the losses incurred since it first opened, (not to mention no ROI) this is being kept open to "save face" of the Council. How long will we go on throwing good money after bad? Hope this is enough feedback to be going on with. Will the Council listen anyway?

There will be a new football pitch as part of the Leisure Complex therefore so much money for Pindar (£193,000) is not acceptable. The Provision of £4M for The Futurist needs to be reassessed. This is an enormous amount of money and we have to borrow to be able to fund just a demolition? What is the likely income from the proposed redevelopment? How long will it take to recoup our money? Why are we using a prime site for a private company to make money at the council's expense? I am sure when the idea was first mooted no one would be aware of the massive amount of monies required to get open space. We need to look at what can be done still using the existing structure to shore up the banking.

Risk Matrix

Risk Ref	Date	Risk	Consequences	Mitigation	Current Risk Score	Target Score	Service Unit Manager/ Responsible Officer	Action Plan
1	February 2016	That the Council does not set a robust budget in 2016/17	Potential overspends and unforeseen draws from reserves in 2016/17.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of savings proposals to ensure that they are achievable. ▪ Regular programme of budget monitoring. ▪ Budget holders taking responsibility and ownership of their budgets and signing off procedures 	B4	B4	HFAM / CFM	None
2	February 2016	That the decisions made in 2016/17 negatively impact future years revenue budgets.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unsustainable revenue budgets in future years. ▪ Unplanned draws from reserves ▪ Cuts in service 	Financial Strategy and long term budget planning	B3	B3	HFAM / CFM	
3	February 2016	That the Council's capital resources are insufficient to fund essential and desirable capital works	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Health and Safety issues. ▪ Increases in the cost of responsive repairs ▪ Increases in unsupported borrowing ▪ Pressure on future year revenue budgets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Priority schemes identified ▪ Future capital receipts earmarked for priority schemes ▪ Unsupported borrowing of £2.8 million factored into 15/16 budget to progress priority schemes 	D4	B4	HFAM / CFM	Obtain accurate costings for all priority schemes and factor into long term budget plans

APPENDIX B

Risk Ref	Date	Risk	Consequences	Mitigation	Current Risk Score	Target Score	Service Unit Manager/ Responsible Officer	Action Plan
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Budget growth factored into future year revenue budget plan to fund further increases in unsupported borrowing 				
4	February 2015	That the Council has insufficient resources in future years to fund current service levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cuts in front facing services ▪ Staffing reductions ▪ Increased budget risk ▪ Draws from reserves 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Financial Strategy and long term budget plan ▪ Early identification of savings requirements ▪ Prioritisation of services 	E4	E2	DT / HFAM	Prioritisation of services and medium to long term strategy for budget reductions.

Fees and Charges - Environment and Regulation service - Food and Occupational Safety and Environmental Regulation	2015/16 charges £	2016/17 charges £	VAT	Cabinet or Council decision?	Statutory?
Food and Occupational Safety:					
Food Export certificate fees:					
All categories of food export certificate	32	n/a	O	n/a	Discretionary
Food export certificate - no approved Export Health Certificate required by Defra	n/a	32	O	Council	Discretionary
Food export certificate - where an approved Export Health Certificate is required by Defra	n/a	45	O	Council	Discretionary
Special treatment registration fees:					
Skin piercing - premises registration	374	n/a	O	n/a	
Skin piercing - practitioner registration	66	n/a	O	n/a	
Skin piercing - combined premises and 1st practitioner registration	n/a	374	O	Council	Discretionary
Skin Piercing - each additional practitioner registration	66	66	O	Council	Discretionary
Skin piercing - amendment to existing registration (premises or practitioner)	n/a	25	O	Council	Discretionary
Ear piercing only - combined premises and 1st practitioner	n/a	100	O	Council	Discretionary
Ear piercing only - each additional practitioner	n/a	45	O	Council	Discretionary
Ear piercing - amendment to existing registration (premises or practitioner)	n/a	25	O	Council	Discretionary
Tattooing - premises registration	374	n/a	O	n/a	Discretionary
Tattooing - practitioner registration	66	n/a	O	n/a	Discretionary
Tattooing - combined premises and 1st practitioner registration	n/a	374	O	Council	Discretionary
Tattooing - each additional practitioner registration	n/a	66	O	Council	Discretionary
Tattooing - amendment to existing registration (premises or practitioner)	n/a	25	O	Council	Discretionary
Tattooing or skin piercing events/conventions	n/a	700	O	Council	Discretionary

Fees and Charges - Environment and Regulation service - Food and Occupational Safety and Environmental Regulation	2015/16 charges £	2016/17 charges £	VAT	Cabinet or Council decision?	Statutory?
Primary Authority Partnership fees:					
Scarborough Borough Council and Company A (hourly rate)	45	45	S	Council	Discretionary
Scarborough Borough Council and Company B (yearly rate)	1,500	1,500	S	Council	Discretionary
Health and Safety					
Officer statement of facts (hourly rate)	n/a	45	O	Council	Discretionary
Environmental Regulation:					
Environmental Protection Act					
Environmental Information Regulations 2004 - Contaminated Land Enquiries:					
Commercial - Hourly rate	45	46	S	Council	Discretionary
Domestic - Hourly rate	45	46	S	Council	Discretionary
General enquiries - Hourly rate	45	46	S	Council	Discretionary
Environmental Protection Schedule 1 Part B Premises:					
a) Summary Of Register	0	20	S	Council	Discretionary
b) First Sheet - A4	0	15	S	Council	Discretionary
c) Each subsequent Sheet - A4	0	5	S	Council	Discretionary
d) First Sheet - A3	0	15	S	Council	Discretionary
e) Each subsequent Sheet - A3	0	5	S	Council	Discretionary
Pollution Prevention and Control Act 1999					

Fees and Charges - Environment and Regulation service - Food and Occupational Safety and Environmental Regulation	2015/16 charges £	2016/17 charges £	VAT	Cabinet or Council decision?	Statutory?
LA-IPPC charges:					
a) Application	3,218	3,218	O	Council	Statutory
b) Additional fee for operating without a permit	1,137	1,137	O	Council	Statutory
c) Annual Subsistence (Low)	1,384	1,384	O	Council	Statutory
d) Annual Subsistence (Medium)	1,541	1,541	O	Council	Statutory
e) Annual Subsistence (High)	2,233	2,233	O	Council	Statutory
f) Substantial Variation	1,309	1,309	O	Council	Statutory
g) Transfer	225	225	O	Council	Statutory
h) Partial transfer	668	668	O	Council	Statutory
i) Surrender	668	668	O	Council	Statutory
LAPPC and LAIPPC subsistence charges:					
Where paid quarterly the total amount payable will be increased by	36	36	O	Council	Statutory
LAPPC Annual Subsistence Charge:					
1.a) Standard process Low	739	739	O	Council	Statutory
1.b) Standard process Medium	1,111	1,111	O	Council	Statutory
1.c) Standard process High	1,672	1,672	O	Council	Statutory
1.d) Standard process Low - Where a LAPPC Part B installation is subject to reporting under the E-PRTR Regulation.	838	838	O	Council	Statutory
1.e) Standard process Medium - Where a LAPPC Part B installation is subject to reporting under the E-PRTR Regulation.	1,210	1,210	O	Council	Statutory
1.f) Standard process High - Where a LAPPC Part B installation is subject to reporting under the E-PRTR Regulation.	1,771	1,771	O	Council	Statutory
2.a) Reduced fee activities (Low)	76	76	O	Council	Statutory
2.b) Reduced fee activities (Med)	151	151	O	Council	Statutory

Fees and Charges - Environment and Regulation service - Food and Occupational Safety and Environmental Regulation	2015/16 charges £	2016/17 charges £	VAT	Cabinet or Council decision?	Statutory?
2.c) Reduced fee activities (High)	227	227	O	Council	Statutory
2.d) Reduced fee activities (Low) - Where a LAPPC Part B installation is subject to reporting under the E-PRTR Regulation.	175	175	O	Council	Statutory
2.e) Reduced fee activities (Med) - Where a LAPPC Part B installation is subject to reporting under the E-PRTR Regulation.	250	250	O	Council	Statutory
2.f) Reduced fee activities (High) - Where a LAPPC Part B installation is subject to reporting under the E-PRTR Regulation.	326	326	O	Council	Statutory
3.a) PVR I & II combined (Low)	108	108	O	Council	Statutory
3.b) PVR I & II combined (High)	326	326	O	Council	Statutory
3.c) PVR I & II combined (Med)	216	216	O	Council	Statutory
3.d) PVR I & II combined - Where a LAPPC Part B installation is subject to reporting under the E-PRTR Regulation (high)	425	425	O	Council	Statutory
3.e) PVR I & II combined - Where a LAPPC Part B installation is subject to reporting under the E-PRTR Regulation (med)	315	315	O	Council	Statutory
3.f) PVR I & II combined - Where a LAPPC Part B installation is subject to reporting under the E-PRTR Regulation (low)	207	207	O	Council	Statutory
4.a) Other reduced fee activities (Low)	218	218	O	Council	Statutory
4.b) Other reduced fee activities (Med)	349	349	O	Council	Statutory
4.c) Other reduced fee activities (High)	524	524	O	Council	Statutory
4.d) Other reduced fee activities (Low) - Where a LAPPC Part B installation is subject to reporting under the E-PRTR Regulation.	317	317	O	Council	Statutory
4.e) Other reduced fee activities (Med) - Where a LAPPC Part B installation is subject to reporting under the E-PRTR Regulation.	448	448	O	Council	Statutory
4.f) Other reduced fee activities (High) - Where a LAPPC Part B installation is subject to reporting under the E-PRTR Regulation.	623	623	O	Council	Statutory
6.a) Standard mobile plant, for first and second permits (Low)	618	618	O	Council	Statutory
6.b) Standard mobile plant, for first and second permits (Medium)	989	989	O	Council	Statutory
6.c) Standard mobile plant, for first and second permits (High)	1,484	1,484	O	Council	Statutory
6.d) Standard mobile plant, for first and second permits (Low) - Where a LAPPC Part B installation is subject to reporting under the E-PRTR Regulation	717	717	O	Council	Statutory
6.e) Standard mobile plant, for first and second permits (Medium) - Where a LAPPC Part B installation is subject to reporting under the E-PRTR Regulation	1,088	1,088	O	Council	Statutory

Fees and Charges - Environment and Regulation service - Food and Occupational Safety and Environmental Regulation	2015/16 charges £	2016/17 charges £	VAT	Cabinet or Council decision?	Statutory?
6.f) Standard mobile plant, for first and second permits (High) - Where a LAPPC Part B installation is subject to reporting under the E-PRTR Regulation	1,583	1,583	O	Council	Statutory
7.a) For the third to seventh permits (Low)	368	368	O	Council	Statutory
7.b) For the third to seventh permits (Medium)	590	590	O	Council	Statutory
7.c) For the third to seventh permits (High)	884	884	O	Council	Statutory
7.d) For the third to seventh permits (Low) - Where a LAPPC Part B installation is subject to reporting under the E-PRTR Regulation	467	467	O	Council	Statutory
7.e) For the third to seventh permits (Medium) - Where a LAPPC Part B installation is subject to reporting under the E-PRTR Regulation	689	689	O	Council	Statutory
7.f) For the third to seventh permits (High) - Where a LAPPC Part B installation is subject to reporting under the E-PRTR Regulation	983	983	O	Council	Statutory
8.a) Eighth and subsequent permits (Low)	189	189	O	Council	Statutory
8.b) Eighth and subsequent permits (Medium)	302	302	O	Council	Statutory
8.c) Eighth and subsequent permits (High)	453	453	O	Council	Statutory
8.d) Eighth and subsequent permits (Low) - Where a LAPPC Part B installation is subject to reporting under the E-PRTR Regulation.	288	288	O	Council	Statutory
8.e) Eighth and subsequent permits (Medium) - Where a LAPPC Part B installation is subject to reporting under the E-PRTR Regulation	401	401	O	Council	Statutory
8.f) Eighth and subsequent permits (High) - Where a LAPPC Part B installation is subject to reporting under the E-PRTR Regulation.	552	552	O	Council	Statutory
LAPPC charges - Application Fee:					
Additional fee for operating without a permit	1,137	1,137	O	Council	Statutory
Additional fee where a LAPPC application for any of the above is for a combined Part B and waste application	297	297	O	Council	Statutory
Other Reduced Fee Activities	346	346	O	Council	Statutory
PVR I & II combined	246	246	O	Council	Statutory
PVRI, SWOBs, and Dry Cleaners Reduced Fee Activities	148	148	O	Council	Statutory
Reduced fee activities: Additional fee for operating without a permit	68	68	O	Council	Statutory
Standard process	1,579	1,579	O	Council	Statutory

Fees and Charges - Environment and Regulation service - Food and Occupational Safety and Environmental Regulation	2015/16 charges £	2016/17 charges £	VAT	Cabinet or Council decision?	Statutory?
LAPPC mobile plant charges - Application fees:					
Number of permits = 1	1,579	1,579	0	Council	Statutory
Number of permits = 2	1,579	1,579	0	Council	Statutory
Number of permits = 3	943	943	0	Council	Statutory
Number of permits = 8	477	477	0	Council	Statutory
LAPPC subsistence fees:					
Late Payment fees	50	50	0	Council	Statutory
LAPPC Substantial change:					
Reduced fee activities	98	98	0	Council	Statutory
Standard process	1,005	1,005	0	Council	Statutory
Standard process where the substantial change results in a new PPC activity	1,579	1,579	0	Council	Statutory
LAPPC Temporary transfer for mobiles					
First transfer	51	51	0	Council	Statutory
Repeat following enforcement or warning	51	51	0	Council	Statutory
LAPPC Transfer and Surrender:					
New operator at low risk reduced fee activity	75	75	0	Council	Statutory
Reduced fee activities: partial transfer	45	45	0	Council	Statutory
Reduced fee activities: transfer - Price on application	0	0	0	Council	Statutory
Standard process partial transfer	476	476	0	Council	Statutory

Fees and Charges - Environment and Regulation service - Food and Occupational Safety and Environmental Regulation	2015/16 charges £	2016/17 charges £	VAT	Cabinet or Council decision?	Statutory?
Standard process transfer	162	162	O	Council	Statutory
Surrender: all Part B activities	0	0	O	Council	Statutory
LAPPC Annual Subsistence charge:					
1.a) Standard process Low (where permit is for a combined Part B and waste installation)	838	838	O	Council	Statutory
1.b) Standard process Medium (where permit is for a combined Part B and waste installation)	1,260	1,260	O	Council	Statutory
1.c) Standard process High (where permit is for a combined Part B and waste installation)	1,870	1,870	O	Council	Statutory
Water Testing charges:					
Private water supplies:					
a) Private water supply sample (hourly rate)		34	O	Council	Statutory up to a maximum limit
b) Risk Assessment (each assessment)	50	68	O	Council	Statutory up to a maximum limit
c) Investigation (hourly rate)	n/a	34	O	Council	Statutory up to a maximum limit
d) Granting an Authorisation (per authorisation)	n/a	100	O	Council	Statutory up to a maximum limit
e) Analysing a Sample Taken Under Regulation 10 - at cost - up to maximum price shown	25	25	O	Council	Statutory up to a maximum limit
f) Analysing a Sample Taken Under Check Monitoring - at cost - up to maximum price shown	41	100	O	Council	Statutory up to a maximum limit
g) Analysing a Sample Taken Under Audit Monitoring - at cost - max price shown	47	500	O	Council	Statutory up to a maximum limit

Fees and charges – Environment and Regulation service - Licensing Services	2015/16 charges £	2016/17 charges £	VAT	Council or Cabinet decision?	Statutory?
Licensing Act 2003:					
Licensing fees:					
Application For Provisional Statement Where Premises Are Being Built etc (Sec 29) 3	315	315	0	Council	Statutory
Application For Transfer Of A Premises Licence (Section 42)	23	23	0	Council	Statutory
Application To Vary Licence To Specify Individual As Premises Supervisor (Section37)	23	23	0	Council	Statutory
Change Of Relevant Registered Address Of Club (Section 83,(1) Or (2)	10.5	10.5	0	Council	Statutory
Duty To Notify Change Of Name Or Address (Section 127)	10.5	10.5	0	Council	Statutory
Interim Authority Notice Following Death Etc Of Licence Holder (Section 47)	23	23	0	Council	Statutory
Notification Of Change Of Name And Address (Section 33)	10.5	10.5	0	Council	Statutory
Notification Of Change Of Name Or Alteration Of Rules Of The Club (Section 82)	10.5	10.5	0	Council	Statutory
Personal Licence	37	37	0	Council	Statutory
Personal Licence Grant Or Renewal (Section 117)	37	37	0	Council	Statutory
Right Of Freeholder Etc To Be Notified Of Licensing Matters (Section 178)	21	21	0	Council	Statutory
Temporary Events Notice	21	21	0	Council	Statutory
Temporary Events Notice (Section100)	21	21	0	Council	Statutory
Theft, Loss etc Of Certificate Or Summary (Section 79)	21	21	0	Council	Statutory
Theft, Loss etc Of Personal Licence (Section 126)	10.5	10.5	0	Council	Statutory
Theft, Loss etc Of Premises Licence Or Summary (Section 25)	10.5	10.5	0	Council	Statutory
Theft, Loss etc Of Temporary Event Notice (Section 110)	10.5	10.5	0	Council	Statutory
Licensing register entries:					
For All Entries (If Plans Are Required)	3,000	3,000	0	Council	Statutory
For All Entries (No Plans Are Required)	1,000	1,000	0	Council	Statutory
Per Individual Copy	26	26	0	Council	Statutory

Fees and charges – Environment and Regulation service - Licensing Services	2015/16 charges £	2016/17 charges £	VAT	Council or Cabinet decision?	Statutory?
Premises Licence:					
Minor Variation	89	89	0	Council	Statutory
Premises Licence - Annual Fee:					
A	70	70	0	Council	Statutory
B	180	180	0	Council	Statutory
C	295	295	0	Council	Statutory
D	320	320	0	Council	Statutory
E	350	350	0	Council	Statutory
Premises Licence - Annual Fee (For Town Centre Pubs Only):					
D x 2	640	640	0	Council	Statutory
E x 3	1,050	1,050	0	Council	Statutory
Premises Licence - New and Full Variation applications:					
A	100	100	0	Council	Statutory
B	190	190	0	Council	Statutory
C	315.00	315	0	Council	Statutory
D	450.00	450	0	Council	Statutory
D x 2	900	900	0	Council	Statutory
E	635.00	635	0	Council	Statutory
E x 3	1905.00	1,905	0	Council	Statutory
Club Premises Certificates					

Fees and charges – Environment and Regulation service - Licensing Services	2015/16 charges £	2016/17 charges £	VAT	Council or Cabinet decision?	Statutory?
Minor Variation	89	89	O	Council	Statutory
Club Premises Certificate - Annual Fee:					
A	70	70	O	Council	Statutory
B	180	180	O	Council	Statutory
C	295	295	O	Council	Statutory
D	320	320	O	Council	Statutory
E	350	350	O	Council	Statutory
Club Premises Certificate - New and Full Variation applications:					
A	100	100	O	Council	Statutory
B	190	190	O	Council	Statutory
C	315.00	315	O	Council	Statutory
D	450.00	450	O	Council	Statutory
E	635.00	635	O	Council	Statutory
Gambling Act 2005:					
Small Casino - new application	8000.00	8,000	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Small Casino - annual fee	5000.00	5,000	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Small Casino - variation	4000.00	4,000	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Small Casino - transfer	1455.00	1484	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Small Casino - Reinstatement	1455.00	1484	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Small Casino - Application for a premises licence which already has a Provisional Statement	3000.00	3,000	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Small Casino - Application for Premises Licence for Provisional Statement	8000.00	8,000	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Converted Casino - Annual fee	3000.00	3000	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit

Fees and charges – Environment and Regulation service - Licensing Services	2015/16 charges £	2016/17 charges £	VAT	Council or Cabinet decision?	Statutory?
Converted Casion - Variation	1787.00	1823	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Converted Casino - Transfer	1034.00	1045	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Converted Casino - Reinstatement	1034.00	1045	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Adult Gaming Centres: a) New Applications	1,787	1823	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Adult Gaming Centres: b) Annual Fees	1,000	1,000	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Adult Gaming Centres: c) Variations	614.00	626	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Adult Gaming Centres: d) Transfers	840	857	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Adult Gaming Centres: e) Reinstatements	840	857	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Adult Gaming Centres: f) Provisionals Statements	1,787	1823	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Adult Gaming Centres: g) Licence Application (Provisional Statement Holders)	1200.00	1,200	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Adult Gaming Centres: h) Copy of licence	19	20	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Adult Gaming Centres: i) Notification of change	39.5	40	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Betting Premises (Excluding Tracks): a) New Applications	3,000	3,000	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Betting Premises (Excluding Tracks): b) Annual Fees	560	571	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Betting Premises (Excluding Tracks): c) Variations	1,227	1,252	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Betting Premises (Excluding Tracks): d) Transfers	848	857	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Betting Premises (Excluding Tracks): e) Reinstatements	840	857	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
<i>Betting Premises (Excluding Tracks): f) Provisionals Statements</i>	3,000	3,000	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Betting Premises (Excluding Tracks): g) Licence Application (Provisional Statement Holders)	1200.00	1,200	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Betting premises (Excluding Tracks): h) Copy of licence	19	20	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Betting premises (Excluding Tracks): i) Notification of change	39.5	40	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Bingo Clubs: a) New Applications	3500.00	3,500	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Bingo Clubs: b) Annual Fees	1,000	1,000	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Bingo Clubs: c) Variations	1,562	1,593	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Bingo Clubs: d) Transfers	840.00	857	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Bingo Clubs: e) Reinstatements	840.00	857	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Bingo Clubs: f) Provisionals Statements	3,500	3,500	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Bingo Clubs: g) Licence Application (Provisional Statement Holders)	1,200	1,200	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit

Fees and charges – Environment and Regulation service - Licensing Services	2015/16 charges £	2016/17 charges £	VAT	Council or Cabinet decision?	Statutory?
Bingo Clubs: h) Notification of change	19	20	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Bingo Clubs: i) Copy of licence	39.5	40	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Club Gaming Permits & Club Machine Permits (Where The Applicant Holds A Club Premises Certificate Under The Licensing Act 2003): a) Application Fee (new Permit)	100.00	100	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Club Gaming Permit (Where The Applicant Holds A Club Premises Certificate Under The Licensing Act 2003): b) Application Fee (conversion of Part 2/Part 3 Registration)	100.00	100	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Club Gaming Permits and Club Gaming Machine Permits (Where applicant holds a Club Premises Certificate under Licensing Act 2003); c) Annual fee	50	50	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Club Gaming Permits & Club Machine Permits (where applicant holds a Club Premises Certificate under Licensing Act 2003); d) Renewal fee	100	100	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Club Gaming Permits & Club Machine Permits (where applicant holds a Club Premises Certificate under Licensing Act 2003); e) Variation fee	100	100	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Club Gaming Permits & Club Machine Permits (where applicant holds a Club Premises Certificate under Licensing Act 2003); f) Copy of permit	15	15	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Club Gaming Permit and Club Gaming Machine Permit: a) Application Fee (New Permit)	200.00	200	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Club Gaming Permit & Club Machine Permit: b) Application Fee (Conversion Of Part 2 / Part 3 Registration)	100	100	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Club Gaming Permit & Club Machine Permit: c) Annual Fee	50.00	50	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Club Gaming Permit & Club Machine Permit: d) Renewal Fee	200.00	200	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Club Gaming Permit & Club Machine Permit: e) Variation Fee	100	100	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Club Gaming Permit & Club Gaming Machine Permit: f) Copy Of Permit	15.00	15	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Family Entertainment Centre: a) New Applications	1787.00	1823	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Family Entertainment Centre: b) Annual Fees	725	740	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Family Entertainment Centre: c) Variations	614.00	626	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Family Entertainment Centre: d) Transfers	560.00	574	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Family Entertainment Centre: e) Reinstatements	560	574	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Family Entertainment Centre: f) Provisionals Statements	1787.00	1823	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Family Entertainment Centre: g) Licence Application (Provisional Statement Holders)	897.00	915	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Family Entertainment Centre: h) Copy of licence	19	20	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Family Entertainment Centre: i) Notification of change	39.50	40	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Licensed Premises - Notification Of Intent To Use Automatic Entitlement (1-2 Machines)	50	50	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit

APPENDIX C

Fees and charges – Environment and Regulation service - Licensing Services	2015/16 charges £	2016/17 charges £	VAT	Council or Cabinet decision?	Statutory?
Licensed Premises Gaming Machine Permit (3+ Machines): a) Application Fee (New Permit)	150.00	150	0	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Licensed Premises Gaming Machine Permit (3+ Machines): b) Application Fee (Conversion Of S34 Permit)	100	100	0	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Licensed Premises Gaming Machine Permit (3+ Machines): c) Annual Fee	50	50	0	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Licensed Premises Gaming Machine Permit (3+ Machines): d) Variation Fee	100	100	0	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Licensed Premises Gaming Machine Permit (3+ Machines): e) Transfer Fee	25	25	0	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Licensed Premises Gaming Machine Permit (3+ Machines): f) Change Of Name	25	25	0	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Licensed Premises Gaming Machine Permit (3+ Machines): g) Copy Of Permit	15.00	15	0	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Prize Gaming Permit: a) Application Fee (New Permit)	300.00	300	0	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Prize Gaming Permit: b) Application Fee (Conversion Of S34 Permit)	100.00	100	0	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Prize Gaming Permit: c) Renewal Fee	300	300	0	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Prize Gaming Permit: d) Change Of Name	25	25	0	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Prize Gaming Permit: e) Copy Of Permit	15	15	0	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Small Society Lotteries: a) New Registration	40.00	40		Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Small Society Lotteries: b) Annual Fee	20.00	20	0	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Tracks: a) New Applications	2410.00	2,458	0	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Tracks: b) Annual Fees	1,000	1,000	0	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Tracks: c) Variations	896	914	0	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Tracks: d) Transfers	560.00	571	0	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Tracks: e) Reinstatements	560.00	571	0	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Tracks: f) Provisionals Statements	2410.00	2,458	0	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Tracks: g) Licence Application (Provisional Statement Holders)	896.00	914	0	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Tracks: h) Copy of licence	19	20	0	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Tracks: i) Notification of change	39.5	40	0	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Unlicensed Family Entertainment Centre Gaming Machine Permit: a) Application Fee (New Permit)	300.00	300	0	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Unlicensed Family Entertainment Centre Gaming Machine Permit: b) Application Fee (Conversion Of S34 Permit)	100	100	0	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Unlicensed Family Entertainment Centre Gaming Machine Permit: c) Renewal Fee	300	300	0	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Unlicensed Family Entertainment Centre Gaming Machine Permit: d) Change Of Name	25	25	0	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit

Fees and charges – Environment and Regulation service - Licensing Services	2015/16 charges £	2016/17 charges £	VAT	Council or Cabinet decision?	Statutory?
Unlicensed Family Entertainment Centre Gaming Machine Permit: e) Copy Of Permit	15.00	15	O	Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Temporary Use Notice	500	500		Council	Statutory - up to maximum limit
Sex establishment licence fees:					
New application	4,532	4,532	O	Council	Discretionary
Renewal - annual fee	3,946	3,946	O	Council	Discretionary
Variation	3,946	3,946	O	Council	Discretionary
Transfer	344	344	O	Council	Discretionary
Change of Licensee name	51	51	O	Council	Discretionary
Replacement copies of documentation	11	11	O	Council	Discretionary
Administration fee - refunding pro-rata fees for surrendered or revoked licences	20	20	O	Council	Discretionary
Refund where applications for grant or renewal are refused in their entirety or withdrawn	740	740	O	Council	Discretionary
Animal licensing fees:					
Animal boarding establishments - new and annual renewal fees (pro-rata basis rounded to nearest 6 months)	143	146	O	Council	Discretionary
Dog Home boarding - new and annual renewal fees (pro-rata basis rounded to nearest 6 months)	108	110	O	Council	Discretionary
Cat Home boarding - new and annual renewal fees (pro-rata basis rounded to nearest 6 months)	108	110	O	Council	Discretionary
Dog Day boarding - new and annual renewal fees (pro-rata basis rounded to nearest 6 months)	125	127	O	Council	Discretionary
Pet shops - new and annual renewal fees (pro-rata basis rounded to nearest 6 months)	143	146	O	Council	Discretionary
Dangerous wild animals (not including vet fees) - new and 2 yearly renewal fees	108	110	O	Council	Discretionary
Riding establishments (not including vet fees) - new and annual renewal fees	161	164	O	Council	Discretionary
Donkey licences (not including vet fees) - new and annual renewal fees	161	164	O	Council	Discretionary
Breeding of Dogs - new and annual renewal fees (pro-rata basis rounded to nearest 6 months)	125	127	O	Council	Discretionary
Zoos - (not including vet fees) - new and renewal fees	535	545	O	Council	Discretionary
Scrap metal licence fees:					

Fees and charges – Environment and Regulation service - Licensing Services	2015/16 charges £	2016/17 charges £	VAT	Council or Cabinet decision?	Statutory?
Scrap metal dealers site	470	479	O	Cabinet	Discretionary
Variation of licence - dealers only	327	333	O	Cabinet	Discretionary
Scrap metal collectors	142	145	O	Cabinet	Discretionary
Minor Amendments to licence - dealers and collectors	25	26	O	Cabinet	Discretionary
Taxi and private hire licence fees:					
Vehicles:					
Taxi vehicle licence - new and annual renewal fees (pro-rata basis rounded up to nearest 6 months)	244	249	O	Council	Discretionary
Private hire vehicle licence - new and annual renewal fees (pro-rata basis rounded up to nearest 6 months)	215	219	O	Council	Discretionary
Taxi or private hire vehicle transfer fee	38	39	O	Council	Discretionary
Replacement vehicle fee - taxi and private hire	45	46	O	Council	Discretionary
Change of vehicle licence holder/owner details - taxi and private hire	6	21	O	Council	Discretionary
Bracket for exterior licence plate - taxi and private hire	10	11	O	Council	Discretionary
Replacements (e.g. exterior licence plate; internal licence plate; paper vehicle licence; tariff card) - taxi and private hire	6	21	O	Council	Discretionary
Failure to attend appointed vehicle inspection - taxi and private hire	10	11	O	Council	Discretionary
Application for advertising on vehicle - taxi only	5	21	O	Council	Discretionary
Administration charge - surrender or cancellations of licences	21	21	O	Council	Discretionary
Drivers:					
Dual driver's licence - renewal application fee (every 3 years) (inclusive of DBS and DVLA checks)	219.5	224	O	Council	Discretionary
Dual driver's licence - new application fee (inclusive of DBS and DVLA checks and knowledge tests) (pro-rata basis rounded up to the nearest 12 months)	242	247	O	Council	Discretionary
External ID Validation check (where required)	5	21	O	Council	Discretionary

Fees and charges – Environment and Regulation service - Licensing Services	2015/16 charges £	2016/17 charges £	VAT	Council or Cabinet decision?	Statutory?
Change of licence holder details	6	21	O	Council	Discretionary
Replacements (e.g. paper licence; photographic ID card; badge)	6	21	O	Council	Discretionary
Re-sit of knowledge and geographical test (following three failed attempts)	22	23	O	Council	Discretionary
Operators (5 year licences):					
Private hire Operator's licence for up to 2 vehicles	990	990		Council	Discretionary
Private hire Operator's licence for 3 to 15 vehicles	1290	1290		Council	Discretionary
Private hire Operator's licence for 16 or over vehicles	1820	1820		Council	Discretionary
Replacement of licence (copy requested or lost/stolen)	6	21		Council	Discretionary
General:					
Additional copy of the Council's Taxi and Private Hire Policy	6	8		Council	Discretionary

Fees and charges – Environment and Regulation service - Crematorium and cemeteries	2015/16 charges £	2016/17 charges £	VAT	Council or Cabinet decision?	Statutory?
Crematorium and cemeteries:					
Cremation fees:					
a/ foetal remains or stillborn baby	17	17.5	O	Council	Discretionary
b/ the body of a child whose age at the time of death did not exceed 5 years	28	28.5	O	Council	Discretionary
c/ the body of a child whose age at the time of death exceeded 5 years but did not exceed 15 years	63	64.5	O	Council	Discretionary
d/ body parts (in accordance with The Cremation (Amendment) Regulations, 2000)	18	18.5	O	Council	Discretionary
e/ the body of a person whose age at the time of death exceeded 15 years	542	582	O	Council	Discretionary
Medical Referee's Fee	18.5	18.5	O	Council	Discretionary
Environmental charge (cremation of adults only)	50	50	O	Council	Discretionary
Total Fee for the body of a person whose age at the time of death exceeded 15 years	610.5	650.5	O	Council	Discretionary
Miscellaneous :-					
Use of Chapel of Rest for each period up to 24 hours	31	31.5	O	Council	Discretionary
Use of Service Chapel for Funeral Service prior to burial in an S.B.C. Cemetery or strewing in the Crematorium grounds (over 15 years)	67	68.5	O	Council	Discretionary
Use of Service Chapel as an extension to an existing booking to allow for an extended service (not including 2.40 services)	67	68.5	O	Council	Discretionary

APPENDIX C

Fees and charges – Environment and Regulation service - Crematorium and cemeteries	2015/16 charges £	2016/17 charges £	VAT	Council or Cabinet decision?	Statutory?
Use of Service Chapel for Funeral Service prior to burial in an S.B.C. Cemetery or strewing in the Crematorium grounds (up to and including 15 years)	Nil	Nil	O	Council	Discretionary
Use of Service Chapel for other than the above	180	184	O	Council	Discretionary
Strewing of cremated remains of persons cremated other than at Scarborough <i>(Whose age at time of death exceeded 15 years)</i>	53	54	O	Council	Discretionary
Holding of cremated remains - after one month; a weekly fee of	14	15	O	Council	Discretionary
Despatch of cremated remains via carrier service <i>(The cremated remains must be in a suitable container which has been placed in a cardboard box for transit)</i>	42.5	43.5	O	Council	Discretionary
For any cremation service starting more than 10 minutes after the designated time	34.5	35	O	Council	Discretionary
For any burial service starting more than 10 minutes after the designated time	34.5	35	O	Council	Discretionary
Late delivery of forms :-					
a/ Delivered between 10.00 a.m. and office closing time on the working day prior to the cremation	63	64.5	O	Council	Discretionary
b/ Delivered on the day of the cremation	90	92	O	Council	Discretionary
Media fees:					
Audio recording of services	39.50	40.5	S	Council	Discretionary
Additional copies of the CD	21.00	22	S	Council	Discretionary
DVD recording of a service	46.00	47	S	Council	Discretionary

Fees and charges – Environment and Regulation service - Crematorium and cemeteries	2015/16 charges £	2016/17 charges £	VAT	Council or Cabinet decision?	Statutory?
Additional copies of the DVD	25.00	26	S	Council	Discretionary
Webcasting per service	41.50	42.5	S	Council	Discretionary
Video Tributes					
Administration per request	8.50	9	S	Council	Discretionary
Photographs (each)	1.25	2	S	Council	Discretionary
Video (per minute)	4.00	5	S	Council	Discretionary
Chapel Organ	Nil	Nil	S	Council	Discretionary
Memorial fees:					
Book of Remembrance					
<i>The following include VAT at the standard rate</i>					
Two line entry	56.50	57.5	S	Council	Discretionary
Five line entry	94.00	96	S	Council	Discretionary
Eight line entry	139.00	142	S	Council	Discretionary
Floral Motif, Coat of Arms, Badge or Picture	50.00	51	S	Council	Discretionary
<i>(Floral Motifs, Badges, Coats of Arms etc. are available with FIVE and EIGHT line entries only)</i>					
Memorial Cards					
<i>The following include VAT at the standard rate</i>					

Fees and charges – Environment and Regulation service - Crematorium and cemeteries	2015/16 charges £	2016/17 charges £	VAT	Council or Cabinet decision?	Statutory?
Card with :- Two line entry Five line entry Eight line entry Floral Motif, Coat of Arms, Badge or Picture	21.00 22.50 24.00 50.00	22 23 25 51	S S S S	Council Council Council Council	Discretionary Discretionary Discretionary Discretionary
Other Memorials					
<i>(All the following include VAT at the standard rate and are renewable after a period of either 10 or 20 years)</i>					
Stone Kerb with Bronze Plaque (Woodlands and Whitby) - 10 years	116.00	118	S	Council	Discretionary
- 20 years	210.00	214	S	Council	Discretionary
Tree with Bronze Plaque - 10 years	322.50	329	S	Council	Discretionary
- 20 years	551.50	562	S	Council	Discretionary
Rose Bed with Bronze Plaque - 10 years	344.00	351	S	Council	Discretionary
- 20 years	581.50	593	S	Council	Discretionary
Single Rose with Aluminium Plaque - 10 years	158.00	161	S	Council	Discretionary
- 20 years	268.50	274	S	Council	Discretionary
Marble Edging Stone with Black Granite Tablet - 10 years	338.50	345	S	Council	Discretionary
- 20 years	581.50	593	S	Council	Discretionary
Wall Plaque & Posy Vase - 10 years	191.00	195	S	Council	Discretionary
Bench Plaque - 10 years	191.00	195	S	Council	Discretionary
Cemetery fees:					

Fees and charges – Environment and Regulation service - Crematorium and cemeteries	2015/16 charges £	2016/17 charges £	VAT	Council or Cabinet decision?	Statutory?
1/ PRIVATE GRAVES					
To purchase the exclusive Rights of Burial for a period of 50 years.					
1/ in a 9' x 4' grave (i.e. full size)	743.00	758	O	Council	Discretionary
2/ in a 6' x 3' grave (Children's Section in Woodlands Cemetery)	253.00	258	O	Council	Discretionary
3/ in a Cremated Remains grave	411.00	419	O	Council	Discretionary
Interment Fees					
<i>For a person over the age of seven years :-</i>					
Single	535.00	545	O	Council	Discretionary
Double	699.00	713	O	Council	Discretionary
Treble	781.00	797	O	Council	Discretionary
<i>For a child up to and including the age of seven years :-</i>					
Single	450.00	459	O	Council	Discretionary
Double	620.00	632	O	Council	Discretionary
Treble	687.00	700	O	Council	Discretionary
Single (in Children's Section of Woodlands Cemetery)	165.00	168	O	Council	Discretionary
Cremated Remains	100.00	102	O	Council	Discretionary
Body Parts	100.00	102	O	Council	Discretionary
2/ BABY GRAVES					
New grave for a foetal, stillborn or baby up to seven days old in the designated section at Woodlands Cemetery (including bronze plaque on stone kerb at head of grave)	178.00	181	O	Council	Discretionary
<i>(maximum coffin size: 24"x12")</i>					
3/ MISCELLANEOUS					
For strewing cremated remains, on a grave, of persons cremated other than					

Fees and charges – Environment and Regulation service - Crematorium and cemeteries	2015/16 charges £	2016/17 charges £	VAT	Council or Cabinet decision?	Statutory?
at Scarborough	53.00	54	0	Council	Discretionary
4/ MEMORIALS					
For the right to erect a memorial on a 9'0" x 4'0" grave					
Kerbset	145.00	148	0	Council	Discretionary
Lawn type up to 3'0" high x 3'0" wide	145.00	148	0	Council	Discretionary
Lawn type up to 3'0" high x 6'0" wide	242.00	247	0	Council	Discretionary
Cross and plinth up to 3'0" high	145.00	148	0	Council	Discretionary
Plaque or desktop up to 6" high	72.00	74	0	Council	Discretionary
For the right to erect a memorial on a 6'0" x 3'0" cremated remain grave	145.00	148	0	Council	Discretionary
(in the Children's Section at Woodlands) Lawn type up to 3'0" high x 3'0" wide	72.00	74	0	Council	Discretionary
Kerbset	72.00	74	0	Council	Discretionary
For the right to erect a vase not exceeding 12" x 12" x 12" on a grave (any section)	27.00	28	0	Council	Discretionary
For the right to cut an additional inscription	22.00	23	0	Council	Discretionary
Transfer of Ownership	20.00	21	0	Council	Discretionary
Quick reference Grave fees (charges include right of burial and interment fees):					
New Graves					
Single	1278.00	1305	0	Council	Discretionary
Double	1442.00	1471	0	Council	Discretionary
Cremated Remains	511.00	521	0	Council	Discretionary

Fees and charges – Environment and Regulation service - Crematorium and cemeteries	2015/16 charges £	2016/17 charges £	VAT	Council or Cabinet decision?	Statutory?
Child's Grave <i>(Section A at Woodlands)</i>	418.00	426	O	Council	Discretionary
Still-born, foetal or baby up to seven days old Including Bronze Plaque on stone kerb <i>(Lower South Terrace at Woodlands)</i> <i>(maximum coffin size: 24" x 12")</i>	178.00	181	O	Council	Discretionary
Re-open Existing Graves					
Single	535.00	545	O	Council	Discretionary
Double	699.00	713	O	Council	Discretionary
Treble - dependent on risk assessment	781.00	797	O	Council	Discretionary
Cremated Remains	100.00	102	O	Council	Discretionary
Vaulted Grave in Woodlands	2028.00	2069	O	Council	Discretionary
Meadow burial in Woodlands - Includes a granite marker	1328.00	1355	O	Council	Discretionary
	1492.00	1522	O	Council	Discretionary
Exhumations:					
Exhumation of body from grave or vault for re-burial in another grave or for cremation (exclusive of interment fees:					

APPENDIX C

Fees and charges – Environment and Regulation service - Crematorium and cemeteries	2015/16 charges £	2016/17 charges £	VAT	Council or Cabinet decision?	Statutory?
Cremation casket	220	225	O	Council	Discretionary
Full grave	828	845	O	Council	Discretionary