# COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING - THURSDAY 24 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ FEBRUARY 2022 <br> INDEPENDENT ALLIANCE GROUP AMENDMENT 

## ANNUAL BUDGET 2022/23

That the following amendments to the proposed budget be approved.

1. The County Council element of the Council Tax is not increased in 2022/23.
2. The Investing in Nottinghamshire programme is amended so that the office development at Top Wighay Farm does not go ahead, and the Capital Programme is amended to add this funding to the Highways capital programme to address the significant backlog of highway maintenance.

## Amendment 1

Citizens in Nottinghamshire and across the country are facing an unprecedented cost of living crisis with significantly increased fuel costs, increased National Insurance charges and inflation for all goods and services running well above any wage increases. As such it is proposed that the County Council element of Council Tax should not be increased in 2022/23.

The proposal is that this reduction in income is offset by an increase in the use of reserves in 2022/23.

The proposal will result in changes to information set out in the Annual Budget Report as detailed below.

Table 1 - Proposed County Council Budget 2022/23

| Committee Analysis | Net Budget 2021/22 fm | Pressures fm ¢m | Savings fm | Pay, Ni \& Pensions increase fm | Budget Changes fm | Net Budget $2022 / 23$ fm |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children \& Young People | 149.087 | 15.040 | (0.357) | - | (2.216) | 161.554 |
| Adult Social Care \& Public Health | 219.272 | 20.692 | (7.745) | - | (0.765) | 231.454 |
| Transport \& Environment | 111.447 | 3.003 | - | - | 0.080 | 114.530 |
| Communities | 18.417 | 0.148 | - | - | (0.327) | 18.238 |
| Policy | 3.186 | - | - | - | 1.798 | 4.984 |
| Economic Development \& Asset Management | 21.246 | 0.566 | - | - | 3.326 | 25.138 |
| Finance | 15.097 | - | - | - | 0.282 | 15.379 |
| Governance \& Ethics | 7.727 | - | - | - | (0.090) | 7.637 |
| Personnel | 18.034 | - | - | - | (0.577) | 17.457 |
| Net Committee Requirements | 563.513 | 39.449 | (8.102) | - | 1.511 | 596.371 |
| Corporate Budgets | (31.863) | - | - | - | (1.273) | (33.136) |
| Use of Reserves | (1.333) | - | - | - | (6.540) | (7.873) |
| Budget Requirement | 530.317 | 39.449 | (8.102) | - | (6.302) | 555.362 |

The Use of Reserves in the Budget Changes and the Net Budget 2022/23 columns are increased by $£ 4.1 \mathrm{~m}$, with the net Budget Requirement reduced by $£ 4.1 \mathrm{~m}$.

Table 2 - Proposed Budget 2022/23

## Corporate Budgets and Reserves

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Net } \\ \text { Budget } \\ 2021 / 22 \\ \text { fm } \end{gathered}$ | Budget Changes fm | Net Budget 2022/23 fm |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flood Defence Levies | 0.294 | 0.015 | 0.309 |
| Pension Enhancements (Centralised) | 2.050 |  | 2.050 |
| Trading Organisations | 1.300 |  | 1.300 |
| Contingency-General | 7.664 | (0.625) | 7.039 |
| Contingency-Pay |  | 10.226 | 10.226 |
| Capital Charges (Depreciation) | (44.070) | (1.290) | (45.360) |
| Interest \& Borrowing | 21.323 | (0.100) | 21.223 |
| Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) | 11.867 | 0.815 | 12.682 |
| New Homes Bonus Grant | (1.172) | (0.465) | (1.637) |
| Social Care Grant | (24.301) | (9.160) | (33.461) |
| Council Services Grant |  | (7.507) | (7.507) |
| Local Council Tax Support Grant | (6.818) | 6.818 |  |
| Subtotal Corporate Budgets | (31.863) | (1.273) | (33.136) |
| Net Transfer (From)/To Other Earmarked Resen | (1.333) | (2.430) | (3.763) |
| Transfer (From)/To General Fund Balances |  | (4.110) | (4.110) |
| Subtotal Use of Reserves | (1.333) | (6.540) | (7.873) |

The above table is amended to include a Transfer from General Fund Balances of $£ 4.1 \mathrm{~m}$.

## Table 3 - Local Tax Requirement Calculation

| 2022/23 | Amount <br> fm | \% <br> Funding |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Initial Budget Requirement | 555.362 | 100.0 |
| Less National Non-Domestic Rates | (120.767) | 21.7 |
| Less Revenue Support Grant | (7.336) | 1.3 |
| Net Budget Requirement | 427.259 |  |
| Less Estimated Collection Fund Surplus | (4.060) | 0.7 |
| Council Tax Requirement | 423.199 | 76.3 |

The above table is amended to reflect the reduced Initial Budget Requirement of $£ 555.362$ m (was $£ 559.472$ m), and a consequential reduction in Council Tax Requirement of the same amount.

## Table 5 - Impact of 0\% Increase on Local Tax Levels

 (County Council Element) 2022/23| $\begin{aligned} & \overline{0} \\ & \overline{0 x} \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | Value as at 1.4.91 | No. of Properties | \% No. of Properties | Ratio | County Council 2021/22 £ | $\begin{gathered} \text { County } \\ \text { Council } \\ 2022 / 23 \\ £ \end{gathered}$ | Change £ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | Up to £40,000 | 146,397 | 39.1\% | $6 / 9$ | 954.14 | 954.14 | 0.00 |
| B | $£ 40,001$ to $£ 52,000$ | 77,141 | 20.6\% | 7/9 | 1,113.16 | 1,113.16 | 0.00 |
| C | £52,001 to $£ 68,000$ | 63,963 | 17.1\% | $8 / 9$ | 1,272.19 | 1,272.19 | 0.00 |
| D | £68,001 to $£ 88,000$ | 43,458 | 11.6\% | 1 | 1,431.21 | 1,431.21 | 0.00 |
| E | £ $£ 8,001$ to $£ 120,000$ | 24,642 | 6.6\% | 11/9 | 1,749.26 | 1,749.26 | 0.00 |
| F | £120,001 to £160,000 | 11,888 | 3.2\% | 13/9 | $2,067.30$ | $2,067.30$ | 0.00 |
| G | $£ 160,001$ to $£ 320,000$ | 6,392 | 1.7\% | 15/9 | 2,385.35 | 2,385.35 | 0.00 |
| H | Over $£ 320,000$ | 485 | 0.1\% | 18/9 | 2,862.42 | 2,862.42 | 0.00 |

The above table is amended to show no increase in the County Council element of Council Tax.

Table 6 - Recommended levels of Council Tax and Adult Social Care

## Precept 2022/23

| $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{0} \\ & \stackrel{1}{6} \end{aligned}$ | Value as at 1.4.91 | No. of Properties | \% No. of Properties | Ratio | County Council 2021/22 £ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { County } \\ \text { Council } \\ 2022 / 23 \\ £ \end{gathered}$ | Change £ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | Up to $£ 40,000$ | 146,397 | 39.1\% | 6/9 | 1,053.90 | 1,085.52 | 31.62 |
| B | $£ 40,001$ to $£ 52,000$ | 77,141 | 20.6\% | 7/9 | 1,229.55 | 1,266.44 | 36.89 |
| C | $£ 52,001$ to $£ 68,000$ | 63,963 | 17.1\% | 8/9 | 1,405.20 | 1,447.36 | 42.16 |
| D | $£ 68,001$ to $£ 88,000$ | 43,458 | 11.6\% | 1 | 1,580.85 | 1,628.28 | 47.43 |
| E | $£ 88,001$ to $£ 120,000$ | 24,642 | 6.6\% | 11/9 | 1,932.15 | 1,990.12 | 57.97 |
| F | $£ 120,001$ to $£ 160,000$ | 11,888 | 3.2\% | 13/9 | 2,283.45 | 2,351.96 | 68.51 |
| G | $£ 160,001$ to $£ 320,000$ | 6,392 | 1.7\% | 15/9 | 2,634.75 | 2,713.80 | 79.05 |
| H | Over $£ 320,000$ | 485 | 0.1\% | 18/9 | 3,161.70 | 3,256.56 | 94.86 |

The above table details the impact of a 3\% increase in Adult Social Care Precept and a 0\% increase in Council Tax. The Band D charge falls from $£ 63.24$ to $£ 47.43$.

Table 7 - Amount of County Precept by District - 2022/23

| District Council | Council Tax <br> Base | County Precept |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Ashfield | $34,052.70$ | $£ 55,447,330$ |
| Bassetlaw | $36,396.81$ | $£ 59,264,198$ |
| Broxtowe | $34,530.00$ | $£ 56,224,508$ |
| Gedling | $37,776.42$ | $£ 61,510,589$ |
| Mansfield | $30,557.30$ | $£ 49,755,840$ |
| Newark | $41,205.00$ | $£ 67,093,277$ |
| Rushcliffe | $45,387.60$ | $£ 73,903,721$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 5 9 , 9 0 5 . 8 3}$ | $\mathbf{£ 4 2 3 , 1 9 9 , 4 6 3}$ |

The County Precept is reduced from $£ 427,308,575$ to $£ 423,199,463$, with the amended split per District shown in the table.

Table 9 - Analysis of Changes to the Medium-Term Financial Strategy 2022/23-2025/26

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2022/23 } \\ \text { fm } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2023/24 } \\ \text { f.fm } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2024/25 } \\ \text { f.m } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2025/26 } \\ \text { fm } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total fm |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year on Year Savings requirement (February 2021 Report) | 17.6 | 14.6 | 15.5 | - | 47.7 |
| Additional Pressures / Inflation | 10.2 | 5.2 | 0.8 | 27.4 | 43.6 |
| Increase in Contingency for Pressures Risk | 4.2 | - | - | - | 4.2 |
| Change in Pay / Pension Related Inflation | 1.9 | 1.9 | 0.1 | 3.9 | 7.8 |
| Approved Efficiencies \& Base Budget Adjustments | (6.0) | (3.6) | (0.3) | 0.1 | (9.8) |
| Change in Grant Funding | (22.9) | (4.9) | (9.2) | (2.3) | (39.3) |
| Increase in Council Tax | 4.1 | (4.1) | (4.4) | (9.2) | (13.6) |
| Change in Council Tax Base assumptions | (3.2) | (0.1) | (0.1) | (5.5) | (8.9) |
| Change in Council Tax Surplus | (5.2) | 5.2 | - | - | - |
| Variation in use of Reserves | (1.1) | (2.6) | 4.3 | 0.5 | 1.1 |
| Other Corporate Adjustments | 0.4 | 0.7 | (0.3) | - | 0.8 |
| Revised Gap | (0.0) | 12.3 | 6.4 | 14.9 | 33.6 |

The above table shows amendments in the Increase in Council Tax row, with $£ 4.1 \mathrm{~m}$ added in 2022/23. The Revised Gap across the MTFS increases from $£ 29.1 \mathrm{~m}$ to $£ 33.6 \mathrm{~m}$.

Table 10 - Medium Term Financial Strategy 2022/23-2025/26

|  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2022 / 23 \\ £ m \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline 2023 / 24 \\ \mathrm{Em} \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2024 / 25 \\ \mathrm{£m} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 2025 / 26 \\ \mathrm{Em} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Net Budget Requirement | 555.4 | 582.6 | 598.9 | 624.5 |
| Financed by : |  |  |  |  |
| Business Rates | 120.8 | 123.0 | 125.3 | 127.7 |
| Revenue Support Grant | 7.3 | 7.4 | 7.4 | 7.4 |
| Council Tax | 373.8 | 387.4 | 401.6 | 416.3 |
| Adult Social Care Precept | 49.4 | 53.7 | 58.2 | 58.2 |
| Collection Fund Surplus / (Deficit) | 4.1 | (1.2) |  |  |
| Total Funding | 555.4 | 570.3 | 592.5 | 609.6 |
| Funding Shortfall | - | 12.3 | 6.4 | 14.9 |
| Cumulative Funding Shortfall | - | 12.3 | 18.7 | 33.6 |

The above table is amended to reduce the Net Budget Requirement from $£ 559.5 \mathrm{~m}$ to $£ 555.4 \mathrm{~m}$ in $2022 / 23$, with a reduction in Council Tax across all years. The Cumulative Funding Shortfall increases from $£ 8.2 \mathrm{~m}$ to $£ 12.3 \mathrm{~m}$ in $2023 / 24$, from $£ 14.4 \mathrm{~m}$ to $£ 18.7 \mathrm{~m}$ in $2023 / 24$ and from $£ 29.1 \mathrm{~m}$ to $£ 33.6 \mathrm{~m}$ in 2025/26.

## Amendment 2

The capital programme currently includes an allocation of $£ 15 m$ for the development of new offices at Top Wighay Farm within the Investing in Nottinghamshire allocation.

Given the changes in working practices as a result of the COVID19 Pandemic a significant proportion of the Councils workforce are unlikely to ever return to full time office working. As a result, this office is no longer required.

There is a significant backlog of highway maintenance within Nottinghamshire. It is therefore proposed that this funding is allocated to the highway maintenance programme instead and is allocated proportionately per District / Borough.

Table 11 - Summary Capital Programme

|  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline \text { Revised } \\ 2021 / 22 \\ £ m \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2022 / 23 \\ £ m \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2023 / 24 \\ £ m \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2024 / 25 \\ £ m \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2025 / 26 \\ £ m \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL <br> £m |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Committee: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Children \& Young People* | 19.844 | 43.193 | 12.139 | 11.301 | 6.500 | 92.977 |
| Adult Social Care \& Public | 0.971 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.971 |
| Transport \& Environment | 57.903 | 58.268 | 30.408 | 29.002 | 26.903 | 202.484 |
| Communities | 2.013 | 1.943 | 0.500 | 0.500 | 0.500 | 5.456 |
| Economic Devt \& Asset | 20.438 | 11.806 | 3.900 | 2.835 | 2.400 | 41.379 |
| Mngt | 20.438 | 11.806 | 3.900 | 2.835 | 2.400 | 1.37 |
| Finance | 10.083 | 7.069 | 5.145 | 3.645 | 2.610 | 28.552 |
| Personnel | 0.151 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.151 |
| Contingency | 0.000 | 4.600 | 4.600 | 4.600 | 4.600 | 18.400 |
| Capital Expenditure | 111.403 | 126.879 | 56.692 | 51.883 | 43.513 | 390.370 |
| Financed By: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borrowing | 39.751 | 56.420 | 17.660 | 14.595 | 13.660 | 142.086 |
| Capital Grants | 64.312 | 65.586 | 35.774 | 35.072 | 29.077 | 229.821 |
| Revenue / Reserves | 7.340 | 4.873 | 3.258 | 2.216 | 0.776 | 18.463 |
| Total Funding | 111.403 | 126.879 | 56.692 | 51.883 | 43.513 | 390.370 |

* These figures exclude Devolved Formula Capital allocations to schools.

The Economic Devt \& Asset Mngt row in the above table has been reduced by $£ 12 \mathrm{~m}$ in $2022 / 26$, $£ 2.5 \mathrm{~m}$ in $2023 / 24$ and $£ 0.5 \mathrm{~m}$ in $2024 / 25$, reflecting the expected phasing of expenditure on the scheme. The Transport \& Environment row has been increased by the same amounts.

## RECOMMENDATION

The Recommendations moved by the Chairman of the Finance Committee as shown on pages 22 and 23 of the report be deleted and replaced by the following: (changes highlighted in red and underlined)

## Recommendations

## It is recommended that:

1) The Annual Revenue Budget for Nottinghamshire County Council is set at $£ 555.362$ million for $2022 / 23$.
2) The principles underlying the Medium-Term Financial Strategy are approved.
3) The establishment of a $£ 15 \mathrm{~m}$ earmarked reserve to fund costs associated with the highways review and the environment strategy.
4) The Finance Committee be authorised to make allocations from the General Contingency for 2022/23.
5) That the $3.00 \%$ Adult Social Care Precept is levied in 2022/23 to part fund increasing adult social care costs.
6) The Country Council element of the Council Tax is not increased in 2022/23. That the overall Band D tax rate is set at $£ 1,628.28$ with the various other bands of property as set out in the report.
7) The County Precept for the year ending 31 March 2023 shall be $£ 423,199,463$ and shall be applicable to the whole of the District Council areas as General Expenses.
8) The County Precept for $2022 / 23$ shall be collected from the District and Borough councils in the proportions set out in Table 7 with the payment of equal instalments on the dates set out in Table 8.
9) The Capital Programme for $2022 / 23$ to $2025 / 26$ be approved at the total amounts below and be financed as set out in the report:

| Year | Capital Programme |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 2 / 2 3}$ | $£ 126.879 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 3 / 2 4}$ | $£ 56.692 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 4 / 2 5}$ | $£ 51.883 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 5 / 2 6}$ | $£ 43.513 \mathrm{~m}$ |

10)The variations to the Capital Programme be approved.

## Reference

Para. 17

Table 9

Para. 13

Para. 19

Para. 28

Para. 29

Para. 32

Table 7
Table 8

Table 11

Para. 51-63
11)The Minimum Revenue Provision policy for $2022 / 23$ be

Appx. C approved.
12)The Capital Strategy including the $2022 / 23$ Prudential

Appx. D Indicators and Treasury Management Strategy be approved.
13)The Service Director - Finance, Infrastructure and Improvement be authorised to raise loans in 2022/23 within the limits of total external borrowings.
14)The Treasury Management Policy for $2022 / 23$ be approved.
15)The Council delegates responsibility for the setting of Treasury Management Policies and Practices relating to Pension Fund cash to the Pension Fund Committee.
16)The report be approved and adopted.

Cllr Lee Waters
Independent Alliance
Group

Cllr Tom Hollis Independent Alliance Group

Agenda Item:

## FINANCIAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE INDEPENDENT ALLIANCE GROUP'S AMENDMENT - COMMENTS OF THE SERVICE DIRECTOR - FINANCE, INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT AND THE SERVICE DIRECTOR - CUSTOMERS, GOVERNANCE AND EMPLOYEES

## 1 Purpose

1.1 The purpose of this report is to set out the financial and constitutional implications of the Independent Alliance Group's Budget Amendments and provide an opinion on whether it meets the funding requirements contained in the Local Government Finance Act 1992, the Local Government Act 2003, the CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance, and is in accordance with the legal requirements and the Council's constitution.

2 Financial Implications
2.1 The impact of amendment 1 is to reduce the proposed Council Tax increase by $1 \%$ to zero for $2022 / 23$. This reduces the funding available to pay for services and, since no offsetting savings are proposed, will increase the use of one-off reserves to fund this, and will increase the shortfall in the 4-year MTFS.
2.2 The impact of amendment 2 is to amend the proposed capital programme by $£ 15 \mathrm{~m}$ across financial years $2022 / 23,2023 / 24$ and $2024 / 25$. The proposal moves the funding from Investing in Nottinghamshire to highways maintenance.

## 3 Commentary on the Proposals

3.1 Any decision to forego a Council Tax increase means that potential increased income is lost forever. At a time of increasing demand on Council services and continued uncertainty around the medium and long term impact of the COVID19 pandemic this inevitably increases the risk that the Council may not be able to maintain its financial sustainability.
3.2 The impact of the proposal is seen in the updated tables included in the amendment, with the reduced income being funded from reserves in $2022 / 23$ and the MTFS shortfall to $2025 / 26$ increasing to $£ 33.6$ m.
3.3 The 2022/23 budget can still be balanced, albeit with an increased use of one-off funding, and the revised overall MTFS position will be amended accordingly. Acceptance of the amendment means that the Council will have foregone a possible $2 \%$ increase in Council Tax, and it is felt that this is the maximum that could be lost without significantly impacting on the future
financial sustainability of the Authority. It should be recognised that acceptance of this amendment increases the risks in the overall Council plan in the medium term.
3.4 It should be noted that the revised MTFS still assumes future Council Tax and Social Care Precept increases in line with current Government guidelines (2\% CT, 1\% SCP).
3.5 The proposal to cease development at Top Wighay Farm and add the funding to the highway maintenance capital programme has no overall impact on the capital programme of the Authority or the borrowing requirement.
3.6 There will be one-off costs associated with any abortive costs incurred to date on the Top Wighay element of the Investing in Nottinghamshire programme which would not be able to be capitalised. These are estimated at $£ 0.5 \mathrm{~m}$ and would need to be funded from the revenue budget at the point when the decision is made.

## 4 Conclusion

4.1 In the opinion of the Service Director - Finance, Infrastructure and Improvement, these amendments meet the requirements of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, the Local Government Act 2003 and the CIPFA Prudential Code.
4.2 In the opinion of the Service Director - Customers, Governance and Employees, the proposals contained in the Independent Alliance Group's Amendments are in accordance with the law and the County Council's Constitution.

NIGEL STEVENSON
SERVICE DIRECTOR - FINANCE, INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT

## MARJORIE TOWARD

## SERVICE DIRECTOR - CUSTOMERS, GOVERNANCE AND EMPLOYEES

