



Date: Wednesday, 11 January 2023
Time: 10.00 am
Venue: Council Chamber, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury, SY2 6ND
Contact: Amanda Holyoak, Committee Officer
Tel: 01743 257714
Email: amanda.holyoak@shropshire.gov.uk

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

TO FOLLOW REPORT (S)

6 Alternative Budget Proposals 2023/24 (Pages 1 - 14) ***Updated report***

To consider alternative budget proposals 2023/24, **to follow**

Attached: Financial Strategy Mid-Year Review Report considered at Cabinet on
14 December 2022

This page is intentionally left blank



Committee and Date

Performance Management Scrutiny Committee
11th January 2023

Item

Public

Alternative Budget Proposals 2023/24

Responsible Officer

James Walton

e-mail: james.walton@shropshire.gov.uk Tel: 01743 258915

1. Synopsis

A revised approach to alternative budgets was agreed in September by Full Council. This report sets out the alternative budget proposals of the opposition groups on the council further to their manifesto and policy priorities and in line with that previous report.

2. Executive Summary

- 2.1. Attached to this report are 3 appendices, setting out alternative budget proposals prepared by three opposition groups within the Council. These proposals are to be considered for possible inclusion within the Cabinet's budget proposals to be set out at its meeting of 15 February.
- 2.2. Alternative budget proposals have been reviewed by finance officers and relevant officers from service departments who have advised on the likely impact and feasibility of the proposals brought forward (in the same way as they would advise Portfolio Holders on their budget proposals to be discussed by Cabinet).
- 2.3. Should any of the attached proposals, wholly or partially, become part of the Cabinet's budget proposals recommended to Council, they will effectively become part of the Cabinet's own budget proposals and will then be considered and adopted, or not, alongside the other proposals brought to Council, including the council tax proposals. (They will not be considered as separate elements of the Cabinet's budget).

3. Recommendations

That Performance Management and Scrutiny Committee

- 3.1. Invites Opposition Group Leaders to present their alternative budget proposals to the committee.
- 3.2. Invites the committee to discuss the proposals presented.
- 3.3. Reports the overall discussion and the proposals presented to Cabinet to be considered for possible inclusion in the budget to be presented by the Leader to Council in March.

REPORT

4. Risk Assessment and Opportunities Appraisal

- 4.1. This will be prepared for separate proposals should they be included in the budget proposals taken forward.

5. Financial Implications

- 5.1. The subject of the report

6. Climate Change Appraisal

- 6.1. No direct impact arising from the report. Decisions with potential budgetary impact will require more detailed review as part of separate decisions, either within the Cabinet's Budget Report or as part of separate policy decisions.

7. Background

- 7.1. At its meeting of 22 September, Council agreed to a revised approach to alternative budgets. These proposals were agreed further to discussion at 4 May Performance Management and Scrutiny Committee and 7 September Cabinet meetings.
- 7.2. The revised process for the alternative budget proposals has been followed as set out in that report:
 - 31 October – Template sent out to Opposition Group Leaders
 - 25 November – Templates received back, and proposals reviewed by officers in relevant service areas

- 16 December – Templates confirmed further to officer review and returned to Opposition Group Leaders (21 December)
 - 3-4 January – final review and clearance of papers prior to publication
- 7.3. The next steps will be for these proposals to be reviewed by PMSC as part of this meeting, and then received by Cabinet 18 January. Cabinet will bring forward its proposals for the 2023/24 budget on 15 February, with recommendations for its approval presented to Full Council on 2 March.
- 7.4. The proposals of Leader and the Portfolio Holder for Resources, working with the cabinet, were published in outline as part of the December update to the Medium Term Financial Strategy, received by Cabinet on 14 December. These form the basis of the public consultation now available on the Council website.
- 7.5. Alternative budget proposals were prepared in isolation from each other and from the preparation of the Cabinet’s budget proposals. Proposals have followed the format common in other councils, by which budget options which support the policy objectives of the opposition groups are put forward. These then have cost or savings estimates attached to them along with feasibility appraisals. This is the same process as is adopted for the Cabinet’s budget proposals.
- 7.6. The three attachments to this report set out proposals received from the Opposition Group Leaders. Where possible, estimated costs and benefits have been identified by officers in the same way that costs and benefits are identified for all budget proposals. Overall proposals are summarised in the table below.

Political Group	Estimated revenue costs / (benefits) in 2023/24	Estimated capital costs / (benefits) in 2023/24
Liberal Democrat Party (Appendix 2)	£20.85m	£60.2m
Labour Party (appendix 3)	£20.19m	£2.0m
Green Party (Appendix 4)	£19.2m	£5.0m

- 7.7. This report presents 4 attachments, including the Administration’s own proposals (also published as the December MTFs update), also one for each of the Liberal Democrat, Labour, and Green political groups of the Council. These attachments set out the alternative budget proposals of each group, for the Cabinet to consider for inclusion within their own budget. The Labour group proposals were withdrawn.

List of Background Papers (This MUST be completed for all reports, but does not include items containing exempt or confidential information)

Alternative Budget proposals:

[Agenda for Performance Management Scrutiny Committee on Wednesday, 4th May, 2022, 2.00 pm – Shropshire Council](#)

[Agenda for Cabinet on Wednesday, 7th September, 2022, 10.30 am – Shropshire Council](#)

[Agenda for Council on Thursday, 22nd September, 2022, 10.00 am – Shropshire Council](#)

December 2022 MTFS update and budget savings proposals:

[Agenda for Cabinet on Wednesday, 14th December, 2022, 10.30 am – Shropshire Council](#)

Cabinet Member (Portfolio Holder)

Local Member

Appendices

Appendix 1 – December MTFS update report presented to Cabinet (effectively the draft budget proposals of the Administration)

Appendix 2 – Liberal Democrat group alternative budget proposals

Appendix 3 – Green Party group alternative budget proposals

Appendix 4 – Labour group alternative budget proposals

Alternative Budget Proposals

Please complete all columns as follows

- a) Please summarise the proposals setting out the current arrangement and the proposed revised arrangement.
- b) Costs - please provide any information on costs. Please contact Cheryl Sedgley or Ben Jay for assistance in making cost estimates.
- c) Please contact Cheryl Sedgley or Ben Jay for assistance in assessing one-off/base budget impacts.
- d) Please indicate your estimate of benefits (these do not have to be financial)
- e) Please indicate your proposed source of funding
- f) Service advice - follows from 28 Nov-9 Dec
- g) Risks and benefits - please add relevant risks and benefits associated with the proposal.

To be completed and returned to Cheryl Sedgley no later than Friday 25 November

Service review (for operational viability) follows, 29 Nov-9 Dec
Collated proposals will be presented to PMSC (11 Jan) and Cabinet (18 Jan)

Financial year: **2023/24**

Political Group: **Liberal Democrats**

Ref No.	a) Brief Description of the Proposal total proposed cost/(benefit)	2023/24 impact		b) Estimated Cost - assumptions		c) One off for 23/24 or Ongoing Base Budget	d) Estimated benefits	e) How will this proposal be funded?	f) Service advice on the proposal (complete 28 Nov-9 Dec)	g) Risks/implications associated with proposal
		Revenue (£)	Capital (£)	Revenue (£)	Capital (£)					
1	Bishops Castle community hospital (SC owned, currently leased to NHS but not in use; approx 20 years of lease remaining, TBC) - explore the option of nursing or stepdown/rehab beds to facilitate acute hospital discharges.	20,850,000	2,500,000		Assumed cost approx. £2.5m. Assumption that would need to end the current lease to the NHS and upgrade the facility to required standards for an 8 bed unit.	One Off for 23/24	Help with social care an extra beds at acute hospitals, will provide increased bed capacity in SW Shropshire.	Additional capital spending	Assumed cost approx. £2.5m, incurred for converting into a 8 bed unit.	Cost escalation.
2	New Care home in Bishops Castle.	nil in 23/24 - recurrent from 24/25.		Approximate cost of £1.5m offset by (client) revenue contributions of £0.250m. Assumed from 24/25 (12 months for capital works)		Ongoing Base Budget	Will provide additional care home beds in Bishop's Castle	Additional revenue costs	Approximate cost of £1.5m offset by (client) revenue contributions of £0.250m.	Client revenue lower than anticipated
3	Need to provide nursing beds in North Shropshire		4,000,000		Assumed cost approx. £4m. Assumption that would need to end the current lease to the NHS and upgrade the facility to required standards for an 8 bed unit.		Similar to option 1. New build or conversion. Suitable properties? Funded from capital budget	Additional capital spending	Assuming we are building this on land we own, then assume £3-5m cost for a new build (8 bed unit)	Cost escalation.
4	Care home in North Shropshire, Revenue implications	nil in 23/24 - recurrent from 24/25.		Approximate cost of £1.5m offset by (client) revenue contributions of £0.250m. Assumed from 24/25 (12 months for capital works)		Ongoing Base Budget		Additional revenue costs	Approximate cost of £1.5m offset by revenue contributions of £0.250m.	Client revenue lower than anticipated
5	List of capital projects, total, and value of each- how can we achieve 10% of highways Capital spent on Active Travel schemes		net nil		Estimated £1.3m top-slice, reinvested.			Reinvested government grant.	We currently receive and spend £9m on Highways Maintenance, £1.6m for LTP, and £2.3m for Incentivisation scheme. We could apply a 10% top slice to this equating to £1.3m.	Loss of future grants.
6	Introduce a Workplace Parking Levy. This would be applied to employers where car parking was used. Money raised would be used to subsidise alternative transport options. Initial funding receipts assumed to be low, with more in the future.	net nil		Assumes £100k additional income.	Yes			Additional revenue scheme	This would be a new initiative, designed to encourage workers to change transport modes.	Local business' staff resistance. Unpopular with local business.
7	Introduce collections so that just one bin to contains all dry recycling (glass, plastic, card, paper etc) in one bin. Would therefore remove the need for the blue bags and not requiring an additional bin (repurpose purple bins).	net nil		Assumes current (purple-lidded) bins are re-used. Costs chiefly around communication and behaviour change.			Less replacement blue bags not required and time emptying bins	self-funding.	Assume we would not introduce another new bin, just re-use the purple lidded bins. If it is planned to introduce a new bin, for reference we spent £2.9m on the purple lidded bin rollout. The effective sorting of the waste is important.	Low take up/compliance resulting in recycle contamination.
8	[removed; determined to be a duplication of 6]									
9	CIL. Current balance retained; potential use to offset other capital costs.	nil	nil		Proposal does not set out additional collection or investment proposals.			nil	Total CIL collected as at 31/10/22 is £58.4m. The total amount spent so far is £34.3m, therefore leaving £24.1m remaining (£19.7m in local area fund, £4.4m in strategic fund)	NA

10	If the Riverside and Pride Hill development projects were put out to private developments and these to provide the needed working capital.		net nil		Current capital allocation is for enabling works needed to prepare the site for marketing and future development.			nil	No SC capital would be saved, as currently it is intended that these projects will be funded from alternative sources of finance. Council approval currently in place for enabling works leading to the	Availability of suitable developer able to provide capital.
11	Cost of providing ANPR Cameras outside those primary schools not suitable for the School Street project. This not to be confused and is to be considered separately from the School Street Project. This to be used to introduce the early introduction of the 20 mph Council policy that was adopted a number of years ago	750,000	5,239,000	Ongoing expense after guarantee of cameras finished.	Installation from capital budget.			Additional capital and revenue funding.	Estimated capital cost of £5.239m with an ongoing revenue maintenance liability of £0.5m. (£31k at a Primary School and £62k at a Secondary School. Total of 148 schools)	Local objections (if any).
12	How many street lights will still be need to be converted to Led ones after March 31st 2023. What cost will be involved in converting all lamps within 3 months, by July 1st. What will be the energy saving in completing this by the end of June 2023.		net nil	capital cost plus some from the fund at present being used. Revenue saving offset by energy price increases.				nil	Currently have a £0.016m budget in capital for this conversion. This originally anticipated a March 25 completion timescale but this has now been moved forward to March 24. Unlikely to be able to meet a July 1st deadline as problems with supply.	Risk around supply chain and availability of specific parts required.
13	Note the recent government statement re making grants available to enable house insulation to be improved. This to make grants available for Housing Associations to carry out extra work and hence stop any further sales of existing affordable homes which they feel is uneconomic for them to do.	TBC	2,000,000		Grant to maybe help HA to obtain other grants and so enable improvement to be made. Potential revenue benefit has not been estimated.		Provide additional affordable, insulated housing. May be targeted or linked to key workers to help recruit or retain staff locally. Alternatively, may help provide temporary accommodation thereby reducing revenue costs.		This is already taking place with a social housing decarbonisation scheme in place. Grants of £2m have been provided with the Housing Associations providing match against this. Proposal is to add a further £2m of council funding.	Delivery will be important to ensure.
14	Reinstate the skip offer to Housing Estates .	100,000		Assume £250 per skip, funding equates to 1 skip per month over 32 sites. May also require some costs e.g. monitoring/supervision.			Reduce fly tipping and associated cost. Improve the environment. Help residents meet the cost of living increase by providing local collection of household surpluses.. Help climate change, reduce car journeys.	Revenue cost	Approximate cost of £250 per skip. Would need to know metrics of how often these are planned to be provided and how many estates this would be offered to.	Risk of availability/misuse/ lack of use.
15	Include the top 10 village safety schemes in the capital programme.		TBC				Enable residents and their children to access their local roads more safely. Increase the number of cycle journeys carried out and so improve the local health of residents. Reduce car journeys. Reduce accidents and so reduce the cost of incurred when they happen..	Nil	A set of schemes was identified by WSP previously. These schemes have not progressed to inclusion in the capital programme. They could be included, but at a capital cost.	NA
16	How many households are now required to pay the reduced 20% Council Tax charge. What is the total amount collected.			Not known. Effect of increased cost of living will effect how these households manage their budgets.					Approximately 3,000. Not easy to extract this figure (would require additional data analysis). This may be better tackled via a review of the current Council Tax Support Scheme.	
17	Note the number of empty homes list in the cabinet paper to be discussed on 30 Nov. What is the maximum charge that council can levy on long term empty homes.		net nil						100% on unoccupied and unfurnished for 0 to 2 years; 200% on unoccupied and unfurnished for 2 to 5 years; 300% on unoccupied and unfurnished for 6 to 10 years;	
18	Explore the cost of providing a loan to the NHS so that they can build Health Hub/s in a place that residents most approve of. Revenue from rent would offset the cost of the capital loan.	net nil	net nil	capital with a revenue revenue return, Invest to save project.					Could provide loan similar to the Pauls Moss scheme, however NHS do have their own Estates & Tehnology Transformation Fund which is used for this type of scheme if the NHS wanted to	Rules regarding cross subsidy between public agencies are strictly controlled.

19	Estimated cost of cancelling or alternatively suspending the NWRR project from March 31st. No allocation then included in next years budget.	20,000,000	only future cost avoidance	cost of revenue write off	Future cost avoidance of c£40m (but see also service advice indicating minimum £20m cost of works to date plus contract breakage costs which would be required to be written off to revenue budgets, also clawback of £58m government and LEP grants).			Any revenue costs written off to revenue budgets will require funding and cannot be deferred and charged to capital.	The cancellation of the NWRR would be operationally challenging. It would result in abortive costs of c£20m (representing writing-off of the capital expenditure to date to revenue costs and some contractual commitments). However, breakage costs and changes to actual contract fees in the meantime is likely to make this a larger sum, which is not yet possible to estimate. OLR not possible to separate as a distinct project to be continued on its own. Costs may be disaggregated for reporting	Loss of economic gross value added of c £290m per year. Loss of house building opportunities include loss of future council tax receipts and affordable homes. Potential risk to future government funding for similar types of schemes.
20	What is the estimated cost of providing an extra 200 EV charging points in our Council carparks, including the P&R sites.	nil (assumes revenue cost recovered via fee income)	1,500,000	capital cost. Potential revenue income difficult to estimate at this point.				Additional capital	Approximate cost would be £1.5m. The operating costs of the charging points would be an additional £0.063m per year, but assume this would be offset by income.	Impact of take up and charges for utilites
21	SC to stay at Shirehall. Cost of increasing insulation and modernising the parts that would be required . Using occupation figures previously used when considering the Pride Hill Centre conversion.		45,000,000					Additional capital spending	Assumed cost of £45m based on previous scoping of what would be required to improve Shirehall on a long term basis.	

This page is intentionally left blank

Alternative Budget Proposals

Please complete all columns as follows

- a) Please summarise the proposals setting out the current arrangement and the proposed revised arrangement.
- b) Costs - please provide any information on costs. Please contact Cheryl Sedgley or Ben Jay for assistance in making cost estimates.
- c) Please contact Cheryl Sedgley or Ben Jay for assistance in assessing one-off/base budget impacts.
- d) Please indicate your estimate of benefits (these do not have to be financial)
- e) Please indicate your proposed source of funding
- f) Service advice - follows from 28 Nov-9 Dec
- g) Risks and benefits - please add relevant risks and benefits associated with the proposal.

To be completed and returned to Cheryl Sedgley no later than Friday 25 November

Service review (for operational viability) follows, 29 Nov-9 Dec
Collated proposals will be presented to PMSC (11 Jan) and Cabinet (18 Jan)

Financial year: **2023/24**

Political Group: **Green Party**

Ref No.	a) Brief Description of the Proposal	2023/24 impact		b) Estimated Cost		c) One off for 23/24 or Ongoing Base	d) Estimated benefits	e) How will this proposal be funded?	f) Service advice on the proposal (complete 28 Nov-9 Dec)	g) Risks/implications associated with proposal
		Revenue (£)	Capital (£)	Revenue (£)	Capital (£)					
	total cost/(benefit) all proposals	19,205,000	5,000,000							
1	We are interested in exploring the option of charging for the collection of Green Waste. Information obtained by us from Chester and West Cheshire Council shows that this could result in savings of over £2.5M per annum. Our proposal is that all proceeds from any charge are used to increase subsidies for bus travel and to establish a limited timetable of free buses between the major towns in the County and Shrewsbury. Additionally, surplus funds will be used to provide information and opportunities to present the benefits of home composting, encouraging wider take up.	(425,000)	0	set up costs c £250k; thereafter estimated gross income of £1m per year (depending on % take up and rate of charges) and net benefit of c.£0.675m per year.	Nil	ongoing	limited change in recycling behaviours but with ongoing benefit to the council arising from adopting a set of charges already adopted in other council areas.	initially from reserves, repaid from subsequent net income.	Operationally feasible. Income is estimated at c£1m with 20% take up and a £40 pa charge, and cost estimates are +/-£325k, so potential benefits +/-£675k. Further benefits may be secured, if higher levels of take up are achieved, but the estimate provided is a prudent initial estimate.	Impact on wider collections.
2	We are proposing that Frankwell and Abbey Gates car parks in Shrewsbury are re-banded to the higher band). We feel this is more equitable as currently residents are paying more to park in SUC car park in places such as Festival Square Oswestry than they are to park in these car parks. This does not reflect the fact that Shrewsbury town centre has much higher property rates and a massively greater range of shops and facilities. Residents visiting the town centre of Shrewsbury also have a far better choice of public transport than residents visiting other towns in Shropshire. We would wish all proceeds from this to be used to ensure that the route 20 bus service, along with any other services threatened with termination, be continued. If there is surplus income over and above this it can be used for the same purpose as in 1 above.	(370,000)	0	estimated ongoing net revenue of £0.370m	Nil	ongoing		Nil additional cost; revenue generation.	Operationally feasible. We estimate that by increasing these two car parks to a Band 3, and also reflecting a slight decrease in demand as a result, this would generate an additional £0.370m.	Potential risk around take-up / occupancy levels in the car parks affected.
3	We note that the Ofsted report of Children Services highlighted that the shortfall in therapeutic services available to children who have been exposed to domestic abuse. The Domestic Abuse officer has informed us that the provision of £150k pa would enable the Council to offer such a service.	net nil	0	annual expenditure of £0.15m, offset by reduction in the cost of children's care placements		ongoing	We believe that this can be done as an invest to save proposal since unaddressed trauma in children coming into care will make placement more complex and expensive. Indeed the annual cost quoted would easily be saved if just one child benefitted from the	Self funding	Operationally feasible.	Low risk
4	We propose that the North West Relief road be abandoned and that all revenue expenditure that is budgeted in forthcoming years for work on this project is redirected to work on active and public transport across the whole of the County.	20,000,000	(only future cost avoidance)		potential future cost avoidance of c£40m (but see also service advice indicating minimum £20m cost of works to date plus contract breakage costs, also clawback of £58m government and LEP grants)			Any revenue costs written off to revenue budgets will require funding and cannot be deferred and charged to capital.	The cancellation of the NWRR would be operationally challenging. It would result in abortive costs of c£20m (representing expenditure to date and contractual commitments). However, breakage costs and changes to actual contract fees in the meantime is likely to make this a larger sum, which is not yet available to estimate.	Loss of economic gross value added of c £290m per year. Loss of house building opportunities include loss of future council tax receipts and affordable homes. Potential risk to future government funding for similar types of schemes.
5	We propose a pilot project for the building or purchasing of houses, the renovation of these properties to the highest standards of energy efficiency and the renting of them to meet housing need. Julian has been working with officers to try and progress this and will provide some further details, but I think we are looking for capital provision of £5M or so. Again we see this as an invest to save option which would be subject to a business case showing that the rental income from these properties would meet the borrowing and operational costs.		5,000,000	Nil (officer cost etc as 'sunk cost').	£5m capital allocation to enable the scheme to be set up; option to expand if it is clearly beneficial.			Additional capital spending.	Operationally feasible. Proposed capital budget of £5m initially but would depend on the number of houses to be planned and the specification to be followed. Would need further analysis.	

6	Scheme to provide private rented houses for Ukrainians	nil		Nil impact - expansion of existing provision through Homes for Ukraine
---	--	-----	--	--

		Use of government grant.	Would be funded through the existing Homes 4 Ukraine funding, therefore no financial implication for the Council.	
--	--	--------------------------	---	--

Alternative Budget Proposals

Please complete all columns as follows

- a) Please summarise the proposals setting out the current arrangement and the proposed revised arrangement.
- b) Costs - please provide any information on costs. Please contact Cheryl Sedgley or Ben Jay for assistance in making cost estimates.
- c) Please contact Cheryl Sedgley or Ben Jay for assistance in assessing one-off/base budget
- d) Please indicate your estimate of benefits (these do not have to be financial)
- e) Please indicate your proposed source of
- f) Service advice - follows from 28 Nov-9 Dec
- g) Risks and benefits - please add relevant risks and benefits associated with the proposal.

To be completed and returned to Cheryl Sedgley no later than Friday 25 November

Service review (for operational viability) follows, 29 Nov-9 Dec
 Collated proposals will be presented to PMSC (11 Jan) and Cabinet (18 Jan)

Financial year: **2023/24**
 Political Group: **Labour Party**

Page 11

Ref No.	a) Brief Description of the Proposal	2023/24 impact		b) Estimated Cost		c) One off for 23/24 or Ongoing Base Budget	d) Estimated benefits	e) How will this proposal be funded?	f) Service advice on the proposal (complete 28 Nov-9 Dec)	g) Risks/implications associated with proposal
		Revenue (£)	Capital (£)	Revenue (£)	Capital (£)					
	total proposed cost/(benefit)	20,192,000	2,000,000							
1	Cancel North West Relief Road project (absorb lack of grants; reallocate savings; continue with Oxon link and associated land sales, council tax collections etc)	20,000,000	(only future cost avoidance)	cost of revenue write off	potential gross saving c£40m (but see also service advice indicating minimum £20m cost of works to date plus contract breakage costs, also clawback of £58m government and LEP grants)	ongoing	End controversial project with 5,000 objections, save officer time, resource and ongoing budgets to divert into alternative investments (see 5) for environmentally sustainable income generation. Reputational benefit to Council of re-prioritising spend according to need.	Any revenue costs written off to revenue budgets will require funding and cannot be deferred and charged to capital.	The cancellation of the NWRR would be operationally challenging. It would result in abortive costs of c£20m (representing expenditure to date and contractual commitments). However, breakage costs and changes to actual contract fees in the meantime is likely to make this a larger sum, which is not yet possible to estimate. Operationally, OLR is not possible to separate as a distinct project to be continued on its own, although the funding continues to be reported separately and can be disaggregated	Loss of economic gross value added of c £290m per year. Loss of house building opportunities include loss of future council tax receipts and affordable homes. Potential risk to future government funding for similar types of schemes.
2	Introduce "market forces" uplift to increase Social Worker salaries to match neighbouring authorities (+£4K per post) , improve T&Cs and offer a golden handshake of £5K per post (with 12 month handcuffs) for Social Workers; reduce reliance on agency staff: net saving £15k per post	(93,000)	nil	The cost of providing a market forces uplift is £0.723m. The saving generated from removing agency workers, covering vacant posts would be £0.630m. Therefore this proposal would		Ongoing Base Budget	Ensure retention of existing social workers and help recruitment into vacancies in order to reduce reliance on agency staffing. Benefits to quality of service delivery (safety for most vulnerable residents) and staff morale/motivation/retention to invest in our workforce when under pressure	The reduced cost of agency fees will be expected to fund the salary uplift.	Operationally feasible. The cost of providing a market forces uplift is £0.723m. The saving generated from removing agency workers, covering vacant posts would be £0.630m. Therefore this proposal would have a net cost to the revenue budget of £0.093m.	Failure to recruit permanent staff
3	To overcome the current delays in approving ECHPs due to the lack of Ed Psychs, we want to appoint 2 x Education psychologists to support schools in SEN requests for funded support for children struggling to access education successfully. Market salary £45K + 27% oncosts	net nil	nil	cost £104,000 subsidised from reduced delivery costs		Ongoing Base Budget	Delays in Ed Psych assessments for SEN support requests are causing distress to the young people and causing more expensive interventions once finally allocated. Additional resource should speed up support, which when applied sooner will be lower cost (lower intensity support) and reduce distress to the children, by supporting them sooner. Social benefit to reduce distress to vulnerable children and their struggling families; and school staff morale currently struggling to manage during delay	medium term savings (reduced acute delivery) will offset original investment	The cost of 2 Education Psychologists is £0.104m (at bottom of grade).	ability to recruit actual level of cashable savings delivered

4	Establish a new company, or a division within Cornovoi developments, to specialise in delivering energy efficiency retrofitting of properties both owned by the Council (to reduce bills) and as a traded service for partners, businesses and residents, working in partnership with Marches Energy Agency, to secure external funding grants to subsidise	250,000	nil	Based on similar teams elsewhere, a team could be established within CDL at this cost, with potential future expansion and income.	Nil	Ongoing Base Budget	Reduced carbon footprint to achieve net zero and reduced energy bills /costs during time of energy insecurity and rising costs; increased external funding; partnership working; income generation; developing supply chain and skills locally	1. Reduced energy bills for SC; 2. Traded service income generation; 3. MEA grant funding	Difficult to accurately quantify level of savings/income to be identified from this without detailed estimation. Current industry advice is that retrofitting efficient energy approaches into existing properties is substantially more expensive than including them as part of new-build solutions. However, a team could be established with a remit to explore options with partners (eg CDL, WME) and identify a possible business model	Risk that costs exceed cashable benefits.
5	Install solar panel PV arrays on Council sites. Starting with a list of Council assets, ordered by size of energy bill, identify those 2-3 buildings or sites with largest energy use (e.g. Quarry pool, children's homes; care home, market hall, Severn Theatre, office, car parks) and explore Rol of installing PVs to reduce energy bills on site.	TBC	TBC	net saving in year 1 or 2: Generate income / savings from energy bills	TBC - subject to individual property reviews.	Ongoing Base Budget	Increased renewable energy production; reduced carbon footprint to achieve net zero and reduced energy bills /costs during time of energy insecurity and rising costs. Reputational benefits to Council in showing leadership in environmental sustainability	invest to save proposal - original investment paid off from energy savings; if needed from SALIX/PWLB	The Council already has a project to instal solar PV on all buildings deemed suitable for the install. This proposal may be impacted by the limited structural support in buildings for solar PVs and so some builoding may require major investment in roof structures prior to installation. Buildings are being prioritised through a combination of factors including	Risk of volatile energy proces.
6	[replaced as overlapped with item 9]									
7	Employ 1 x additional Council tax officer to focus on cross referencing new build houses and extensions to homes and businesses (by following up on planning consents) they could a) push building control certificates as an income generator @£242 ea and b) assess homes for uprated Council Tax bandings to increase CT income. Salary £32,909 plus 27% on costs = £41,794. If they secure a minimum of 2 building control certificates and banding uplifts per week this would add 100 x £650 differential = £65,000 and cover their salary with income of £25K. Not including businesses and new builds which would add £2-3k per hous - the post would easily generate more income overall. Council Tax is liable from the point of occupancy so can be backdated; whereas the extensions uplift is liable from the date of building control certificate.	35,000		Income to be generated assumed 2 additional properties per week, which is challenging in current economic circumstances.	Generate income: £23K p.a.	Ongoing Base Budget	Ensure that those residents and businesses with additional income to be able to expand, extend and invest in their properties, are paying the correct level of Council Tax, which should in most cases lead to moving up a Council tax band. These wealthier individuals can contribute more into the Council's budget, to help carry some of the burden in our budget deficit.	costs estimated as £35k per year, with potential additional income to ofset this in part.	The proposal is partially feasible, but the option to backdate council tax and to aply an increased band is not possible without the sale of the property, which will reduce estimated benefit. The Council currently employ 3 visiting officers who flag any extensions or potential changes to bandings to the Valuation Office. It should be noted though that the change in banding only takes effect when the property is sold, not when an extension is developed, therefore realisation of income may not be as soon as anticipated. Therefore cannot confirm the level of income to be achieved as will also depend on the level of new builds and extensions that do not have a building control certificate. The cost of the proposal is estimated at £0.035m.	Risk that identified proprties cannot easily be traslated into a legal council tax charge. There are c 148,000 chargeable properties in the county. 100 properties amounts to only a small percentage, but will require considerable work to secure.
8	20 is plenty scheme across towns and residential areas in Shropshire: TRO and install signage		2,000,000		cost	One Off for 23/24	reduce accidents and fatalities; increase active travel; reduce highways repairs	Additional capital spending	Already investing £1.5m in total within capital programme. £2m cost assumed for this if only planning TRO and signage, however costs have changed in a number of areas in recent months and some indications are that the proposal may cost more	

9	Flat rate Council Tax Rebate of £70 for residents in receipt of benefits, in A & B band properties (intended to remove the pressure caused by the proposed 5% CT increase).	net nil	NA	<p>Estimated cost of rebating the proposed council tax increase for households in bands A and B in receipt of benefits is c£700k.</p> <p>Costs to be funded in the longer term through the revenue receiveable from increased charges on second homes (estimated at £2.2m). In the 23/24 year, to be funded from other reserves, which can then be replenished in the subsequent year.</p>	NA	Ongoing Base Budget	limiting impacts of the cost of living crisis on more vulnerable households.	charge to revenue budgets	<p>The government has published a proposal for a council tax rebate of £25 for lower bands on benefits. A flat rate reimbursement is easier to put into operation than a rebate on the 5% increase, due to the number of factors involved in the calculation.</p> <p>Based on the estimated cost of rebating the 5% increase, an alternative proposal would be to extend the government's scheme of a £25 rebate to £70-£75. This is operationally more achievable, but would also both extend over and above the government scheme, and reflect the 5% increase more fully. Again, the increased second homes income could be used as a funding source, with the caveats set out above</p>	Risk of raising bills which are then left unpaid (properly or not) leading to additional costs of collection.
---	---	---------	----	--	----	---------------------	--	---------------------------	---	---

This page is intentionally left blank