

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION INCLUDING THE EXECUTIVES RESPONSE TO BUDGET SCRUTINY

1. Details of the Cabinet’s initial draft budget proposals were sent to key stakeholders and published on the Council’s website on 12 January. The Council’s Overview and Scrutiny Committee and panels also considered the draft business plans of the Council’s service units and the budget. A summary of the comments is given below.

Stakeholder Response

2. In terms of the generality of the budget proposals the following responses were received:

	No
Parish Council	3
Other Stakeholders	5
	<hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/> 8 <hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/>

3. In the main, the issues were with regard to specific items included in the budget. No comments were received on the possible levels of increase in Council Tax for the Chorley element of the bill. A summary of responses is attached for your information (Appendix 1a).

Overview and Scrutiny

4. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee received reports from the three Panels who had looked in more detail at the budgets of the following services:

- Environmental Services
- Revenues & Benefits
- Planning Services

5. The intention of the reviews was to establish reasons for the apparent high cost of the service as compared to the Council’s family group. This issue was raised during the Audit Commission’s recent Use of Resources review as something the Council should look at. In addition, members of the Panels were also asked to consider if the Council was achieving its policy objectives by looking at performance on Best Value Performance Indicator and other local indicators where they were available.

6. Details of the questions and the answers the Panel received are available in the reports that have been produced for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. From the process a further number of issues have emerged that the Scrutiny Committee would like the Executive to consider. The recommendations of the Committee are set out below.

Recommendations Environment Overview & Scrutiny Panel

1. That the Executive Cabinet be requested to pursue the provision of more detailed comparative data from the Audit Commissions’ ‘family tree’ authorities, particularly in relation to the output, cost and quality of services, in order to enable a more reasonable value for money assessment of the whole of the Council’s environmental service.
2. What steps will the Executive Cabinet take to achieve a better understanding of the perception gap in the measurement of residents satisfaction with standards of cleanliness within the Street Cleaning Contract.

3. The Executive Cabinet is requested to examine the quality of design of litter bins and the capability of the contractors Cleanaway to emptying the litter bins whilst on collection rounds.
4. The Executive Cabinet is requested to ensure that high profile cases on enforcement are publicised.
5. The Executive Cabinet is requested to ensure the enforcement of the management of the Cleanaway contract and that they clean up whilst waste collecting.
6. The Executive Cabinet is requested to introduce policy targets for the Neighbourhood Wardens relating to their street scene duties.
7. The Executive Cabinet is requested to examine the need for improved co-ordination of services to bring efficiency. Particular attention should be paid to problem areas and neighbourhoods as well as a wider promotion of the hot line number.

Recommendations Customer Overview & Scrutiny Panel

1. The Executive Cabinet is requested to take action to pursue the provision of more detailed comparative data from the Audit Commissions' 'family tree' authorities, particularly in relation to the output, cost and quality of services, in order to enable a more reasonable value for money assessment of the whole of the Revenues and Benefits Service.
2. What steps will the Executive Cabinet take to ensure that the high-quality service the public is receiving from the Benefits service is maintained when the service moves into the Contact Centre.
3. The Executive Cabinet is requested to undertake a consistent and measured review of all services via the Procurement strategy for the delivery of value for money services.

Recommendations Community Overview & Scrutiny Panel

1. The Executive Cabinet be recommended to pursue the provision of more detailed comparative data from the Audit Commissions' 'family tree' authorities, particularly in relation to the output, cost and quality of services, in order to enable a more reasonable value for money assessment of the whole of the Council's planning services.
2. That action be taken to introduce effective performance indicators for planning enforcement work.

Individual Councillors

7. A number of individual Councillors have raised detailed queries with Officers which have been answered.

Summary of Responses

Heath Charnock Parish Council (Edna Woodrow – Clerk by email 10 February 2006)

Has the 4% for the Fire Service been deducted from the amount payable to the County Council (now 74%)?

North & Western Lancashire Chamber of Commerce (Hugh Evans, Director of Policy & Commercial Services – by email 2 February 2006)

Thank you for the consultation document on the Council's spending plans for 2006 – 2007.

As you would expect our main focus of attention concerns the spending plans for economic development. We were pleased, therefore, to note that the focus of any additional investment will include economic regeneration and creating a thriving and sustainable town centre.

One opportunity to provide some additional investment for the town centre is by creating a Business Improvement District. Is this something that you have considered? If not we would welcome the opportunity to discuss the concept in more detail. We have developed considerable expertise in engaging city centre businesses in Preston as part of a potential BID campaign and would welcome the opportunity to work more closely with the Council on a similar initiative for Chorley.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Michael Maher, 42 Avondale Road, Chorley (by letter undated)

I have read Chorley Borough Council's Public Consultation on your spending 2006.

I would like included under the Chorley Community Safety Partnership that the Alley Gate Scheme, which brings safety to many of the residents in the area, and neighbourhood, that the maintenance of the gates will rest up to Chorley Borough Council. Whether the land be adopted or unadopted. Thanking you for giving me the chance to comment on the budget above.

Ken Bowden (By email 19 January 2006)

First, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposals and for an easy to read document.

My concerns centre around the level of increase and a growing feeling that Council Tax is becoming an inappropriate mechanism for funding local spending.

As regards the level of increase, I want my council (and especially Lancashire County Council) to plan for increases in line with inflation rather than at the capping level. If I am lucky, my pension will increase at that sort of level and I have to manage within it - I would like the council to operate on the same principle especially after the extortionate increases of recent years. I believe this approach would have two impacts on the budget proposals.

- New activities should be severely curtailed unless funding can be found from reducing or stopping current spend.
- All existing spend should be reviewed on a zero budget basis and justified from scratch.

As a senior manager in business, I had to operate within targets of keeping current spending flat even with the effects of inflation and wage increases and of justifying new investment within budget

constraints. I would like to see more evidence of the council operating this way with my money. I do have the feeling that Government and Council mentalities do not understand the concept of reduced spending and prudence.

The Council Tax itself, I believe, has become a bloated and unaccountable tax with all parties pointing at each other to take the blame for the increases. The latest Government proposals for establishing and monitoring property values are appallingly intrusive and can only lead to further unacceptable increases. The infamous 'poll tax' now looks a far more equitable means of taxation with the benefit of including more people on the taxation process. I will certainly support any moves to change the method of local taxation.

Dawn Waddington (by email 8 February 2006)

With reference to the proposed Council tax increase I would like to see more dog bins within the Chorley area. I have a dog and live on the Parkers Wood Estate, Gillibrand North and I know of only 1 dog bin in a field within Yarrow Valley. I feel this area of Chorley (which is highly populated with dog owners) would benefit greatly from more dog bins by the roadside.

Dr Shelagh Garnett, Chorley & South Ribble NHS (by letter 9th February 2006)

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Council's spending plans for 2006/07. We have read the consultation document with interest and have only two specific comments to make:

1. It would be useful to include a breakdown of spend on cultural services. Although the document refers to expenditure for Astley Hall, running Community Centres and sports facilities, and the costs of maintaining parks and open spaces, it gives us no idea of how much is spent in each area of service.
2. Although the Local Strategic Partnership Community Strategy priorities are identified within the document, the links between this and the Council's proposed spending plans are unclear.

Lynne Rowett (Clerk to Ulnes Walton Parish Council) (by email 15th February 2006)

At the recent meeting of the Parish Council, Members gave consideration to the consultation document on the Borough's proposed spending for 2006/07 and wish to comment as follows:

It was agreed that whilst the proposals for the town centre were supported it should not be at the detriment of development in rural areas.

Tony Harkness (Clerk to Brindle & Houghton Parish Council) (by email 16th February 2006)

Thank you for consulting Brindle Parish Council on the draft budget and spending plans for next year. The Parish Council would like to make the following comments on your proposals:

Level of Council Tax

Next year's council tax should rise no more than the current rate of inflation (2%). The proposal to increase council tax by 5% would have a detrimental impact on vulnerable residents and those on fixed incomes.

Savings

The savings suggested seem reasonable and if implemented effectively should deliver more saving in expenditure than that estimated. Additional savings to those already proposed can be made when you look at the total underspend of budgets last year of £199,000 which demonstrates that not all the budgets were needed and is a good starting point to looking for future savings.

Investment/Re-direction of resources

Existing resources should be re-directed to streetscene services, such as more cleansing and better maintenance of green areas, which has a major impact on the quality of life of local people. The Parish Council has to wait for almost twelve months to have graffiti cleared from Denham Quarry because the budget was used early in the financial year.

The Borough Council should also look at the needs of rural communities when planning and developing services, with many residents classed as deprived because of the social isolation and lack of facilities. The grants that the Borough Council once provided to establish and develop community groups was successful in contributing positively to this issue and should be re-introduced. At least one group was established in Brindle using one of these small grants and has contributed a great deal to parish like, with almost sixty members and built into a thriving network, which wasn't previously there. The next stage in developing the customer contact centre should be to provide more outreach services and deliver customer service locally.

The proposed contribution to the funding of Lancashire Constabulary's police community support officers should not be funded from Borough council tax. The amount spent on environmental wardens should also be limited. Even though residents identify community safety in the consultation carried out for the community strategy and local strategic partnership – it does not state who should fund these activities. The community strategy and partnership is made up of many partner organisations. Most people would say Lancashire Police and the Government should fund community safety activities like this through their own tax levying powers. Last year the Borough Council was keen to reduce 'double taxation' with parish/town councils, this is an example of the Borough council tax subsidising the Police Authority's council tax levy or even the Government.

I hope that these comments are helpful. We should also like to suggest that next year's consultation is carried out in a more robust manner as written consultation exercises such as this are always difficult. Perhaps the Lancashire Association of Parish Councils Chorley Area Committee might be used or other workshops where discussions could take place in a more detailed and effective way.

Lancashire Association of Parish and Town Councils – Chorley Area Committee (letter from Debra Platt, Secretary dated 15 June 2005)

Parish Council By-Elections

At a meeting of the Chorley Area Committee of the LAPTC, members expressed concerns over the costs of a Parish Council by-election.

Members felt that costs were high and to precept each year for this 'possible' event was quite restrictive for them bearing in mind some parishes have very low income.

A suggestion was made that the LAPTC CAC ask Chorley Borough Council if it would in future, investigate the possibility of accruing a fund which could pay for any Parish by-elections for casual vacancies. This would equate to a very small amount for each Parish to put into the fund when taken at source from the Borough Council, but could free up hundreds of pounds in the Parish Council's budgets.

I was asked to survey other local Council's to see if they fund Parish Council elections for casual vacancies and from the six I contacted three did fund them and the other three charged them back, as Chorley Borough Council does.

In the new Quality Status scheme, being promoted by Councils and their Associations, to achieve and retain the Quality status a Council must have a fully elected membership, achieved through raising the Parish Council's profile, encouraging membership and participation. It was a concern at the meeting that if this was to take place effectively, it would result in a rise in parish by-elections for casual vacancies.

To this end, the Chorley Area Committee would like to request Chorley Borough Council investigate the possibility of creating a fund.

**General Fund Revenue Budget 2006/07
Summary of Variations**

	£	£
2005/06 Base Budget		12,343,020
Additional Spending		
Inflationary Changes		
Pay	461,850	
Non-Pay	89,720	
Contractual	52,290	
Income	91,450	695,310
Increments		118,370
Revenue Effects of the Capital Programme		(1,160)
Agreed Savings		
Lancs. Highways Partnership	(116,880)	
Duxbury Golf Course	(86,080)	
Property Services Outsourcing	(52,230)	
CuDOSS Efficiency Savings	(48,450)	
Recruitment Advertising	(40,000)	
Community Management Plan	(27,890)	
Cleaning Attendants Services	(18,500)	
Base Budget Review	(56,880)	
Further Savings	(111,310)	
Senior Management Review	(50,000)	(608,220)
Growth		
Improving Neighbourhoods - Co-ordinating Services	35,000	
Cleaner More Attractive Streets & Neighbourhoods	50,000	
Safer Neighbourhoods	22,000	
Communicating More Effectively with Local People	59,000	
Attracting & Retaining Jobs in Chorley	55,000	
The Council as Community Leader - Strengthening the Local Strategic Partnership	24,000	
Further Growth	141,250	386,250
Technical & Volume Changes		
Full Year Effect of Growth / Savings	(22,050)	
Technical / Volume Changes	520,745	498,695
Changes in Capital Financing Costs		202,360
Changes in Contingency		
Procurement Savings	40,000	40,000
Change in Use of Reserves & Collection Fund Surpluses		
Use of Reserves	(173,500)	
Use of General Balances	250,000	76,500
Cost of Maintaining Current Service Levels & Meeting New Statutory Requirements		13,751,100

General Fund Revenue Budget 2006/07
Further Savings

Ref		2006/07 Saving £'000	Full Year Saving £'000	Comment
	Efficiency Savings			
	Senior Management Review	(50,000)	(50,000)	Reduction in number of senior managers
	Efficiencies in CuDOSS	(48,450)	(48,450)	Disestablishment of 4.5 post currently held vacant
	Community Management Plan	(27,890)	(37,830)	Savings achieved by transferring responsibility for management of community centres to voluntary groups supported by CBC
	Property Services Outsourcing	(52,230)	(104,460)	Savings based on current plans to transfer to third party management by 1st October 2006.
	Service Reductions			
	Making Highways transfer Cost Neutral	(116,880)	(131,800)	Savings to be achieved following scheduled transfer of Highways activity to Lancashire CC from 1st July 2006.
	Total Savings Identified	(295,450)	(372,540)	

INVESTING IN OUR PRIORITIES GROWTH PROPOSALS 2006/07

1. IMPROVING NEIGHBOURHOODS - CO-ORDINATING SERVICES

- Appointment of a neighbourhood co-ordinator to operate across the 3 area forum pilot areas.
- They will:
 - Ensure agreed actions from fora are implemented
 - develop innovative solutions to local problems
 - work pro-actively across Council services, County Council services and partner agencies - e.g. PCT, Police, Parish Councils to address local issues
- Bespoke consultation and research in local areas to assess local views:

	<u>2006/07</u>	<u>2007/08</u>	<u>2008/09</u>
<u>Costs</u>	£35,000	£65,000	-

2. CLEANER MORE ATTRACTIVE STREETS AND NEIGHBOURHOODS

- Preventative enforcement and education campaign to discourage fly-tipping, dog fouling, graffiti etc
- Targeted area clean-ups integrating all aspects of streetscene
- Community skips

	<u>2006/07</u>	<u>2007/08</u>	<u>2008/09</u>
<u>Costs</u>	£50,000	-	-

3. SAFER NEIGHBOURHOODS

- Appointment of six Police Community Support Officers on a pilot basis to reassure local residents and reduce crime and disorder in local areas
- Ensure a 'one team' approach with existing neighbourhood wardens to increase capacity and street presence in target areas
- Appointment of additional neighbourhood warden

<u>Costs</u>	<u>2006/07</u> £22,000	<u>2007/08</u> £66,000	<u>2008/09</u> £66,000
--------------	---------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------

4. COMMUNICATING MORE EFFECTIVELY WITH LOCAL PEOPLE

- Centralisation of corporate communication budgets to achieve more of an impact
- Appointment of graphic designer to reduce costs of procurement and re-inforce corporate branding
- Improvement of the Council's website to encourage more take-up and make it easier to use
- Increase the editions of Borough News to 6 copies per year
- Pilot neighbourhood newsletters in 3 Area Forum areas
- Produce a Living in Chorley guide for all local residents (including other local partners information, e.g. PCT, Police)

<u>Total Cost:</u>	<u>2006/07</u> £59,000	<u>2007/08</u> -	<u>2008/09</u> -
--------------------	---------------------------	---------------------	---------------------

5. ATTRACTING AND RETAINING JOBS IN CHORLEY

- Marketing campaign for Chorley as a location for potential investment
- Improvement to the public realm and environment in the town centre
- Appointment of Economic Regeneration Officer to deliver the new Regeneration Strategy

	<u>2006/07</u>	<u>2007/08</u>	<u>2008/09</u>
<u>Total Cost:</u>	£55,000	£45,000	£50,000

6. THE COUNCIL AS COMMUNITY LEADER - STRENGTHENING THE LOCAL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP

- Appointment of a LSP development officer to drive up the achievements of the Partnership
- Encouraging joint service planning and delivery across the public, voluntary and private sectors in the Borough

	<u>2006/07</u>	<u>2007/08</u>	<u>2008/09</u>
<u>Costs:</u>	£24,000	-	-

	<u>2006/07</u>	<u>2007/08</u>	<u>2008/09</u>
<u>Total Costs:</u>	£245,000	£176,000	£116,000

- The 2007/08 and 2008/09 figures are indicative only at this stage. The intention is to make Members aware that to deliver the outcomes in the Corporate Plan further resources are likely to be required over the planning cycle. It will be a policy choice for Members whether to and at what level the Council continues to invest in these particular priority areas.

Special Expenses

Parish	Taxbase	Grounds Maintenance Costs	Borough Special Expenses at Band D	Borough General Expenses	Borough Services Council Tax	Parish Precept	Parish Band D	Combined Borough and Parish	2005/06 Combined Borough and Parish	Percentage Increase
	No.	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	%
Adlington	1,964.10	35,252	17.95	151.69	169.63	17,270	8.79	178.43	169.92	5.0%
Anderton	475.20	952	2.00	151.69	153.69	3,800	8.00	161.69	152.58	6.0%
Anglezarke	15.30	-	-	151.69	151.69	-	-	151.69	144.60	4.9%
Astley Village	1,117.50	27,548	24.65	151.69	176.34	22,000	19.69	196.02	189.06	3.7%
Bretherton	282.70	-	-	151.69	151.69	7,951	28.13	179.81	175.88	2.2%
Brindle	455.80	2,032	4.46	151.69	156.14	5,250	11.52	167.66	162.11	3.4%
Charnock Richard	666.90	2,470	3.70	151.69	155.39	20,600	30.89	186.28	177.92	4.7%
Clayton le Woods	4,747.60	167,336	35.25	151.69	186.93	118,690	25.00	211.93	188.20	12.6%
Coppull	2,350.70	32,920	14.00	151.69	165.69	72,920	31.02	196.71	188.64	4.3%
Croston	1,029.60	8,889	8.63	151.69	160.32	20,664	20.07	180.39	165.93	8.7%
Cuerden	41.40	426	10.29	151.69	161.98	950	22.95	184.92	175.04	5.6%
Eccleston	1,533.30	6,981	4.55	151.69	156.24	40,355	26.32	182.56	175.26	4.2%
Euxton	3,215.80	57,314	17.82	151.69	169.51	93,200	28.98	198.49	181.58	9.3%
Heapey	379.20	6,138	16.19	151.69	167.87	8,706	22.96	190.83	182.99	4.3%
Heath Charnock	801.40	15,678	19.56	151.69	171.25	6,000	7.49	178.74	170.72	4.7%
Heskin	348.80	1,354	3.88	151.69	155.57	6,104	17.50	173.07	165.80	4.4%
Hoghton	361.50	2,260	6.25	151.69	157.94	3,500	9.68	167.62	160.20	4.6%
Mawdesley	755.80	957	1.27	151.69	152.95	23,040	30.48	183.44	174.89	4.9%
Rivington	53.90	-	-	151.69	151.69	1,100	20.41	172.09	165.59	3.9%
Ulnes Walton	258.60	-	-	151.69	151.69	4,000	15.47	167.15	156.37	6.9%
Wheilton	392.30	-	-	151.69	151.69	10,035	25.58	177.27	169.12	4.8%
Whittle Woods	1,750.30	39,622	22.64	151.69	174.32	23,724	13.55	187.88	179.12	4.9%
Withnell	1,252.20	9,983	7.97	151.69	159.66	25,540	20.40	180.05	169.18	6.4%
All other parts of the Council's area	10,494.50	271,475	25.87	151.69	177.55	-	-	177.55	169.26	4.9%
Total	34,744.40	689,586	19.85	151.69	171.53	535,399	15.41	186.94	175.59	6.5%

Draft resolution on setting of 2006/07 Council Tax for the Borough to be passed in approving the Executive Cabinet's recommendations for the Council's Budget.

1. That it be noted that acting under delegated powers the Director of Finance calculated the amount of 34,744.40 as its Council Tax Base for the year 2006/07 in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992 made under Section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.
- (a) 34,744.40 being the amount calculated by the Council, in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992, as its Council Tax Base for the year.

(b) **Part of the Council's Area**

Parish of:	Adlington	1,964.10
	Anderton	475.20
	Anglezarke	15.30
	Astley Village	1,117.50
	Bretherton	282.70
	Brindle	455.80
	Charnock Richard	666.90
	Clayton le Woods	4,747.60
	Coppull	2,350.70
	Croston	1,029.60
	Cuerden	41.40
	Eccleston	1,533.30
	Euxton	3,215.80
	Heapey	379.20
	Heath Charnock	801.40
	Heskin	348.80
	Hoghton	361.50
	Mawdesley	755.80
	Rivington	53.90
	Ulnes Walton	258.60
	Wheelton	392.30
	Whittle Woods	1,750.30
	Withnell	1,252.20
	All other parts of the Council's area	10,494.50
	Total	34,744.40

being the amounts calculated by the Council, in accordance with Regulation 6 of the Regulations, as the amounts of its Council Tax Base for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.

2. That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2006/07 in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:
- (a) £41,090,589 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(2)(a) to (e) of the Act;
- (b) £26,804,065 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(3)(a) to (c) of the Act;

- (c) £14,286,524 being the amount by which the aggregate at 2(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 2(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 32(4) of the Act, as its budget requirement for the year;
- (d) £7,791,688 being the aggregate of the sums which the Council estimates will be payable for the year into its general fund in respect of redistributed non-domestic rates, Revenue Support Grant, increased by the amount of the sums which the Council estimates will be transferred in the year from its collection fund to its general fund in accordance with Section 97(3) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988;
- (e) £186.94 being the amount at 2(c) above less the amount at 2(d) above, all divided by the amount at 2(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 33(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year;
- (f) £1,224,985 being the aggregated amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act;
- (g) £151.69 being the amount at 2(e) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 2(f) above by the amount at 1(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no special items relates;
- (h) **Part of the Council's Area**

		£
Parish of:	Adlington	178.43
	Anderton	161.69
	Anglezarke	151.69
	Astley Village	196.02
	Bretherton	179.81
	Brindle	167.66
	Charnock Richard	186.28
	Clayton le Woods	211.93
	Coppull	196.71
	Croston	180.39
	Cuerden	184.92
	Eccleston	182.56
	Euxton	198.49
	Heapey	190.83
	Heath Charnock	178.74
	Heskin	173.07
	Hoghton	167.62
	Mawdesley	183.44
	Rivington	172.09
	Ulnes Walton	167.15
	Wheelton	177.27
	Whittle le Woods	187.88
	Withnell	180.05
	All other parts of the Council's area	177.55

being the amounts given by adding to the amount at 2(g) above to the amounts of the special item or items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area

mentioned above divided in each case by the amount at 1(b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act, as the basic amounts of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate;

(i) **Part of the Council's Area**

	<u>Valuation Bands</u>							
	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>G</u>	<u>H</u>
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Parish of:								
Adlington	118.95	138.78	158.60	178.43	218.08	257.73	297.38	356.85
Anderton	107.79	125.76	143.72	161.69	197.62	233.55	269.48	323.37
Anglezarke	101.12	117.98	134.83	151.69	185.39	219.10	252.81	303.37
Astley Village	130.68	152.46	174.24	196.02	239.58	283.15	326.71	392.05
Bretherton	119.87	139.85	159.83	179.81	219.77	259.73	299.68	359.62
Brindle	111.77	130.40	149.03	167.66	204.92	242.18	279.44	335.32
Charnock Richard	124.19	144.88	165.58	186.28	227.67	269.07	310.46	372.56
Clayton le Woods	141.29	164.84	188.38	211.93	259.03	306.12	353.22	423.86
Coppull	131.14	153.00	174.85	196.71	240.42	284.14	327.85	393.42
Croston	120.26	140.30	160.35	180.39	220.47	260.56	300.65	360.78
Cuerden	123.28	143.83	164.38	184.92	226.02	267.11	308.20	369.85
Eccleston	121.70	141.99	162.27	182.56	223.13	263.69	304.26	365.11
Euxton	132.33	154.38	176.44	198.49	242.60	286.71	330.82	396.98
Heapey	127.22	148.42	169.63	190.83	233.24	275.64	318.05	381.66
Heath Charnock	119.16	139.02	158.88	178.74	218.46	258.17	297.89	357.47
Heskin	115.38	134.61	153.84	173.07	211.53	249.99	288.44	346.13
Hoghton	111.75	130.37	148.99	167.62	204.87	242.12	279.37	335.24
Mawdesley	122.29	142.67	163.05	183.44	224.20	264.96	305.73	366.87
Rivington	114.73	133.85	152.97	172.09	210.34	248.58	286.82	344.19
Ulnes Walton	111.44	130.01	148.58	167.15	204.30	241.44	278.59	334.31
Wheelton	118.18	137.87	157.57	177.27	216.66	256.05	295.44	354.53
Whittle le Woods	125.25	146.13	167.00	187.88	229.63	271.38	313.13	375.75
Withnell	120.04	140.04	160.05	180.05	220.07	260.08	300.09	360.11
All other parts of the Council's area	118.37	138.10	157.83	177.55	217.01	256.47	295.92	355.11

being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at 2(g) and 2(h) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands.

3. That it be noted that for the year 2006/07 the Lancashire County Council, Lancashire Police Authority, and the Lancashire Combined Fire Authority have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:

	Valuation Bands							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Precepting authority								
Lancashire County Council *	664.57	775.33	886.09	996.85	1,218.37	1,439.89	1,661.42	1,993.70
Lancashire Combined Fire Authority *	36.47	42.55	48.63	54.71	66.87	79.03	91.18	109.42
Lancashire Police Authority*	75.39	87.96	100.52	113.09	138.22	163.35	188.48	226.18

* These values are assessments and have to be confirmed by the precepting authority.

4. That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 2(i) and 3 above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2005/2006 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:

(i) **Part of the Council's Area**

	Valuation Bands							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Parish of:								
Adlington	895.38	1,044.62	1,193.84	1,343.08	1,641.54	1,940.00	2,238.46	2,686.15
Anderton	884.22	1,031.60	1,178.96	1,326.34	1,621.08	1,915.82	2,210.56	2,652.67
Anglezarke	877.55	1,023.82	1,170.07	1,316.34	1,608.85	1,901.37	2,193.89	2,632.67
Astley Village	907.11	1,058.30	1,209.48	1,360.67	1,663.04	1,965.42	2,267.79	2,721.35
Bretherton	896.30	1,045.69	1,195.07	1,344.46	1,643.23	1,942.00	2,240.76	2,688.92
Brindle	888.20	1,036.24	1,184.27	1,332.31	1,628.38	1,924.45	2,220.52	2,664.62
Charnock Richard	900.62	1,050.72	1,200.82	1,350.93	1,651.13	1,951.34	2,251.54	2,701.86
Clayton le Woods	917.72	1,070.68	1,223.62	1,376.58	1,682.49	1,988.39	2,294.30	2,753.16
Coppull	907.57	1,058.84	1,210.09	1,361.36	1,663.88	1,966.41	2,268.93	2,722.72
Croston	896.69	1,046.14	1,195.59	1,345.04	1,643.93	1,942.83	2,241.73	2,690.08
Cuerden	899.71	1,049.67	1,199.62	1,349.57	1,649.48	1,949.38	2,249.28	2,699.15
Eccleston	898.13	1,047.83	1,197.51	1,347.21	1,646.59	1,945.96	2,245.34	2,694.41
Euxton	908.76	1,060.22	1,211.68	1,363.14	1,666.06	1,968.98	2,271.90	2,726.28
Heapey	903.65	1,054.26	1,204.87	1,355.48	1,656.70	1,957.91	2,259.13	2,710.96
Heath Charnock	895.59	1,044.86	1,194.12	1,343.39	1,641.92	1,940.44	2,238.97	2,686.77
Heskin	891.81	1,040.45	1,189.08	1,337.72	1,634.99	1,932.26	2,229.52	2,675.43
Hoghton	888.18	1,036.21	1,184.23	1,332.27	1,628.33	1,924.39	2,220.45	2,664.54
Mawdesley	898.72	1,048.51	1,198.29	1,348.09	1,647.66	1,947.23	2,246.81	2,696.17
Rivington	891.16	1,039.69	1,188.21	1,336.74	1,633.80	1,930.85	2,227.90	2,673.49
Ulnes Walton	887.87	1,035.85	1,183.82	1,331.80	1,627.76	1,923.71	2,219.67	2,663.61
Wheelton	894.61	1,043.71	1,192.81	1,341.92	1,640.12	1,938.32	2,236.52	2,683.83
Whittle le Woods	901.68	1,051.97	1,202.24	1,352.53	1,653.09	1,953.65	2,254.21	2,705.05
Withnell	896.47	1,045.88	1,195.29	1,344.70	1,643.53	1,942.35	2,241.17	2,689.41
All other parts of the Council's area	894.80	1,043.94	1,193.07	1,342.20	1,640.47	1,938.74	2,237.00	2,684.41

5. That the Director of Finance and his officers be authorised to take any action necessary to ensure collection and recovery of the Council Tax and Non-Domestic Rates.

EXPLANATION OF COUNCIL TAX SETTING RESOLUTION

RESOLUTION 1

(a) Before we can calculate the Council Tax to be charged, we first have to calculate the Council Tax base. The Council Tax base is the amount which a Band D Council Tax of £1.00 would raise. For 2006/07 we estimate that a £1.00 Council Tax at Band D would raise £34,744.40 in the Chorley area.

(b) This shows the "base" figure for each Parish in the area. For example, a £1.00 Band D Council Tax in Adlington would raise £1,964.10.

RESOLUTION 2

(a) This is the grand total of money which the Council estimates it will spend on all services in 2006/07. It also includes £535,399 which Parish Councils need to run their services.

(b) This is the grand total of money which the Council estimates it will receive from various sources in the year. This includes, for example, car park charges, housing rents, government grants in respect of benefits, etc.

(c) This is the difference between 2(a) and 2(b) and is in effect the Council's and Parishes net spending on services.

(d) This is the amount that the Government will contribute towards the cost of our services. Also included is extra Council Tax resulting from new properties and expected collection rates in previous years.

(e) The difference between 2(c) and 2(d) is £6,494,836 and this is the amount we need to charge Council Taxpayers. This is divided by the base (see 1(a) above) and the resulting figure of £186.94 is the average Band D Council Tax for all Borough and Parish services.

(f) The total of all the amounts needed from Council Taxpayers by the Parish Councils in the area and for Chorley Borough Special Expenses.

(g) This is the Band D Council Tax for Chorley Borough Council's own services, ie excluding Parish Council spending and Special Expenses

(h) This table shows the Band D Council Tax for all parishes including the cost of the Parish Councils and Chorley Borough Council. For example, Adlington's Band D Council Tax is £151.69 for Chorley Borough services and £8.79 for Adlington Town Council services and £17.95 for Chorley Borough Special Expenses.

- (i) The rate for each property Band is calculated by reference to the Band D charge. The following ratios apply:

Band A	$\frac{6}{9}$ ths of Band D
Band B	$\frac{7}{9}$ ths of Band D
Band C	$\frac{8}{9}$ ths of Band D
Band D	$\frac{9}{9}$ ths of Band D
Band E	$\frac{11}{9}$ ths of Band D
Band F	$\frac{13}{9}$ ths of Band D
Band G	$\frac{15}{9}$ ths of Band D
Band H	$\frac{18}{9}$ ths of Band D

For Adlington Band A, for example, the charge is $\pounds 178.43 \times 6 \div 9 = \pounds 118.95$; for Band B it is $\pounds 178.43 \times 7 \div 9 = \pounds 138.78$.

RESOLUTION 3

Lancashire County Council, Lancashire Fire Authority and Lancashire Police Authority are separate bodies who have worked out their own estimates of spending and income for 2006/07 and have set taxes in a similar way to Chorley Borough Council. This resolution notes their final decision.

RESOLUTION 4

This pulls together the Council Taxes for Lancashire County Council, Lancashire Fire Authority, Lancashire Police Authority, Chorley Borough Council and the Parish Councils. For example, the Band D for Adlington is $\pounds 1,343.08$ made up as follows:

	£
Lancashire County Council (as in 4 above)	996.85*
Lancashire Fire Authority (as in 4 above)	54.71*
Lancashire Police Authority (as in 4 above)	113.09*
Chorley Borough Council (as in 3(g) above)	151.69
Adlington Town Council	8.79
Special Expenses	17.95

* These values have to be confirmed by the precepting authority

RESOLUTION 5

Formally authorise the necessary staff to take legal action to collect arrears as and when this is necessary. **For the vast majority of taxpayers, this is not needed**