

# **BRIEFING REPORT TO CABINET**

**REPORT OF:** Chief Executive

**REPORT NO.** CEX235

**DATE:** 21st June 2004

**TITLE:** Determining Non-Priorities

As Cabinet members will be aware, following consultation with the Cabinet and all PDCs the following timetable was approved by Council on the 27th May for the completion of the prioritisation process:

	<b>Task</b>	<b>Timetable</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Finalise services in Category B and set performance targets for A and B priorities.</b>	<b>July 2004</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Assess all existing services against this classification and allocate services between the four categories.</b>	<b>July to September 2004</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Assess and set service standards for category Y services.</b>	<b>September to October 2004</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Determine speed of implementation for services falling into category Z.</b>	<b>October to November 2004</b>

The first of these tasks has been completed as part of the preparation of the Best Value Performance Plan, which was brought forward so it could receive Council approval in May. Although it would appear that this gives a reasonable period of time for the rest of the tasks, the determination of non-priorities is likely to be far more contentious than the setting of priorities. If the Cabinet wishes to consult the relevant scrutiny panels before presenting a final report to Council rapid progress will need to be made.

Although in theory it would be possible to engage in open public consultation on the selection of non-priorities, in practice widespread consultation would be very difficult since those residents most adversely affected by the proposals would be most inclined to input their views irrespective of their number.

One effective way of securing some public input into the process would be to prepare a report for the first meeting of each Local Area Assembly. This report would inform these assemblies of the Category A and B priorities approved at the Council meeting on the 27th May and explain the reasons for their selection. It could then explain in outline some proposals for tackling these priorities and invite comment on whether the assemblies see these methods as likely to be effective. This would then make a good background to explain the reasons for identifying non-priorities and seek informed views on the services under consideration.

In the same way it is proposed that the consultation with the Development and Scrutiny Panels be built around the clear understanding that we can only have effective priorities if we have equal clarity about which services are non-priorities.

In the light of this the following timetable is proposed:

Date	Event
21 June	Initial consideration by Cabinet at an informal briefing
12 July	Consideration and approval by the Cabinet of a consultative document describing the allocation of services to categories, setting operational targets for all services falling within categories B and Y and speed of implementation for services falling within category Z
August and September	Consultation through Local Area Assemblies
7, 9, 16, 23 and 30 September	Consultation with all Development and Scrutiny Panels
11 October	Consideration of outcome of consultation
28 October	Approval by Council

In accordance with this timetable the Corporate Management Team have started to analyse the Council services and evaluate them using the following framework:

Four criteria:

	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Weighting</b>
1	Contribution to Category A Priorities	10
2	Presence of Statutory Targets	6
3	Contribution to the Council's vision	8
4	Capacity to improve based on comparison of current performance	5

As can be seen, the highest weighting was given to the contribution that this service could make to the category A priorities already approved. It should be emphasised here that this is the potential contribution that could be made rather than a scoring of the current service provision pattern. In the case of some services it would require considerable re-focussing and alterations to realise this potential.

The next area of weighting reflected those services which are the subject of national targets. We know from the allocation of the Planning Delivery Grant that a failure by the Council to achieve a national target can disadvantage our communities by denying the authority access to considerable resources.

The third area was the contribution to the Council's overall vision of "To ensure that the residents of South Kesteven are proud of their district and their Council". Some services make a significant contribution to this, even though they may not directly contribute to the Council's category A priorities.

The final area for evaluation was the relative performance of the service in comparison with other authorities. A high score here represents a relatively poor service, the concept being that there is more potential for improvement in a service that is performing comparatively weakly than there is in a service that is already performing at a very high level.

Informally, in consultation with the cabinet the following assessment has been made of the Council's services. This assessment is now being brought before the cabinet for formal consideration and determination.

Service	Priorities (10)	Targets (6)	Vision (8)	Improve (5)	Total	Proposed Category
LSP and Community Strategy Support	8	5	6	5	24	B
<i>Council Tax Collection</i>	5	6	6	3	20	B
Housing Management	8	0	6	5	19	B
Car Parks	8	0	6	3	17	Y
Public Toilets	6	0	7	4	17	Y
Asset Management	7	2	6	1	16	Y
<i>Business Rates</i>	5	6	3	2	16	Y
<i>Financial services</i>	6	1	5	3	15	Y
<i>Licensing</i>	8	0	5	1	14	Y
Business Management	8	1	2	2	13	Y
Markets	5	0	6	2	13	Y
Arts	5	0	5	2	12	Y
<i>Housing Repairs</i>	2	5	3	2	12	Y
Leisure	4	0	6	2	12	Y
<i>Legal and Admin</i>	6	0	4	2	12	Y
Human Resources	4	3	3	1	11	Y
Parks	5	0	5	1	11	Y
<i>Environmental Health</i>	3	2	3	1	9	Stat =Y Disc =Z
Tourism	3	0	3	1	7	Z
Public Transport	2	0	1	0	3	Stat =Y Disc =Z
Grants to voluntary bodies (inc CAB)	2	0	1	0	3	Z
<i>Building Control</i>	1	0	1	1	3	Y

- \* These services were scored on the potential contribution they could make, not on the basis of the current service delivery arrangements.
- \*\* Statutory elements in Y, discretionary in Z.

Services in italics are wholly or mainly statutory.

As can be seen, three additional services are proposed for category B, making the number of services in this category nine. Sixteen are proposed for category Y and three for category Z. Public transport is split between Y and Z because it is

proposed that the statutory element of this service fall into Y and the discretionary element into Z.

The following services were not considered as part of this assessment because they were adjudged to have been already prioritised by either the selection of category A priorities or the proposals for category B priorities. For completeness these services, with their categorisation is :

<b>Service</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Priority that it is primarily linked to</b>
Street sweeping	A	Street scene
Waste Management	A	Recycling
Crime Disorder	A	Anti-social behaviour
Information Technology	A	Access
Economic Development	A	Town-centre development and business development
Benefits	B	Vulnerable persons
Care Services	B	Vulnerable persons
Communications	B	Communications and Consultation
Housing (Enabling)	B	Affordable housing
Development Control	B	Planning and affordable housing
Planning policy and conservation	B	Planning, conservation and affordable housing
Equalities	B	Diversity

### Setting Service Targets

For all services that fall into category Y it is necessary to set some minimum statutory or operational targets. These are defined below. In addition to these, as category Y services are non-priorities, it is proposed to introduce an efficiency target of 3% a year, which will be, applied to all category Y services.

### **Setting of Minimums for Category Y Services**

<b>Service</b>	<b>Statutory Minimum</b>	<b>Operational Minimum</b>	<b>By</b>
Building Control	Yes	Stated ROI for any additional investment	SM
Business Rates	Yes	Specified collection targets	JB
Environmental Health	Yes	Specified customer satisfaction levels	SM
Licensing	Yes	Specified operational targets	SM/NG
Housing Repairs	Yes	Decent Homes and tenant expectations	SM
Legal and Admin	Yes	Specified operational targets	NG
Finance	Yes	Specified operational targets	JB
Business Management	No	Maintenance of PM system and CMAP	IY

Public Toilets	No	As defined in current strategy	IY
Human Resources	Yes	As defined in HR and Equalities strategies	CS
Car Parks	No	As defined in Town centre master plans and to meet specified ROAE.	IY
Parks	No	User satisfaction levels	JP/IY
Leisure Centre	No	Sustaining four centres within set subsidy levels and user satisfaction.	JP
Leisure (Other)	No	Operational standards for development work	JP
Arts	No	Subsidy per user and quality of arts programme targets.	JP
Public Transport (Statutory scheme)	Yes	Half-fare concessionary bus passes	IY

For services falling within category Z, the Council needs to determine the exit strategy and speed of implementation. Without this the resources freed to invest into priority areas cannot be realised or included in the medium-term budget proposals. The following table proposes an implementation timetable and identifies the resources which would be made available for re-investment into priority areas:

## Speed of Implementation for services in Category Z

Service	Exit from	Maximum Revenue Savings*
Funding of voluntary organisations, including CAB	31/3/05	£489,000
Public Transport (Discretionary expenditure)	By gradual withdrawal from 31/3/05 to 31/3/08	£156,000
Tourism	31/3/05	£223,000
TOTAL		£868,000

At this stage these figures are simply the amounts committed in the current approved budget. In practice it is unlikely that the actual savings available from re-investment into priority areas will equate to these amounts. This is because certain elements on the expenditure included here already contribute to our priorities. For example some grants may assist in reducing crime and anti-social behaviour and some tourism expenditure is an essential component of town centre regeneration.

If it is assumed that two-thirds of this expenditure is available for re-investment it would nevertheless provide well over half a million pounds for investment into priority areas. To assist the Cabinet in understanding the nature of the expenditure included in these services I have provided some additional information in Appendix A.

### Considerations

That the Cabinet considers whether it wishes to proceed on the basis of the timetable and the information given in this briefing report.

Duncan Kerr,  
Chief Executive

<u>APPENDIX 1</u>	-	Concessionary Travel
<u>APPENDIX 2</u>	-	Discretionary Grants & Subscriptions
<u>APPENDIX 3</u>	-	Tourism

## Appendix 1

### **Travel Concessions**

#### **Impact analysis**

#### **Financial savings**

A staged withdrawal from travel vouchers over a three year period would provide the following financial savings

2003/2004	
Number of booklets issued	12,641
Total number of vouchers issued	250,838
Total number of vouchers redeemed	£156,236
Redemption rate	62%

Financial saving by withdrawing vouchers	£156,236
--	----------

#### **Staged withdrawal**

Year	0-2	2-5	Over 5	Amount issued	Financial saving *
2003/04	£18	£22	£28	12,641	-
Year 1	£14	£17	£21	12,641	36,238
Year 2	£9	£11	£14	12,641	78,476
Year 3	£5	£6	£7	12,641	120,711
Year 4	0	0	0	0	156,236

\*assumes 62% redemption rate

Careful consideration needs to be given to the impact of such an approach.

#### Customer upset

- There is a high demand for these vouchers to enable pensioners and the disabled to use public transport. Experience has shown that these customers will form a powerful lobby group.
- The complaints regarding the issue will be repeated every year
- Some recipients will identify this service affects their quality of life irrespective of the small size of the benefit.

#### *Needs*

- Amounts currently issued are deemed to be too small and perhaps only cover the cost of one taxi journey in the outlying areas. The amounts issued in the third year may be of no use at all and contribute very little to travel.
- The equality issue. Are we treating customers the same if they are unable to use a bus pass and will no longer have the option of a different benefit



#### *Value of benefit*

- Would the decrease in the value of vouchers result in any real benefit to the customer?

#### *Operational factors*

- Given the reduction in amounts each year there will still be costs associated to the service: The administration time each year will not reduce. The printing costs will reduce although an element of the cost is fixed for the setting of the plates. Staffing will still be required for the main distribution unless they were to be issued for a period greater than one year.

Costs to be retained (based upon 2003/2004)

Postage costs	£2,382
Printing of vouchers	£8,400
Staffing – main distribution	£983
Support Services	£6,580

### **Dial a Ride Scheme**

#### **Impact analysis**

#### **Financial savings**

	2003/2004	2004/2005	2005/2006
Scheme cost	£52,000	£101,750	£66,145
LCC contribution*	£6,500	£12,179	£33,073
Countryside Agency Contribution	£39,000	£76,313	NIL
SKDC financial saving	£6,500	£12,718	£33,072

\*Note service is match funded with Lincolnshire County Council. Further investigation required as to withdrawal of SKDC funding and the impact / financial penalty . Vehicles require replacing in four years time.

#### *Customer need*

- The scheme is popular and well established with a large customer base. There are currently three buses fully utilised within the scheme.

#### Customer upset

- The customer already requires an expansion of the service to include journeys outside of the district and to hospitals around the area. A reduction in the service will not be seen as popular.

## **Rural Routes**

### **Impact analysis**

#### **Financial Savings (net of income)**

Scheme cost 2003/2004	£30,820
Countryside Agency Contribution	£23,115
Cost to SKDC (2003/04)	£7,705

Scheme cost 2004/05	£36,716
Countryside Agency Contribution	NIL
SKDC saving due to withdrawal	£36,716

#### *Customer need*

- The customer base is very low on some of the routes, which lead to a reduction in some services for this current financial year (following report PRO268 – November2003)

#### *Income*

- The service yields very low income, in the region of £1,500 to £2,000 per annum

## Appendix 2

### Discretionary Grants and CAB

#### **Impact Analysis of Withdrawal from this Activity**

1. In 2004/05 the estimated grant expenditure is £489,060 covering a wide range of projects and organisations. I have tried to summarise the type of grant on the attached table.
2. The list covers all areas where grant payments are currently made. The following analysis aims at summarising the issues from ceasing funding, if possible.

#### (a) Closed Burial Grounds

Constitutes those grants to Parishes to maintain closed burial grounds, instead of SKDC. If grant was ceased SKDC would end up maintaining the Burial Grounds.

<i>Impact on savings</i>	-	<i>Limited</i>
Impact of decision	-	Increased workload for SKDC

#### (b) Discretionary Rate Relief

Constitutes the discretionary rate relief 'top-ups' for those businesses/charities qualifying for mandatory business relief and those that benefit purely from discretionary rate relief. I enclose a separate report on the allocation of discretionary rate relief:-

- (a) Options - review policy on discretionary rate relief to make it more targeted towards Council objectives - highlight impact upon those businesses currently receiving support.

Impact on savings	-	Potentially high but difficult to achieve in short timescales
		<u>Impact of decision - Significant</u>

#### (c) Business Support and Community Projects

A series of grants targeted at Business and Community Groups through the Economic Development unit, and the LSP.

- (a) Options - review of Grants and Targeting.

Impact on savings	-	Medium
Impact of decision	-	Needs assessing

#### (d) Housing

Some limited support is given to the Homeless Function and Private Sector as part of Council enabling role.

- (a) Options - review grants
 

Impact on savings	-	Low
Impact of decision	-	Low

(e) Arts

The two grants now given are to the Eastern Orchestral Board (EOB) and the Arts Council.

- (a) Options - stop grant

Impact on savings	-	Medium
Impact of decision	-	Needs assessing

The subscription to the Arts Council entitles the Council to receive AAs Council Grant.

Client Leisure Grants

- (f) These are historical grants paid to Leisure Clubs following the award of the contract to Leisure Connections and use of increased scale of charges eg Deepings Swimming Club had used facilities at subsidised rate, could not afford revised scale of charges, hence client side support grants.

- (a) Options - stop grant

Impact on savings	-	Medium
Impact of decision	-	Needs assessing

(g) Archaeological

A grant is paid to the Heritage Trust of Lincolnshire to contribute to the salary of the archaeologist working within the Kesteven area. A total payment of £25,470 which is split ½ for planning fees and ½ for this grant.

- (a) Options - stop grant

Impact on savings	-	Medium
Impact of decision	-	Unknown

(h) Recreation Act Grants

This consists of the District contributions to the County-wide scheme. If schemes are approved at County we are committed to a set level of funding.

- (a) Options - Review level of contribution

Impact on savings	-	High
Impact of decision	-	High

(i) Bowls Club and Langtoft Playing Field - Parachute Payments

Relate to SEA's and will fall away in the next 2 years.

No assessment required.

(j) Funding Fair

Part of the enabling role; a contribution to the organisation of the recent funding fair.

(a) Options - Stop contribution

Impact - Needs assessing

(k) Community Activities

Miscellaneous grants to various bodies - schools, clubs etc for sports development.

(l) Planning Policy and Historic Building Grants

Part of the Conservation Policy of the Council.

(a) Options - Review level of scheme support

Impact on savings - Significant  
Impact of decision - Needs assessing

(m) Market Deeping Toilets and Community Cleaners

*Grants to Parishes to help support SKDC functions.*

(a) Options - Stop contributions

	Impact on savings	-	Significant
Impact of decision	-	Significant	

(n) Voluntary Body Grants and CAB

I attach a separate paper on the voluntary body grants budget.

Type of Grant	Expenditure	Budget	Variance		Expenditure	Budget
	2003/2004					2004/2005
CLOSED BURIAL GROUNDS	£2,227.48	£4,500.00	-£2,272.52		£0.00	£4,500.00
DISCRETIONARY RATE RELIEF	£106,374.11	£103,900.00	£2,474.11			£107,000.00
BUSINESS SUPPORT PROJECTS	£4,750.00	£5,000.00	-£250.00			£5,000.00
COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP PROJ	£10,521.43	£5,000.00	£5,521.43			£14,000.00
ECONOMIC & ENTERPIRSE GROUP	£0.00	£5,000.00	-£5,000.00			£5,000.00
COMMUNITY SAFETY GROUP	£5,512.49	£5,000.00	£512.49			£5,000.00
ENVIROMENT GROUP	£3,198.57	£5,000.00	-£1,801.43			£5,000.00
TRANSPORT GROUP	£0.00	£5,000.00	-£5,000.00			£5,000.00
LEARNING GROUP	£2,500.00	£5,000.00	-£2,500.00			£5,000.00
HEALTH GROUP	£50.00	£5,000.00	-£4,950.00			£5,000.00
HOUSING GROUP	£281.25	£5,000.00	-£4,718.75			£5,000.00
HOMELESS	£2,050.00	£2,000.00	£50.00			£2,000.00
HOUSING POLICY (Private Sector)	£0.00	£1,000.00	-£1,000.00			£1,000.00
ARTS	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00			£0.00
ARTS - LOCAL SOCIETIES	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00			£0.00
ARTS - RURAL TOURING SCHEME	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00			£0.00
EOB SUBSCRIPTION	£3,864.00	£4,000.00	-£136.00			£4,000.00
ARTS COUNCIL SUBSCRIPTION	£4,500.00	£4,500.00	£0.00			£4,500.00
CLIENT LEISURE	£4,114.25	£5,000.00	-£885.75			£4,500.00
GIFTED PERSONS	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00			£0.00
ARCHAEOLOGICAL	£12,387.50	£12,390.00	-£2.50			£12,700.00
RECREATION ACT	£49,439.00	£50,000.00	-£561.00			£50,000.00
MILLENNIUM GRANTS	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00			£0.00
BOWLS CLUBS GRANTS	£24,000.00	£24,000.00	£0.00			£18,000.00
BOWLS CLUBS INSURANCE	£245.98	£250.00	-£4.02			£250.00
CYCLING SPONSORSHIP	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00			£0.00
LANGTOFT PLAYING FIELD	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00			£8,450.00
FUNDING FAIR	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00			£1,530.00
DEEPINGS FESTIVAL	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00			£0.00
LINCS COUNTY CRICKET	£7,500.00	£7,500.00	£0.00			£0.00
COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES	£1,005.70	£1,000.00	£5.70			£1,000.00
PLANNING POLICY	£2,600.00	£2,600.00	£0.00			£3,000.00
INWARD INVESTMENT	£48,000.00	£50,000.00	-£2,000.00			£50,000.00
HISTORIC BUILDINGS	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00			£0.00
HISTORIC BUILDINGS	£0.00	£35,000.00	-£35,000.00			£35,000.00
HISTORIC BUILDINGS	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00			£0.00
MARKET DEEPING TOILETS	£5,780.37	£5,300.00	£480.37			£7,000.00
BOURNE TOILETS	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00			£0.00
COMMUNITY CLEANERS	£1,569.04	£11,250.00	-£9,680.96			£15,000.00
ENVIRONMENTAL	£2,698.65	£2,700.00	-£1.35			£0.00
VOLUNTARY BODIES - SOCIAL	£11,882.50	£13,000.00	-£1,117.50			£13,000.00
VOLUNTARY BODIES - REC	£0.00	£100.00	-£100.00			£100.00
VOLUNTARY BODIES - HEALTH	£400.00	£400.00	£0.00			£400.00
SUBSCRIPTIONS	£22,169.43	£22,190.00	-£20.57			£23,520.00
CAB RENT PAYMENTS	£4,560.00	£4,560.00	£0.00			£4,560.00
CAB RENT PAYMENTS - BOURNE	£6,250.00	£6,250.00	£0.00			£6,250.00
CAB FUNDING	£57,800.00	£57,800.00	£0.00			£57,800.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£408,231.75</b>	<b>£476,190.00</b>	<b>-£67,958.25</b>		<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£489,060.00</b>

ORGANISATION  NAME	GRANT  AWARD 2002/2003	GSEA  E82K04	GRANT AWARD 2003/2004 E11E28	REC.  01	HEALTH  02	ECON.  03
			SOCIAL  00			
<b>GRANTS UNDER £1000</b>						
Access Ability Grantham	150.00	200.00				
Access Stamford					200.00	
Alternatives (Grantham)	200.00	300.00				
Alternatives (Bourne)	200.00				200.00	
Bourne & District Blind Club	100.00		100.00			
Deeping U3A			250.00			
Deeping St. James Over 60's Club	300.00		250.00			
Earlesfield Community Forum	725.93	979.48				
Grantham & District Sports Council	50.00	50.00				
Grantham Townswomen's Guild	50.00	50.00				
Grantham U3A	300.00	250.00				
Kesteven Age concern *hire of corn exchange			310.50			
Lincolnshire Deaf Services			300.00			
Lincoln Centre for Counselling	200.00		250.00			
Poacher 100 Classic Tour	50.00					
RELATE (Peterborough & District)	600.00		500.00			
Royal British Legion		120.00				
Royal Naval Association (Grantham)	50.00		50.00			
Samaritans (Grantham)			240.00			
South Lafford Pop in Club	100.00		50.00			
South Lincs Gay Men Talking			200.00			
Volunteer Bureau			50.00			
Welcome Club Over 60's	100.00		100.00			
<b>TOTAL</b>	3,175.93	1949.48	2650.50	0.00	400.00	0.00
<b>BUDGET</b>		<b>2500.00</b>	<b>15500.00</b>	<b>300.00</b>	<b>200.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>REMAINING BUDGET</b>		550.52	3377.50	300.00	-200.00	0.00
<b>GRANTS OVER £1000</b>						
Age Concern Grantham (now Stamford) per CF	4,000.00		2,472.00			
Age Concern Deeping	1,500.00		1,500.00			
Community Care for the Elderly Grantham	1,000.00		2,000.00			



The Butterfield Centre	2,500.00		2,500.00			
Poverty Concern Group	600.00		1000.00			
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9,600.00</b>		<b>9,472.00</b>			

**Rural pubs, petrol stations, village stores & post offices - £20,360.66  
(£5,090.16)**

Such businesses are, subject to other criterion, entitled to receive 50% mandatory relief where they are the only such business situated within a 'rural settlement'. Legislation allows Local Authorities to remit all or part of the remaining 50%. Current policy dictates that 'top-up' discretionary relief of 25% shall be awarded.

**Rural pubs, petrol stations, village stores & post offices - £43,624.27  
(£32,718.20)**

In addition to the above, current policy states that 25% discretionary relief shall be awarded where the business would have qualified for mandatory relief but for the existence of at least one other such business.

**Sports clubs, Village halls, charities etc... - £64,582.97  
(£48,437.23)**

Discretionary relief awards only

**Sports clubs, Village halls, charities etc... - £65,870.68  
(£16,467.67)**

Discretionary relief awards where mandatory relief has also been awarded.

**Totals - £194,438.58  
(£102,713.26)**

### Appendix 3

#### Tourism

Whilst Tourism has not emerged as a priority in its own right, the service does make an important contribution to both Town-Centre regeneration (a priority A) and business development (a priority B). This has been recognised by both the DCMS and the East Midlands Development Agency (EMDA). In the East Midlands Tourism contributes 3.5% to GDP and accounts for over 30,000 businesses of which over 75% are small and privately owned. The Local Strategic Partnership have identified the importance of Tourism in the Community Plan recognising the contribution it can make to promote the District and the sub region as a visitor destination. It is likely that there will be strong representations against any reduction in service from the tourism business sector will argue against reducing tourism activity.

The following staffing resources are employed in Tourism.

<u>Tourism HQ.</u>	<i>Annual Cost (£)</i>
Tourism Manager	25,977
Assistant Tourism Manager	12,442
Assistant Tourism Manager	14,070
 <u>Information Centres.</u>	
Tourism Information Centre Supervisor	14,178
Tourism Assistant	3,111
Tourism Assistant	3,196
Tourism Assistant	9,772
Tourist Information Assistant	<u>7,375</u>
 <b>Total base salaries</b>	90,121
Employer on-cost	<u>27,749</u>
	117,870
 Other employee expenses	<u>5,170</u>
Total employee costs	<u>123,040</u>

There may well be potential for re-deploying staff into mainstream business and town-centre development. If redeployment could not be secured there may be significant redundancy cost associated which are estimated to be £50,000.

Additional costs for the service are detailed below:

	<u>£</u>
Premises	6,970
Transport	2,190
Support Services	33,710
Supplies and Services	
Information Centres	39,010
Publicity/Marketing	21,000
Partnerships	3,000
Other Extraordinary	5,250

Office Costs	12,480
Subscriptions	<u>7,500</u>
	88,240
Income	<u>30,400</u>
Total Service Cost	<u>223,750</u>

Some of these costs are internal re-charges and may not be available as savings unless accommodation vacated could be used by other sections or support services costs can be reduced.

The average footfall through the Tourist Information Centres has been 62,000 per annum in Stamford and 21,000 in Grantham\*.

(\* BASED ON AN AVERAGE OF THE LAST FIVE YEARS).

In Grantham the TIC is already integrated into the Arts Centre Box Office. If the TIC element closes and the Box Office continues financial savings would be marginal.