

# PROPOSED CHANGES TO STAFF TERMS AND CONDITIONS

**CABINET – 15 SEPTEMBER 2011**

Report of the: Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Corporate Resources

Also considered by: Services Select Committee - 20 September 2011

Status: For Decision

---

**Executive Summary:** This report sets out proposals to achieve the savings planned from changes to staff terms and conditions included in the 10-year budget. The proposal requires Council to approve a phased introduction of the changes, but over the life of the 10-year budget the total savings required would still be achieved.

The proposal has been subject to extensive consultation with staff and the feedback from them is broadly supportive of the proposals, though a number of concerns have been raised about the impact of the proposals on staff pay, motivation and morale. SDC has been recognised nationally for its achievements in staff motivation and empowerment, leading to high levels of productivity. This proposal is designed to mitigate the impact on productivity and should ensure residents continue to receive high quality, value for money services.

---

## **This report supports the Key Aims of the Community Plan**

**Portfolio Holder** Cllr. Peter Fleming and Cllr. Brian Ramsay

**Head of Service** Head of Finance and HR – Tricia Marshall

---

**Recommendation:** It be recommended to Council that:

- a) the changes to staff terms and conditions set out below be implemented from 1 April 2012; and
- b) the 10-year budget be amended as shown in Appendix C, to take account of the phased introduction of these changes.

---

## **Background and Introduction**

- 1 Members will be aware that the 10-year budget includes a saving of £370,000 from staff pay and conditions, with £320,000 planned for delivery in 2012/13 and a further £50,000 in 2013/14.
- 2 This paper provides Members with an update on the changes to terms and conditions proposed to achieve these savings and feedback from staff consultation on those proposals as well as setting out the implications for the 10-year budget.

- 3 As part of the previous and current savings plans, the following savings with an impact on staff terms and conditions have already been implemented:
- Removal of market supplements (previously paid to staff based on market conditions for recruitment to specific posts);
  - No national pay awards for the financial years 2010/11, 2011/12 and 2012/13; and
  - Removal of leased car option.
- 4 In addition, the Government is expected to announce this Autumn proposals for increased pension contributions for local government staff, to be phased in from April 2012, together with changes to the benefits payable from the Pension Scheme.

**The development of the proposed changes to staff terms and conditions**

- 5 In order to make changes from 1 April 2012, the following timetable has been adopted:

<b>Action</b>	<b>Date</b>
Initial staff briefings	April 2011
Development of proposals with input from a new Staff Consultative Group (SCG) (see below) and consultation with Unison, including feedback to and from service teams by SCG	May 2011
Formal 90 day consultation period of proposed changes	6 June to 6 September 2011
Feedback on consultation - Staff briefings	September 2011
Member approval	October 2011
New contracts issued to staff	November 2011
Revised terms and conditions begin	1 April 2012
Consideration of any appeals against changes	May 2012

- 6 Set out above are a number of changes to staff terms and conditions that are already in place or planned. In this context, it was considered important that the development of proposals to achieve the future savings be carefully

planned to minimise the impact on staff motivation and morale, and hence service delivery.

- 7 To this end, at the start of the consultation process all staff were invited to briefings led by Management Team, to ensure they understood the financial environment within which the Council is delivering its services, and to encourage them to be involved in the development of the savings proposals and consultation on them.
- 8 To encourage participation in developing the proposals, a Staff Consultative Group was established. The group was made up of officers who had volunteered and were from a cross section of teams and grades across the organisation.
- 9 One of the first tasks for the Group was to establish some key principles which, if possible, the organisation would wish to adhere to in considering any proposals. These included a recognition of the national picture and the need to have a solution that was financially sound over the 10-year budget process as well as if possible staying within national terms and conditions and finding a solution that was fair to all staff.
- 10 The Group put forward and considered a number of options for making the savings and staff were consulted on their favoured option. This option is set out in more detail in Appendix A, but in summary:
  - The current lengthy pay bands will be shortened from 11 spinal points to four points, with the top two points being deleted;
  - In order to offer some protection, staff currently in the top two points will continue to receive national pay awards for five years from when those awards resume; at the end of that period their pay will drop down to the level of the new top point.
- 11 Unison has also been separately consulted on the proposals and a Unison representative has one seat on the Staff Consultative Group.

### **Summary of consultation responses**

- 12 The consultation period with staff ends on 6 September and Members will be updated at the Cabinet meeting on any final comments received. Staff have been encouraged to feedback their comments, and briefing sessions and one-to-one meetings have been held to facilitate this. The comments received are summarised below and are set out in more detail in Appendix B.
- 13 Overall, it is understood that the majority of staff understand and accept the Council's need to make savings and consider the proposal to be the least worst option. Some staff whose pay will reduce on the longer term are concerned about the impact on their motivation. Others have raised concerns about these changes being made at a time when they are receiving no inflationary pay awards, but RPI is running at 5% and CPI at 4.4%, leading to a fall in pay levels in real terms. They also feel that making this change to terms and conditions when they have already experienced other detrimental

changes, as well as proposed changes to pension contributions, is demotivating, particularly when SDC is recognised nationally for its staff productivity levels.

- 14 However, most staff accept that under the circumstances, this is the most equitable outcome and have recognised that the proposed solution spreads the saving in the 10-year budget. Staff working at Dunbriok have signed petitions to support the proposals in full. This is in contrast to previous consultations, where usually high levels of responses are only received when staff are very dissatisfied.

## **Key Implications**

### Financial

- 15 The 10-year budget assumes that £320,000 a year will be saved from 2012/13 onwards, and a further £50,000 will be saved from 2013/14 onwards. Under the proposal above, initial financial modelling (set out in Appendix C) suggests that the majority of the savings will not be achieved until 2016/17 onwards but, over the period of the 10-year budget, the cumulative savings will be fully achieved. The reason for this is that the savings will be achieved through holding pay at existing levels for staff affected for a number of years instead of reducing pay levels from next year.
- 16 In practice the Budget Stabilisation Reserve will fund the shortfall in earlier years with repayments being made to the Reserve in later years. The budget already assumes that there will be no national pay award from 2010/11 to 2012/13.

### Staffing

- 17 The proposals above, together with extensive consultation with staff should mitigate the impact on staff morale and motivation (and hence potentially the quality of service to residents) of changing staff terms and conditions. Although unemployment levels are high nationally, the Council is experiencing difficulties recruiting to certain posts within the organisation and has found it difficult to retain others; a phased approach such as that proposed should minimise the risk that staff are dissatisfied and leave the organisation.

### Equality

- 18 An Equalities Impact Assessment has been completed. The proposed changes will reduce the risk of discrimination of age grounds, as pay levels will vary less with length of service, but on the other hand those affected by the changes are more likely to be older; however there are extended protection arrangements proposed that mitigate the impact.

### Community Impact

- 19 The proposals should have a positive impact as they ensure that in the long term the required savings are achieved as well as protecting high quality service delivery for residents.

**Risk Assessment Statement**

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Risk</b>
Recruitment and retention of staff more difficult due to changes to terms and conditions, with adverse impact on service delivery due to vacancies.	SDC recognised as a good employer through Investors in People Gold and Champion status, top placed local authority in Times 'Best Public Sector Organisation to work for' awards	Medium – staff still continue to want to work for SDC
Morale and motivation reduced as a result of these changes to terms and conditions in addition to previous changes, leading to reductions in productivity (through loss of loyalty and goodwill) with an adverse impact on service delivery.	Extensive consultation with staff to develop a scheme that most staff support.	Low/Medium
Some staff refuse to accept the proposed new terms and conditions, leading to service disruption.	Continue with approach of consultation, feedback and 1-1 meetings for those most affected.	Low – generally staff have given positive responses to the consultation process
Proposal may not deliver required savings, leading to the need to generate additional savings to balance the budget.	Financial modelling has been carried out at a detailed level. Continue to monitor position through monthly budget monitoring and check assumptions on an annual basis.	Low
The amendment to the 10-year budget is not approved, resulting in a requirement to make the saving from 1 April 2012. This would cause considerable anxiety and uncertainty for staff and the need to develop and consult on an alternative solution at short notice. Impact on service delivery would be adverse due to loss of	Members briefed fully on the proposal, including the implications for the 10-year budget, in that by the end of the 10-year period the cumulative savings achieved would remain unchanged. Members also briefed on staff comments and concerns.	Low

motivation and staff goodwill.		
--------------------------------	--	--

**Conclusion**

- 20 The Council's success and national reputation has been made possible by the people it employs, their hard work and commitment and desire to deliver the highest quality of service to the community. It is therefore not easy, having already asked them over recent years to reduce their pay and conditions, to once again make that request. However, the Council has been faced with unprecedented challenges requiring more difficult solutions.
- 21 The proposed changes to terms and conditions aim to strike a balance between the need to deliver savings for the Council against the potential impact on staff recruitment, retention, motivation and morale, and hence productivity levels. The proposed changes meet the Council's financial targets over the period of the 10-year budget and also offer staff substantial protection from reductions in pay.

**Sources of Information:** Staff consultation on proposed changes to terms and conditions papers

**Contact Officer(s):** Tricia Marshall – Ext. 7218  
[tricia.marshall@sevenoaks.gov.uk](mailto:tricia.marshall@sevenoaks.gov.uk)

**Pav Ramewal**  
**Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Corporate Resources**

**Proposed changes to staff terms and conditions**

1. The current bands are reduced from 11+ spinal pay points per band to four points, by removing the top two points (the 'starred area') and the lower five points; this also removes the current overlap between bands;
2. Officers who are on a point below the new top spinal point, subject to performance, carry on progressing one spinal point each year until they reach the new top point of the band;
3. Officers who are currently on the top two points (12% of staff) will continue to receive national pay awards for five years from when national pay award are reintroduced. After that period expires, their pay will revert to the new top spinal point.; and
4. Officers can still be rewarded via the appraisal scheme with one-off payments for outstanding performance.

The attached salary band table shows the proposed new bands in bold.

Under this proposal staff would stay on national terms and conditions.

Band A		Band B		Band C	
SCP	Salary	SCP	Salary	SCP	Salary
4	12,145	12	15,039	18	17,161
5	12,312	13	15,444	19	17,802
6	12,489	14	15,725	20	18,453
7	12,787	15	16,054	21	19,126
8	13,189	16	16,440	22	19,621
9	13,589	17	16,830	23	20,198
10	13,874	18	17,161	24	20,858
11	14,733	19	17,802	25	21,519
12	15,039	20	18,453	26	22,221
13	15,444	21	19,126	27	22,958
14	15,725	22	19,621	28	23,708
15	16,054				
16	16,440				
17	16,830				

Band D		Band E		Band F	
SCP	Salary	SCP	Salary	SCP	Salary
23	20,198	29	24,646	35	29,236
24	20,858	30	25,472	36	30,011
25	21,519	31	26,276	37	30,851
26	22,221	32	27,052	38	31,754
27	22,958	33	27,849	39	32,800
28	23,708	34	28,636	40	33,661
29	24,646	35	29,236	41	34,549
30	25,472	36	30,011	42	35,430
31	26,276	37	30,851	43	36,313
32	27,052	38	31,754	44	37,206
33	27,849	39	32,800	45	38,042
34	28,636	40	33,661	46	38,961
		41	34,549		

Band G		Band H		Band I		Band J	
SCP	Salary	SCP	Salary	SCP	Salary	SCP	Salary
42	35,430	47	39,855	53	45,112	59	50,800
43	36,313	48	40,741	54	46,019	60	51,818
44	37,206	49	41,616	55	46,934	61	52,855
45	38,042	50	42,499	56	47,880	62	54,173
46	38,961	51	43,363	57	48,822	63	55,528
47	39,855	52	44,234	58	49,808	64	56,914
48	40,741	53	45,112	59	50,800	65	58,340
49	41,616	54	46,019	60	51,818	66	59,791
50	42,499	55	46,934	61	52,855	67	61,290
51	43,363	56	47,880	62	54,173	68	62,825
52	44,234	57	48,822	63	55,528	69	64,398
		58	49,808	64	56,914	70	66,009



## Appendix B

### Proposed Changes to Pay Bands – Employee Consultation

#### Summary of Comments

1. Comments have been made via staff briefing sessions, which were well attended, e-mails sent directly to the Human Resources Advisors and during the one to one meetings offered to staff most affected.
2. The comments range considerably from members of staff who are fully in support of the proposal, some of whom are currently in receipt of salaries within the starred area spine points of the salary bands, versus those that consider this group to be the worse affected by the proposals. Other staff comments question the decision to consult on only one option (at least at the beginning of the consultation process); although this point has subsequently been responded to it still appears to be an outstanding issue for some staff. In addition, some staff have also expressed a view that they do not think that the Staff Consultation Group is a true representation of how staff feel about the proposals (although this may be a comment more specifically related to communication) and further question the Council's financial considerations, implications and overall predicted savings.
3. Set out below are the responses received, which have been grouped together into commonly themed areas. A response has been added to each group of comments.

#### Comments in support of the proposals

- a) "I am in the starred area so this proposal does affect me and I am grateful that my pay will not be immediately changed and that SDC have given me protection for 6 years. With what I have read in the papers and have seen in the news this is a more preferable line of action to take than a percentage reduction of pay for all staff which would impact the lower staff employees of the Council, removing the outer fringe allowance or making further redundancies.

We are not the only Council to be facing these difficulties and I appreciate the efforts being made Sevenoaks".

- b) "In response to your email I would like to thank you and the Staff Consultative Group for all your hard work in reaching what must have been a difficult decision regarding the changes to the pay bandings. I found the staff briefings very informative and helpful.

Although as I am not in the starred area and therefore not immediately affected by these changes I believe that in the current climate this is the fairest way to implement changes without reducing the salaries of all employees".

- c) "I think that this is by far the best option and I totally support it".
- d) "I would like to give my support to this idea of a change in salary bands as I believe that this choice will have the least negative impact upon all staff working at the SDC."
- e) "Whilst I am uneasy supporting a proposal that disadvantages some people and not others, the changes proposed do seem to be the most proactive way of making the savings, whilst still providing those who are impacted sufficient time to adapt to the changes. In my view a straight reduction to all staff will have far worse impact upon staff morale, would prompt the loss of many staff and would result in a knock-on decline in the Council's services.

Therefore I would be grateful if you could register my reluctant support for the current proposal.

Notwithstanding the above, I would raise an objection in principle to the inclusion within the budget of the staff costs as they stand. Whilst I appreciate the difficult times we face, I feel disappointed in Members that they would rather see cuts to a 'Gold' standard staff workforce than risk the political wrath of actions such as scrapping free bin bags.

I also believe there should have been a staff consultation regarding the inclusion of the cut within the budget in the first place."

- 4. In addition, employees at Dunbriok have demonstrated their approval of the proposed changes in the form of a petition by signing and submitting a copy of the initial consultation letter, dated 6th June 2011 (a total of 23 signatures obtained).

### **Fairness of the proposal**

- 5. Particularly strong comments have been received questioning the 'fairness' of the proposal as it has been expressed that it particularly affects those members of staff either just approaching the spine column point starred areas, and those currently in receipt of salaries within the starred areas. It is also noted from comments that there may be a possible negative effect on the motivation of staff in terms of their work performance and the impact this may have on their personal circumstances due to the financial loss which may ultimately result in a loss of staff.
- f) "I feel the measures that are proposed are completely disproportionate and act as a disincentive for staff...I work hard and do my job to the best of my ability, but am effectively being punished for doing so...I therefore fail to see how this is the least worst option."
- g) "Despite hearing the arguments, I still feel it is totally unfair to penalise the small percentage and number of staff (12% / 36 [approx] individuals) in the starred area who in the vast and overwhelming majority of cases (I know

some placements were due to past job evaluations) have earned their place to be there through the appraisal scheme.

I have heard the argument that people who get into this area are thereafter unreasonably rewarded for years, but for some of us that isn't true and no one has ever felt this was unfair enough to change before, so it doesn't seem a valid argument to now use in the justification of targeting all the cuts towards this tiny group of people.

I think that these savings should have been spread out across the whole workforce not just 36 people, why should they be penalised for performing well and take the full brunt of these cuts.

Obviously I like no doubt everyone else in this group, will reluctantly accept this now but purely because the proposal is delayed up until 2018, whereas I understand if the 4% pay cut for staff was introduced it would have been taken affect next year. (Surprisingly, I don't imagine the 88% of the non affected workforce are going to disagree either with the proposal).

However, if one system can be delayed for 7 years why not another.

I understand this is 'inducement' its not what I would call it."

- h) "I see this as a way of financially penalising and dis-incentivising those in the starred areas, who have achieved that spinal point by continued high level performance. A one off payment is not equivalent to an increment and does not add to your pension. I do not know how many staff are in the starred areas, but this would seem very unfair that they should bear this savings burden."

### **Response to comments**

- 6. All staff will be affected in that they will no longer be able to progress into the starred area. However, it has been recognised that those in the starred area will be more affected by these proposals and pay protection arrangements have been included in the current proposal.**
- 7. It is acknowledged that any adverse change to staff terms and conditions is likely to affect morale and motivation and that most staff on the top two points that are being removed have gained that pay level by performing to a very high level. Steps have been taken to try to mitigate the impact, in addition staff have been provided with information on why the changes are being proposed and the financial environment within which the Council is having to operate. The most affected staff have had individual meetings with HR to discuss the impact on their pay and to hear their concerns.**

**Financial concerns in terms of the loss of salary to the individual and requests for further financial information**

- i) “I note that the information regarding the effects on Salary Bands/Spinal Column Points for what was Option C (and now the only Option offered under the Employee Consultation) only covers Salary Bands A to J inclusive. This gives no clue to the effects of the proposal on Salary Bands X & Y, and hence no information on how (and indeed if) the proposal will affect Director/ Executive level staff.....In the interests of fairness, and given that we are led to believe that very senior employees have received substantial pay increases in recent years whilst other employees have received little or nothing, I trust that you will agree that this information is critical to assisting staff in making informed decisions regarding the Employee Consultation.”

**Response to comments**

- 8. Yes, both the Chief Executive and Directors’ salaries will be affected in the same way as all other staff. Details of their salaries are already available on SiMON however these will also be published on the Staff Consultative Group pages. All employees receive the same pay award each year, including the most senior officers, there is no difference in treatment across the organisation.**

**Impact on recruitment and consideration of salary uplifts in light of equal pay issues**

- j) “In terms of recruitment it gives a fairer indication of expected salary range for new recruits particularly those who have not worked before in local government...this will be a fairer way to advertise any vacancies as the difference between the top and the bottom of the scale will be that much reduced.”
- k) It was also raised at the last Staff Consultative Group Meeting on 18<sup>th</sup> August 2011, whether it has been taken into consideration that the practice of offering sometimes higher salaries within a pay band to secure skilled & experienced candidates to roles will also mean that the salaries of current staff doing similar roles will also be addressed (i.e. in the Licensing Department); it was confirmed that this would be the case and that any issues arising would be reviewed on a case by case basis.

**Response to comments**

- 9. Yes, new members of staff would enter on the bottom point of the proposed new bands. It is recognised that this could result in inequality amongst existing and new members of staff, and should this occur then the salary of the existing staff member will be looked into. However, given that the % of officers within the lower bands is extremely low combined with a very low turnover within the Council we anticipate that this will be a rare occurrence.**

**The number of options put forward for consultation with staff and comments on the role of the Staff Consultative Group**

10. Further questions have also been raised with regard to why only one option has been pursued and no financial demonstrations of the other options outlined in the initial consultation letter. The role & operation of the Staff Consultation Group and the consultation process itself has also been raised. (Please note that Carrie McKenzie–Lloyd’s e-mail sent to all staff on 12th July 2011 communicated and confirmed the change to the original proposal).
- l) “Answer states that Option 3 was felt to be the one which meant people lost the least. Certainly not true for staff in the starred area, surely? What percentage or number of staff voted for/expressed an opinion or preference on each of the three options?”
  - m) “By putting forward only Option C, staff have been effectively denied the opportunity to comment on the above proposals. The SCG cannot be considered representative of the views of all staff.”
  - n) “Why have all employees not been given the opportunity to give their preferences on Options A, B and C as discussed by the SCG, rather than just what amount to the Option C proposals being put to all staff, please? At what point was it decided that only this single Option would be put out for employee consultation? This was certainly never made clear at any of the meetings of the SCG that I attended.”
  - o) “I do note that the only published set of minutes from the Staff Consultative Group are those for the meeting of 11 May. No minutes of other meetings of the SCG have been published.....despite the best efforts of the SCG members, many employees still remained unaware of the whole process. This being the case, the informal consultations carried out amongst employees by members of the Staff Consultative Group can hardly be considered to have constituted a full and representative sampling of opinion upon which to select only one Option to put forward for employee consultation.”
  - p) It has also been expressed that the Council may lose some of its best people as result of these changes whereas others expressed that in some respects the revised option C is ‘putting off’ the inevitable.

**Response to comments**

**11. More than three options were initially discussed by the SCG, however these were narrowed down to the three in the letter. Members of the SCG put these proposals to their teams and the feedback received was that option C was the option which most people thought should be taken forward.**

**12. The other two options were:**

- **A percentage pay cut for all staff**

- ***Incremental rises every other year instead of every year.***

**13. Option C was the option was felt to be the one which meant people lost the least. A percentage pay cut would affect the lower paid members of staff to a greater extent and incremental rises every other year, would disadvantage those in the lower areas of the bands.**

#### **Additional Questions Raised & Suggestions**

- q) “So far, the consultation has only touched on salaries. What other changes to terms and conditions for individual employees' existing contracts of employment will these new contracts contain?”

***Response: no other changes to terms and conditions will be included in contracts other than those set out in Appendix A on which staff have been consulted***

- r) “Please can you let me know how much the current wages freeze is expected to save the Council annually and whether that figure has been taken into account in the proposed savings to be generated from changes to terms and conditions?”

***Response: 1% increase in pay costs would add around £132,000 to the budget. A pay award in line with current CPI would cost £580,000 a year. A pay award in line with average pay increases in the UK (2.2% in June per the ONS) would cost £290,400 a year. The savings from a pay freeze are built into the budget separately from the savings expected from changes to terms and conditions.***

- s) “Has consideration been given to those in the starred area who are nearing retirement age?”

***Response: all staff in the starred area have been offered a meeting with HR to discuss their particular situation including those close to retirement.***

- t) “What is the highest deficit on the budget book? Has Sevenoaks District Council taken pensions contributions "holidays", or withheld payments to the pension fund, thereby increasing the pensions deficit, and if so, by how much? As staff had no choice but to continue to pay their pension contributions regardless of whether the pension fund was in surplus or deficit, it is grossly unfair to penalise them now if such actions by their employer have been instrumental in causing or increasing such deficit.”

***Response: The Council makes payments into the pension fund not only for ongoing liabilities but also to make up the pension fund deficit. Employees currently pay a maximum of 7.5% of pay into the Fund whereas SDC as employer pays 15.7% for ongoing service plus a lump sum payment towards the deficit (£2m payment in 2010/11). It can be seen that the Council has picked up a much higher proportion***

***of pension costs than employees, though it is acknowledged that increases to employee contribution rates (as yet unannounced) are expected from April 2012.***

- u) “I note that other Authorities have opted to close for up to one day a month with all staff taking unpaid leave. This would seem to be a much fairer option and one that all staff "benefit" from as they have extra days away from work?”

***Response: This is an interesting suggestion. This would have an immediate impact on staff take home pay and also would reduce the level of service to our customers – it would not be possible to accommodate such a reduction in working time without having a significant impact on service delivery. Staff already have the option to reduce their pay in exchange for additional leave.***





## Appendix C

### Impact of proposals on current 10-year budget

#### Ten Year Budget - Revenue

	Budget	Plan	Plan	Plan	Plan	Plan	Plan	Plan	Plan	Plan	Plan
	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
<b>Expenditure</b>											
Net Service Expenditure c/f	16,711	16,711	13,771	13,162	13,223	14,200	14,789	15,379	15,971	16,565	17,158
Inflation		442	507	547	611	589	590	592	594	593	593
Pension Fund deficit: actuarial increase		(220)	0	0	520						
Net savings (approved in previous years)		(71)	34	(25)	(75)						
Concessionary Fares reduction		(699)									
Expenditure previously classified as capital*		100									
<b>Net savings (NEW)</b>		<b>(2,492)</b>	<b>(1,150)</b>	<b>(461)</b>	<b>(79)</b>						
<b>Net Service Expenditure b/f</b>	<b>16,711</b>	<b>13,771</b>	<b>13,162</b>	<b>13,223</b>	<b>14,200</b>	<b>14,789</b>	<b>15,379</b>	<b>15,971</b>	<b>16,565</b>	<b>17,158</b>	<b>17,751</b>
<b>Financing Sources</b>											
Government Support	(6,348)	(5,358)	(4,632)	(4,251)	(3,870)	(3,986)	(4,106)	(4,229)	(4,356)	(4,487)	(4,622)
Govt Support - Conc. Fares reduction		446	446	446	446	459	473	487	502	517	533
Govt Support to offset C Tax freeze	0	(229)	(229)	(229)	(229)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Council Tax	(9,172)	(9,199)	(9,199)	(9,475)	(9,759)	(10,149)	(10,555)	(10,977)	(11,416)	(11,873)	(12,348)
Interest Receipts	(192)	(153)	(289)	(594)	(714)	(662)	(596)	(529)	(462)	(397)	(353)
Contributions to Reserves	716	471	330	430	330	330	330	330	330	330	330
Contributions from Reserves	(1,715)	(14)	(645)	(645)	(645)	(645)	(645)	(645)	(645)	(645)	(645)
<b>Total Financing</b>	<b>(16,711)</b>	<b>(14,036)</b>	<b>(14,218)</b>	<b>(14,318)</b>	<b>(14,441)</b>	<b>(14,653)</b>	<b>(15,099)</b>	<b>(15,563)</b>	<b>(16,047)</b>	<b>(16,555)</b>	<b>(17,105)</b>
<b>Contribution to/(from) Stabilisation Reserve</b>		<b>265</b>	<b>1,056</b>	<b>1,095</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>(136)</b>	<b>(280)</b>	<b>(408)</b>	<b>(518)</b>	<b>(603)</b>	<b>(646)</b>
<b>Budget Gap</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Cumulative 10 year position (surplus)/deficit:</b>											<b>(66)</b>

<b>Effect of Terms &amp; Conditions Savings Changes</b>												
Effect of changes				320	370	405	288	145	(17)	(318)	(504)	(691)
REVISED Cont to/(from) Stabilisation Reserve		265	736	725	(164)	(424)	(425)	(391)	(200)	(99)	45	
<b>Cumulative 10 year position (surplus)/deficit:</b>											<b>(68)</b>	