

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Northstowe & New Communities Portfolio Holder

23 June 2011

AUTHOR/S: Executive Director (Corporate Services)

FINANCIAL MONITORING REPORT NORTHSTOWE & NEW COMMUNITIES PORTFOLIO FINAL REVENUE AND CAPITAL EXPENDITURE FOR 2010-11

Purpose

1. The purpose of this report is to compare the actual revenue and capital expenditure for the Northstowe & New Communities Portfolio with the final working budget for the year ending 31 March 2011.

Recommendations

2. That the Northstowe & New Communities Portfolio Holder notes the revenue and capital expenditure for the Northstowe & New Communities Portfolio for the year ending 31 March 2011.

Reasons for Recommendations

3. The report shows an acceptable comparison between the actual revenue and capital expenditure against the working budget for the year.

Background

4. The Northstowe & New Communities Portfolio is one of the small number of changes to Cabinet made by the Leader of the Council on 23 May 2011. In terms of services that come under the remit of this portfolio, the only service under the previous Northstowe Portfolio was Communications, which now comes under the Policy & Performance Portfolio, while the only change from the services under the previous New Communities Portfolio is that Sustainability now comes under the Sustainability, Planning & Climate Change Portfolio.
5. There was one previous monitoring report to the then New Communities Portfolio Holder in 2010-11, covering expenditure up to the end of August 2010. In addition, the New Communities 2010-11 revised estimates were reported to the then portfolio holder in January 2011.
6. The format of this report is consistent with the previous monitoring report and the revised estimates report, in that it concentrates on the direct costs, which are under the control of the relevant cost centre managers, whereas the various recharges are dependent on factors that are more corporate in nature.
7. The reported figures are summarised in **Appendix A**. The working budgets against which to compare the year-end figures are the 2010-11 revised estimates, as adjusted for additional virements.
8. Grant expenditure is shown on a commitments basis to 31 March, whereas other expenditure is on an accruals basis.

Considerations

9. Total Direct Revenue Portfolio Expenditure: under by £25,896
The revenue net direct costs show £250,884 spent out of a budget of £276,780 (91%). The main areas of underspending are set out in paragraphs 10 to 14 below.
10. Community Development: under by £6,164
The underspend is mainly due to a late request for a £5,000 Community Developments Grant to fund a particular initiative, submitted to officers in March 2011, which - when assessed - did not quite fit the grant scheme criteria and was therefore rejected. [Note: This underspend has a disproportionate effect on the overall percentage spent against this budget.]
11. Sports Development: under by £3,901 – this is within 4% of both the original and revised 2010-11 estimates.
12. Arts Development: under by £2,518 – this is within 3% of both the original and revised 2010-11 estimates.
The portfolio holder has approved a rollover from 2010-11 to 2011-12 of £1,550 in respect of the Dual Use Arts Programme.
13. Growth Agenda: under by £5,742
The underspend is due to less use of consultants in the year than anticipated (£9,261 spent against the revised estimate of £15,000, which again has a disproportionate effect on the overall percentage spent against this budget).
14. Planning Policy: under by £7,571
Less expenditure was required on the Local Development Framework in the year than anticipated (£8,646 spent against the revised estimate of £15,320, which again has a disproportionate effect on the overall percentage spent against this budget).
15. Capital Grant Expenditure: under by £4,731
Capital grant expenditure comprises Village Sports Facility Grants, Community Facilities Grants (both of which were virtually fully allocated by the year-end) and Arts Capital Grants, of which grants of £10,250 were awarded out of the remaining budget of £14,940 at the then New Communities Portfolio Holder meeting in March 2011.
16. Other Capital Expenditure (River Cam Project): over by £170
This capital expenditure – while it slightly exceeded the working budget – is externally funded, which means that the small adverse variance is covered.

Implications

17. Financial	Financial implications are set out in paragraphs 9 to 16 above.
Legal, Staffing, Risk Management, Equality and Diversity	There are no Legal, Staffing, Risk Management, or Equality and Diversity implications resulting from this report.
Equality Impact Assessment completed	No Not applicable, as the report compares actual expenditure against the budget, rather than setting out a policy, strategy or procedure.
Climate Change	There are no Climate Change implications resulting from this report.

Consultations

18. The cost centre managers have been informed of the expenditure and grant details and budgets.

Consultation with Children and Young People

19. There has been no consultation with children and young people on this report.

Effect on Strategic Aims

20. The report has no effect on the strategic aims of the Council.

Conclusions / Summary

21. There was underspending of £25,896 (9%) on direct costs for this portfolio; reasons for the variances on individual budget headings are given in paragraphs 9 to 14 above.
22. There was underspending of £4,561 (2%) on the capital programme for this portfolio; reasons for the variances are given in paragraphs 15 and 16 above.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

Budget files, grant decisions and the financial management system.

Contact Officer: John Garnham – Principal Accountant (General Fund and Projects)
Telephone: (01954) 713101