

# Supplementary Committee Agenda



## **Overview & Scrutiny Committee Thursday, 19th November, 2020**

**Place:** Virtual Meeting on Zoom

**Time:** 7.00 pm

**Democratic Services Officer:** V Messenger Tel: (01992) 564243  
Email: [democraticservices@eppingforestdc.gov.uk](mailto:democraticservices@eppingforestdc.gov.uk)

---

### **4. MINUTES (Pages 3 - 14)**

To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 15 October 2020 (attached).

### **12. BUDGET MONITORING REPORT QUARTER 2 (Pages 15 - 24)**

To consider the budget monitoring report for quarter 2 (attached).

This page is intentionally left blank

## EPHING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MINUTES

**Committee:** Overview & Scrutiny Committee      **Date:** Thursday, 15 October 2020

**Place:** Virtual Meeting on Zoom      **Time:** 7.30 - 10.45 pm

**Members Present:** Councillors M Sartin (Chairman) R Jennings (Vice-Chairman) R Baldwin, P Bolton, L Burrows, D Dorrell, I Hadley, S Heather, J Lea, S Murray, D Plummer, S Rackham, P Stalker, D Stocker, D Sunger, J H Whitehouse and D Wixley

**Other Councillors:** Councillors R Bassett, N Bedford, R Morgan, M Owen, A Patel, J Philip, C Whitbread, H Whitbread and J M Whitehouse

**Apologies:** -

**Officers Present:** G Blakemore (Chief Executive), N Dawe (Chief Operating Officer), P Maginnis (Service Director (Corporate Services)), V Messenger (Democratic Services Officer), R Moreton (Corporate Communications Officer), A Small (Strategic Director Corporate and 151 Officer), L Wade (Service Director (Strategy, Delivery & Performance)) and G Woodhall (Team Manager - Democratic & Electoral Services)

**By Invitation:** Ms S Rea (Associate Director – EPUT)

---

### 29. WEBCASTING INTRODUCTION

The Chairman reminded everyone present that this virtual meeting would be broadcast live to the Internet, and that the Council had adopted a protocol for the webcasting of its meetings.

### 30. SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

The Committee noted that no substitute Members had been appointed for this meeting.

### 31. MINUTES

**Resolved:**

(1) That the minutes of the meeting held on 16 July 2020 be taken as read and signed by the Chairman as a correct record, subject to the following amendment:

(a) adding Cllr J M Whitehouse to the list of attendees.

### 32. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest pursuant to the Council's Code of Member Conduct.

**33. PUBLIC QUESTIONS & REQUESTS TO ADDRESS THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

The Committee noted that no public questions or requests to address the meeting had been received.

**34. EXECUTIVE DECISIONS - CALL-IN**

The Chairman updated the Committee on progress with the call-in received regarding releasing the restrictive covenants at Epping Forest College in Loughton.

There had been an informal meeting held regarding the call-in and the lead signatory had indicated that sufficient progress had been made and discussions were ongoing so there was not the need to debate the call-in at the current time and that it would be withdrawn in the not too distant future.

**35. LOCAL MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES - SCRUTINY OF EXTERNAL ORGANISATION**

The Chairman introduced Ms S Rea, Associate Director of West Essex Mental Health Services, from the Essex Partnership University NHS Foundation Trust (EPUT) as the Committee had previously requested an opportunity to undertake external scrutiny of local mental health services.

Ms S Rea gave a presentation to the Committee to answer the specific questions raised by Members before the meeting and provide a wider overview of the services provided by the EPUT within the District:

- Impact of Covid-19 on mental health;
- How we responded;
- Response during Covid:
  - o Older people and those with dementia;
- Projected surge;
- Mental health & wellbeing of students aged 18 +;
- Funding for local mental health services;
- Working in collaboration;
- EPUT Services in Epping Forest;
- Services for older people and all age dementia; and
- Adult community.

The Chairman thanked Ms S Rea for her presentation and requested questions from the Committee. In response to a number of questions from Cllr S Rackham, Ms S Rea stated that it was always considered that a second wave of Covid-19 infections would have mental health ramifications with a gradually developing peak. Consideration was already being given to further supporting those people already using the local services, as well as considering how to further support those people previously released from the local services. Extra funding for the Crisis Team had come from NHS England, but the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) had to make a commitment to using that funding for long term care. The Trust was also examining how to develop the Crisis Team using funding from Essex County Council, for example the Crisis Café in Harlow. It was acknowledged that risk assessments were challenging in the current circumstances, but the Trust was actively checking in with people on their books – although some of these people were not keen on having outsiders come to their homes.

Cllr D Plummer acknowledged that mental health services were not funded as well as they should be, and enquired if there was any specific help that could be given to the

mental health of young people as they become adults. Ms S Rea accepted that there was a gap in mental health provision for youngsters as they transitioned from children to adults, and there was a project whereby adult services became involved with an individual from the age of 17. A pilot scheme for young people aged 18 – 25 appeared to be working well and it was intended to continue with this scheme. The Trust supported any initiative which reinforced the view mental health was an issue that could affect anyone.

Cllr S Murray was heartened to hear that services were not withdrawn during the first Pandemic, and complimented the quality of the staff who supported a weekly mental health group in Loughton. The Councillor commented that schools were far more aware of mental health issues with children now, but felt that it was still difficult for children aged 11- 18 to access services, or they were accessing them too late. Finally, was mental health services now being adequately funded? Ms S Rea informed the Committee that the Trust did not deal with mental health issues for children, but contact details for the relevant bodies had been provided to Officers. Ms S Rea felt that investment in mental health services was improving as they had a higher profile now, but CCGs were being held to account for the services they were providing.

Cllr J H Whitehouse enquired as to what support was provided by the Home Support Team and how long it lasted for. Ms S Rea explained that Psychiatrists and Mental Health Nurses within the Team could initiate medication if required, provide counselling and provide support around social issues such as employment and housing. The individual would stay under the care of the Team for as long as their episode required, before being transferred to a Community Team. The Community Team would continue to monitor the individual and provide support in accordance with their care plan and mental health needs. They were not visited as often as when they were under the Home Support Team, but they were given support in re-engaging with their local community.

Cllr D Sunger highlighted the bold message of World Mental Health Day, i.e. that it is ok to not be ok, and that mental health issues affected 1 in 4 people in any given year. Had the Trust considered a similar initiative for the District? Ms S Rea stated that the Trust always campaigned on World Mental Health Day to raise local awareness of mental health issues. For example, middle-aged men were most likely to commit suicide for various different reasons, and the Trust was working on a number of initiatives to deal with this issue. Any work with the Council to promote positive mental health wellbeing would be excellent, and the Trust would support any joint initiatives with the Council.

In response to a number of questions from Cllr A Patel, Ms S Rea informed the Committee that there were a whole range of initiatives that the Trust could work alongside the Council to progress. In respect of cross border transitions of patients, there was a clear transfer process which was followed. The Trust worked across the traditional borders of administrative units, and the Home Support Team would provide assistance in the early stages outside of the Trust's area. The Trust had a place of safety at the Derwent Centre in Harlow, where people could go if they wished, and a number of Crisis Cafes were also being developed. There was also a Street Triage Service which could be contacted by the Police if mental health issues were identified during an incident. For community referrals, the Trust had accepted direct referrals from the general public for some time now if it was noticeable that a neighbour was suffering from mental health issues for example, and the 1112 telephone number was open for everyone to use if required. It was acknowledged that with awareness of mental health issues having increased, it was difficult to find suitably qualified staff. There was a national shortage of such staff, but the Trust had

attended a stakeholders event to identify particular gaps in staffing and Mental Health Coaches were also used to raise awareness with suitably qualified people.

The Committee had no further questions and Ms S Rea emphasised that she would be happy to answer any further questions from Councillors in the days after the meeting. Cllr M Sartin opined that this item had raised as many questions as it had answered, and thanked Ms S Rea for her attendance at the meeting.

**Resolved:**

- (1) That the external scrutiny by the Committee of the Essex Partnership University NHS Foundation Trust regarding the current provision, planning, management and performance of local mental health services across the Epping Forest District be noted.

### **36. ACCOMMODATION STRATEGY**

The Service Manager for Strategy, Delivery & Performance, L Wade, presented a verbal update on the Accommodation Strategy.

L Wade reported that the refurbishment works of the Civic Offices were progressing well, and discussions had progressed on the Travel Plan with the appointment of a Sustainable Transport Officer. It was highlighted that the Strategy for the space had been focused on introducing new ways of working and learnings from how individuals had been working from home, leading to a focus on collaboration. In terms of both partner and commercial space, there had been some positive interest. The Customer Journey for residents was also being developed, and a budget update was provided for the Committee which indicated that the Strategy was on target.

Cllr S Murray requested further information on the community groups that would be based in the refurbished Civic Offices, as the current impression was that there was more emphasis on securing commercial enterprises to share the building rather than community groups. Cllr S Murray also informed the Committee that Citizens Advice could not consider using any of the space inside the Civic Offices as the cost of the proposed lease was more for less space than what they were paying for and using at the moment.

L Wade responded that no agreements had been finalised with any local groups, and that discussions were on-going with Voluntary Action Epping Forest (VAEF) and the Library service at the current time. Cllr S Murray opined that VAEF and the Library would not form the sort of Community Hub that had originally been proposed. The Leader of the Council, Cllr C Whitbread, reassured the Committee that the Council was in discussions with various bodies about sharing the space in the Civic Offices. The Leader would be happy to discuss the current situation with Citizens Advice further with Cllr S Murray, and added that the refurbishment would create a brilliant space within the Civic Offices for the Council and others to use.

**Resolved:**

- (1) That the update on progress with the implementation of the Council's Accommodation Strategy be noted.

### **37. PEOPLE STRATEGY**

The Service Director for Business Support, P Maginnis, presented a verbal update on progress with the implementation of the Council's People Strategy.

P Maginnis referenced to the 'Candidate Journey' video from the last meeting, and informed the Committee that a full update on the Strategy had been provided at the recent meeting of the Stronger Council Select Committee. A lot of time and resource had been spent on developing measures to support the mental health and wellbeing of staff recently, as well as the development of Key Performance Indicators to measure the work from the People Strategy. The Council's Apprentice Programme had been further developed and the Council now had more apprentices employed than was required under its public sector duty. The Council was also using the Apprentice Levy for training purposes.

Cllr S Murray commented that a number of the current Apprentices were ex-pupils of Roding Valley High School where the Councillor worked, and they were very complimentary of the scheme. Councillor H Whitbread welcomed Cllr S Murray's comments, and highlighted that young people were affected more by the Covid-19 pandemic than other sectors of society. Councillor C Whitbread added that the Council produced excellent Apprentices, and that the majority of the people currently in furlough were aged 19 – 24. Essex County Council had also recently launched an entry into work scheme for young people.

Cllr R Jennings enquired, from a mental health and wellbeing perspective, whether considerable numbers of staff had issues dealing with the isolation of working from home? P Maginnis responded that a number of questions had been added to the staff survey on display screens relating to coping with working from home, which had identified a number of issues. To address these issues, further support and guidance had been provided for Team Managers, as well as online resources that staff could access. In addition, it was planned to have 10% of staff trained as mental health first aiders by the end of February 2021.

At the conclusion of this item, the Committee adjourned for a five-minute comfort break.

**Resolved:**

- (1) That the verbal update on progress with the Council's People Strategy be noted.

**38. QUALIS QUARTERLY MONITORING REPORT - Q1/Q2 2019/20**

At the request of the Chairman, the Committee agreed to take this item and the next item on the agenda together.

The Strategic Director, A Small, presented the two Quarterly Monitoring reports for Qualis covering the first three quarters of 2020/21, and stated that he would focus on the report for the third quarter. The emphasis during this period for Qualis had been in completing the loan funding transaction, progressing planning work for the Epping development sites and preparing for the transfer of the Housing Repairs service from the Council to Qualis. Qualis was meeting its obligations under the shareholders agreement, and all but one of the key performance indicators had been met. The Covid-19 pandemic had delayed many of the key actions for both the Council and Qualis, some of the originally planned targets had slipped, and the pandemic had affected values and capital markets, but good progress was now being made. The next quarter would be different as key asset acquisitions and further service transfers would take place, and future monitoring reports would reflect this.

Councillor M Sartin enquired whether local companies had been secured to fulfil the various roles outlined in the report? The Chief Operating Officer, N Dawe, stated that Qualis had required an audit company with the necessary skills and experience but the auditors engaged were a local regional company. Legal support was temporarily being provided by a non-local company, but it was the intention for Qualis to use local companies in preference wherever possible.

Cllr J H Whitehouse referred to the options for the re-provision of a Leisure Centre in Epping, and queried when would the decision be made regarding the provision of a Sports Hall in the new Leisure Centre? The Chief Executive, G Blakemore, stated that the next stage of public consultation for the Epping development sites, including the Leisure Centre, would begin in early November. The Leader of the Council, Cllr C Whitbread, added that the responses for this next stage of the public consultation would inform the resulting planning applications for the different sites. Cllr S Murray was concerned that the residents of Epping could be disappointed if the replacement Leisure Centre did not contain a Sports Hall, and the Board of Qualis needed to take note of this. Cllr D Wixley also commented that he hoped a Sports Hall would be included; N Dawe reiterated that a decision had yet to be taken.

Cllr J M Whitehouse enquired whether Qualis would continue to own the proposed new Leisure Centre in Epping or whether it would be leased to the Council? N Dawe reminded the Committee that the current Leisure Management contract with Places for Leisure gave them the right to design and build the new Leisure Centre, and this was the subject of ongoing discussions. No commercial decision had yet been taken over whether to purchase or lease the new Leisure Centre.

Cllr S Murray went on to enquire if Qualis would also consult with the recognised trades unions as part of the staff consultation plan for the transfer of the Housing Repairs service? A Small responded that the law required meaningful consultation and so it would involve the recognised trades unions. Cllr D Wixley commented that he hoped the Housing Repairs staff would not be disadvantaged as a result of their transfer, but A Small reassured the Councillor that they would retain their existing benefits under the TUPE regulations.

Cllr D Wixley wanted confirmation that the Pyrles Lane Nursery had been purchased by Qualis. N Dawe reminded the Committee that the Nursery site at Pyrles Lane had originally been the subject of a conditional offer to purchase by a third party, but this had been withdrawn. A Small added that the Council would lend funds to Qualis to purchase this and other sites, and would earn interest on those loans. It had not been part of the first batch of property assets to be transferred to Qualis. Cllr D Wixley also asked for the neighbours to be taken into consideration when the site was developed as their back gardens all backed onto the Nursery site. N Dawe acknowledged that it was a difficult site to develop but Qualis would be mindful of the neighbours, as indeed it would be of any site within the District that it developed. Cllr D Wixley also enquired whether the management of private rented properties in Loughton referred to in the report related to the Council-owned properties in the High Road? N Dawe confirmed that this related to the residential properties owned by the Council in Centric Parade.

In response to some questions from Cllr I Hadley, N Dawe stated that Qualis would provide any information required by the Council as a shareholder, and that A Small had been appointed as the intermediary between the Council and Qualis. A Small added that the Council had considerable control over Qualis through the Shareholder Agreement, including unfettered access to their accounts, and was content that there was sufficient access to Qualis information for the Council.



Cllr D Plummer wanted confirmation that any Council housing built through Qualis would not be subject to Right-to-Buy? N Dawe replied that none of the proposed property transactions had an envisaged future sale in terms of social housing. The sites were more likely to consist of privately rented properties, but would provide some affordable housing. Cllr Plummer was disappointed to hear this as he felt that the District needed more social housing throughout the District.

Cllr J M Whitehouse requested further clarification regarding the purchases yet to be actioned referred to in the report for quarter 3, and whether the forecast shortfall in income for the Council of £1.6million represented interest payments for loans already agreed for Qualis. N Dawe explained that the search for potential investment properties began in March 2020, and several have been examined. The first purchases should be actioned by the end of October, although it generally took 6 to 8 weeks to complete a purchase, which would hopefully give a yield of 7%. N Dawe confirmed that the shortfall in income to the Council represented lost interest payments.

Cllr H Whitbread, the Portfolio Holder for Housing & Community Services, reminded the Committee that the Council had a successful Housebuilding Programme in the District, and was considering further ways of assisting people to own their homes. In addition, the first few weeks following the transition of the Housing Repairs staff to Qualis had been successful with more repairs being undertaken by staff for tenants.

**Resolved:**

- (1) That the Qualis Quarterly Monitoring reports for quarters 1, 2 and 3 of 2020/21 be noted.

**39. QUALIS QUARTERLY MONITORING REPORT - Q3 2019/20**

This item had been considered in conjunction with the previous item on the agenda.

**40. COVID-19 UPDATE**

The Strategic Director, A Small, presented an update report on the Covid-19 pandemic.

A Small reported that the Council had responded to the pandemic in a proactive and positive fashion and had also played an active part in the co-ordinated Greater Essex response. Most of the Council's services were now operating normally but with some necessary restrictions to ensure the safety of staff and residents. With the easing of the national lockdown, the Council's response had moved from 'Response' to 'Restoration' with a forward look to the 'Recovery' phase. However, there was the continued threat of a second spike in infections, and since the report was written the infection rate within the District had increased significantly from 49 to 90 infections.

A Small stated that Officers felt that the Council had acted quickly to help residents, businesses and staff during the first wave of the pandemic. The Council ensured that local democracy had continued through the implementation of virtual meetings, and the regular Portfolio Holder Advisory Group (PHAG) meetings had helped to shape the policy decisions taken by the Council. It was felt that the support infrastructure was now much more resilient and the Council was better placed to cope with further spikes of infections, but it would be interesting to understand the Member perception of the Council's response to the pandemic.

The Vice-Chairman, Cllr R Jennings, felt that the Council had responded quickly for the benefit of residents, but wondered what services were suspended and the impact of this. A Small stated that Leisure provision and children's play areas were initially suspended, but they had now reopened to the public albeit with restrictions. However, many core services such as waste collection had been able to continue as normal, and the Corporate Communications Team had issued a significant number of press releases to keep residents informed.

Cllr J H Whitehouse highlighted that the Careline alarms service had not been provided during the first wave of the pandemic, which was a vital service for elderly people living on their own, and the Councillor requested that every effort be made to not suspend this service again. A Small accepted that community alarms were important to the people who received them, and the Council would ensure that this service was prioritised during any second wave of infections. In the future, it was planned for Essex County Council to provide a county-wide service for Careline.

Cllr D Wixley enquired whether there were any notes taken of the PHAG meetings for Councillors to examine, and where were most of the infections in the District occurring? A Small replied that the notes of the PHAG meetings were informal but he could discuss any particular areas of concern with individual Councillors if they wished. Although the spread of infections had been seen across the whole District, they were concentrated in Loughton, Buckhurst Hill and Waltham Abbey. The current total of 90 infections was above average for the East of England, but below average for the whole of the country. However, unless the Council took action now then there was the possibility of the District being in the same position as some of the larger cities throughout the country.

Cllr S Murray commented that the Council did what its residents could reasonably expect of it, and it did it well. The Councillor shared the concerns raised about the Careline service, but pointed out that the County Council had delayed their takeover of the service until April 2021. The Council's waste collection service had performed well, as had its management of the homeless and the economic support grants were also progressed quickly by Officers. Cllr S Murray also wanted to congratulate Cllr C Whitbread on his leadership of the Council during the first wave of the pandemic. However, there had not been as much done to encourage social distancing in Loughton as there had in Epping, and the Councillor was also disappointed at the response of the Member of Parliament for Epping Forest during the pandemic as the corresponding Member for Harlow had had a much higher public profile during the pandemic.

Cllr D Sunger was concerned that two of his residents had passed away during a weekend and had to be buried within 24 hours for religious reasons, but this had not happened. Could not the Council assist with such requests in the future. The Chief Executive, G Blakemore, informed the Committee that the Council had taken up this request with the County Council to provide an out-of-hours service for residents to access.

Cllr J Lea highlighted the issue of many people not wearing face coverings, and there had been no social distancing in a nightclub in Waltham Abbey. A Small reassured the Committee that the Council was taking enforcement action against some establishments due to the lack of social distancing measures. Cllr H Whitbread added that the Council's Licensing Team was working closely with the Police on these issues, and if Members observed any further breaches of the regulations then please report them.

Cllr J M Whitehouse praised the efforts of the Council's staff over the summer, but queried when the Council's Housing Repairs team would be able to respond to requests in accordance with those set out in the Tenants Handbook? A Small agreed that planned maintenance work was more problematic, and would investigate further before responding to the Councillor.

The Leader of the Council, Cllr C Whitbread, informed the Committee that on Friday of last week, there were 45 patients in Essex hospitals with Covid-19; as of 8.00am this morning (6 days later) this number had risen to 87, therefore the County Council was right to request that the county be moved into Tier 2 of the restrictions. The Council had been fully tested by the pandemic and had done the right things for residents. The Council had received support from the national Government, and Officers had performed well to make the payments to local businesses in a timely fashion. The Leader felt that there had been a number of positives for the Council during the pandemic: the waste collection service had been excellent; the homeless had been taken off of the streets and looked after; and the Management Team had performed excellently also. However, the Council should also learn any lessons from the first wave and be ready for any possible second wave of infections.

**Resolved:**

- (1) That the good response of the Council thus far to the Covid-19 pandemic be noted, but that lessons be learnt for any potential second wave of infections in the near future.

**41. CORPORATE PLAN KEY ACTION PLAN 2020/21 - QUARTER 2 PROGRESS**

L Wade, the Service Manager for Strategy, Delivery & Performance, presented a report on progress with the Service Plan objectives for the second quarter of 2020/21.

L Wade reported that the Committee was being asked to determine the level of reporting that should be presented to the Council's Scrutiny function, either: a summary of progress at the programme and project level; or a summary of progress at the programme level with exceptions reported at the project level. It was also reported that there were three projects within the programmes that were currently 'red' in terms of the progress made during the quarter. For the Telecare Offering project, there had been a delay in the cessation of the service following the withdrawal of the Essex County Council tender, there had also been a delay in the completion of the ICT restructure, and in the review of the main modifications document for the Local Plan resulting from the Planning Inspector's limited capacity to undertake the review. The Committee was also requested to review the performance of the Key Performance Indicators for the first two quarters of 2020/21, and review the recommended Indicators for reporting in quarter 3.

Due to the lateness of the hour, Cllr D Sunger proposed that this report be deferred until the Committee's next meeting, which was seconded by Cllr D Plummer, and L Wade confirmed that she was happy for this report to be held over until the next meeting.

**Resolved:**

- (1) That the report be deferred until the next meeting of the Committee on 19 November 2020.

**42. UK INNOVATION CORRIDOR - SCRUTINY OF EXTERNAL ORGANISATION**

The Chairman, Cllr M Sartin, requested that if Members had any questions or key lines of enquiry for the external scrutiny of the UK Innovation Corridor then they inform the Team Manager for Democratic & Electoral Services – G Woodhall. Cllr R Jennings requested that the contact details for the UK Innovation Corridor be placed in the Council Bulletin as well.

**43. CABINET BUSINESS**

The Committee considered the Executive's current programme of Key Decisions.

Cllr J H Whitehouse raised a general point that new Council policies should be considered by Overview & Scrutiny first before they were agreed by the Cabinet, and cited the proposed Right-to-Buy Disposals policy as an example. The Housing & Community Services Portfolio Holder, Cllr H Whitbread, explained that the policy would simply use Right-to-Buy receipts to buy new properties as part of the Council Housebuilding Programme before the receipts expired and had to be returned to the Government.

**Resolved:**

- (1) That the Executive's current Programme of Key Decisions be noted.

**44. OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - WORK PROGRAMME**

The Team Manager for Democratic & Electoral Services, G Woodhall, presented the Overview & Scrutiny Committee Work Programme for 2020/21.

Following on from the earlier external Scrutiny of local adult Mental Health Services, Cllr M Sartin proposed that external scrutiny of local youth Mental Health services be undertaken – either later this municipal year or during the next municipal year.

**Resolved:**

- (1) That the external scrutiny of local youth Mental Health services be added to the Work Programme; and
- (2) That, as revised above, the current Overview & Scrutiny Work Programme for 2020/21 be noted.

**45. SELECT COMMITTEES - WORK PROGRAMME**

The Committee considered the current Work Programmes for the three Select Committees.

Stronger Communities Select Committee

The Chairman of the Stronger Communities Select Committee, Cllr D Sunger, informed the Committee that the District Police Commander was due to attend the Select Committee's next meeting in January 2021.

Stronger Place Select Committee

The Chairman of the Stronger Place Select Committee, Cllr R Bassett, informed the Committee that the corporate governance policy for Select Committees had been

reviewed, as well as the Council Housebuilding Programme; phase five would see another 256 properties added to the Council's housing stock.

**Resolved:**

- (1) That the Work Programmes for the three Select Committees be noted.

**46. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

The Committee noted that there was no other urgent business for consideration at the meeting.

**47. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS**

The Committee noted that there was no business which necessitated the exclusion of the public and press from the meeting.

**CHAIRMAN**

This page is intentionally left blank



## Report to Overview & Scrutiny Committee

**Date of meeting: 19th November 2020**

**Subject: Quarter 2 Budget Monitoring Report 2020/21**

**Portfolio Holder: Councillor John Philip**

**Officer contact for further information: Chris Hartgrove 01992 564000 (Ext. 2532)**

**Democratic Services Officer: Vivienne Messenger 01992 564265**

# SCRUTINY



---

### Recommendations/Decisions Required:

1. The General Fund revenue position at the end of Quarter 2 (30th September 2020) for 2020/21, including actions being or proposed to improve the position, where significant variances have been identified, be noted (*Appendix A*).
2. The General Fund capital position at the end of Quarter 2 (30th September 2020) for 2020/21 be noted (*Appendix B*).
3. The Housing Revenue Account capital position at the end of Quarter 2 (30th September 2020) for 2020/21 be noted (*Appendix C*).

### Executive Summary:

This report sets out the 2020/21 General Fund revenue and capital positions, as at 30th September 2020 ("Quarter 2"). The report also updates the Committee on the Quarter 2 capital position for the Housing Revenue Account.

The revenue elements of the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) are currently under review, with detailed projections being developed for the Quarter 3 stage for consideration by Members. This will include an update on progress against the Council's adopted 30-Year HRA Business Plan.

In terms of General Fund revenue expenditure – at the Quarter 2 stage – a budget over spend of £1.944 million is forecast, with projected net expenditure of £19.118 million against an overall budget provision of £17.174 million.

The General Fund revenue position is dominated by the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic. Most notably:

- **Budget Pressures** – a range of 2020/21 budget pressures are being experienced, especially on Council income streams. Major cost centres affected include:
  - Leisure Facilities (£2,815,030) – the combined impact of the loss of the Management Fee is exacerbated by the need for compensation payments to the contractor in order to maintain the availability of Leisure Centres, whilst complying with social distancing requirements
  - Qualis Income (£2,112,071) – a major shift in economic assumptions such as property prices and interest rates have reduced achievable income streams from the Qualis initiative in the year. This has also reduced the Council's forecast borrowing costs, thereby offsetting the overall reduction.
  - Car Parking (£1,011,359) – there has been a major decline in the usage of Council car parks in 2020/21, especially during the initial 'lockdown' phase. A huge increase in homeworking is also leading to a large – and sustained – reduction in in car park usage by commuters; and

- Development Control (£677,863) – a sharp downturn in income from Planning Fees is being experienced.
- **Government Support** – so far, the Government has been generally supportive of local authorities and recognises the scale of the financial challenge at a local level. To this end, £1.947 million in general un-ringfenced funding has already been provided, along with further support through an income loss compensation scheme, which is forecast to rise to £1.875 million by the year end (i.e. combined funding of circa £3.8 million).

Turning to capital spending:

- General Fund Capital Programme – the Council has incurred capital expenditure of £1.4 million at the Quarter 2 stage, against an overall budget of £17.43 million. However, increased spending on major schemes in the second half of the financial year is expected to result in overall expenditure of £17.34 million by the year end (leading to a net underspend of £0.094 million); and
- Housing Revenue Account – the Council has incurred capital expenditure of £6.369 million at the Quarter 2 stage, against an overall budget of £25.313 million. The year-end forecast anticipates overall expenditure of £18.427 million by the year end (leading to a net underspend of £6.886 million). Lower than planned Housebuilding in 2020/21 is the primary reason behind the variance.

The Committee should further note:

- Council Tax and Business Rates – due to the way in which the Collection Fund accounting system works for local taxation, the impact of any shortfalls in Council Tax and Business Rates will not be felt in the Council's budget until 2021/22. For example, an initial estimate included in the updated Medium-Term Financial Plan (MTFP) reported to the Cabinet on 16th November 2020 assumes an initial funding reduction of £1.3 million in 2021/22; and
- General Fund Reserve – the Council held an unallocated reserve balance of £7.759 million on its Balance Sheet as at 31st March 2020. After adjustment for District Development Fund (DDF) commitments for 2020/21 (£712,000), this leaves a balance of £7.047 million, which is adequate to absorb the currently projected overspend of £1.944 million for 2020/21.

Finally, the Covid-19 pandemic is a completely unprecedented event, and the forecasts presented in this report, whilst based on the best and latest available intelligence, will continue to remain uncertain for some time to come. In particular – at the time of finalising this report – the country has just entered a further period of 'lockdown'; initially for one month, the restrictions imposed on businesses and the community are likely to cause further damage to the fragile recovery of the Councils' income streams that have been experienced in recent months. Further clarity will be provided in the Quarter 3 report.

## 1) Background and Introduction

- 1.1 The Council's budget for 2020/21 (both General Fund and Housing Revenue Account) was approved by full Council on 25th February 2020. This report updates the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on how the Council's services have performed against their budgets in the first six months of the financial year, and projects forward to the anticipated outcome for the end of the financial year.
- 1.2 This is the second update for 2020/21 and includes an analysis of the General Fund revenue and capital positions, as well as an update on the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) capital position. The revenue elements of the HRA are currently under review, with detailed projections being developed for Quarter 3. This will include an update on progress against the Council's adopted 30-Year HRA Business Plan.



## 2) General Fund Revenue Budget

2.1 The General Fund revenue position for 2020/21, at the Quarter 2 stage – summarised by service area – is presented in **Appendix A**. The headline is a forecast budget overspend of £1.944 million, with projected net expenditure of £19.118 million against an overall budget provision of £17.174 million. The table below summarises the position by service area.

General Fund Revenue Budget 2020/21 (Quarter 2)			
Description	Budget 2020/21 (Updated)	Forecast Spending (31/03/21)	Variance
	£000's	£000's	£000's
Business Support	8,548	9,694	1,145
Community & Partnerships	3,156	3,134	(22)
Commercial & Regulatory	(4,947)	(6,019)	(1,072)
Contracts & Technical	5,371	9,161	3,791
Customer Services	3,695	3,478	(217)
Housing & Property	1,338	1,347	9
Planning	2,249	2,944	695
Chief Executive	2,174	1,747	(427)
Qualis	(3,626)	(1,514)	2,112
Government Covid Support	0	(3,822)	(3,822)
HRA Recharges	(2,642)	(2,642)	0
Financing	1,858	1,610	(248)
<b>Totals</b>	<b>17,174</b>	<b>19,118</b>	<b>1,944</b>

2.2 The notable variances to budget in the table include the following:

- Business Support (£1,145,274 million forecast Overspend) – the single largest factor, is an assumed requirement at this stage to provide an additional £500,000 towards the corporate Bad Debt Provision as the impact of the pandemic is likely to make general outstanding debts owed to the Council less collectable. Additional cost pressures have also been experienced due to the additional capacity required to manage Covid19 impacts, such as the ICT demands of homeworking and understanding the financial impact. Additional one-off costs are also anticipated on Legal Services as part of moving towards a fully shared service. However, the spending pressures in Business Support are being partially offset by savings in other areas.
- Commercial and Regulatory (£1,071,554 forecast Underspend) – the dominant factor is a positive variance of £1.146 million on Land and Property, driven by additional income from the Council's acquisition of premises; this occurred after the budget had been prepared, so the income is in addition to the base budget. In contrast, a forecast overspend of £205,400 is expected on Regulatory Services, due to a shortfall in Building Control income due to the pandemic.

- Contracts and Technical Services (£3,790,513 forecast Overspend) – the large projected overspend is due to two well documented financial pressures. Firstly, Car Parking (£1,011,359) with lower income resulting from lower demand for parking provision, due to changes in working and shopping habits as a result of the Pandemic. The introduction of a temporary 20 pence charge has helped increase take-up, but commuter long stay parking is still particularly low and will potentially remain so, for the foreseeable future. And secondly, Leisure Facilities (£2,815,030), which is the largest single Covid-19 related cost. The viability of the Places for Leisure contracts has changed dramatically, both during lockdown and during the subsequent period of restriction in how these centres can be used. For now, the Council is working with the contractor to share the losses on an open book basis, pending clarity emerging on whether operations will return to normal and within what timeframe.
- Customer Services (£216,935 forecast Underspend) – the single largest factor in the forecast underspend is a better than expected Subsidy recovery rate on Rent Allowances (impact £333,306). This is added to by savings on delayed elections and some staff vacancies, although there are some spending pressures on Housing Benefits (staffing) and Local Taxation due to the pandemic.
- Planning (£694,583 forecast Overspend) – the underlying pressure is dominated by the Development Control cost centre, which is anticipating an overspend of £677,863, driven by a major reduction in income from Planning Fees due to the pandemic.
- Chief Executive (£427,989 forecast Underspend) – a significant decline in the demand for set-up related costs for Qualis, resulting in a projected underspend of £313,040, is the primary reason for the anticipated underspend on the Chief Executive's budgets.
- Qualis Income (£2,112,071 forecast Overspend) – forecast income from Qualis is now significantly lower than that assumed within the original budget. The pandemic occurred at a critical time for the development of Qualis Business Plan as, necessarily, the organisation was required to focus on managing the impacts of the virus. The consequential delay in getting to a point where Qualis could implement its Business Plan, the Covid19 related impacts on property prices and the reductions in the capital financing costs have all had an impact on the base budget assumptions. When the budget was developed the Qualis related income was flagged as being dependent on key actions taking place during the year in order to deliver this income stream. Prudently, contingency was built into the budget plans should any slippage occur. This included a large contingency provision and the central control over the release of funding for some service investment activities until there was confidence that the targeted income had been achieved. Given the unknown nature of the pandemic this caution has proved fortuitous and enables the Council to accommodate the reduced Qualis income associated with the pandemic delays. The delays have also reduced the amount of borrowing the Council had expected to have taken at this point and also the cost of that borrowing. The reductions partially net off the forecast overspend here.
- Government Support (£3,821,956 forecast Underspend) – the Government has introduced a range of funding support streams and continues to consider its position in relation to on-going support. However, as it stands, the amount of expected support is approximately half of the cost of the pandemic on the Council. Thus far the Government has provided £1.947 million in general un-ringfenced support. It has also introduced an income loss compensation scheme, under which the Government has undertaken to cover 75% of the Council's income losses, but only after councils meet the first 5% of budgeted losses themselves. It is currently estimated that this will cover £1.875 million of Epping Forest District Council's income losses, but this may vary as actual income losses change. The Government continues to collect data on the actual costs of Covid-19 to individual councils via monthly returns. Whilst not certain, it is hoped that the Government will use this information to provide further support to the sector.

### 3) General Fund Capital Programme

3.1 The General Fund Capital Programme for 2020/21 as at 30th September 2020 is summarised – at a service level – in the table below. A more detailed analysis – at a scheme level – is included in **Appendix B**. The Programme – updated in the light of the Covid-19 pandemic – totals £17.43 million. Spending in the first 6 months was £1.4 million, with a forecast outturn of £17.34 million, which – if this materialises – would lead to a small net underspend of £0.094 million.

General Fund Capital Programme 2020/21 (Quarter 2)					
Description	Budget 2020/21 (Updated)	Spending (@ 30 Sept 2020)	Remaining Budget (@30 Sept 2020)	Forecast Spending (31/03/21)	Variance
	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's
Business Support	1,252	98	1,155	1,266	14
Commercial & Regulatory	12,177	1,210	10,967	12,141	(36)
Community & Partnerships	896	41	855	890	(6)
Contracts & Technical	2,645	2	2,643	2,570	(75)
Housing & Property	460	48	412	469	9
<b>Totals</b>	<b>17,430</b>	<b>1,399</b>	<b>16,032</b>	<b>17,336</b>	<b>(94)</b>

3.2 The table above shows that spending has been constrained in the first half of the financial year, which is – to a large extent – due to the disruption caused by the pandemic. However, capital spending this year is dominated by the Commercial & Regulatory element of the Programme and two schemes in particular:

- Civic Offices Accommodation – this is the largest General Fund project in 2020/21, with a project budget of £7.242 million (excluding IT costs). The bulk of the spending activity is anticipated in the second half of the financial year, with the new facility expected to open early in the new calendar year. The forecast outturn at this stage is £7.203 million, which would bring the project in on budget with just a small underspend of £39,000. In addition, budgeted IT costs of £0.907 million are anticipated, primarily during the fit-out stage of the project; and
- Investment Property Acquisitions – an unspent balance of £4.833 million was rolled forward into 2020/21 from the original allocation of £30.0 million in 2019/20 for investment property acquisitions. At the time of preparing this report, Council officers have identified and are pursuing a suitable investment opportunity, with a purchase expected to imminently conclude. It is currently anticipated that the remaining balance will be spent in full by the year end.

#### 4) Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Capital Programme

4.1 The Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Capital Programme for 2020/21 as at 30th September 2020 is summarised in the table below. A more detailed analysis – at a scheme level – is included in **Appendix C**. The Programme budget totals £25.313 million. Spending in the first 6 months was £6.369 million, with a forecast outturn of £18.427 million, which – if this materialises – would lead to an underspend of £6.886 million.

<b>HRA Capital Programme 2020/21 (Quarter 2)</b>					
<b>Description</b>	<b>Budget 2020/21 (Updated)</b>	<b>Spending (@ 30 Sept 2020)</b>	<b>Remaining Budget (@30 Sept 2020)</b>	<b>Forecast Spending (31/03/21)</b>	<b>Variance</b>
	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>
Housing Development	15,092	4,041	11,051	8,350	(6,742)
Capital Works	9,592	2,294	7,298	9,522	(70)
Other Housing Schemes	855	34	821	855	0
Vehicle Replacements	74	0	74	0	(74)
Leaseholder Contributions	(300)	0	(300)	(300)	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>25,313</b>	<b>6,369</b>	<b>18,944</b>	<b>18,427</b>	<b>(6,886)</b>

4.2 The dominating factor on the HRA Capital Programme for 2020/21, is Housing Development, with a net underspend of £6.742 million forecast for the year end at the Quarter 2 stage. There are two elements to note:

- *Housebuilding* – the Housebuilding Programme has a budget of £15.092 million for 2020/21 (including rolled forward funds of £640,000 from 2019/20). The projected outturn on the Programme is £5.326 million, which – if this materialises – would lead to an underspend of £9.766 million at year end. The Covid-19 pandemic has caused delays and – due to planning delays – Phase 4.4 has been removed from the 2020/21 Programme; however
- *Open Market Acquisitions* – the anticipated underspend has been offset by the purchase of some existing properties on the open market (£3.024 million). This has allowed the Council to increase its housing stock, whilst averting the loss of capital receipts from the Right to Buy (RTB) scheme (which are required to be paid over to the Government if they are not spent on replacement stock within three years). A further assessment of available RTB receipts is currently being undertaken and proposals to purchase further properties on the open market could be brought forward. Such purchases – should they occur – are not assumed in current projections.

4.3 It should be noted that the Housing Repairs service was transferred from the Council to Qualis with effect from 1st October 2020. The new arrangements affect the Capital Works element of the HRA Programme (e.g. capital works on voids). At the time of preparing this report, officers are now working with Qualis on developing detailed projections on Capital Works. These will be presented in the Quarter 3 report.

**Reason for Decision:**

This report facilitates the scrutiny of the Council's financial position for 2020/21. In terms of General Fund revenue, it is a very challenging year due to the financial pressures created by the Covid-19 pandemic. The comments made at this Committee, where relevant, will be reported to Cabinet for their consideration at their meeting on 3rd December 2020.

**Options:**

There are no matters for decision in this report. The Committee is asked to note the contents but may choose to take further action depending on the matters reported.

**Resource Implications:**

The resource implications in this report are overwhelmingly financial in nature, in the form of budgetary control. Robust budget monitoring processes maximise the opportunity for services to react quickly to potential problems as they emerge, thus reducing the risk of financial problems, impeding the delivery of strategic priorities.

**Legal and Governance Implications:**

The Council has a statutory obligation to maintain a balanced budget and the monitoring process enables the Committee to remain aware of issues and the process to be taken to maintain a balanced budget.

**Safer, Cleaner, Greener Implications:**

There are no SGS implications.

**Consultation Undertaken:**

The development of the original 2020/21 budget was informed by the statutory public consultation and democratic scrutiny processes.

**Background Papers:**

Management Accounts 2020/21 (Month 6)

**Risk Management**

The report is primarily presented for information only and has no risk management implications, although regular monitoring and reporting of the type included in this report ensures early warning of significant issues that may place the Council at financial risk. This gives the Cabinet the best opportunity to take actions to mitigate such risks.

## General Fund Revenue Budget 2020/21

## Quarter 2 Forecast

Service Area	Activity	Full Year Budget £'s	Net Expenditure			Forecast £'s	Variance £'s
			Budget (M6) £'s	Actual £'s	Variance £'s		
<b>Business Support</b>	Accommodation	909,840	680,028	357,431	(322,596)	866,680	(43,160)
	Business Support	1,660,060	824,825	683,162	(141,663)	1,424,850	(235,210)
	Cost Centres - Business Support	161,690	80,770	54,058	(26,712)	161,990	300
	Finance Support Services	804,040	383,705	491,220	107,515	1,001,295	197,255
	ICT	3,260,853	2,039,512	2,210,147	170,635	3,624,380	363,527
	Other Activities	106,560	(9,695)	(3,131)	6,564	576,550	469,990
	Other Support Services	1,645,310	788,405	894,251	105,846	2,037,882	392,572
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>8,548,353</b>	<b>4,787,549</b>	<b>4,687,138</b>	<b>(100,411)</b>	<b>9,693,627</b>	<b>1,145,274</b>
<b>Community &amp; Partnerships</b>	Community, Health & Wellbeing	192,146	(53,207)	(123,135)	(69,928)	189,930	(2,216)
	Community & Partnership	410,053	113,787	4,832	(108,954)	395,865	(14,188)
	Community & Partnership Support Services	251,850	125,795	153,690	27,895	288,500	36,650
	Cost Centres - Community & Partnerships	1,346,500	695,180	689,078	(6,102)	1,306,110	(40,390)
	Museum, Heritage & Culture	659,120	293,265	299,827	6,562	657,580	(1,540)
	Voluntary Sector Support	296,320	125,930	119,238	(6,692)	296,320	-
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>3,155,989</b>	<b>1,300,750</b>	<b>1,143,529</b>	<b>(157,220)</b>	<b>3,134,305</b>	<b>(21,684)</b>
<b>Commercial &amp; Regulatory</b>	Commercial & Regulatory Support Services	550,160	287,420	339,052	51,632	705,560	155,400
	Cost Centres - Commercial & Regulatory	1,723,690	861,695	711,728	(149,967)	1,620,100	(103,590)
	Emergency Planning & Other	75,130	37,770	45,832	8,062	101,210	26,080
	Environmental Health	215,840	106,645	6,072	(100,573)	212,150	(3,690)
	Land & Property	(6,554,520)	(4,919,650)	(5,022,340)	(102,690)	(7,700,845)	(1,146,325)
	North Weald Centre	(7,370)	(130,665)	(69,625)	61,040	(32,699)	(25,329)
	Private Sector Housing	(115,570)	(27,870)	(778,588)	(750,718)	(295,070)	(179,500)
	Regulatory Services	(833,780)	(416,340)	(307,268)	109,072	(628,380)	205,400
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>(4,946,420)</b>	<b>(4,200,995)</b>	<b>(5,075,136)</b>	<b>(874,141)</b>	<b>(6,017,974)</b>	<b>(1,071,554)</b>
<b>Contracts &amp; Technical Services</b>	Car Parking	(959,470)	(620,637)	294,551	915,188	51,889	1,011,359
	Contracts & Technical Support Services	1,411,790	777,195	724,209	(52,986)	1,390,423	(21,367)
	Cost Centres - Contracts & Technical	1,272,830	634,515	548,463	(86,052)	1,248,370	(24,460)
	Land Drainage/Sewerage	107,200	58,720	36,093	(22,627)	114,490	7,290
	Leisure Facilities	(1,414,820)	(465,473)	697,197	1,162,671	1,400,210	2,815,030
	Parks & Grounds	852,840	53,590	37,577	(16,013)	656,770	3,930
	Waste Management	4,300,431	1,161,296	2,482,947	1,321,651	4,299,162	(1,269)
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>5,370,801</b>	<b>1,599,206</b>	<b>4,821,037</b>	<b>3,221,832</b>	<b>9,161,314</b>	<b>3,790,513</b>
<b>Customer Services</b>	Cost Centres - Customer Services	2,316,080	1,151,820	1,262,906	111,086	2,583,770	267,690
	Customer Support Services	1,878,660	916,760	858,294	(58,466)	1,752,270	(126,390)
	Elections	291,550	24,930	(106,488)	(131,418)	137,460	(154,090)
	Housing Benefits	(695,870)	64,130	(747,784)	(811,914)	(1,060,665)	(364,795)
	Local Taxation	(516,200)	(201,763)	(373,758)	(171,996)	(312,760)	203,440
	Member Activities	420,460	210,230	176,421	(33,809)	377,670	(42,790)
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>3,694,680</b>	<b>2,166,107</b>	<b>1,069,591</b>	<b>(1,096,516)</b>	<b>3,477,745</b>	<b>(216,935)</b>
<b>Housing &amp; Property</b>	Cost Centres - Housing & Property	546,890	273,050	237,436	(35,614)	520,370	(26,520)
	Facilities & Depot Management	636,860	245,893	170,285	(75,609)	694,140	57,280
	Homelessness	(304,090)	(390,280)	(429,464)	(39,184)	(347,970)	(43,880)
	Housing Policy	32,046	-	-	-	-	(32,046)
	Housing & Property Support Services	426,190	329,805	165,020	(164,785)	480,720	54,530
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1,337,896</b>	<b>458,468</b>	<b>143,277</b>	<b>(315,191)</b>	<b>1,347,260</b>	<b>9,364</b>
<b>Planning</b>	Cost Centres - Planning Services	1,535,400	766,135	847,558	81,423	1,631,610	96,210
	Local Plan Implementation	1,376,640	286,930	(283,075)	(570,005)	1,342,260	(34,380)
	Planning & Development	(1,156,300)	(573,790)	(376,501)	197,289	(458,697)	697,603
	Planning Support Services	493,560	246,780	214,330	(32,450)	428,710	(64,850)
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>2,249,300</b>	<b>726,055</b>	<b>402,313</b>	<b>(323,742)</b>	<b>2,943,883</b>	<b>694,583</b>
<b>Chief Executive</b>	Chief Executive Support Services	1,231,670	620,275	586,560	(33,715)	1,226,699	(4,971)
	Corporate Activities	49,560	12,015	84,574	72,559	76,582	27,022
	Other Activities	892,680	-	170,189	170,189	442,640	(450,040)
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>2,173,910</b>	<b>632,290</b>	<b>841,323</b>	<b>209,033</b>	<b>1,745,921</b>	<b>(427,989)</b>
<b>General Fund Total</b>		<b>21,584,509</b>	<b>7,469,430</b>	<b>8,033,072</b>	<b>563,643</b>	<b>25,486,081</b>	<b>3,901,572</b>
	<b>Qualis Income</b>	(3,626,398)	-	-	-	(1,514,327)	2,112,071
	<b>Government Support:</b>						
	Main Government Grant	-	-	(1,946,631)	(1,946,631)	(1,946,631)	(1,946,631)
	SFC Compensation	-	-	(725,325)	(725,325)	(1,875,325)	(1,875,325)
		<b>17,958,111</b>	<b>7,469,430</b>	<b>5,361,116</b>	<b>(2,108,313)</b>	<b>20,149,798</b>	<b>2,191,687</b>
<b>HRA Recharges</b>		(2,641,990)	-	-	-	(2,641,990)	-
		<b>15,316,121</b>	<b>7,469,430</b>	<b>5,361,116</b>	<b>(2,108,313)</b>	<b>17,507,808</b>	<b>2,191,687</b>
<b>Financing</b>	<i>Interest (inc. Qualis):</i>						
	Interest Receivable	(100,000)	(50,000)	(34,253)	15,747	(40,000)	60,000
	Interest Payable	1,443,600	-	-	-	911,992	(531,608)
	MRP (inc. Qualis)	514,000	-	-	-	738,000	224,000
<b>Net Expenditure</b>		<b>17,173,721</b>	<b>7,419,430</b>	<b>5,326,863</b>	<b>(2,092,566)</b>	<b>19,117,800</b>	<b>1,944,079</b>

## General Fund Capital Programme 2020/21

## Quarter 2 Forecast

	2019/20 Budget Outturn (xtract)			2020/21 Budget Progress (@ 30 September 2020: Q2)						
	2019/20 Unspent/ (Overspent) Balances	Savings	Balances Rolled Forward into 2020/21	Balances Rolled Forward from 2019/20	2020/21 Budget Allocation	2020/21 Budget (Updated)	Spending to Date	Remaining Budget	Forecast Outturn	Forecast Variance (Under)/ Over
Schemes	£'s	£'s	£'s	£'s	£'s	£'s	£'s	£'s	£'s	£'s
<b>Business Support</b>										
ICT General Schemes	2,397	2,397	-	-	111,000	111,000	20,582	90,418	111,000	-
ICT Strategy Implementation	122,137	12,037	110,100	110,100	124,000	234,100	68,274	165,826	247,617	13,517
Civic Offices (ICT)	-	-	-	-	907,000	907,000	8,627	898,373	907,000	-
<b>Sub-Totals</b>	<b>119,740</b>	<b>9,640</b>	<b>110,100</b>	<b>110,100</b>	<b>1,142,000</b>	<b>1,252,100</b>	<b>97,483</b>	<b>1,154,617</b>	<b>1,265,617</b>	<b>13,517</b>
<b>Commercial &amp; Regulatory</b>										
Civic Offices Accomodation	67,354	639	67,993	67,993	7,310,000	7,242,007	1,182,825	6,059,182	7,203,000	39,007
NWA Brexit HGV Parking	138,378	138,378	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
St Johns Road development	172,000	172,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Waltham Abbey SP site	339	339	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Investment Properties (Landmark Building & Cartersfield Road)	80,381	87	80,468	80,468	-	80,468	27,421	53,047	105,760	25,292
EFDC Shopping Park	21,677	-	21,677	21,677	-	21,677	-	21,677	-	21,677
Investment Property Acquisitions	4,833,000	-	4,833,000	4,833,000	-	4,833,000	-	4,833,000	4,833,000	-
<b>Sub-Totals</b>	<b>4,901,665</b>	<b>34,513</b>	<b>4,867,152</b>	<b>4,867,152</b>	<b>7,310,000</b>	<b>12,177,152</b>	<b>1,210,246</b>	<b>10,966,906</b>	<b>12,141,760</b>	<b>35,392</b>
<b>Community &amp; Partnership</b>										
CCTV Systems	38,639	7,562	31,077	31,077	170,000	201,077	40,153	160,924	194,675	6,402
Superfast Broadband	350,000	350,000	-	-	350,000	350,000	-	350,000	350,000	-
Museum Schemes	-	-	-	-	300,000	300,000	-	300,000	300,000	-
Car Park CCTV Systems	-	-	-	-	45,000	45,000	335	44,665	45,660	660
<b>Sub-Totals</b>	<b>388,639</b>	<b>357,562</b>	<b>31,077</b>	<b>31,077</b>	<b>865,000</b>	<b>896,077</b>	<b>40,488</b>	<b>855,589</b>	<b>890,335</b>	<b>5,742</b>
<b>Contract &amp; Technical</b>										
Leisure Centres	3,310	3,310	-	-	1,300,000	1,300,000	2,270	1,297,730	1,300,000	-
Grounds Maintenance	25,050	-	25,050	25,050	30,000	55,050	-	55,050	55,050	-
Climate & Enviromental	-	-	-	-	400,000	400,000	-	400,000	325,000	75,000
Highways	-	-	-	-	140,000	140,000	-	140,000	140,000	-
Parking & Traffic Schemes	60,000	60,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vehicle Fleet	-	-	-	-	750,000	750,000	-	750,000	750,000	-
<b>Sub-Totals</b>	<b>88,360</b>	<b>63,310</b>	<b>25,050</b>	<b>25,050</b>	<b>2,620,000</b>	<b>2,645,050</b>	<b>2,270</b>	<b>2,642,780</b>	<b>2,570,050</b>	<b>75,000</b>
<b>Housing &amp; Property</b>										
Depots	799	-	799	799	-	799	225	1,024	21,030	20,231
Investment Property works	48,541	10,563	37,978	37,978	315,000	352,978	37,018	315,960	354,985	2,007
Active Planned Maintenance	13	3,159	3,172	3,172	109,250	106,078	11,273	94,805	92,805	13,273
<b>Sub-Totals</b>	<b>49,327</b>	<b>13,722</b>	<b>35,605</b>	<b>35,605</b>	<b>424,250</b>	<b>459,855</b>	<b>48,066</b>	<b>411,789</b>	<b>468,820</b>	<b>8,965</b>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>5,547,731</b>	<b>478,747</b>	<b>5,068,984</b>	<b>5,068,984</b>	<b>12,361,250</b>	<b>17,430,234</b>	<b>1,398,553</b>	<b>16,031,681</b>	<b>17,336,582</b>	<b>93,652</b>

## Housing Revenue Account Capital Programme 2020/21

## Quarter 2 Forecast

	2019/20 Budget Outturn (xtract)			2020/21 Budget Progress (@ 30 September 2020: Q2)							
	2019/20 Unspent/ (Overspent) Balances	Savings	Balances Rolled Forward into 2020/21	Balances Rolled Forward from 2019/20	Virements between schemes 2020/21	2020/21 Budget Allocation	2020/21 Budget (Updated)	Spending to Date	Remaining Budget	Forecast Outturn	Forecast Variance
Schemes	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's
<b>Housing Development Programme:</b>											
Housebuilding	640	-	640	640	-	14,452	15,092	1,017	14,075	5,326	9,766
Open Market Acquisitions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,024	3,024	3,024	3,024
<b>Sub-Totals</b>	<b>640</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>640</b>	<b>640</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>14,452</b>	<b>15,092</b>	<b>4,041</b>	<b>11,051</b>	<b>8,350</b>	<b>6,742</b>
<b>Capital Works:</b>											
Heating	158	-	158	158	200	1,454	1,096	171	925	1,096	-
Windows, Door and Roofing	307	-	307	307	18	2,374	2,663	404	2,259	2,663	-
Compliance Planned Maintenance	44	3	41	41	30	265	276	38	238	276	-
Kitchens & Bathrooms (inc void allocation)	322	-	322	322	1,175	2,300	1,447	618	829	1,447	-
Electrical	69	-	69	69	200	1,001	1,132	571	561	1,132	-
Sprinklers	179	-	179	179	-	-	179	1	178	179	-
Environmental	128	9	119	119	43	240	402	-	402	402	-
Structural works	688	2	690	690	1,180	1,100	1,590	384	1,206	1,590	-
Disabled adaptations	6	-	6	6	-	450	444	46	398	444	-
Asbestos	18	-	18	18	-	205	223	61	162	223	-
Estate Improvements	-	-	-	-	-	140	140	-	140	70	70
<b>Sub-Totals</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>9,529</b>	<b>9,592</b>	<b>2,294</b>	<b>7,298</b>	<b>9,522</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Other Housing Schemes:</b>											
Service Enhancements	108	-	108	108	-	592	700	-	700	700	-
Oakwood Hill Depot Extension	155	-	155	155	-	-	155	34	121	155	-
<b>Sub-Totals</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>592</b>	<b>855</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>821</b>	<b>855</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Vehicle Replacements</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>Gross Expenditure</b>	<b>994</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>980</b>	<b>980</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>24,633</b>	<b>25,613</b>	<b>6,369</b>	<b>19,244</b>	<b>18,727</b>	<b>6,886</b>
<b>Leaseholder Contributions</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Net Expenditure</b>	<b>994</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>980</b>	<b>980</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>24,333</b>	<b>25,313</b>	<b>6,369</b>	<b>18,944</b>	<b>18,427</b>	<b>6,886</b>