



A

ceps A
✓out

PRIME MINISTER

COMMUNITY CHARGE CAPPING

In advance of our meeting on Monday I am sending you a copy of the paper on my capping proposals. Subject to minor amendments, I shall be circulating it on Monday for discussion at E(LG) on Tuesday 27 March. I thought it would be helpful if, in advance of that meeting and our own Monday meeting, I outlined some of the considerations affecting our approach to decisions on capping.

Capping is not an easy option. As my paper makes clear there are significant political and presentational disadvantages, and inevitably we shall face legal challenge with the potential embarrassment even if ultimately we are successful. Any capping scheme will produce anomalies, such as some capped authorities having lower charges than others not caught. Although there are good reasons for this (such as the operation of the safety net and the statutory threshold below which authorities are exempt from capping), we must recognise that such a result will be wholly inexplicable to the public.

Nor can I say that there is unbridled enthusiasm for capping among our supporters. Whilst my impression is that Parliamentary colleagues tend to favour capping - the Whips are currently conducting an exercise to ascertain more fully what colleagues feel - Conservatives in local government tend to be against capping because it could cut across their campaign at the forthcoming elections. And inevitably, whatever we do, some of our Parliamentary colleagues will be disappointed since there is no possibility of capping some of the authorities which we have been pressed to cap. Moreover, where our proposals for caps differ - as they will - from proposals for cuts put forward by Conservative groups on local councils this could create some difficulties for them.

CONFIDENTIAL



Nonetheless, we have made clear that if authorities budget excessively, we shall cap them. And undoubtedly chargepayers in selected authorities will welcome lower charges. I believe there is little option but to cap some authorities and I have therefore developed proposals which are in my judgement the toughest possible. I am very concerned that we do everything possible to avoid successful legal challenge, which could have serious implications not only for capping but for the whole new system. I am also anxious to ensure, as explained in my minute to you of 5 February, that we maintain our fast track timetable so that the 28 day period during which authorities can respond to my proposed caps ends before the May elections. If we were to adopt proposals involving capping significantly more authorities, the risk of successful challenge would inevitably increase and the timetable would be seriously at risk given the labour intensive nature of capping.

My preferred option is to cap authorities budgeting more than 12.5% and £75 per adult above SSA with a proviso that the budget is at least £26 above the criterion. This proviso ensures that we do not cap authorities where the reduction in charge is less than £26 and hence not worth the extra burden and expense of rebilling.

A combined percentage/per capita approach ensures that an authority is capped only if it has a significant overspend on SSA relative to the size of its budget which also results in a significant burden on chargepayers. A percentage approach by itself would give no direct recognition to the burden on chargepayers; a per capita approach by itself would not be an adequate measure of overspend relative to the budget concerned and could be difficult to defend in litigation if it represented only a small percentage overspend. It would be possible to have different criteria for different classes of authorities - say counties and districts, reflecting the relative size of their budgets - provided that there were a reasoned



justification for such an approach. But this would result in an authority in one class being able to impose a greater burden on chargepayers than an authority in another before we were prepared to cap. This would be illogical and unfair.

I could also cap authorities, although not high spenders in absolute terms, whose budgets represent an excessive increase over those for the previous year. There are very great difficulties in adopting this for 1990/91 because we would need to rely on notional 1989/90 budgets as the baseline against which to measure the increase. This reliance on notional figures would seriously increase the risk of successful legal challenge.

I have also considered whether to adopt tougher percentage or per capita figures within the combined measure of excessiveness which I propose. A percentage figure less than 12.5% above SSA would be legally risky. This was the minimum above GRE which was considered safe under ratecapping given the approximation inherent in GREs. To go below 12.5% on chargecapping would imply that SSAs were more accurate than GREs. This would be a very difficult argument to sustain. A per capita figure below £75 could not readily be represented as a significant extra burden on chargepayers when our own safety net arrangements can add £75 to the charge.

I have also considered whether a de minimis proviso of less than £26 per adult would be appropriate. Reducing it to, say, £13 would (on the basis of the 12.5%/£75 criterion) catch another seven authorities, increasing the total to 28. But I believe capping an authority to reduce its charge by only £13 - 25 pence per week - would be indefensible.

Finally, turning to the caps for selected authorities, the paper includes my preliminary views which will be subject to further refinement. The caps I finally propose will represent my judgement as to the lowest we could safely and reasonably reduce budgets without the risk of serious service disruption and financial

though that is the basis for transitional relief and the safety net. Rec 6.

CONFIDENTIAL



collapse. If E(LG) agrees I propose to fine tune the caps in consultation with colleagues during the course of next week.

I am copying this minute to Norman Lamont and to Sir Robin Butler.

RB

RB CP
23 March 1990

*(Approved by the Secretary of State
and signed in his absence).*

CONFIDENTIAL

THIS DOCUMENT IS THE PROPERTY OF HER BRITANNIC MAJESTY'S
GOVERNMENT

E(LG) (90)

COPY NO

MARCH 1990

CABINET

MINISTERIAL STEERING COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC STRATEGY

SUB-COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT

COMMUNITY CHARGE CAPPING 1990/91

Memorandum by the Secretary of State for the Environment

1. This paper sets out my proposals on charge capping for 1990/91. We need to decide:

- whether any authorities should be capped; and, if so,
- the criteria for selecting individual authorities; and
- the size of the cap we should propose for each selected authority.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Authorities' spending and charges

2. We now have details of all authorities' budgets. Overall, authorities are raising £3bn more from chargepayers than we assumed when we set Total Standard Spending for 1990/91 at £32.8bn. The average charge is £363. The average for shire areas is £360, for metropolitan areas £366, and in London, the average is £371. If all authorities had budgeted in line with SSAs the average charge would be around £273 (£278 before allowing for special grants).

Use of capping powers in 1990/91

3. Our capping powers enable us to require an authority which has budgeted excessively to reduce that budget with a consequent reduction in community charges. A description of the capping process is at Annex A. Our public stance has been that if authorities budget excessively we shall cap them.

4. By capping we can give chargepayers in selected authorities lower charges, which will undoubtedly be welcomed. And it will not only have an effect this year. It will also be a warning to authorities for the future that even if they are prepared to risk the direct accountability pressures in our new system, they will not be able to spend up with impunity. But we cannot look to capping, which attacks individual authorities' budgets on a selective basis, as a remedy for the macro economic problems of the £3bn local authority overspend. Indeed, the toughest capping option I judge we could safely adopt would give public expenditure savings of only £250m, although it would help some 4.3 million chargepayers. Nor as illustrated in Annex B can we look to capping to be a universal panacea for the problem of charges being higher than the public expected.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

5. Any capping scheme has considerable presentational and political drawbacks. Most importantly, as explained in Annex C, there will inevitably be anomalies, in particular where due to the safety net and special grants some authorities with low charges (eg under my options Calderdale with a charge of £297) may be capped, while authorities with considerably higher charges (eg South Oxfordshire with a charge of £456) may not be capped. We shall face attack that capping is an admission that our new system of improved accountability has failed, that we are not prepared to trust in the judgement of voters at the local elections, and that by requiring authorities to revise their budgets and issue fresh bills (necessitating the reassessment of community charge benefit) we are creating administrative chaos and expense for authorities. The very act of capping will continue to keep the community charge, and the Government's involvement with it, very much in the public eye right through to the summer recess when we shall be announcing our proposals for the 1991/92 Settlement, and possibly beyond. We are also likely to be faced with capped authorities publicly arguing that our caps are forcing them to make cuts in highly sensitive areas and damaging our own important initiatives in fields such as social services and education. Finally, over time the chosen criteria will indicate to authorities the level up to which they can safely budget, and in future years a number of authorities can be expected to increase their spending to that level.

6. Nonetheless, I believe we have little option but to cap the budgets of the highest spending authorities. We have always recognised that in the first year of the new system there might be need for capping given that the accountability pressures would not be fully in place, and the events have shown this to be the case.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Selection of authorities for capping

7. In considering the selection of authorities for capping I am particularly concerned that the criteria should be robust to legal challenge. There will inevitably be challenges and it is most important that we maintain the excellent record of success that we have had with ratecapping. A successful challenge to the validity of SSAs, for example, would not only create great difficulties for capping itself but could jeopardise the Revenue Support Grant settlement that we have made. The need for robust criteria has been a major consideration in my approach to selection.

8. The statute provides that I may select authorities whose budgets are in my opinion - on the basis of general principles - either excessive, or represent an excessive increase over the previous year, but I am not empowered to select any authority whose budget is below a threshold of £15m. Overspending comes home to the community charge payer as the amount in £s per head by which his charge exceeds that for spending at SSA, and I believe that a measure of overspending in these terms should be our main criterion. However, to be legally secure I believe that we must also measure overspending against SSA in percentage terms. I have identified 2 options using this approach.

9. My first option is that an authority's budget (subject to special adjustment for inner London Boroughs to allow for ILEA abolition, and for the City of London) should be judged excessive if it exceeds its Standard Spending Assessment (SSA) by more than 12½% (the lowest criterion we used for rate capping) and by more than £100 per adult. Under my second option an authority's budget would be judged excessive if it exceeds its SSA by more than 12½% and by more than £75 per adult. These are illustrated in tables A and B respectively.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

10. In both cases there is the proviso that the budget is at least £26 per adult above the threshold. The purpose of this is to ensure that we cap only those authorities where the maximum possible reduction in the community charges is worth the inevitable cost of revising budgets and issuing fresh bills. Treasury Counsel has advised that we cannot require an authority to reduce its budget below the selection criteria used as a benchmark to judge excessivity. I conclude that unless the maximum possible reduction is at least £26 (50 pence per week off the bill) an authority should not be capped. If we were to cap authorities for smaller reductions I believe we would be a laughing stock.

11. Option 1 selects 19 authorities and brings help to 3.6 million chargepayers. It could secure reduction in General Government Expenditure (GGE) of about £200m. Option 2 selects 21 authorities, assists 4.3 million chargepayers and could secure reduction of £250m in GGE. Table C shows the results of these options in the context of all authorities' charges.

12. The options I am putting forward are I believe the toughest we can adopt consistent with the aim of giving as much help as practicable to chargepayers, whilst at the same time minimising the risk of successful legal challenge. Under rate capping we never capped an authority budgeting less than 12½% above its grant related expenditure assessment (GRE) - the equivalent of SSA in the old system - given the inherent approximations of GREs. If we were now to cap below the 12½% margin we would need to argue successfully in any legal challenge that SSAs were more accurate and precise than their predecessor GREs. I do not believe we could sustain such an argument. It would also be difficult to argue that an extra amount of less than £75 on a community charge would be an inordinate burden when our own safety net arrangements can add up this amount on a charge. But an overspend of anything more than £75 could probably be seen as a significant burden on

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

chargepayers, and hence I propose we should adopt my second tougher option. Compared with my first option two additional authorities are caught - Avon and Bristol.

13. As explained in Annex D I believe that to have adopted some different approach to selection - for example, different criteria for the districts and shire counties, or selecting authorities by reference to the increase in their budgets over 1989/90 - would very significantly increase the risks of successful legal challenge to our selection decisions without any real gains.

Proposed caps

14. Each authority's cap - that is, the alternative, lower budget figure which I propose - needs to reflect its individual circumstances and be realistic and achievable. Treasury Counsel has advised that an authority cannot be capped to below the level at which it is selected for capping - the higher of the $12\frac{1}{2}\%$ or £75 per adult under the option I propose we adopt; nor can an authority be capped to below £15m (the threshold below which authorities are exempt from capping).

15. I am approaching the setting of caps by first considering in the light of all the information available to me about the authorities' circumstances whether the maximum possible reduction suggested by the selection criteria appear reasonably achievable. In the case of 13 authorities my preliminary view is that this is the case, and I intend proposing caps accordingly. For the remaining 8 authorities my preliminary conclusion is that the maximum reductions are not achievable without severe disruption to services and possible financial collapse. In these cases my intention is to propose caps that will require smaller but tough reductions. Table B shows my preliminary views on proposed caps and their likely effects on the actual community charges. In total these proposed caps would yield savings in GGE of £250m and

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

reduce the average community charge from £363 to £356. I propose in consultation with colleagues to finalise proposed caps over the next few days.

Conclusion

16. My proposal will mean that we cap 21 authorities, saving in total £250m, and giving reductions in the community charges ranging from £26 to £100. This will be welcomed by the chargepayers concerned. But inevitably there will be disappointment in other areas where the authorities are not capped and the charges are high. It will be difficult to explain why we have capped, although with good reason, some authorities with charges considerably below others which have not been capped. We shall have to be prepared to defend ourselves against attack on the one hand that by capping 21 authorities we are admitting our new system of accountability has failed and we are creating administrative chaos for authorities, and on the other hand that by capping only 21 authorities we have failed to live up to our pledge to protect chargepayers from excessive budgets.

17. If colleagues agree my proposals I would wish to announce my decisions by a Parliamentary statement on 3 April and formally to designate the selected authorities on that day. This will ensure that the 28 day period, during which authorities may respond to their proposed caps, ends before the local elections on 3 May as I proposed in my minute of 5 February to the Prime Minister.

18. Colleagues are invited to agree:

- (i) that I should use my capping powers for 1990/91;
- (ii) that the authorities (shown in Table B) should be selected whose budgets are more than $12\frac{1}{2}\%$ above SSA and more than £75 per adult above

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

SSA, provided that the budget is at least £26 per adult above the 12½/£75 per adult criterion;

- (iii) that in consultation with colleagues I should finalise my proposals for caps for these authorities.

CP

Department of the Environment
March 1990

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

ANNEX A

CHARGE CAPPING PROCEDURE

1. Charge capping is an "in year" system. This contrasts with rate capping which was a pre-year system. Pre-year capping meant that if an authority was not capped for the year on the basis of its expenditure in previous year there was no limit on the rate or precept it could set (other than the risk of its leading to capping in the following year). This created a particular loophole which enabled some authorities to get away for one year with very large rate increases eg Hammersmith & Fulham in 1987/88 some 127%, and Ealing in the same year with 72%. Our inability to act led to a good deal of criticism from local residents and their MPs.

2. Under charge capping authorities first set their budgets and submit information about them to the Secretary of State. If on the basis of general principles applicable to classes of authorities he decides that an authority's budget is excessive, or represents an excessive increase over the previous year, the Secretary of State designates it for capping and proposes a maximum limit for the budget (the cap). For these purposes the budget is expressed in terms of an authority's demand on the collection fund in the case of a charging authority or aggregate precepts in the case of a precepting authority (ie the expenditure net of income such as specific grants and fees and charges.) Authorities whose budgets are under £15m are exempt.

3. Authorities are notified of their selection and the caps proposed at the same time. Caps are not set on the basis of general principles but have to take account of the individual circumstances of the authorities concerned. Authorities have 28 days to respond. If the authority accepts the proposed cap the Secretary of state confirms it. If the authority proposes a different figure, the cap is set by Order and may be higher

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

or lower than or the same as the originally proposed figure. Where the Secretary of State agrees to a higher cap than that which he originally proposed for an authority he may impose conditions about its expenditure and financial management. If the authority does not respond, the cap is likewise set by Order but must be at the originally proposed level. The Orders are subject to Commons Affirmative resolution procedure.

4. Once the cap is set the authority has 21 days to reduce its budget and the revised budget feeds through into reduced community charges.

5. A summary of the charge capping procedure is at (i). At (ii) is a separate chart showing the process from the perspective of the Government, local authorities and the public and how these interact.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT

March 1990

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CHARGE CAPPING PROCEDURE

MARCH/
APRIL

- Authorities send budget information (Deadline: 18 March) and charge information (Deadline: 2 April).
- S of S designates authorities for capping if on basis of general principles applicable to classes of authorities he considers budgets excessive (or excessive increase over previous year). [Authorities with budgets under £15m exempt.]
- S of S proposes maximum budget limits (caps) for each designated authority on basis of what is reasonable in individual circumstances, i.e. not general principles.
- Notices to authorities informing them of designation, principles and proposed caps issue 3 April.

MAY/
JUNE

- Authorities 28 days to reply: Deadline: 1 May
 - (i) If authority accepts: S of S confirms by notice.
 - (ii) If no answer: cap set by Order at level S of S proposed.
 - (iii) If different cap proposed: S of S considers. Cap set by Order at same, higher or lower level than the S of S proposed.

LOCAL ELECTIONS 3 MAY.

- Orders: Commons affirmative resolution: May/June.
- Notices confirming caps in Orders: May/June.
- If S of S raises limit he may impose conditions on expenditure or financial management by means of notice.

JUNE/
JULY

- Authority has 21 days after cap set to reduce budget.
- Lower budgets feed through to lower charges. Authorities issue substitute charge demands: June/July.

CONFIDENTIAL

TIMING	GOVERNMENT	LOCAL AUTHORITY	PUBLIC
MAR/APR	Secretary of State considers budget information, selects authorities and proposes caps: announcement on 3 April.	Sets <u>budget</u> in March and tells DoE. Preceptors issue precepts to charging authorities, which issue <u>charges</u> by 1 April. If authority is capped it considers whether and how to respond within 28 day period. If challenging cap it will consider what alternative amount to propose to the Secretary of State and reasons for it and what further information (if any) to submit to support case. Authority may seek meeting with Ministers.	Receive charge bills end March/ beginning April. May pay in lump sum or by instalments. First instalment due April or May.
MAY/JUN	28 day period ends 1 May. - If authority accepts cap Secretary of State confirms by notice.	Authority has 21 days to set substitute budget reflecting cap. If preceptor, substitute precepts issued to charging authority. Substitute charges set and new bills issued as soon as practicable after substitute budgets made. Charging authorities have to recalculate instalments, benefit, transitional relief. Overpayment by chargepayers refunded.	Chargepayers continue to pay charge initially set until substitute charge set.
	- If authority does not respond Secretary of State sets by Order (Debate in Commons) and confirms by notice.	As above. (June/July)	Receive new lower bills + refunds where appropriate. Benefit etc changes.
	- If authority challenges, Secretary of State considers case (Ministers may meet authority) and decides whether to set cap at same, higher or lower level than proposed. He also considers whether to impose conditions on authority's expenditure or financial management and, if so, what these should be. Cap set by Order (debate in Commons on this and non-responders Order). Cap confirmed by notice. Any conditions included in notice.	As above. (June/July). If conditions imposed authority has to comply with them for remainder of financial year.	As above.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

ANNEX B

CHARGE CAPPING:
DISAPPOINTED EXPECTATIONS

1. The Department has received many representations from conservative MPs, local conservative groups and members of the public pressing for capping in particular cases. Inevitably, if the capping powers are used and these authorities are not capped this is likely to lead to a degree of frustration on the part of the MPs and others concerned.

2. Some examples of authorities, the range of charges involved and why the authority is not caught on a criterion of 12½% and £75 are:

Local Authority	Charge, or charge range if county	Why not caught
<u>Bedfordshire</u>	397 - 414	9.1% and £64ph
<u>Berkshire</u>	359 - 449	9.1% and £62ph
Cheshire	385 - 430	Implied reduction only £8
Cornwall	311 - 329	6.2% and £42ph
Devon	285 - 395	7.8% and £50ph
Humberside	291 - 384	<u>11.7%</u> and <u>£83ph</u>
Lancashire	299 - 407	<u>11.4%</u> and <u>£81ph</u>

Oxfordshire	376 - 489	Implied reduction only £21
Surrey	295 - 452	7.9% and £45ph
Hackney	499	11.6% and £183 ph*
Harlow	425	Below £15m
Southend	420	39.3% and £45ph
West Oxfordshire	412	-36% and -£31ph
Windsor & Maidenhead	434	37% and £29ph
Wolverhampton	395	7.7% and £72ph

* net of Inner London education grant

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

ANNEX C

CHARGE CAPPING:
POSSIBLE ANOMALIES

High charges not caught

- (a) Where an authority makes a contribution to the safety net at or near the £75 maximum. Even budgeting in line with SSA would mean a charge of over £350 (£278 + £75). A relatively modest overspend would take authority's charge over £400. Example: Wokingham (charge £434; overspend £7 per adult - area overspend £69 per adult), Manchester (charge £425; overspend £46 per adult - area overspend £50 per adult).
- (b) Where an authority has a very high SSA a high overspend in £ per adult may not represent a high percentage overspend. Example: Hackney (charge £499 - area overspend 11.7% and £183 per adult; area overspend per adult £184 - all overspend figures net of inner London education grant).
- (c) Where the district is under the £15m threshold and the county is not caught. Examples: Oxford (charge £489; overspend £23 per adult - area overspend £119 per adult); Epsom and Ewell (charge £452; overspend £64 per adult - area overspend £109 per adult).

Lower charges caught

- (d) Where an authority's charge is much lower than that implied by its budget because it benefits substantially from transitional support (area safety net, inner London education grant or low rateable value areas grant). Examples: Calderdale (charge £297; transitional support £163 per adult (safety net £138

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

per adult, LRV areas grant £25 per adult); overspend per adult £160 - area overspend per adult £172). Greenwich (charge £408; transitional support £285 per adult (safety net £212 per adult, inner London education grant £73 per adult); overspend per adult £314 - area overspend per adult £315 - all overspend figures net of inner London Education grant).

Charges below assumed charge caught

- (e) An authority may be capped even though the charge set is below the assumed charge. The latter (and the spending assumption on which it is based) does not represent a target or guideline or an amount which an authority could or should set or spend. It is simply a reference point for the calculation of an appropriate degree of protection under the safety net and transitional relief scheme. The SSA represents an appropriate level of spending. The only case in this category is Haringey (actual charge £572.89; assumed charge £573.17; overspend above SSA 29.8% and £351 per adult - area overspend £352 per adult).

Chargepayers worse off because of capping

- (f) Charge capping could result in a chargepayer, after taking account of community charge benefit, having to pay more, not less, to his local authority. These circumstances arise because of the de minimis rule in the benefit regulations which provides that where but for this rule benefit entitlement would be less than 50p per week, the entitlement is set to 0. Thus capping could leave the chargepayer some £26 worse off for the year.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Similar capped charges reduced by different amounts

- (g) This situation is likely to arise inter alia because the relationship between budgets and charges is indirect and obscured by transitional arrangements in particular, because the amount by which budgets (and therefore charges) are reduced must reflect the individual circumstances of the capped authority and be realistic and achievable and because no authority can in any event be capped below the level implied by the higher of the two criteria (if a combined criterion) or £15m (the statutory threshold below which authorities are exempt from capping) whichever is the higher.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT

March 1990

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

ANNEX D

SELECTION CRITERIA

1. Authorities can be selected for charge capping if in my opinion their budgets are either excessive or represent an excessive increase over the previous year, but I am not empowered to select any authority whose budget is below a threshold of £15m. Selection must be on the basis of general principles but I may adopt different principles for different classes of authorities (eg shire districts, county councils) where there are reasoned grounds for doing so.

2. To minimise the risk of successful legal challenge I am proposing to judge the excessiveness of authorities' budget by reference to their standard spending assessments (SSAs) - the amount for each authority which in our view is the appropriate level of spending for the authority to provide a standard level of service consistent with total standard spending of £32.8bn. This approach is broadly analagous to that adopted under rate capping where authorities were selected if their budgets were judged excessive by reference to their Grant Related Expenditure assessments (GRES) which SSAs have replaced in the new system.

3. The measure of excessiveness I am proposing is a joint percentage/per capita measure. This twofold test means that an authority is capped only if its overspend on SSA results in a significant burden on charge payers and if it is significant relative to the size of its budget. A per capita approach by itself would not be an adequate measure of overspend relative to the budget concerned, and would be difficult to defend in litigation if it represented only a small percentage overspend. The 12½% criterion in my proposed options is the tried and tested figure used in the last few rounds of rate capping.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

4. I am not proposing to use different criteria for different classes of authority (subject to special arrangements to allow for the abolition of ILEA - see paragraph 6 below, and for the City of London in recognition of its special circumstances of having a local business rate). This will minimise the risk of legal challenge to selection. If we were to adopt different criteria for different classes (eg cap a county council if it was overspending by £90 per adult and a district if it were overspending by £10 per adult in recognition of the relative sizes of the authorities' budgets) I believe that it would be impossible to rebut the argument that it was illogical and unfair to allow one class of authority to impose a greater burden on chargepayers than another class before we were prepared to cap.

5. Likewise to minimise the risk of successful legal challenge I do not intend to use my power to select authorities whose budgets represent an excessive increase over the previous year. To use this option for next year we would have to rely on notional budget figures (ie the budget which would have been set had the new system been in operation in 1989/90) for individual authorities for 1989/90 as the baseline for measuring increases in 1990/91 budgets. Whilst we have indeed calculated such notional figures for the area safety net and transitional relief scheme, I do not believe they are sufficiently robust for capping purposes. Given the penal nature of capping it is essential that any notional base is calculated with precision if it is to withstand successful legal challenge. Treasury Counsel has advised that there are significantly more legal risks attached to using the excessive increase option in 1990/91 than adopting the course I am proposing.

6. Under my two options for selection criteria, for inner London boroughs I would deduct from each borough's budget for the purposes of comparison with SSA the amount of its inner

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

London education grant entitlement. This deduction is intended to meet our objective of making an allowance for that part of the ILEA overspend inherited by those boroughs which it would not be reasonable to expect an authority to be able to cut in 1990/91. The amount of the grant would serve as a proxy for the amount of such inherited overspending, which we were prepared to recognise, and would be consistent with the sums approved by Parliament in the Special Grant Report. The individual circumstances of authorities caught by the selection criteria would be taken into account in setting the caps themselves.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CHARGE CAPPING: Table A - 12.5% and £100 over SSA

Authority	Cont rol	Budget £m	Over SSA		Proposed maximum amount or 'cap'	Implied reduction	
			%	£/head		£m	£/head
Haringey	Lab	216.5	30%	351	206.5	10.0	71
Lambeth	Lab	305.1	23%	321	272.4†	32.7	190
Greenwich	Lab	213.0	32%	314	203.0	10.0	64
Hammersmith and Fulham	Lab	167.5	21%	239	155.8	11.7	99
Southwark	Lab	241.0	20%	232	226.9	14.1	85
Brent	Lab	253.9	18%	202	241.7	12.2	63
Islington	Lab	189.5	15%	188	185.8	3.7	30
Camden	Lab	181.4	15%	180	176.9	4.5	35
Barnsley	Lab	142.0	27%	178	129.0†	13.0	78
Calderdale	Noc	132.9	21%	160	124.3†	8.6	60
*Derbyshire	Lab	560.6	25%	157	519.9	40.7	57
Amber Valley	Con						
Bolsover	Lab						
Chesterfield	Lab						
Derby	Con						
Erewash	Con						
High Peak	Noc						
N E Derbyshire	Lab						
South Derbyshire	Lab						
Derbyshire Dales	Con						
Basildon	Noc	27.9	194%	154	23.7	4.2	35
*Rochdale	Lab	152.0	19%	152	144.0†	8.0	50
*Wigan	Lab	200.6	21%	151	190.6	10.0	43
*Doncaster	Lab	190.1	20%	144	180.5†	9.6	44
*Hillingdon	Noc	151.0	20%	143	143.5	7.5	43
*North Tyneside	Lab	129.7	19%	136	124.2†	5.5	37
*Rotherham	Lab	165.4	19%	134	158.6	6.8	34
*St Helens	Lab	126.7	16%	130	122.8	3.9	29

CONFIDENTIAL

TABLE A

CHARGE CAPPING: Table A continued

Charge set	Charge implied by cap	Assumed charge	Charge at SSA	Authority
573	502	573	278	Haringey
640	450	308	196	Lambeth
408	344	252	-8	Greenwich
424	325	347	109	Hammersmith and Fulham
390	305	254	61	Southwark
498	435	481	296	Brent
499	469	380	256	Islington
534	499	344	301	Camden
330	252	222	128	Barnsley
297	237	245	115	Calderdale
				Derbyshire
398	341	270	220	Amber Valley
353	296	220	145	Bolsover
414	357	282	208	Chesterfield
458	401	315	278	Derby
419	362	283	227	Erewash
393	336	279	218	High Peak
420	363	297	216	N E Derbyshire
440	383	301	262	South Derbyshire
432	375	316	263	Derbyshire Dales
478	443	395	315	Basildon
386	336	269	206	Rochdale
382	339	293	209	Wigan
338	294	264	173	Doncaster
367	324	359	236	Hillingdon
399	362	334	237	North Tyneside
337	303	240	165	Rotherham
411	382	297	256	St Helens

* = Not caught on equivalent GRE criteria (ie These would not have been caught if SSAs had been constructed using the same methodology as GREs).

+ These are the lowest possible caps: detailed assessment of achievability has yet to be made.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

TABLE 6

CHARGE CAPPING: Table B - 12.5% and £75 over SSA

CHARGE CAPPING: Table B continued

Authority	Cont rol	Budget £m	Over SSA		Proposed maximum amount or 'cap'	Implied reduction	
			%	£/head		£m	£/head
Haringey	Lab	216.5	30%	351	206.5	10.0	71
Lambeth	Lab	305.1	23%	321	270.3 †	34.8	202
Greenwich	Lab	213.0	32%	314	203.0	10.0	64
Hammersmith and Fulham	Lab	167.5	21%	239	155.8	11.7	99
Southwark	Lab	241.0	20%	232	226.9	14.1	85
Brent	Lab	253.9	18%	202	241.7	12.2	63
Islington	Lab	189.5	15%	188	185.8	3.7	30
Camden	Lab	181.4	15%	180	176.9	4.5	35
Barnsley	Lab	142.0	27%	178	126.2 †	15.8	94
*Calderdale	Noc	132.9	21%	160	123.6 †	9.3	65
Derbyshire	Lab	560.6	25%	157	514.6	46.0	64
Amber Valley	Con						
Bolsover	Lab						
Chesterfield	Lab						
Derby	Con						
Erewash	Con						
High Peak	Noc						
N E Derbyshire	Lab						
South Derbyshire	Lab						
Derbyshire Dales	Con						
Basildon	Noc	27.9	194%	154	23.7	4.2	35
* Rochdale	Lab	152.0	19%	152	144.0 †	8.0	50
* Wigan	Lab	200.6	21%	151	190.6	10.0	43
* Doncaster	Lab	190.1	20%	144	178.4 †	11.7	54
Hillingdon	Noc	151.0	20%	143	141.7	9.3	53
* North Tyneside	Lab	129.7	19%	136	122.9 †	6.8	45
* Rotherham	Lab	165.4	19%	134	157.5	7.9	39
* St Helens	Lab	126.7	16%	130	122.8	3.9	29

Charge set	Charge implied by cap	Assumed charge	Charge at SSA	Authority
573	502	573	278	Haringey
640	438	308	196	Lambeth
408	344	252	-8	Greenwich
424	325	347	109	Hammersmith and Fulham
390	305	254	61	Southwark
498	435	481	296	Brent
499	469	380	256	Islington
534	499	344	301	Camden
330	236	222	128	Barnsley
297	232	245	115	Calderdale
				Derbyshire
398	334	270	220	Amber Valley
353	289	220	145	Bolsover
414	350	282	208	Chesterfield
458	394	315	278	Derby
419	355	283	227	Erewash
393	329	279	218	High Peak
420	356	297	216	N E Derbyshire
440	376	301	262	South Derbyshire
432	368	316	263	Derbyshire Dales
478	443	395	315	Basildon
386	336	269	206	Rochdale
382	339	293	209	Wigan
338	284	264	173	Doncaster
367	314	359	236	Hillingdon
399	354	334	237	North Tyneside
337	298	240	165	Rotherham
411	382	297	256	St Helens

CONFIDENTIAL

† These are the lowest possible caps: detailed assessment of achievability has yet to be made.

* = Not caught on equivalent GRE criteria (i.e. these would not have been caught if SSAs had been constructed using the same methodologies as GREs).

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CHARGE CAPPING: Table B continued

Charge set	Charge implied by cap	Assumed charge	Charge at SSA	Authority
				Avon
385	348	300	278	Bath
490	427	331	255	Bristol
395	358	274	278	Kingswood
423	386	296	289	Northavon
399	362	299	278	Wansdyke
432	395	304	288	Woodspring
490	427	331	255	Bristol

CONFIDENTIAL

CHARGE CAPPING: Table B - 12.5% and £75 over SSA

Authority	Cont rol	Budget £m	Over SSA		Proposed maximum amount or 'cap'	Implied reduction	
			%	£/head		£m	£/head
Avon	Noc	533.7	18%	117	507.1	26.6	37
Bath	Con						
Bristol	Lab						
Kingswood	Con						
Northavon	Con						
Wansdyke	Con						
Woodspring	Con						
Bristol	Lab	64.2	96%	108	56.7	7.5	26

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CHARGE CAPPING

Charging Authorities affected/not affected by capping - 12.5% and £75

Charging authority	Control	Charge set £	Affected by capping	County
Lambeth	Lab	640	D	-
Haringey	Lab	573	D	-
Camden	Lab	534	D	-
Hackney	Lab	499	-	-
Islington	Lab	499	D	-
Brent	Lab	498	D	-
Bristol	Lab	490	DC	Avon
Oxford	Lab	489*	-	Oxfordshire
Basildon	Noc	478	D	Essex
Derby	Con	458	C	Derbyshire
South Oxfordshire	Con	456*	-	Oxfordshire -
Epsom and Ewell	Ind	452*	-	Surrey -
Liverpool	Lab	449	-	-
Windsor and Maidenhead	Con	449*	-	Berkshire -
Newham	Lab	449	-	-
Elmbridge	Con	449*	-	Surrey
Reading	Lab	447	-	Berkshire
Welwyn Hatfield	Lab	445*	-	Hertfordshire
Reigate and Banstead	Con	445*	-	Surrey
Ipswich	Lab	440	-	Suffolk
South Derbyshire	Lab	440*	C	Derbyshire
Castle Morpeth	Noc	438*	-	Northumberland
Waltham Forest	Lab	438	-	-
Stevenage	Lab	435*	-	Hertfordshire
Ealing	Lab	435	-	-
Wokingham	Con	434*	-	Berkshire
Derbyshire Dales	Con	432*	C	Derbyshire
Woodspring	Con	432*	C	Avon
Macclesfield	Con	430*	-	Cheshire
Middlesbrough	Lab	429	-	Cleveland
Cambridge	Lab	428*	-	Cambridgeshire
Stockton-on-Tees	Lab	428	-	Cleveland
Harlow	Lab	425*	-	Essex
Manchester	Lab	425	-	-
Walsall	Lab	425	-	-
Hammersmith and Fulham	Lab	424	D	-
Northavon	Con	423*	C	Avon
Three Rivers	Noc	423*	-	Hertfordshire
Sandwell	Lab	423	-	-

D=Authority caught, C=County caught, *=Charging Authority's budget under £15m.

CONFIDENTIAL

CHARGE CAPPING

Charging Authorities affected/not affected by capping - 12.5% and £75

Charging authority	Control	Charge set £	Affected by capping	County
Langbaugh-on-Tees	Noc	421		Cleveland
Southend-on-Sea	Noc	420		Essex
N E Derbyshire	Lab	420*	C	Derbyshire
Erewash	Con	419*	C	Derbyshire
Thurrock	Lab	417*		Essex
Crewe and Nantwich	Noc	417*		Cheshire
Hertsmere	Con	416*		Hertfordshire
Blyth Valley	Lab	415*		Northumberland
South Bedfordshire	Con	414*		Bedfordshire
Chesterfield	Lab	414*	C	Derbyshire
Vale of White Horse	Con	412*		Oxfordshire
West Oxfordshire	Con	412*		Oxfordshire
St Helens	Lab	411	D	-
Wycombe	Con	409*		Buckinghamshire
Greenwich	Lab	408	D	-
Ellesmere Port and Neston	Lab	406*		Cheshire
Birmingham	Lab	406		-
Waverley	Con	405*		Surrey
Leicester	Lab	405		Leicestershire
Watford	Noc	404*		Hertfordshire
Luton	Con	403		Bedfordshire
Chiltern	Con	402*		Buckinghamshire
Chester	Noc	401*		Cheshire
Newbury	Con	401*		Berkshire
Surrey Heath	Con	401*		Surrey
Guildford	Con	400*		Surrey
Dacorum	Con	400*		Hertfordshire
Congleton	Noc	400*		Cheshire
North Hertfordshire	Con	399*		Hertfordshire
South Bucks	Con	399*		Buckinghamshire
Stockport	Noc	399		-
North Tyneside	Lab	399	D	-
Wansdyke	Con	399*	C	Avon
Milton Keynes	Noc	398		Buckinghamshire
Amber Valley	Con	398*	C	Derbyshire
North Bedfordshire	Noc	398*		Bedfordshire
Mid Bedfordshire	Con	397*		Bedfordshire
Chelmsford	SLD	397*		Essex
St Albans	Con	396*		Hertfordshire
Salford	Lab	396		-

D=Authority caught, C=County caught, *=Charging Authority's budget under £15m.

CONFIDENTIAL

CHARGE CAPPING

Charging Authorities affected/not affected by capping - 12.5% and £75

Charging authority	Control	Charge set £	Affected by capping	County
Hounslow	Lab	396		-
Wolverhampton	Lab	395		-
Torbay	Con	395*		Devon
Halton	Lab	395*		Cheshire
Richmond-upon-Thames	SLD	395		-
Hart	Noc	395*		Hampshire
Kingswood	Con	395*	C	Avon
Coventry	Lab	394		-
Warrington	Lab	394*		Cheshire
Rushcliffe	Con	394*		Nottinghamshire
Bracknell	Con	394*		Berkshire
Solihull	Con	393		-
High Peak	Noc	393*	C	Derbyshire
Vale Royal	Noc	391*		Cheshire
North Warwickshire	Lab	391*		Warwickshire
Newcastle upon Tyne	Lab	391		-
Nottingham	Con	390		Nottinghamshire
Southwark	Lab	390	D	-
Suffolk Coastal	Con	390*		Suffolk
Tynedale	Noc	389*		Northumberland
Cotswold	Ind	389*		Gloucestershire
Mole Valley	Noc	388*		Surrey
Fylde	Con	388*		Lancashire
Rochford	Con	388*		Essex
Dudley	Lab	387		-
Warwick	Con	386*		Warwickshire
Nuneaton and Bedworth	Lab	386*		Warwickshire
Rochdale	Lab	386	D	-
Lancaster	Noc	386*		Lancashire
Bath	Con	385*	C	Avon
Eastbourne	Con	385*		East Sussex
Hartlepool	Lab	385*		Cleveland
Preston	Lab	384*		Lancashire
Blackpool	Noc	384		Lancashire
Great Grimsby	Lab	384*		Humberside
Cherwell	Con	383*		Oxfordshire
Wrekin	Lab	383*		Shropshire
Wigan	Lab	382	D	-
Epping Forest	Con	381*		Essex
Sutton	SLD	381		-

D=Authority caught, C=County caught, *=Charging Authority's budget under £15m.

CONFIDENTIAL

CHARGE CAPPING

Charging Authorities affected/not affected by capping - 12.5% and £75

Charging authority	Control	Charge set £	Affected by capping	County
Stratford on Avon	Con	381*		Warwickshire
Stroud	Noc	380*		Gloucestershire
Kensington and Chelsea	Con	380		-
Broxtowe	Con	380*		Nottinghamshire
Hastings	Noc	380*		East Sussex
East Hertfordshire	Con	379*		Hertfordshire
West Lancashire	Con	378*		Lancashire
Mansfield	Lab	378*		Nottinghamshire
Forest Heath	Con	377*		Suffolk
Castle Point	Con	377*		Essex
Newark and Sherwood	Noc	377*		Nottinghamshire
Wyre	Con	376*		Lancashire
Brentwood	Con	375*		Essex
Sefton	Noc	375		-
South Wight	Con	374*		Isle of Wight
Bury	Lab	373		-
Tandridge	Con	373*		Surrey
Beverley	Con	373*		Humberside
Brighton	Lab	373		East Sussex
Charnwood	Con	372*		Leicestershire
Bassetlaw	Lab	371*		Nottinghamshire
Gedling	Con	371*		Nottinghamshire
Oadby and Wigston	Con	370*		Leicestershire
Rutland	Noc	370*		Leicestershire
Knowsley	Lab	370		-
Eastleigh	SLD	368*		Hampshire
East Hampshire	Con	368*		Hampshire
Spelthorne	Con	368*		Surrey
Cleethorpes	Noc	367*		Humberside
Harborough	Noc	367*		Leicestershire
Hillingdon	Noc	367	D	-
North West Leicestershire	Noc	366*		Leicestershire
Oldham	Lab	366		-
Blackburn	Lab	365		Lancashire
Norwich	Lab	365*		Norfolk
Teignbridge	Noc	365*		Devon
Holderness	Ind	364*		Humberside
Cheltenham	Noc	364*		Gloucestershire
Chorley	Con	363*		Lancashire
South Somerset	SLD	363*		Somerset

D=Authority caught, C=County caught, *=Charging Authority's budget under £15m.

CONFIDENTIAL

CHARGE CAPPING

Charging Authorities affected/not affected by capping - 12.5% and £75

Charging authority	Control	Charge set £	Affected by capping	County
Tewkesbury	Noc	362*		Gloucestershire
Harrogate	Con	362*		North Yorkshire
Broxbourne	Con	361*		Hertfordshire
Glanford	Con	361*		Humberside
Mendip	Noc	361*		Somerset
Fareham	Con	360*		Hampshire
Peterborough	Noc	360*		Cambridgeshire
Woking	Noc	359*		Surrey
Slough	Lab	359*		Berkshire
Rother	Con	359*		East Sussex
Winchester	Noc	359*		Hampshire
East Dorset	Con	358*		Dorset
Ribble Valley	Con	358*		Lancashire
South Ribble	Con	358*		Lancashire
South Northamptonshire	Con	358*		Northamptonshire
Uttlesford	Con	357*		Essex
Darlington	Noc	356*		Durham
Cannock Chase	Lab	356*		Staffordshire
Scunthorpe	Lab	356*		Humberside
Sheffield	Lab	356		-
Durham	Lab	355*		Durham
Aylesbury Vale	Con	355*		Buckinghamshire
Daventry	Con	354*		Northamptonshire
Gloucester	Noc	354*		Gloucestershire
Bolsover	Lab	353*	C	Derbyshire
Sedgemoor	Con	352*		Somerset
Leeds	Lab	351		-
Lewes	Con	351*		East Sussex
Taunton Deane	Con	351*		Somerset
Adur	SLD	351*		West Sussex
Waveney	Noc	350*		Suffolk
Corby	Lab	350*		Northamptonshire
Plymouth	Con	350		Devon
Havering	Noc	350		-
Newcastle-under-Lyme	Lab	349*		Staffordshire
Northampton	Con	349		Northamptonshire
Lichfield	Con	349*		Staffordshire
South Lakeland	Noc	349*		Cumbria
Tameside	Lab	349		-
Wealden	Con	349*		East Sussex

D=Authority caught, C=County caught, *=Charging Authority's budget under £15m.

CONFIDENTIAL

CHARGE CAPPING

Charging Authorities affected/not affected by capping - 12.5% and £75

Charging authority	Control	Charge set £	Affected by capping	County
Wansbeck	Lab	348*		Northumberland
Braintree	Noc	348*		Essex
Alnwick	Noc	347*		Northumberland
Shepway	Noc	347*		Kent
Rugby	Noc	347*		Warwickshire
Hinckley and Bosworth	Con	347*		Leicestershire
Maldon	Noc	347*		Essex
Tendring	Noc	346*		Essex
Redditch	Lab	345*		Hereford and Worcester
Bolton	Lab	345		-
Kingston-upon-Thames	Con	345		-
Crawley	Lab	345*		West Sussex
East Devon	Con	345*		Devon
Exeter	Noc	344*		Devon
Malvern Hills	Noc	343*		Hereford and Worcester
Forest of Dean	Noc	343*		Gloucestershire
Blaby	Con	343*		Leicestershire
Wyre Forest	Noc	343*		Hereford and Worcester
Chester-le-Street	Lab	343*		Durham
Medina	Con	342*		Isle of Wight
Wirral	Noc	341		-
Gosport	Con	340*		Hampshire
Worcester	Lab	340*		Hereford and Worcester
Christchurch	Con	339*		Dorset
Havant	Con	339*		Hampshire
Bromsgrove	Con	339*		Hereford and Worcester
Mid Devon	Ind	339*		Devon
Stafford	Noc	339*		Staffordshire
Melton	Con	338*		Leicestershire
Doncaster	Lab	338	D	-
Barnet	Con	338		-
East Staffordshire	Noc	338*		Staffordshire
Rossendale	Lab	338*		Lancashire
Rotherham	Lab	337	D	-
Thamesdown	Lab	337*		Wiltshire
Carlisle	Lab	337*		Cumbria

D=Authority caught, C=County caught, *=Charging Authority's budget under £15m.

CONFIDENTIAL

CHARGE CAPPING

Charging Authorities affected/not affected by capping - 12.5% and £75

Charging authority	Control	Charge set £	Affected by capping	County
Weymouth and Portland	Noc	336*		Dorset
West Somerset	Ind	335*		Somerset
Colchester	Noc	335*		Essex
South Hams	Con	334*		Devon
West Wiltshire	Con	333*		Wiltshire
Shrewsbury and Atcham	Noc	333*		Shropshire
Derwentside	Lab	332*		Durham
Mid Suffolk	Con	332*		Suffolk
West Devon	Ind	331*		Devon
Babergh	Noc	330*		Suffolk
Dartford	Con	330*		Kent
Barnsley	Lab	330	D	-
Hove	Con	330*		East Sussex
Maidstone	Noc	330*		Kent
Kerrier	Noc	329*		Cornwall
Tamworth	Noc	329*		Staffordshire
Enfield	Con	329		-
Oswestry	Noc	329*		Shropshire
Copeland	Lab	328*		Cumbria
Barrow in Furness	Lab	328*		Cumbria
New Forest	Con	328*		Hampshire
South Cambridgeshire	Ind	328*		Cambridgeshire
Test Valley	Con	328*		Hampshire
East Yorkshire	Con	326*		Humberside
Great Yarmouth	Noc	326*		Norfolk
Rushmoor	Con	325*		Hampshire
Poole	Con	325*		Dorset
South Staffordshire	Con	325*		Staffordshire
Wychavon	Con	324*		Hereford and Worcester
Carrick	Noc	324*		Cornwall
North Wiltshire	Con	323*		Wiltshire
Kettering	Noc	323*		Northamptonshire
Berwick-upon-Tweed	Noc	323*		Northumberland
Staffordshire Moorlands	Noc	323*		Staffordshire
Basingstoke and Deane	Con	323*		Hampshire
Sevenoaks	Con	322*		Kent
Harrow	Con	322		-
Caradon	Ind	321*		Cornwall
Restormel	Noc	321*		Cornwall

D=Authority caught, C=County caught, *=Charging Authority's budget under £15m.

CONFIDENTIAL

CHARGE CAPPING

Charging Authorities affected/not affected by capping - 12.5% and £75

Charging authority	Control	Charge set £	Affected by capping	County
<hr/>				
Gateshead	Lab	321	-	
Ashfield	Lab	320*		Nottinghamshire
Tonbridge and Malling	Con	320*		Kent
Bournemouth	Con	320		Dorset
Broadland	Con	320*		Norfolk
St Edmundsbury	Con	319*		Suffolk
North Devon	Noc	319*		Devon
North Shropshire	Ind	317*		Shropshire
Mid Sussex	Con	317*		West Sussex
Southampton	Lab	317		Hampshire
Penwith	Noc	317*		Cornwall
Tunbridge Wells	Con	315*		Kent
Hyndburn	Lab	315*		Lancashire
Bridgnorth	Ind	315*		Shropshire
Arun	Con	314*		West Sussex
Wakefield	Lab	313		-
West Dorset	Ind	313*		Dorset
Stoke-on-Trent	Lab	313		Staffordshire
Salisbury	Noc	313*		Wiltshire
South Norfolk	Con	313*		Norfolk
East Cambridgeshire	Ind	312*		Cambridgeshire
Hambleton	Noc	312*		North Yorkshire
North Cornwall	Ind	312*		Cornwall
Breckland	Con	310*		Norfolk
Sunderland	Lab	310		-
South Shropshire	Ind	310*		Shropshire
South Tyneside	Lab	309		-
Portsmouth	Con	309		Hampshire
Wear Valley	Lab	308*		Durham
Kingston upon Hull	Lab	307		Humberside
Kennet	Noc	307*		Wiltshire
East Northamptonshire	Con	306*		Northamptonshire
Horsham	Con	304*		West Sussex
Sedgefield	Lab	303*		Durham
Canterbury	Con	300*		Kent
Isles of Scilly	Ind	300*		-
Thanet	Noc	300*		Kent
Burnley	Lab	299*		Lancashire
Pendle	SLD	299*		Lancashire
Ashford	Con	299*		Kent

D=Authority caught, C=County caught, *=Charging Authority's budget under £15m.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CHARGE CAPPING

Charging Authorities affected/not affected by capping - 12.5% and £75

Charging authority	Control	Charge set £	Affected by capping	County
Swale	Noc	299*		Kent
Dover	Con	298*		Kent
Huntingdonshire	Con	298*		Cambridgeshire
Trafford	Con	298		-
Calderdale	Noc	297	D	-
Eden	Ind	297*		Cumbria
Lewisham	Lab	297		-
Tower Hamlets	Noc	297		-
Worthing	Con	296*		West Sussex
Runnymede	Con	295*		Surrey
North Dorset	Ind	295*		Dorset
Chichester	Con	294*		West Sussex
Gravesham	Noc	294*		Kent
Fenland	Con	293*		Cambridgeshire
Purbeck	Noc	291*		Dorset
Boothferry	Noc	291*		Humberside
North Norfolk	Ind	291*		Norfolk
Kirklees	Noc	290		-
Redbridge	Con	290		-
Ryedale	Ind	289*		North Yorkshire
Hereford	SLD	289*		Hereford and Worcester
Allerdale	Noc	289*		Cumbria
West Lindsey	Noc	288*		Lincolnshire
Wellingborough	Con	288*		Northamptonshire
City of London	Ind	288		-
Croydon	Con	287		-
King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Con	285*		Norfolk
Gillingham	Con	285*		Kent
Torridge	Ind	285*		Devon
South Holland	Noc	284*		Lincolnshire
Lincoln	Lab	284*		Lincolnshire
Selby	Noc	283*		North Yorkshire
Bromley	Con	283		-
North Kesteven	Noc	282*		Lincolnshire
Leominster	Ind	281*		Hereford and Worcester
Boston	Noc	280*		Lincolnshire
Barking and Dagenham	Lab	280		-
Bexley	Con	280		-
Merton	Noc	280		-

D=Authority caught, C=County caught, *=Charging Authority's budget under £15m.

CONFIDENTIAL

CHARGE CAPPING

Charging Authorities affected/not affected by capping - 12.5% and £75

Charging authority	Control	Charge set £	Affected by capping	County
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
South Kesteven	Con	279*		Lincolnshire
Easington	Lab	278*		Durham
East Lindsey	Ind	277*		Lincolnshire
Bradford	Con	276		-
Scarborough	Noc	276*		North Yorkshire
Richmondshire	Ind	276*		North Yorkshire
South Herefordshire	Ind	273*		Hereford and Worcester
York	Lab	264*		North Yorkshire
Craven	Noc	256*		North Yorkshire
Rochester upon Medway	Con	249*		Kent
Teesdale	Ind	245*		Durham
Westminster	Con	195		-
Wandsworth	Con	150		-

CONFIDENTIAL

CHARGE CAPPING

County Councils affected/not affected by capping - 12.5% and £75

County Council	Control	Overspend on SSA %	Overspend on SSA £/head	Affected by capping

Counties				
Derbyshire	Lab	25.0	157	D
Avon	Noc	18.4	117	D
Cumbria	Noc	16.0	103	
Northumberland	Lab	16.5	102	
Oxfordshire	Noc	15.5	96	
Cleveland	Lab	10.4	85	
Humberside	Lab	11.7	83	
Cheshire	Noc	12.5	83	
Lancashire	Lab	11.4	81	
Nottinghamshire	Lab	11.5	78	
Isle of Wight	SLD	11.9	76	
Somerset	Con	11.2	72	
Bedfordshire	Noc	9.1	64	
Warwickshire	Con	10.3	64	
Berkshire	Con	9.1	62	
Gloucestershire	Noc	8.9	56	
Leicestershire	Noc	7.9	55	
Devon	Con	7.8	50	
Suffolk	Con	7.8	49	
Durham	Lab	6.9	46	
Surrey	Con	7.9	45	
Cornwall	Noc	6.2	42	
Hertfordshire	Con	6.2	40	
Northamptonshire	Noc	5.7	40	
Buckinghamshire	Con	5.7	39	
Shropshire	Noc	5.4	37	
Staffordshire	Lab	5.5	35	
Wiltshire	Noc	5.0	32	
Norfolk	Con	4.8	30	
North Yorkshire	Noc	3.8	24	
Dorset	Con	4.0	23	
East Sussex	Con	3.7	22	
Cambridgeshire	Con	3.2	21	
Essex	Con	2.1	13	
Hampshire	Con	2.0	13	
Hereford and Worcester	Con	0.8	5	
Lincolnshire	Con	0.0	0	
Kent	Con	-1.2	-8	
West Sussex	Con	-3.3	-20	