

FROM: Management Team

REPORT NUMBER:

J105

TO: STRATEGY COMMITTEE

DATE OF MEETING: 8 October 2009

INTERIM REPORT ON THE 2009/10 STRATEGIC AND FINANCIAL PLANNING PROCESS

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To set out:

- The financial context within which the Council's medium term planning is being undertaken.
- The current position on achieving the Council's savings and efficiencies targets for 2009/10 and 2010/11 and to inform Members of the current position on the development of the 2010/11 Budget.
- Approaches and specific actions to seek to meet the savings and efficiencies targets in order to achieve a balanced 2010/11 Budget.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS TO STRATEGY COMMITTEE AND COUNCIL

2.1 That the current position on achieving the Council's savings and efficiencies targets for 2009/10 and 2010/11, and the current position on the development of the 2010/11 Budget, are noted.

2.2 That the approaches and specific actions set out in this report to seek to meet the savings and efficiencies targets in order to achieve a balanced 2010/11 Budget are endorsed; and that these are referred to the SFP Task Group for development and identification of the likely impact on service levels and staffing establishment.

Because of the significance of the issues within this report, Strategy Committee is asked to seek the endorsement of Full Council on the above recommendations.

3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

3.1 These are comprehensively set out in the report.

4. RISK MANAGEMENT

4.1 The report is linked to Significant Business Risk no. 8 – Savings and Efficiencies. Given the scale of the challenge facing the Council, and the clear risks to meeting the savings target with no readily achievable mitigation measures, the rating for this risk has been increased from B2 (Likelihood – High; Impact – Critical, to A1 (Likelihood – Very High; Impact – Catastrophic). This is the highest possible risk rating.

4.2 Key risks relating to the proposals in this report are indicated below:

Risk Description	Likelihood	Seriousness or Impact	Mitigation Measures
Failure to achieve sufficient savings and efficiencies in 2010/11 and future years	Very High	Catastrophic	Savings & Efficiencies Plan in place and discussions with Unison/staff taking place on Terms and Conditions.
Cuts in services and staffing levels	Very High	Critical	The Council's plans will need to carefully weigh up the options and issues and inform/consult with stakeholders as appropriate.
Economic Downturn results in further deterioration in the Council's financial position e.g. impact on income levels	High	Critical	Sufficient additional savings will have to be identified to cover this, involving probable further job losses and/or reductions in service.

5. **KEY INFORMATION**

Background

5.1 A report to Strategy Committee in May 2009 (J17) set out the key issues and challenges relating to this year's Strategic and Financial Planning process and the formation of the 2010/11 Budget. These were:

- Reserves – these are reducing and far less is available to support budgets in future years.
- Economic downturn – this is having an ongoing and significant impact on the Council's finances, and placing an increased demand on certain services
- Council Tax – the 2010/11 Budget would have to weigh up, in line with the Council's financial strategy, the Council's financial position and pressures against the desire to keep increases as low as possible
- Savings, efficiencies and additional income – £1.3m to be found in 2009/10 as well as an estimated additional £1.4m in 2010/11 and around £1.0m in both 2011/12 and 2012/13.
- Efficiencies – a cumulative Government efficiency target was set from 2008/09 as part of the current Comprehensive Spending Review. This requires £0.8m to be achieved by the end of 2009/10 and an additional £0.5m by the end of 2010/11 (a total of £1.3m).
- Capital Programme – its scale and affordability is affected by the impact of prudential borrowing on annual revenue budgets and the impact of the economic downturn in terms of potential capital receipts and their timing.

Overall Financial Context

- 5.2 The overall context for the savings, efficiencies and additional income that is needed is based on the Council's Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) projection in February 2009, which indicated a potential total saving requirement over the next 3 years of £3.3m. This includes annual savings on the salary budget of £0.25m (about 3% of the salary bill) as a result of staff turnover and vacancies.
- 5.3 The Council's financial planning must look at this 3-year time horizon and not solely focus on the 2010/11 Budget. In doing so, the Government's next Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) will undoubtedly result in less money for public services and this will impact on the 2011/12 Budget and the level of savings/additional income required. Indications of reductions of anything up to 25%-30% are being suggested in some quarters.
- 5.4 It must be recognised, therefore, that the February 2009 forecast is likely to be well below what will actually be required when the results of the CSR are known next year. To illustrate the potential impact, Babergh's Government Grant is £6.24m for next year, so a 5% per annum cut from 2011/12 would result in a further £0.3m a year having to be saved.

Medium -Term Financial Strategy projection

- 5.5 The key components of the MTFS projection in February 2009 are set out in the table below:

	2010/11 £000	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000
Base budget from previous year	11,242	10,924	11,195
Inflation	+300	+400	+400
Commitments/cost pressures	+200	+250	+250
Strategic/Service Priorities	+100	+200	+200
Prudential borrowing	+250	+100	+100
Efficiencies, Savings and Additional Income (Excluding £250k a year saving from staff vacancies/turnover)	-1,168	-679	-685
	10,924	11,195	11,460
Use of Reserves	-97	-70	-30
Budget Requirement	10,827	11,125	11,430
Formula Grant (approx. +2% per annum)	-6,240	-6,365	-6,490
Council Taxpayers	4,587	4,760	4,940
Council Taxbase	33,000	33,250	33,500
Council Tax for Band D Property (based on 3% inflation increase)	£139.00	£143.17	£147.47

- 5.6 The key points of this are:
- The 2% increase in Government Grant is only fixed for next year. Although the Government could, in theory, renege on that, there have been no indications to date that it will
 - A lower inflation assumption for next year than previous years
 - A small allowance of £100k additional money for strategic/service priorities, which could be removed

- A significant allowance for prudential borrowing, which could be reduced by scaling down the capital programme. A review is currently being undertaken
- Under the current reserves strategy, very little is available to support the Budget. As a last resort, more could be taken from reserves by reducing the minimum approved level of reserves from £1.2m to £1m. However, even if this is done, it would be prudent to use the additional £0.2m over the 3-year planning period and not all in 2010/11 (as this would simply make the task of finding savings greater in 2011/12)
- Council Tax – the taxbase may not grow at the rate indicated and the Council may want to achieve a Council Tax increase below the 3% shown. No increase would equate to £135,000 a year (1% = £45,000).

Efficiencies, savings and additional income - summary

5.7 An initial assessment of the areas for potential savings has been undertaken and it is concluded that:

- The total savings required in this and future years cannot be delivered without some very difficult choices, including cuts in services and the prospects of staff redundancies, on top of any savings that can be made from normal retirements and not replacing posts when vacancies arise
- This leaves the Council with some stark choices between the various areas where costs could be reduced and options for generating additional income. Decisions on these will be needed in relation to the 2010/11 Budget.
- The prospects for 2011/12 and beyond will require even further savings and/or additional income. Although shared services could be starting to make a real impact by then, the scale of budget reductions that are required will leave the Council with very little room to manoeuvre.

5.8 The key message from this has to be that all possible cost reduction and income generation measures will need to be considered for implementation, and nothing can or should be ruled out at this stage. Further details are provided in the following section of the report.

Savings and Efficiencies Plan

5.9 A Savings and Efficiencies Plan has been drawn up to ensure a comprehensive and methodical assessment and approach to the enormous challenge that the Council faces. Its objectives are:

In 2009/10	In 2010/11
Achieve the 2009/10 saving target of £1.4m	Achieve the 2010/11 saving target of £1.4m
Deliver the cumulative efficiency saving of £0.8m	Deliver the cumulative efficiency saving of £1.3m
Identify and plan to deliver £1.4m savings in 2010/11	Plan for LGR / District mergers / radical shared service options from 2011 onwards.
Plan for 2011/12 onwards, whatever the future holds.	

The 2009/10 Budget

- 5.10 Around £0.4m of the £1.3m savings required for this year are still to be found. Of this it is estimated that around half will accrue as a result of savings from staff vacancies and general underspends on the overall budget, although both of these clearly carry some risk. The only other identified scope for meeting the remaining £0.2m would be the introduction of reduced staff terms and conditions in the current year (see para.5.56).
- 5.11 The cumulative efficiency target has been met with the help of an 'excess' efficiency gains of £0.45m made in previous years.

The 2010/11 Budget and Beyond

- 5.12 The £1.4m savings and efficiencies requirement for 2010/11 is a very significant amount in relation to the Council's budget, representing 12.5% of the Council's current net General Fund Revenue Expenditure. It is highly likely that the required savings for 2010/11 will require some fundamental changes that will make an appreciable impact on service delivery and staff numbers and/or terms and conditions.
- 5.13 The Council is therefore facing a huge challenge and the remainder of this report sets out proposed approaches and specific actions, taking account of the current position on local government review and the longer term implications for savings and efficiency targets in the event that LGR does not occur.
- 5.14 Key elements within the Savings and Efficiencies plan are:
- Understanding costs and budget deconstruction
 - Review of strategic priorities, outcomes and Medium Term Action Plans (MTAPs)
 - Income generation
 - Procurement and contracts
 - Achieving savings and efficiency gains
 - Staffing review.

Understanding costs and budget deconstruction

- 5.15 All the 2009/10 budgets (separated into staffing and other) are being allocated either to each of the Strategic Plan priorities and outcomes, or to any core support services that cannot readily be aligned to specific strategic priorities. This will contribute to a better understanding of how resources are aligned to stated priorities and will allow resources to be tracked during the refresh of the Medium Term Action Plans (MTAPs). It will also identify any areas where costs, when compared to outcomes, do not seem to represent good value for money.
- 5.16 The exercise will also contribute to a better understanding of the balance between outward-facing service and back-office support costs, and identification of any budgets/staff resources that cannot be readily aligned to strategic priorities or core support services. These will become prime areas for identification of realignment or savings opportunities.

5.17 In addition, a separate exercise that reviewed the 2008/09 expenditure outturn compared to budget has identified that a reduction in base budgets for 2010/11 of £120k should be possible.

Benchmarking

5.18 Benchmarking has been used as a tool to analyse the Council's service costs against other councils and identify services that will be reviewed.

5.19 The benchmarking exercise was carried out through a desk top analysis of a range of independently produced reviews, benchmarking cost performance against a number of key comparator groups of local authorities. Most of the reviews use a cost per head of population figure as the comparator. The information sources used for this review were:

- A Value for Money snapshot provided by Tribal Consulting;
- Total expenditure comparison with SPARSE rural local authorities;
- SPARSE detailed reviews of Recycling, Corporate Health, Planning and Housing Benefit;
- Audit Commission Value for Money tool.

5.20 The results of this exercise need to be considered in the context of the excellent ranking which Babergh achieves as a low cost local authority. When compared with all SPARSE District Councils, Babergh was ranked the 14th lowest cost out of 201 on the total expenditure per head of population

5.21 Based on the outcomes of the benchmarking exercise, the following areas are identified as having the greatest potential for making savings. The proposed methodology for review in each case is as shown in the relevant column heading.

Link with shared service discussions	Undertake efficiency review	Review of Contract
Benefits Admin (£1045k) & Local Taxation (£449k)	Development Control (£928k) The whole Planning service (£2m)	Open Space Contract, which includes street cleansing and parks and open spaces (£1.1m)
Culture and Heritage (£171k) & Tourism (£225k)	Car Parking (£243k gross, £137k net)	Pest Control (£34k)
Licensing (£364k gross, £210k net)	Recreation and Sport (£1271k) Private Housing Services (£51k) Flood Defence (£23k)	

5.22 Flood Defence is being investigated on a countywide basis through the Joint Emergency Planning Unit and officer and Member groups, to prepare for the implications of the Flood and Water Management Bill. This incorporates recommendations from the Pitt Review and could have considerable financial implications. However, at this point in time, no further budgetary provision in the 2010/11 Budget is proposed for flood management.

5.23 All the other areas listed for review are considered in more detail later in this report.

Review of strategic priorities, outcomes and Medium Term Action Plans (MTAPs)

5.24 The review of the strategic priorities and outcomes will be carried out through the State of the District Debate (Council, 20 October). The objective will be to review the strategic priorities and underlying outcomes to ensure that they are still provide the correct focus for the Council – especially in the context of the current economic recession, which could mean:

- Business failures
- Rising unemployment
- Increased debt and payment issues for residents
- House repossessions and homelessness
- Rising social costs (crime/health)

5.25 An exercise has been carried out to map out the outcomes underpinning each of the strategic priorities against the potential impacts of the recession. This provides an indication of the potential importance of each priority outcome in supporting Babergh communities at this time.

5.26 This work shows that each of the strategic priorities provides a vital contribution to supporting Babergh communities through the current economic recession. It also highlights the importance of the core council functions in delivering a housing /homelessness service, effective benefits and advice services, economic support and advice for businesses, and community support through enforcement and community safety.

5.27 This information in conjunction with a Suffolk Speaks consultation exercise undertaken in the summer will be used to inform the State of the District Debate, and a more detailed review of the individual priority outcomes and associated resource allocation as part of the refresh of the MTAPs and the formation of the 2010/11 Budget. This will be done in parallel with the savings and efficiencies work, and MTAPs will reflect the outcomes of the budget deconstruction exercise.

5.28 With current resources allocated to the strategic priorities and outcomes, and informed by the State of the District Debate, the MTAPs will be refreshed to cover the 3 year period 2010-13 and a 2010/11 Delivery Plan produced. All proposed outcomes will indicate both a staffing and budgetary allocation to inform the SFP process for 2010/11. This will further add to the benchmarking exercise referred to at para 5.21 in identifying VFM reviews, and savings and efficiency opportunities, and will be considered as an integral part of the service and financial planning process.

Income generation

5.29 Officers have sought to identify any significant opportunities for new/increased income generation, having regard to the constraints of the current economic climate. In the current economic climate, no areas that are already the subject of a charging regime have yet been identified as having scope for increased charging beyond an inflation level increase. The only remaining area where no charges are currently levied but could be introduced is that of car park charging.

5.30 The Council last considered the possible introduction of car parking charges in 2005. At that time, Strategy Committee made a recommendation to Council that a charging policy for long-stay parking be introduced with a view to achieving a cost neutral service by 2007/08. This was not supported at Council. At that time, the range of potential income that could be raised through various charging regimes was identified as follows:

Charge	Full year income £
Long Stay Only	
- £1	165,000
- £1.50	260,000
Long Stay charge of £1.50 and 20p/hour short stay charge – first hour free	290,000
Long Stay charge of £1 and 20p/hour short stay charge – no free period	346,000

5.31 Allowing for consultation and legal work, slightly less than half of these annual amounts would be generated in 2010/11 and the amounts would have to be reassessed by officers.

5.32 PLG and the SFP Task Group have considered the issue in the light of the savings and efficiency requirements and have concluded that, given the serious financial position, the issue of generating income from long stay parking charges needs to be given serious consideration as part of this year's SFP process.

5.33 Assuming Strategy Committee and Council on the 20th October support this, or any other approach to possible car park charging, the following issues will require further consideration by officers and the SFP Task Group:

- Stakeholder consultation/communication arrangements
- The practical implications of only introducing any particular charging regime
- The locations in which car park charging should be introduced

5.34 Members are advised that the annual gross revenue cost in the 2009/10 budget of providing car parks in Babergh is £243,000. In addition there is a capital budget for planned maintenance of around £60,000 - £70,000 a year.

5.35 Babergh is the only council in Suffolk that does not implement a car park charging regime. In relation to benchmarking, Babergh's costs obviously therefore compare unfavourably with other councils. For example, income received by other councils in Suffolk range from £0.5m to £2.6m and the net surplus generated ranges between £0.2m and £1.5m.

Procurement and contracts

- 5.36 Officers have reviewed the Contracts Register to ensure it is complete and to ensure the timely identification of contract renewal dates. This will maximise the opportunities to plan for more cost-effective procurement methods, such as joint commissioning with other councils.
- 5.37 The Register has some 60 contracts recorded. 17 are cyclical i.e. have fixed time periods, while the remainder are one-off procurements. The main initiatives in terms of partnering, consortium buying and innovation (whole house servicing) have already been taken and, although there will still be procurement savings achieved through contract review, they will not be significant.
- 5.38 The biggest opportunity is in the longer term (2011/12) where we should be exploring joint procurement and/or joint management with adjacent authorities e.g. Mid Suffolk, or possibly even joint procurement with housing associations that have properties within the district. It needs to be borne in mind, however, that any savings on council housing related expenditure will accrue to the HRA and not to the General Fund.
- 5.39 The impact of reducing the specification for grounds maintenance and cleansing contracts will be examined. Refuse collection is currently subject to negotiations and some further savings may be deliverable that will have an impact in 2010/11. Options for Pest Control are under consideration. However should the Council cease to provide a service there may be other costs associated with the statutory role which will have to be provided for.
- 5.40 Further examination of other contracts such as for the canteen and out of hours call-out will be carried out. Joint working initiatives and partnerships will also be investigated to seek opportunities to share costs with other providers – councils, voluntary sector etc.
- 5.41 A potential target saving of 90k has been set based on the above reviews. This would largely achieve the stretched target of £100k that already forms part of the Council's Procurement Strategy.

Savings and efficiency gains

- 5.42 Officers have identified areas that appear to have the greatest potential to contribute to making the necessary savings through either shared service arrangements or internal efficiency reviews. None of these represents an easy or guaranteed saving. Most carry the risk of reduced service levels and/or reductions in staffing establishment and the savings shown cannot be regarded as anything more than an indicative target. Nonetheless, they provide an outline of where attention will be focused in trying to drive out savings for 2010/11 and beyond. Detailed business cases will need to be developed in each case which, as well as establishing the actual saving, will also need to set out any reductions in service, quality, performance or staff numbers expected to arise from any savings that can be achieved.

Area - efficiencies	Saving (000)
Community Development Community Alarm – possible retirement opportunity and identify scope for further savings through outsourcing	16
Total	16
In addition, opportunities will be sought to reduce the staffing establishment by the following amounts through other efficiency reviews: Natural and Built Environment - 1 FTE post Corporate Services- 3 FTE posts Finance – 0.5 FTE post	
Total	90
Efficiency Reviews - overall potential saving	106
Area – shared service	
Community Development Economic Development – investigate scope for shared service Tourism – further development of shared service and review TICs Arts, recreation and sport– investigate scope for shared service	20 20 10
Total	50
Customer Services Revenues and Benefits - explore possibility of a shared service and two possible retirement opportunities. Customer Services – linked to the retirement, planned transition of component parts into appropriate divisions. Planned transition of any residual elements of Customer Services into CAM Division. Identify scope for further efficiencies and economies of scale. Planned transition of residual revenues/finance elements to Finance Division. Note – it is anticipated that a saving in 2010/11 can be made following the two retirements, but some cover arrangements may need to be put in place and/or there may be a need to cover up-front costs on any shared service proposal. Therefore the potential saving has been scaled back.	75 20 -45
Total	50
Finance Shared service savings (audit & benefit fraud)	10
Total	10
Natural & Built Environment Licensing - Investigate scope for shared service	10
Total	10
Shared Service - overall potential saving	120

- 5.43 Currently, shared service reviews carry a high risk and hence a reduced probability of realising their full potential savings. The table above sets out best case scenarios and to allow for the high risks involved, it is suggested that only 75% of the saving should be regarded as achievable at this stage.
- 5.44 Nearly all of the savings that might arise from the above reviews will be from the salary budget. This would equate to a reduction of approximately 11 staff in 2010/11.

5.45 Other reviews will also be undertaken in 2009/10 and 2010/11, with savings anticipated in 2011/12:

- Corporate Services - Investigate the scope for shared service delivery in ICT, Information Management and HR.
- Finance - Investigate the scope for shared services in Finance and Payroll with one or more councils.
- Natural and Built Environment - Undertake efficiency reviews in Environmental Services.
- Natural and Built Environment - A change in Government guidance enabled councils to charge for the sorts of discussions/negotiations which can take place before receipt of a planning application. This review will consider whether the Council should introduce charging for this service.

Staffing and pay reviews

5.46 Savings from a review of the senior management structure, along with other staffing reviews in Corporate Services, Customer Services and Natural & Built Environment, result in total savings for the General Fund of around £150k in the current year and £185k for 2010/11. The 2009/10 Base Budget assumed that £125k would be saved from this type of staffing review, which means that there is a further saving of £60k in relation to the 2010/11 Budget.

5.47 The pay review undertaken by Inbucon Consultants for all staff employed on a Performance Grade is an increase of 1.5% in 2009. The review also recommends that this percentage should be used for next year's budget. The 2010/11 MTFS forecast already allows for lower inflation costs and less than a 3% rise. Therefore, although a 1.5% pay award results in a saving to the General Fund of £110k next year, only £80k of this will contribute to the £1.4m target savings and efficiencies target.

5.48 Officers have analysed incidence of vacancies/staff turnover in 2008/09 and the first quarter of 2009/10 to inform the predicted salary budget saving from normal staff turnover for the remainder of 2009/10 and 2010/11, and a prediction of savings from a total recruitment freeze on filling vacancies in 2009/10 and 2010/11. They have also reviewed all current temporary and agency staffing arrangements, and projected retirements together with budgetary implications to ascertain any positions that could be terminated and when, together with budgetary implications. Potential savings of £35k have been identified to date.

5.49 A £250k saving through vacancy management has been assumed in the Budget for recent years. In 2008/09 the actual saving was lower than this at around £150k and this is likely to be repeated in 2009/10 and next year. The main cause of this is a reduction in the turnover figure through the general slowdown in recruitment. Although £250k could remain as the target for 2009/10 and 2010/11, this would mean not filling some posts for a substantial period, or not filling further posts at all during any particular year.

5.50 Staff will be affected by the efficiency reviews outlined above, a review of staff terms and conditions and the refresh of the MTAPs. There is no doubt that the size of the budget gap will result in the need to consider compulsory or voluntary redundancies to realise some savings or efficiencies. Obviously the costs of these would have to be factored into the financial aspect of any business case.

- 5.51 Officers have identified the budgetary implications and the issues/options that may arise through a review of staff terms and conditions. These have been discussed with Unison, which has carried out a survey into the attitudes of branch members towards hypothetical changes to elements of their contracts. Unison considers the survey results to be of indicative value only and does not constitute a mandate of its members.
- 5.52 From the survey, the four terms and conditions that received the most support for review were:

Area	Budget (£000)	Potential General Fund saving (£000)
Health insurance	31	23
Telephone allowances	8	3 (Based on staff only)
Car leasing	118	20
Payment of professional subscriptions	14	4
Total	171	50

- 5.53 The four terms and conditions that received the least support for review were:

Area	Budget (£000)	Potential saving (£000)
Core salaries (incl. NI/Pension)	10,000	1%=£100k
Contractual hours	-	
Holiday entitlement	-	
Salary increments	150	150
Total	10,150	250

- 5.54 Although a review of salary increments did not receive much support for review, there was more support for a review of PRP bonus payments.
- 5.55 Management Team and Heads of Service view is that PRP bonus payments, car allowances and leased cars and health insurance, are taken forward for further discussions and consultation with Unison and staff, together with any other options that staff might support, with a view to making substantial savings from 2009/10 onwards.
- 5.56 The specific areas from which savings/additional income could be sought for 2010/11 and indicative financial values attaching to each of these is set out below. It cannot be assumed at this stage that any of them will be realisable in whole or in part, but it is obvious that if any of these were deemed to be unacceptable in principle or cannot deliver savings in practice, alternative means of bridging the projected budget deficit for 2010/11 and beyond will have to be identified.

Area	Potential Saving (000)
Staffing	
Final senior management structure/other reviews (2010/11 Budget impact)	60
Efficiency reviews/Shared services (£226k x 75% probability)	170
Vacancy management	150
Pay Award	80
Savings on Staff Terms & Conditions	300
Temporary/Agency staff	35
Base Budget reductions (based on 2008/09 outturn)	120
Sub-Total – staffing costs	915
Procurement and contracts (likely to involve some service reduction on open spaces contract)	90
Income from car parking (based on £1.50 long-stay charge)	110
Total	1,115
Shortfall - to be found from restricting any budget growth, compulsory and voluntary redundancies/service or capital programme cuts	303
Estimated Savings, Efficiencies & Additional Income required	1,418

5.57 The shortfall of £303k would rise if the aim is for a Council Tax increase of less than 3% (1% = £45,000). Therefore, even if all of the items referred to in this report and summarised in the table above were achieved, there will still be a shortfall of around £350k to £450k to be found.

5.58 Whatever the shortfall, this will have to be found from a mixture of:

- No new money for strategic/service priorities
- Compulsory and voluntary redundancies
- Service or capital programme cuts

5.59 Although some of the shortfall could be bridged by the additional use of £65k from reserves in 2010/11 (£200k maximum spread over the next 3 years), this should be seen as a last resort.

6. APPENDICES

None

7. BACKGROUND PAPERS

None

CONTACT: Andrew Hunkin
Barry Hunter

Email: andrew.hunkin@babergh.gov.uk
barry.hunter@babergh.gov.uk