

## The Coalition: programme for government

Coalition Proposal	Practical Implication	Cost +ve or -ve	Other Comments
We will cut red tape by introducing a 'one-in, one-out' rule whereby no new regulation is brought in without other regulation being cut by a greater amount.	Sensible given economic climate	Neutral although not all regulations have the same resource impact.	
We will end the culture of 'tick-box' regulation, and instead target inspections on high-risk organisations through co-regulation and improving professional standards.	Current inspection is no longer proportionate to risk.	-ve	There is the potential for this council along with others to lobby government to ensure that there is a reduction in the costs of regulation. i.e. fees to the Audit Commission as a result of these changes.
We will give the public the opportunity to challenge the worst regulations	Will give the opponents of local regulations (i.e. Dog bans on beaches) the opportunity to challenge the council. Is likely to be time consuming to respond to such challenges and will require further public consultations to assess support. E-Petitions could have the same effect and they are legislative from June 2010.	-ve due to time to process objections.	Worst regulations are not defined in any detail  1 July 2010 the Government has issued a call to arms against pointless regulation and unnecessary bureaucracy, launching a new Your Freedom website at <a href="http://www.hmg.gov.uk/yourfreedom">www.hmg.gov.uk/yourfreedom</a> . The site asks the public how they want the Government to redress the balance between the citizen and the state.
We will find a practical way to make small business rate relief automatic.	Simplification welcomed.	+ve if system simpler.	
We will seek to ensure a level playing field between small and large retailers by enabling councils to take competition issues into account when drawing up their local plans to shape the direction and type of new retail developments.	Welcomed as could assist High Street shopping areas	Neutral	

Coalition Proposal	Practical Implication	Cost +ve or -ve	Other Comments
<p>We will review employment and workplace laws, for employers and employees, to ensure they maximise flexibility for both parties while protecting fairness and providing the competitive environment required for enterprise to thrive.</p>	<p>Impact of change uncertain but it provides ability to make changes to contracts of employment easier then this will aid initiatives to make working patterns more flexible to meet demand (annualised hours, definition of unsocial hours etc.</p>	<p>Reduced costs - may allow to save on additional employment costs, but figure not quantifiable at this stage.</p>	<p>Likely to take some time to implement.</p>
<p>We will end the ban on social tenants starting businesses in their own homes</p>	<p>This should be no problem except where the business will interfere with the “quiet enjoyment” of neighbours, e.g. if the business is a car repair business or similar.</p>	<p>+ve cost as it is assumed higher levels of HB will be paid where currently it is reduced.</p>	<p>May lead to some additional workload in benefit administration.</p>
<p>We will promote small business procurement, in particular by introducing an aspiration that 25% of government contracts should be awarded to small and medium-sized businesses and by publishing government tenders in full online and free of charge.</p>	<p>Unless this makes changes to the impact of European procurement law and the Remedies Directive then this is very likely to have little real impact on procurement practices. These are now catching even small areas of work that would fall within the scope of small businesses.</p>	<p>Neutral Short term +ve.</p>	<p>Difficult to achieve within current EU/UK law.</p>

Coalition Proposal	Practical Implication	Cost +ve or -ve	Other Comments
<p>We will support the creation of Local Enterprise Partnerships – joint local authority-business bodies brought forward by local authorities themselves to promote local economic development – to replace Regional Development Agencies (RDAs). These may take the form of the existing RDAs in areas where they are popular.</p> <p><b><i>Decentralisation &amp; Localism Bill</i></b></p>	<p>The Council would potentially have greater influence on economic development spending than it currently does. Welcome presence of business in Partnerships and more local influence.</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	<p>The commitment is silent on what would happen to the investment resources distributed by RDAs and the future ownership of their assets.</p> <p>East Kent Context does exhibit shared economic development objectives.</p> <p>Ministers have announced that the Decentralisation and Localism Bill will be introduced to Parliament at the end of 2010.</p> <p>This was backed up again in the Emergency Budget 2010 with the statement that “to survive RDAs will have to become public-private partnerships organised at sub-regional level”.</p> <p>The Government launched 29 June 2010 a £1billion Regional Growth Fund. The fund will operate between 2011-12 and 2012-13. Its intention is to help areas most dependent on public sector employment as the country makes the transition to private sector-led growth. Both private bodies and public-private partnerships will be able to bid for funding by demonstrating that their proposals will bring in private investment and support sustainable increases in private sector jobs and growth in their area.</p> <p>An Invite to LA Chief Executives, Leaders and Business Leaders was sent on 29 June 2010 asking them to consider forming new local enterprises partnerships. Outline proposals for LEP’s are to be submitted no later than the 6 September 2010. A White Paper which sets out the Government’s approach to sub-national growth was also promised in the letter and is due for publication later in the summer.</p>

Coalition Proposal	Practical Implication	Cost +ve or -ve	Other Comments
<p>We will take steps to improve the competitiveness of the UK tourism industry, recognising the important part it plays in our national economy.</p>	<p>This is far too unspecific to make any predictions about the impact. Welcome the words but is it going to lead to more help and investment?</p>	<p>Unquantifiable</p>	<p>Could be of considerable local benefit.</p>
<p>We will extend the scope of the Freedom of Information Act to provide greater transparency.</p> <p><b><i>Freedom (Great Repeal) Bill</i></b></p>	<p>The system is already being abused by individuals and by businesses seeking commercial information. In some operational areas like contaminated land and pollution, FOI now constitutes a significant part of the sections workload.</p>	<p>-ve as may increase current costs which are already excessive.</p>	<p>TDC should lobby for a reduction in the cost threshold above which requestors may be charged.</p>
<p>We will further regulate CCTV.</p> <p><b><i>Freedom (Great Repeal) Bill</i></b></p>	<p>Will require a review of our guidance and operating procedures for CCTV to comply with any new guidance. A review was already scheduled of our guidelines. May be a requirement to produce annual reports and open up our operation to scrutiny by lay inspectors.</p> <p>See comment further on in relation to RIPA powers.</p>	<p>Neutral</p> <p>Additional requirements are likely to be contained within existing budgets.</p>	<p>There is very little detail available on what form this might take however it is likely to restrict the use of CCTV to support enforcement activities e.g. to direct parking attendants to illegally parked vehicles etc. There may also be limits or restrictions on the expansion of camera networks.</p>

Coalition Proposal	Practical Implication	Cost +ve or -ve	Other Comments
<p>We will promote the radical devolution of power and greater financial autonomy to local government and community groups. This will include a review of local government finance.</p> <p><b><i>Decentralisation and Localism Bill</i></b></p>	<p>This may have a significant impact on service delivery at a local level even for front line services. The way these powers are devolved and the basis of the relationship between local government and community groups may drive this impact, but this is not yet spelled out in any detail.</p> <p>These comments relate to several other initiatives below.</p>	<p>-ve increased costs – unless this allows the devolution by councils of responsibilities without costs (i.e. voluntary activity). Size of cost increase cannot be estimated at present</p>	<p>Councils face different circumstances. Greater freedoms on finance allow priorities to be dealt with without standard bureaucracy costs.</p>
<p>We will rapidly abolish Regional Spatial Strategies and return decision-making powers on housing and planning to local councils, including giving councils new powers to stop 'garden grabbing'.</p> <p><b><i>Decentralisation &amp; Localism Bill</i></b></p>	<p>There is a corporate plan commitment to prevent the over development of existing residential areas but the delivery of this objective has been constrained by planning policy.</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	<p>The local control over housing numbers is very welcome. The requirement to provide 7,500 new homes in Thanet was not deliverable and probably not desirable. There are nearly 3,000 empty homes in the District indicating an over supply of housing relative to demand. This situation underpins the failures in the housing market in Cliftonville. But time consuming and potentially expensive.</p> <p>9 June 2010 Government re-issued <i>Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (PPS3)</i> with the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the definition of previously developed land in Annex B now excludes private residential gardens</li> <li>• the national indicative minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare is deleted from paragraph 47</li> </ul> <p>Government announced 17 June 2010 plans have been put in motion to “swiftly” dismantle the funding and powers of Regional Local Leaders’ Boards. (South East England Partnership Board).</p>

Coalition Proposal	Practical Implication	Cost +ve or -ve	Other Comments
<p>In the longer term, we will radically reform the planning system to give neighbourhoods far more ability to determine the shape of the places in which their inhabitants live, based on the principles set out in the Conservative Party publication <i>Open Source Planning</i>.</p> <p><b>Decentralisation &amp; Localism Bill</b></p> <p>E.g 'Garden Grabbing'</p>	<p>This could have a detrimental effect on the provision of new housing especially affordable housing in the district. Much new development will be opposed by local communities and therefore there will need to be strong political leadership to push through potentially controversial new housing schemes. On the other hand local choice is good for economy.</p>	<p>-ve will cost more</p>	<p>Participation, listening and providing feedback costs money.</p> <p>The Government announced 28 June 2010 that the National Housing and Planning Advisory Unit, an independent advisory body sponsored by the CLG will close with immediate effect.</p>
<p>We will abolish the unelected Infrastructure Planning Commission and replace it with an efficient and democratically accountable system that provides a fast-track process for major infrastructure projects.</p> <p><b>Decentralisation &amp; Localism Bill</b></p>	<p>We are not likely to have any development appropriate to the Commission.</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	<p>The Government confirmed 28 June 2010 that the Infrastructure Planning Commission will be abolished in. It will be replaced with a new rapid and accountable system where Ministers, not unelected commissioners, will take the decisions on new infrastructure projects critical to the country's future economic growth. A Major Infrastructure Planning Unit will be established in the Planning Inspectorate to continue fast-tracking major infrastructure projects like offshore windfarms and nuclear power stations. In addition, all National Policy Statements (NPS), the Government's future infrastructure blueprints, will now be subject to ratification by Parliament.</p>
<p>We will publish and present to Parliament a simple and consolidated national planning framework covering all forms of development and setting out national economic, environmental and social priorities.</p>	<p>Uncertain how this will work given lack of detail. Simpler would be welcome.</p>	<p>-ve will cost more</p>	<p>National framework will not work in all neighbourhoods. More consultation/participation cost.</p>

Coalition Proposal	Practical Implication	Cost +ve or -ve	Other Comments
We will maintain the Green Belt, Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and other environmental protections, and create a new designation – similar to SSSIs – to protect green areas of particular importance to local communities.	The extension of a SSSI like designation for extra areas may increase the management and maintenance responsibilities of local authorities if the land is in our ownership.	-ve Increased costs - cannot be quantified at this stage.	Is this an extension of the village green concept that protest groups will be able to object to land being developed.
We will abolish the Government Office for London and consider the case for abolishing the remaining Government Offices.	Not relevant to Thanet.	Neutral	Impinges on Planning policy. Until new law is made.
We will provide more protection against aggressive bailiffs and unreasonable charging orders, ensure that courts have the power to insist that repossession is always a last resort, and ban orders for sale on unsecured debts of less than £25,000.	<p>Welcomed. Will help prevent vulnerable and marginal home owners from becoming homeless and requiring support and assistance from the council.</p> <p>This may have an impact on the recovery of costs from non-payment of parking fines.</p>	<p>-ve as may result in harder to collect debts.</p> <p>Reduced income recovery – cannot be quantified at this stage.</p>	
We will explore a range of measures to bring empty homes into use.	Dealing with empty properties especially long term empties is a staff intensive activity. Our housing resources will be more focussed on the increased regulation of private sector landlords.	Neutral unless new burdens are imposed.	There are nearly 3,000 empty homes in Thanet and currently bring back into use through our intervention around 100 per year.

Coalition Proposal	Practical Implication	Cost +ve or -ve	Other Comments
We will promote shared ownership schemes and help social tenants and others to own or part-own their home.	<p>The promotion of shared ownership schemes will be useful in Cliftonville and will help address the significant affordability gap that exists in Thanet.</p> <p>There have been various produces to encourage tenants to take up part ownership of their homes but the take up has been poor.</p>	<p>-ve if the responsibility is passed to local government.</p> <p>Neutral if given to RSLs.</p>	<p>Affordability of home ownership is as big an issue in Thanet as it is in West Kent, because of the relationship between average wages and house prices</p> <p>The nature of social housing tenants has changed significantly in recent years. They are much less likely to be working and more likely to be dependent on benefits than they were in the hey-day of the RTB.</p> <p>Welcome.</p>
We will promote 'Home on the Farm' schemes that encourage farmers to convert existing buildings into affordable housing.	Limited impact on TDC given that compared to most Kent authorities we are substantially an urban authority.	Neutral	Implications for green belt, but not an issue in Thanet
<p>We will create new trusts that will make it simpler for communities to provide homes for local people.</p> <p><b>Decentralisation &amp; Localism Bill</b></p>	Has the potential to change the relationship with existing RSL partners. In effect seems to be creating new locally based housing associations. Creates the possibility of the Council setting up its own Community Housing Trust. May be a model that can be used in Cliftonville.	Neutral.	29 June 2010 the Government confirmed that plans for Local Housing Trusts will be included in the Decentralisation and Localism Bill due to be introduced in the Autumn.
<p>We will create new trusts that will make it simpler for communities to provide homes for local people.</p> <p><b>Decentralisation &amp; Localism Bill</b></p>	The indications are that the government will continue with the HRA reforms proposed by the previous government. The settlement looks favourable for Thanet.	+ve to Thanet under Government's current plans.	Separate paper to cabinet on HRA 17 <sup>th</sup> June.
We will freeze Council Tax in England for at least one year, and seek to freeze it for a further year, in partnership with local authorities.	The Council has planned a 2.5% increases over the next 3 years.	-ve unless RSG is raised.	<p>The Government is silent on RSG assistance in 2012/13.</p> <p>Ministers have still not confirmed details of how this freeze will operate at the time of writing this paper.</p>



Coalition Proposal	Practical Implication	Cost +ve or -ve	Other Comments
<p>We will create directly elected mayors in the 12 largest English cities, subject to confirmatory referendums and full scrutiny by elected councillors.</p>	<p>Not applicable to Thanet.</p>		
<p>We will give councils a general power of competence.</p> <p><b><i>Decentralisation &amp; Localism Bill</i></b></p>	<p>Welcomed</p> <p>This will provide a legal power that will enable the council to act as it sees fit in the best interests of its communities.</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	<p>Draft Local Government (Power of General Competence Bill).</p> <p>This Bill has been published by the LGA and forwarded for consideration by the Communities and Local Government Select Committee. This Bill would establish a 'power of first resort' for local government which would be wider than the well being power, create greater certainty for councils and encourage innovation. The bill can be downloaded from the LGA website <a href="http://www.lga.gov.uk/ga/core/page.do?pageld=9763866">http://www.lga.gov.uk/ga/core/page.do?pageld=9763866</a></p> <p>The draft Bill would create power for a council to do anything it considers likely to benefit its area and people who live there.</p> <p>The draft Bill also includes a power for a local authority to do anything in relation to, or for, the benefit of any person or area situation outside its area if it considers that it is likely to benefit its area and people who live there.</p>

<b>Coalition Proposal</b>	<b>Practical Implication</b>	<b>Cost +ve or -ve</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
<p>We will ban the use of powers in the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act (RIPA) by councils, unless they are signed off by a magistrate and required for stopping serious crime.</p>	<p>Our ability to use covert cameras to gather evidence to combat graffiti, fly tipping and anti social behaviour will be restricted or curtailed.</p> <p>This also relates in part to greater regulation of CCTV. This is likely to reduce the use of surveillance for fly-tipping, reduce chances of prosecution for environmental crime, and lead to increased fly-tipping clean up costs.</p> <p>Impedes licensing and some planning enforcement because costs of gathering evidence is increased.</p>	<p>-ve as other methods of evidence may have to be deployed.</p>	<p>Where we have used the CCTV cameras under RIPA, this has been done at the behest of the police and presumably will still be permissible albeit we will need to seek the authority of a magistrate first.</p>
<p>We will allow councils to return to the committee system, should they wish to.</p>	<p>Would mean a potential increase in democratic costs as more meetings would occur.</p>	<p>- ve as the Council will need additional staff.</p>	<p>A requirement under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 Act still exists for Councils to resolve to adopt strengthened governance arrangements (either a Directly Elected Mayor and Cabinet, or strengthened Leader and Cabinet). So far there has been no indications from the new Government whether this provision is to be revoked. We await further developments.</p>
<p>We will abolish the Standards Board regime.</p> <p><b><i>Decentralisation &amp; Localism Bill</i></b></p>		<p>-ve as will return costs to councils.</p>	

Coalition Proposal	Practical Implication	Cost +ve or -ve	Other Comments
<p>We will impose tougher rules to stop unfair competition by local authority newspapers.</p>	<p>Thanet Matters does not compete against local media.</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	<p>The government announced 25 June 2010 that there will be a toughening up of rules governing taxpayer-funded council newspapers. The <i>Code of Recommended Practice on Local Authority Publicity is a statutory guidance</i>. However, it is important to note that the Secretary of State is legally obliged to consult on the revised code. The Code was originally introduced in 1988 and amended by the last Government in 2001.</p>
<p>We will stop the restructuring of councils in Norfolk, Suffolk and Devon, and stop plans to force the regionalisation of the fire service.</p> <p><b>Local Government Bill</b></p>	<p>Not relevant to Thanet</p>		<p>Local Government Bill was introduced to Parliament on 26 May 2010.</p>
<p>We will introduce new powers to help communities save local facilities and services threatened with closure, and give communities the right to bid to take over local state-run services.</p> <p><b>Decentralisation &amp; Localism Bill</b></p>	<p>This may have implications for the council looking to close or re-organise services.</p>	<p>-ve if under used facilities have to be retained.</p>	<p>Depends what is included in the definition of local services. Could residents use these powers to prevent the closure of museums, community halls, district offices, leisure and recreational facilities.</p> <p>Good news provided the Council does not have to fund the transfer, and subsidise the service.</p> <p>Work has commenced on this initiative and it has been mooted that early measures will be in place by the autumn.</p>

Coalition Proposal	Practical Implication	Cost +ve or -ve	Other Comments
<p>We will implement the Sustainable Communities Act, so that citizens know how taxpayers' money is spent in their area and have a greater say over how it is spent.</p>	<p>The Council is already committed to greater transparency.</p> <p>Proposals under this Act are intended to be driven by the community and the Council. TDC would be expected to establish or recognise one or more panels of representatives of local persons and consult these panels and try to reach an agreement about which proposals (if any) it wants to put forward. It is important to note that authorities are not required to submit proposals.</p> <p>The preparation of placing a potential bid could be very labour intensive and looking at the first tranche very few bids were successful.</p> <p>No additional funding is provided for pursuing bids to submit to the Secretary of State – so if TDC wished to pursue a bid it would need to find the resources to do so.</p> <p>TDC will need to ensure it has mechanisms to produce the information for the Local Spending Reports requirements.</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	<p>More detail needed</p> <p>The principal aim of the Act is to promote the sustainability of local communities by encouraging the improvement of the economic, social or environmental well-being of the authority's area, including a participation in civic and political activity. It provides a channel for local people to ask central government to work in cooperation with the LGA, which represents the interests of local authorities in making it happen.</p> <p>The Sustainable Communities Act 2007 also places a requirement on the Secretary of State to make arrangements for the production of Local Spending Reports. 'The aim of Local Spending Reports is to support local authorities, their partners and local people in promoting the sustainability of local communities by providing more information about the funding that is spent in their area.' Currently only top tier council's information has been published.</p> <p>It is important to note that both the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats both pledged to implement this Act but given there are more pressing matters we wait to see how much emphasis will be put on this in the first year of the new Government. Therefore, it is an unlikely priority.</p>

Coalition Proposal	Practical Implication	Cost +ve or -ve	Other Comments
<p>We will cut local government inspection and abolish the Comprehensive Area Assessment.</p>	<p>Already announced.  CAA was burdensome on officer time.</p>	<p>+ve as will reduce audit fees.</p>	<p>Audit Commission confirmed all work in relation to CAA and UoR has stopped with immediate effect 28 May 2010. However, Data Quality checks will still be enforced.</p> <p>It is important to note they say Local Government (LG) Inspection – does this mean other LG inspections will also cease. We wait for further announcements.</p> <p>The CLG have announced that they are considering the future role of the Place Survey in the context of the new Government's agenda. They have therefore, recommended that Local Authorities do not proceed any further with preparations for this autumn's survey at this current time and that they will provide a more detailed up date as soon as possible.</p>
<p>We will require continuous improvements to the energy efficiency of new housing.</p>	<p>This is welcomed but will add to build costs both in the affordable sector and in market housing</p>	<p>-ve if this applies as it will to new social housing.</p>	<p>It may make development in Thanet more marginal and discourage builders/developers from investing in the area. Developers will want to off set these additional costs against potential section 106 liabilities, thereby reducing income to support infrastructure, community facilities and affordable housing.</p>
<p>We will provide incentives for local authorities to deliver sustainable development, including for new homes and businesses.</p>	<p>Welcomed</p>	<p>+ve as will increase costs.</p>	
<p>We will review the effectiveness of the raising of the stamp duty threshold for first-time buyers.</p>	<p>May help more local residents become home owners and may help stimulate demand from home owners in Cliftonville.</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	<p>Access to the housing market remains a significant issue in Thanet. The relationship between lower quartile house prices and average earnings means that Thanet is one of the most difficult areas in Kent for first time buyers Only Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells are worse.</p>

Coalition Proposal	Practical Implication	Cost +ve or -ve	Other Comments
We will give councillors the power to vote on large salary packages for unelected council officials.	The Council already has this power	Neutral	
We will introduce honesty in food labelling so that consumers can be confident about where their food comes from and its environmental impact.	Welcomed	Neutral if placed with KCC, -ve if TDC.	It is presumed that the regulatory function in this respect will fall on Trading Standards and not the food safety teams of District Councils.
<p>We will amend the health and safety laws that stand in the way of common sense policing.</p> <p><b><i>Police Reform &amp; Social Responsibility Bill</i></b></p>	The council has a statutory duty in regulating and investigating breaches of Health and safety legislation, (alongside the H&S Executive). We would need to review our practices in the light of any new guidance but the implication is less regulation.	+ve if leads to reduction in inspection requirements.	14 June 2010 Government announced Lord Young will undertake a Whitehall-wide review of the operation of health and safety laws and the growth of the compensation culture. It is expected that he will report to the PM in the summer 2010
We will review alcohol taxation and pricing to ensure it tackles binge drinking without unfairly penalising responsible drinkers, pubs and important local industries.	To be welcomed, good social and health objectives. Alcohol abuse contributes to many areas where Thanet has abnormally high crime levels, e.g. violence in the night time economy, domestic violence criminal damage.	Neutral, provided fees reflect new duties.	Also plays a significant part in the poor health of Thanet residents – compared to the county average.  Target at 'Happy Hours' etc.
<p>We will overhaul the Licensing Act to give local authorities and the police much stronger powers to remove licences from, or refuse to grant licences to, any premises that are causing problems.</p> <p><b><i>Police Reform &amp; Social Responsibility Bill</i></b></p>	As above	Neutral	

<b>Coalition Proposal</b>	<b>Practical Implication</b>	<b>Cost +ve or -ve</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
<p>We will allow councils and the police to shut down permanently any shop or bar found to be persistently selling alcohol to children</p> <p><b><i>Police Reform &amp; Social Responsibility Bill</i></b></p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	
<p>We will double the maximum fine for under-age alcohol sales to £20,000</p> <p><b><i>Police Reform &amp; Social Responsibility Bill</i></b></p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	
<p>We will permit local councils to charge more for late-night licences to pay for additional policing.</p> <p>We will promote better recording of hate crimes against disabled, homosexual and transgender people, which are frequently not centrally recorded.</p> <p><b><i>Police Reform &amp; Social Responsibility Bill</i></b></p>	<p>To be welcomed.</p> <p>A significant amount of resources associated with the community safety partnership are used to reduce problems caused by the night time economy.</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	
<p>We will work with the Mayor of London to ensure a safe and successful Olympic Paralympic Games in London 2012 and urgently form plans to deliver a genuine and lasting legacy.</p>	<p>This decision is regrettable given the success of the free swimming initiative in Thanet, and will be unpopular. The Council is working on a good offer to replace free swimming with TLF, though the details of this have yet to be finalised.</p>	<p>Unable to advise at this stage.</p> <p>Some potential to compromise the additional funding received from the PCT though this will be resisted.</p>	<p>The Government announced 17 June 2010 funding for free swimming will cease from the 31 July 2010.</p>

Coalition Proposal	Practical Implication	Cost +ve or -ve	Other Comments
We will examine the case for moving to a 'gross profits tax' system for the National Lottery and reform the National Lottery so that more money goes into sport, the arts and heritage.	To be welcomed – could open up more funding opportunities.	+ve to TDC if additional resources available.	Announced 10 June 2010 plans to increase sports' share of the lottery returns from 16% to 20% are progressing quickly with an Order expected to be put before Parliament after the summer recess.
We will use cash in dormant betting accounts to improve local sports facilities and support sports clubs.	To be welcomed – could open up more funding opportunities.	As above	
We will cut red tape to encourage the performance of more live music.	<p>Live music events in pubs and similar establishments already generate a large number of complaints to the council. Any changes will increase the number of complaints.</p> <p>This may help with the delivery of events either directly or the ones we fund.</p>	-ve as may lead to more demands for out of hours noise services.	Implications for Licensing.
We recognise that deficit reduction, and continuing to ensure economic recovery, is the most urgent issue facing Britain.	Generally accepted	-ve as likely to lead to a reduction in local government funding.	
We will significantly accelerate the reduction of the structural deficit over the course of a Parliament, with the main burden of deficit reduction borne by reduced spending rather than increased taxes.	As above	As above	



Coalition Proposal	Practical Implication	Cost +ve or -ve	Other Comments
We will introduce arrangements that will protect those on low incomes from the effect of public sector pay constraint and other spending constraints.	Although we are not a poor payer in relation to manual staff this may have a disproportionate affect due to the number of manual staff we employ (especially in Waste and Cleansing services).	Uncertain as the reserved reduced NI position may offset increases on lower paid staff's pay.	
We will protect jobs by stopping the proposed jobs tax.	Welcomed	See above	
We will set out a plan for deficit reduction in an emergency budget. We have created an independent Office for Budget Responsibility to make new forecasts of growth and borrowing for this emergency budget.  <b>Office of Budget Responsibility Bill</b>	Not relevant to the Council	Neutral	Emergency budget date set for 22 June 2010 which will set the direction of travel.

Coalition Proposal	Practical Implication	Cost +ve or -ve	Other Comments
<p>We will make modest cuts of £6 billion to non-front-line services within the financial year 2010/11, subject to advice from the Treasury and the Bank of England on their feasibility and advisability. A proportion of these savings can be used to support jobs.</p>	<p>This may depend on the definition of non-frontline services.</p>	<p>-ve The Council has already pre-anticipated having to make savings and will have to make choices about how these are delivered in relation to our own local view about our service priorities.</p>	<p>Eric Pickles announced spending cuts 10 June 2010. View full release and accompanying attachments via following weblink: <a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/news/corporate/1611138">http://www.communities.gov.uk/news/corporate/1611138</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communities and Local Government has been asked to find £780m savings in 2010/11. Departmental and Arms Length Body running costs are therefore being reduced by 10 per cent.</li> </ul> <p>The need to act quickly to reduce the deficit means that Government departments have had to make difficult decisions about reducing grants to local government. Shielding the frontline has underpinned decisions on where savings can be found.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The £29bn general grant, the main source of funding that local government receives every year, is not being reduced. This will ensure that key frontline services can be protected and prevent council tax rises.</li> <li>• Local Government is being asked to contribute £1.166bn to overall savings. No individual local authority will face a reduction in their revenue grant of more than 2 per cent.</li> <li>• Reduction in revenue and capital non-schools ring-fencing this year from 10.7 per cent (£4.5bn) to only 7.7 per cent (£3.2bn) as a first step to giving councils more freedom over spending decisions. In addition, a major scaling back of quangos puts local government centre stage in meeting the needs of local residents.</li> </ul>

Coalition Proposal	Practical Implication	Cost +ve or -ve	Other Comments
<p>We will hold a full Spending Review reporting this autumn, following a fully consultative process involving all tiers of government and the private sector.</p>	<p>The Council will need to be prepared to advance its case for change with other Kent local authorities.</p>	<p>Unquantifiable</p>	<p>The Spending Review Framework was published on 8 June 2010. Document can be download via following weblink:  <a href="http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/spend_index.htm">http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/spend_index.htm</a></p> <p>The Spending Review process will be used to simplify Local Government funding and centrally driven reporting requirements.</p> <p>The spending review will “also provide a platform to consider new and radical approaches to public service provision”. The Government will challenge central Government departments and local Government to consider different ways of providing services including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better targeted interventions;</li> <li>• Looking at the linkages between delivery bodies;</li> <li>• Placing responsibility with the front-line.</li> </ul> <p>The Spending Review is expected to be presented on 20 October 2010.</p> <p>Announced 24 June 2010 a new website has been set up by the government called the Spending Challenge. It's aiming to get the best ideas from people who work on the frontline of public services on how the government can deliver more for less. The website is open until Thursday 8 July, after which date, it will be opened up to the wider public. Ministers are asking all public sector workers to share their most innovative, yet practical, ideas for delivering services to citizens while saving money in the process.  <a href="http://spendingchallenge.hm-treasury.gov.uk/">http://spendingchallenge.hm-treasury.gov.uk/</a></p>

Coalition Proposal	Practical Implication	Cost +ve or -ve	Other Comments
We will reduce spending on the Child Trust Fund and tax credits for higher earners.	Not relevant to the Council	Unquantifiable	
We will create strong financial discipline at all levels of government and place an obligation on public servants to manage taxpayers' money wisely.	Already exists in current law	Neutral	
<p>We will reduce the number and cost of quangos.</p> <p><b>Public Bodies (Reform) Bill</b></p>	<p>Need more detail. A number of Quangos we deal with and have built up relationships with may be at threat.</p> <p>This is already impacting on Sport England and Arts Council so unless they will be paying Councils directly rather than going through these bodies then councils will lose money.</p>	<p>Unquantifiable overall.</p> <p>Sport England – TDC already lost £12k through immediate funding changes.</p> <p>Overall estimate is loss of £20,000 per annum.</p>	<p>We have invested significant time into ensuring that quangos like the HCA and SEEDA understand the issues faced by Thanet to ensure that they continued to fund projects and schemes in the district.</p> <p>Risk that new funding routes may be less sympathetic to the needs of Thanet.</p> <p>It has been mooted that the Public Bodies (Reform) Bill will be introduced after the Summer Recess.</p> <p>Government announced 29 June 2010 that, as part of the review of Defra's arms length bodies, the Commission for Rural Communities will be abolished, with a strengthened Rural Communities Policy Unit within Defra.</p>
<p>We will cancel the third runway at Heathrow.</p> <p><b>Airport Economic Regulation Bill</b></p>	<p>May lead to indirect opportunities for air traffic at KIA.</p>	<p>-ve</p> <p>This and the SE Airport Taskforce will bring extra workload, not yet quantifiable.</p>	<p>Lack of capacity at other airports in the South East and constraints on the expansion of existing airports may stimulate growth in the use of Manston as an alternative. Activity at KIA will increase.</p> <p>15 June 2010 the Government announced the establishment of a South East Airports Task force with key players from across the industry to explore the scope for measures to help make the most of existing airport infrastructure and improve conditions for all users.</p>

<b>Coalition Proposal</b>	<b>Practical Implication</b>	<b>Cost +ve or -ve</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
<p>We will refuse permission for additional runways at Gatwick and Stansted.</p> <p><b><i>Airport Economic Regulation Bill</i></b></p>	As above	-ve	Lack of capacity at other airports in the south east and constrains on the expansion of existing airports may stimulate growth in the use of Manston as an alternative. Activity at KIA will increase
We will deliver an offshore electricity grid in order to support the development of a new generation of offshore wind power.	Welcomed Potential benefits for Ramsgate Port	Neutral	Affects us at Pegwell, link to Richborough
<p>We will encourage community-owned renewable energy schemes where local people benefit from the power produced.</p> <p>We will also allow communities that host renewable energy projects to keep the additional business rates they generate.</p>	Welcomed	Neutral	Onshore turbines inhibit airport operations (radar interference).
We will launch a national tree planting campaign.	Very uncertain unless this involves extra funding for new trees.	Unquantifiable	Emphasis on tree protection will follow.
We will work towards full compliance with European Air Quality standards.	<p>May give more clout to the council's air quality action plans, e.g. forcing other agencies, especially highways to take actions to reduce pollution in our designated management areas (Birchington and St Lawrence).</p> <p>This will have an impact in relation to choices of vehicles in waste service when we come to replace these in 2013.</p>	Unquantifiable	<p>The councils approach in monitoring air quality and declaring Air quality management zones is built around the existing European Standard. The weakness is in the ability to compel remedial actions from other agencies.</p> <p>Unless fees to business cover full costs.</p>

Coalition Proposal	Practical Implication	Cost +ve or -ve	Other Comments
<p>We will take forward the findings of the Pitt Review to improve our flood defences, and prevent unnecessary building in areas of high flood risk.</p>	<p>Not relevant generally for river risk in Thanet but may affect some coastal areas</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	<p>Excellent news. Thanet has under invested sea defences.</p> <p>29 June 2010 Environmental Agency Chief Executive told Councils at their Flood and Coastal Risk Management Conference that local contributions to the funding of flood defences will have to play a greater role in reducing the risk of flood and coastal erosion.</p>

Coalition Proposal	Practical Implication	Cost +ve or -ve	Other Comments
<p>We will work towards a 'zero waste' economy, encourage councils to pay people to recycle, and work to reduce littering.</p>	<p>The pay to recycle idea has contrary implications. The aim is to offset payments against reduced costs of diverting waste away from landfill and other more expensive methods of processing (Allington). Most of the savings would accrue to KCC, and would need a mechanism to feed this back if districts are the ones making the recycling payments to residents. The costs of administering such schemes and dealing with the "scams" that would spring up would need to be dealt with.</p> <p>The comment about littering is welcome but there is no certainty about additional support to do this.</p> <p>Following on from the announcement on the 17<sup>th</sup> June if such a move was forced then this would have a very serious impact in Thanet. In addition, there is little call locally for a shift away from the system used by Thanet, with far more residents requesting entry onto the wheeled bin scheme.</p>	<p>-ve</p> <p>Recycling – would need to be operated in a way in which diversion savings outweighed recycling payments. Presume reduced costs overall but cannot be quantified at this stage and would need agreements with KCC.</p> <p>Unless additional cleaning resources are provided that action on littering may lead to additional costs but cannot be quantified at this stage.</p> <p>This would either remove almost all the recycling services, which would have a large negative impact on disposal costs for KCC or add significant costs to the collection of waste and recycling.</p>	<p>The Government announced on 15 June 2010 that it is to carry out a full review of waste policy in England, looking at the most effective ways of reducing waste, maximising the money to be made from waste and recycling, and how waste policies affect local communities and individual households. The review will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the effect of waste policies on local communities and individual households, and how local authorities can best work with people to make the best decisions;</li> <li>• maximising the contribution of the waste and recycling industries to the UK economically and environmentally;</li> <li>• how we work towards the "zero waste economy", and drastically reduce the amount of waste created and valuable resources sent to landfill, looking at the entire process from source to end of life; and</li> <li>• new approaches to dealing with commercial waste and promoting 'responsibility deals', reducing the amount of waste generated by production and retail.</li> </ul> <p>The Communities and Local Government Secretary (Eric Pickles) announced on the 17 June 2010 that he has instructed the Audit Commission to repeal their guidance on waste. This repeal would allow Councils to reinstate weekly bin collections.</p> <p>However, the latest East Kent joint waste proposals agreed at Cabinet on 17th June propose a collection model that collects food waste separately on a weekly basis, whilst retaining high levels of recycling which maximises the value of the recycle. This is a more rational approach that improves levels of recycling and reduces overall costs of waste management.</p>

<b>Coalition Proposal</b>	<b>Practical Implication</b>	<b>Cost +ve or -ve</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
We will take forward the Marine and Coastal Access Act and ensure that its conservation measures are implemented effectively.	Welcomed. This is likely to be neutral unless it places some very unusual requirements on us that exceed our current arrangements under the Thanet Coast Project	Neutral	
We will ensure that food procured by government departments, and eventually the whole public sector, meets British standards of production wherever this can be achieved without increasing overall cost.	May have implications as local authorities are the regulating authority.	-ve if additional staffing is required.	
We will create a presumption in favour of sustainable development in the planning system.	Welcomed	Neutral	Implies 'testing' of applications. A complex area.
We will promote equal pay and take a range of measures to end discrimination in the workplace.	We have mainly done this for manual staff within works service under the Modernisation Project.	Neutral	
We will extend the right to request flexible working to all employees, consulting with business on how best to do so.	Already in TDC Terms & Conditions	Neutral	
We will undertake a fair pay review in the public sector to implement our proposed '20 times' pay multiple.	No employee is affected in TDC	Neutral	
We will take Sure Start back to its original purpose of early intervention, increase its focus on the neediest families, and better involve organisations with a track record of supporting families. We will investigate ways of ensuring that providers are paid in part by the results they achieve	Potential implications for the role of Children's centres in the Margate Task Force. The focus on neediest families is welcomed and addresses the charge levelled at the Sure Start programme that the benefits went to better off households.	Neutral	Implications are more for KCC and their role in commissioning children centre services. The biggest risk is to Millmead, which is commissioned differently from other similar centres in Kent. All other services are run in house by KCC.



Coalition Proposal	Practical Implication	Cost +ve or -ve	Other Comments
<p>We will investigate a new approach to helping families with multiple problems</p>	<p>Welcomed</p> <p>Potentially will assist in dealing with high cost households in the Margate task force. May strengthen interventions in dysfunctional households associated with high levels of worklessness and anti social behaviour.</p> <p>See comments below at B.</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	<p>The Government announced on 17 June 2010 that they are to set up a new 'Childhood and Families Taskforce'. The taskforce will be expected to resolve fundamental coalition differences on family policy and its proposals will be developed in the context of the Comprehensive Spending Review. The taskforce will report its conclusions around the end of the year.</p>
<p>We will publish serious case reviews, with identifying details removed</p>	<p>We occasionally contribute to serious case reviews. We are required to produce an action plan as a result of our participation in the process and this might be seem to implicate the council as having a contributory role in the death or injury to the child. Thus potential reputation risk to the council.</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	<p>We have been involved in just one serious case review during the last year.</p>

Coalition Proposal	Practical Implication	Cost +ve or -ve	Other Comments
<p>We will review the criminal records and vetting and barring regime and scale it back to common sense levels.</p>	<p>Welcomed</p>	<p>+ve will potentially reduce the Council's costs.</p>	<p>This may reduce costs of CRB checking of staff.</p> <p>The Government announced on 15 June 2010 that the registration with the Vetting and Barring Scheme (VBS) has been halted.</p> <p>Voluntary registration with the VBS for new employees and job-movers working or volunteering with children and vulnerable adults was due to start on 26 July.</p> <p>However, TDC needs to be aware that some existing arrangements under the Scheme which will continue include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>employers are still legally obliged to refer information to the ISA if they have moved or removed an individual because they have harmed or there is a risk of harm to a member of a vulnerable group.</li> </ul>
<p>We will require public bodies to publish online the job titles of every member of staff and the salaries and expenses of senior officials paid more than the lowest salary permissible in Pay Band 1 of the Senior Civil Service pay scale, and organograms that include all positions in those bodies.</p>	<p>We are already going beyond this requirement (depending on what level Pay band one kicks in at).</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	
<p>We will introduce new protections for whistleblowers in the public sector.</p>	<p>Welcomed but unclear what these are.</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	
<p>We will require all councils to publish meeting minutes and local service performance data.</p>	<p>Already done by TDC</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	<p>Announced 4 June 2010 by CLG see below</p>

Coalition Proposal	Practical Implication	Cost +ve or -ve	Other Comments
<p>We will require all councils to publish items of spending above £500, and to publish contracts and tender documents in full.</p> <p><b><i>Decentralisation and Localism Bill</i></b></p>	<p>This seems onerous and will generate a high level of follow up enquires from FOI.</p> <p>Surely this is far too low a threshold and will be very onerous.</p>	<p>-ve</p> <p>Increased cost – assumed that to this is almost a full time job for a Council of our size, estimate £20,000 per annum.</p>	<p>Announced 4 June 2010 by CLG</p> <p>Councils are being encouraged to publish a wide range of data online including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• information on senior salaries, names and job descriptions</li> <li>• councillor allowances and expenses; minutes and papers of council meetings</li> <li>• job vacancies that will enable people to see why council wage bills are so high and how many of the positions are for key local services</li> <li>• frontline service data - including rubbish and recycling rates, council tax collection rates and detail of major planned projects</li> <li>• data such as food hygiene reports for food outlets - information which is routinely collected and of interest to residents, but not currently shared in an easily accessible format.</li> </ul> <p>Link to website:  <a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/newsstories/localgovernment/1607020">http://www.communities.gov.uk/newsstories/localgovernment/1607020</a></p>
<p>We will ensure that all data published by public bodies is published in an open and standardised format, so that it can be used easily and with minimal cost by third parties.</p>	<p>We are already working towards this objective.</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	<p>Cabinet Office announced 25 June 2010 that everyone will be invited to comment on new principles for transparency and open data and put forward new suggestions for data sets they want to see released. To view the suggestions of the Transparency Board and put forward suggestions on public data principles log on to <a href="http://data.gov.uk/ideas">http://data.gov.uk/ideas</a></p>

Coalition Proposal	Practical Implication	Cost +ve or -ve	Other Comments
<p>We will end all existing welfare to work programmes and create a single welfare to work programme to help all unemployed people get back into work.</p>	<p>Curtailment of Thanet works and other initiatives.</p> <p>This is likely to have very uncertain consequences in our more deprived areas. If it encourages people into work then it will be beneficial in social and environmental terms leading to reduced management and maintenance costs. However, the change is likely to be over a generation if any.</p>	<p>Unquantifiable</p>	<p>Future Jobs Fund Round 2 has been cancelled.</p> <p>Government announced 10 June 2010 that it aims to have the new 'single Work Programme' up and running by Summer 2011.</p>
<p>We will realign contracts with welfare to work service providers to reflect more closely the results they achieve in getting people back into work.</p>	<p>Welcomed</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	
<p>We will ensure that receipt of benefits for those able to work is conditional on their willingness to work.</p> <p><b>Welfare Reform Bill</b></p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	
<p>We will re-assess all current claimants of Incapacity Benefit for their readiness to work. Those assessed as fully capable for work will be moved onto Jobseeker's Allowance</p> <p><b>Welfare Reform Bill</b></p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	
<p>We will develop local Work Clubs – places where unemployed people can gather to exchange skills, find opportunities, make contacts and provide mutual support.</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	<p>We will need probably TDC support</p>

Coalition Proposal	Practical Implication	Cost +ve or -ve	Other Comments
<p>We will investigate how to simplify the benefit system in order to improve incentives to work.</p> <p><b>Welfare Reform Bill</b></p>	<p>Welcomed</p>	<p>+ve may lead to reduced expenditure.</p>	
<p>We will explore alternative forms of secure, treatment-based accommodation for mentally ill and drugs offenders.</p>	<p>Welcomed</p>	<p>-ve if the LA has to provide the accommodation.</p>	
<p>We will ensure that there is a stronger voice for patients locally through directly elected individuals on the boards of their local primary care trust (PCT). The remainder of the PCT's board will be appointed by the relevant local authority or authorities, and the Chief Executive and principal officers will be appointed by the Secretary of State on the advice of the new independent NHS board. This will ensure the right balance between locally accountable individuals and technical expertise.</p> <p><b>Health Bill</b></p>	<p>Unclear how elections will be conducted and how this squares with a greater localism agenda</p>	<p>neutral</p>	
<p>The local PCT will act as a champion for patients and commission those residual services that are best undertaken at a wider level, rather than directly by GPs. It will also take responsibility for improving public health for people in their area, working closely with the local authority and other local organisations.</p>	<p>This may lead to additional funding being provided to health promotion activities and specifically to support the type of sports programmes TDC manages or promotes. Funding coming in may help replace current budgets in sports development service.</p>	<p>+ve</p> <p>Reduced costs – cannot be quantified at this stage.</p>	

Coalition Proposal	Practical Implication	Cost +ve or -ve	Other Comments
<p>If a local authority has concerns about a significant proposed closure of local services, for example an A&amp;E department, it will have the right to challenge health organisations, and refer the case to the Independent Reconfiguration Panel. The Panel would then provide advice to the Secretary of State for Health.</p>	<p>Welcomed but which tier of local government does it relate to.</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	
<p>We will renegotiate the GP contract and incentivise ways of improving access to primary care in disadvantaged areas.</p>	<p>Welcomed</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	
<p>We will help elderly people live at home for longer through solutions such as home adaptations and community support programmes.</p>	<p>Could have implications for TDC – would need further details of proposed programmes before further comment.</p>	<p>-ve unless additional resources provided.</p>	
<p>We will phase out the default retirement age and hold a review to set the date at which the state pension age starts to rise to 66, although it will not be sooner than 2016 for men and 2020 for women. We will end the rules requiring compulsory annuitisation at 75.</p> <p><b><i>Pensions and Savings Bill</i></b></p>	<p>Will have potential impacts for employers including TDC.</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	<p>Under current legislation, the State Pension age is due to increase to 66 between 2024 and 2026 followed by two further increases at ten-year intervals. The review will re-examine this timetable and make recommendations</p>

Coalition Proposal	Practical Implication	Cost +ve or -ve	Other Comments
<p>We will establish five-year fixed term Parliaments. Stating that the next general election will be held on the first Thursday of May 2015. Following this motion we will legislate to make provision for fixed-term Parliament of five years. This legislation will also provide for dissolution if 55% or more of the House votes in favour.</p> <p><b>Parliamentary Reform Bill</b></p>			
<p>We will bring forward a Referendum Bill on electoral reform, which includes provision for the introduction of the Alternative Vote in the event of a positive results in the referendum, as well as for the creation of fewer and more equal sized constituencies. We will whip both Parliamentary parties in both Houses to support a simple majority referendum on the AV, without prejudice to the positions parties will take during such a referendum.</p> <p><b>Parliamentary Reform Bill</b></p>	<p>Could have implications in relation to 'more equal sized constituencies'.</p> <p>If AV goes through will it be pushed down to Local Government for District Council Elections?</p>		<p>Nick Clegg, the deputy prime minister, is expected to make the referendum announcement on Tuesday 6 July 2010 as part of a constitutional package including an equalisation in the size of parliamentary constituencies. It is expected that a national vote on the Alternative Vote system will be held on 5 May next year, the same day as the local elections, in an effort to increase voter turnout.</p>
<p>We will bring forward early legislation to introduce a power of recall, allowing voters to force a by-election where an MP is found to have engaged in serious wrongdoing and having has a petition calling for a by-election signed by 10% of his or her constituents.</p> <p><b>Parliamentary Reform Bill</b></p>			

<b>Coalition Proposal</b>	<b>Practical Implication</b>	<b>Cost +ve or -ve</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
<p>We will reduce electoral fraud by speeding up the implementation of individual voter registration.</p> <p><b><i>Parliamentary Reform Bill</i></b></p>	<p>Unclear how this will work</p>	<p>Potentially -ve if additional cost</p>	
<p>We will fund 200 all-postal primaries over this Parliament, targeted at seats which have not changed hands for many years. These funds will be allocated to all political parties with seats in Parliament that they take up, in proportion to their share of the total vote in the last general election.</p>	<p>Could apply to North Thanet Constituency</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	
<p>We will introduce a new 'public reading stage' for bills to give the public an opportunity to comment on proposed legislation online, and a dedicated 'public reading day' within a bill's committee stage where those comments will be debated by the committee scrutinising the bill.</p>	<p>Welcomed</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	
<p>We will publish details of every UK project that receives over £25,000 of EU funds.</p>	<p>Welcomed</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	
<p>We will give residents the power to instigate local referendums on any local issue</p> <p><b><i>Decentralisation and Localism Bill</i></b></p>	<p>Does the government really mean "any" local issue?</p>	<p>-ve Increased cost – extremely difficult to estimate.</p>	
<p>We will stop plans to impose supplementary business rates on firms if a majority of the firms affected do not give their consent.</p>	<p>Attention is required to the raising and distribution of business rates</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	



<b>Coalition Proposal</b>	<b>Practical Implication</b>	<b>Cost +ve or -ve</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
<p>We will give residents the power to veto excessive council tax increases.</p> <p><b><i>Decentralisation and Localism Bill</i></b></p>	Unclear how a veto could operate democratically	-ve if it leads to rebilling could be incurred.	
We will give local communities greater control over public health budgets with payment by the outcomes they achieve in improving the health of local residents.	Welcomed	Neutral	
We will investigate ways of improving access to preventative healthcare for those in disadvantaged areas to help tackle health inequalities.	<p>Welcomed</p> <p>Potential implications for the organisation and use of resources in the Margate Task Force.</p> <p>See comment C above.</p>	Neutral	Could be crucial route to funding in parts of Thanet.
We will fund a significant premium for disadvantaged pupils from outside the schools budget by reductions in spending elsewhere.	Welcomed as could lead to additional resources in Thanet	Neutral	
We will support the creation and expansion of mutuals, co-operatives, charities and social enterprises, and enable these groups to have much greater involvement in the running of public services.	Welcomed in principle	Neutral	Relevant to Thanet, but will need Council support.
We will give public sector workers a new right to form employee-owned co-operatives and bid to take over the services they deliver. This will empower millions of public sector workers to become their own boss and help them to deliver better services.	Assumed this will mean under management contract arrangements	-ve unless set up cost met by central government.	Need to consider the implications for commissioning and monitoring of such services e.g. cost of service plus cost of monitoring – contract management.

Coalition Proposal	Practical Implication	Cost +ve or -ve	Other Comments
We will train a new generation of community organisers and support the creation of neighbourhood groups across the UK, especially in the most deprived areas.	<p>Welcomed. Seems to be in line with many aspects of the SSCF programme. Would support the ongoing development of the Cliftonville N'hood Plan.</p> <p>See comment A above.</p>	Neutral	Participation costs money
We will support sustainable travel initiatives, including the promotion of cycling and walking and will encourage joint working between bus operators and local authorities.	Welcomed	-ve unless supported by additional resources.	Whilst transport comes down to KCC it is unclear what tier of LA this means. More detail required before comments can be given in relation to implications to TDC.
We will stop central government funding for new fixed speed cameras and switch to more effective ways of making our roads safer, including authorising 'drugalyser' technology.		-ve as may reduce current funding.	
We will tackle rogue private sector wheel clampers.	May have implications for District councils if they are appointed as the enforcement and regulatory authority. May be a requirement for clampers to be licenced by the local authority, increasing work load of licensing section.	-ve if powers passed to District Councils.	