

SECRET

B

CCB/isp.



Minister for Local Government
and Inner Cities

Department of the Environment
2 Marsham Street
London SW1P 3EB

Telephone 01-276 3000

5 (a-c)

02 FEB 1990

Dear Paul

TRANSITIONAL RELIEF

- top of file

Your letter of 29 January asked about the merits of an alternative basis for fixing the assumed community charges against which entitlement to community charge transitional relief will be calculated.

The Secretary of State and Mr Hunt are presently looking at the level of assumed charges with a view to laying in the next few days a Report setting out the assumed charges and assumed rate poundages to be used for the transitional relief scheme. This Report is made under the transitional relief Regulations, which have now been prayed against by the Opposition. I understand that the Business Managers are considering the timing of the debate.

There have already been a number of representations made to Ministers by some Conservative Members over the past few weeks. There is no doubt that a considerable number of low spending authorities feel keenly that the Government's assumptions about the level of spending in each area in the first year of the new system are unfair. This is so where the assumed level of spending (last year's budgetted rate and grant income plus 4.64%) is below the new Standard Spending Assessment (SSA) for the area. It is felt most where the spending assumption implies spending even further below an SSA than it was below the old Lower Grant-Related Expenditure Assessment (GRE).

That said, to shift to the basis which the Prime Minister has in mind or something similar does present significant difficulties.

So far, both the safety net and the transitional relief arrangements have sought to protect authorities and the chargepayer, during an interim period, only from the changes in financial burden resulting from structural changes in the system. An arrangement of the type suggested would start to protect against changes in the level of spending by authorities, which we have not previously sought to do. Furthermore, it would do so differentially, by giving extra help to chargepayers in areas which historically have spent at a comparatively low level and which increased their spending by more than our overall assumption. But it would not give extra help to

SECRET

other chargepayers whose authorities spend above our assumption (these chargepayers will equally have to meet the full cost of the charge above that level). It can be said that accountability needs to bite more in the latter case but it is questionable whether the chargepayers concerned will readily see the distinction. It was this consideration which underlay one of the references to transitional relief in the Secretary of State's minute of 16 January.

By increasing some assumed charges we should also be implying that in aggregate some spending above Total Standard Spending (TSS) is wholly reasonable and conceding that the average community charge we have quoted is to that extent unrealistic. It will be said that we were validating spending by some authorities above the level implied by last year's budgets plus 4.64%. And it is very likely that some, perhaps many, authorities would take it as a signal that they could spend in 1990/91 beyond the levels which they contemplate at the moment. This might well result in extra spending and would add in that case even further to the RPI.

On the assumption that all authorities in the benefitting areas spent up to the level of their SSAs, the proposal in your letter would have the effect in England of raising the average assumed charge for the purposes of transitional relief to £298. We should implicitly be accepting as reasonable a further £924 million of expenditure; the greater part would be expenditure which authorities already intend to undertake, but some might be new spending. The additional relief given would be up to £225 million on top of the £300 million already expected in 1990/91, and over the three years of the scheme £500 million on top of the £700 million of relief we now expect to give. The probability is that the eventual figures for the relief would be of this order. They would result in an actual reduction of community charges and would be additional public expenditure. The effects for particular areas are exemplified in table 1.

An alternative version of the proposal, which has been suggested by Terence Higgins and other MPs, would be for the spending assumption to be the same percentage below SSA as their budgetted income was below GRE in 1989/90. This would increase the average assumed charge to £283, implies acceptance of spending some £370 million above TSS, and would cost an extra £70 million in transitional relief given. The effects for particular areas are exemplified in table 2. This alternative is however open to the same objections in principle, which is why our Ministers have so far resisted the suggestion.

My Secretary of State and Mr Hunt are uncertain whether, if extra money from the national taxpayer were to be spent to ease the implementation of the new system, this would be the best way to use it. There is for example the possibility of reducing the threshold for transitional relief generally.

We may have to consider delaying the report, because when it is laid the indications are that the Opposition will press hard for a debate

SECRET

not only on the regulations for the transitional relief scheme but also on details of the assumed community charges. This will give a further opportunity for MPs who are unhappy with the revenue support grant settlement to express their discontent, with the possibility that they may be joined by others who will have objections to the assumed charges. It would be possible (at the cost of some noisy criticism for giving operational information late in the day and suggestions that the Government was responsible for the late issue of charge bills) to leave the making of the relevant report until later this month. This would curtail the scope for authorities to increase their budgetted spending on the strength of the more generous assumed charges. If we did this, however, authorities which are responsibly seeking to keep down their charges would think that they had been unfairly treated.

If, in the light of the information in this letter, the Prime Minister wishes my Secretary of State and Mr Hunt to pursue the alternative possibilities with their Treasury colleagues urgently, they are very ready to do so.

I am sending copies of this letter to John Gieve (HM Treasury), Carys Evans (Chief Secretary's Office) and Sonia Phippard (Cabinet Office).

yours

Trevor

TREVOR BEATTIE
Private Secretary

Paul Gray Esq
Private Secretary

SECRET

TABLE 1: ASSUMED 1990/91 COMMUNITY CHARGES IF ALL AREAS ASSUMED TO SPEND UP TO SSA

	Assumed 1990/91 CC without safety net -----1-----	Assumed 1990/91 CC with safety net -----2-----	Alternative assumed 1990/91 CC with net -----3-----	Difference (Col 3 - Col 2) -----4-----
GREATER LONDON				
City of London	363	357	357	-
Camden	321	344	344	-
Greenwich	537	252	252	-
Hackney	310	297	297	-
Hammersmith and Fulham	515	347	347	-
Islington	402	380	380	-
Kensington and Chelsea	223	253	308	55
Lambeth	390	308	308	-
Lewisham	458	249	249	-
Southwark	471	254	254	-
Tower Hamlets	496	247	247	-
Wandsworth	341	171	171	-
Westminster	237	259	300	41
Barking and Dagenham	385	278	278	-
Barnet	245	315	348	33
Bexley	288	281	281	-
Brent	463	481	481	-
Bromley	269	269	278	9
Croydon	160	222	340	118
Ealing	302	328	328	-
Enfield	270	300	308	8
Haringey	573	573	573	-
Harrow	251	295	322	27
Havering	296	291	291	-
Hillingdon	401	359	359	-
Hounslow	347	352	352	-
Kingston-upon-Thames	317	326	326	-
Merton	287	287	287	-
Newham	307	326	326	-
Redbridge	238	239	279	40
Richmond-upon-Thames	297	341	341	-
Sutton	291	305	305	-
Waltham Forest	255	297	320	23

TABLE 1: ASSUMED 1990/91 COMMUNITY CHARGES IF ALL AREAS ASSUMED TO SPEND UP TO SSA

	Assumed 1990/91 CC without safety net -----1-----	Assumed 1990/91 CC with safety net -----2-----	Alternative assumed 1990/91 CC with net -----3-----	Difference (Col 3 - Col 2) -----4-----
GREATER MANCHESTER				
Bolton	269	269	278	9
Bury	332	326	326	-
Manchester	243	314	349	35
Oldham	285	269	269	-
Rochdale	341	269	269	-
Salford	308	308	308	-
Stockport	291	305	305	-
Tameside	320	265	265	-
Trafford	238	268	308	40
Wigan	362	293	293	-
MERSEYSIDE				
Knowsley	285	301	301	-
Liverpool	269	303	312	9
St Helens	319	297	297	-
Sefton	292	296	296	-
Wirral	364	381	381	-
SOUTH YORKSHIRE				
Barnsley	371	222	222	-
Doncaster	369	264	264	-
Rotherham	353	240	240	-
Sheffield	392	286	286	-
TYNE AND WEAR				
Gateshead	350	264	264	-
Newcastle upon Tyne	349	328	328	-
North Tyneside	375	334	334	-
South Tyneside	328	256	256	-
Sunderland	300	234	234	-
WEST MIDLANDS				
Birmingham	180	248	347	98
Coventry	326	329	329	-
Dudley	270	284	292	8
Sandwell	236	262	304	42
Solihull	233	285	330	45
Walsall	276	298	299	2
Wolverhampton	222	269	325	56
WEST YORKSHIRE				
Bradford	284	229	229	-
Calderdale	408	245	245	-
Kirklees	351	220	220	-
Leeds	271	257	264	7
Wakefield	351	240	240	-

TABLE 1: ASSUMED 1990/91 COMMUNITY CHARGES IF ALL AREAS ASSUMED TO SPEND UP TO SSA

	Assumed 1990/91 CC without safety net	Assumed 1990/91 CC with safety net	Alternative assumed 1990/91 CC with net	Difference (Col 3 - Col 2)
	1	2	3	4
AVON				
Bath	300	300	300	-
Bristol	354	331	331	-
Kingswood	274	274	278	4
Northavon	285	296	296	-
Wansdyke	299	299	299	-
Woodspring	294	304	304	-
BEDFORDSHIRE				
North Bedfordshire	229	274	323	49
Luton	234	295	339	44
Mid Bedfordshire	249	289	318	29
South Bedfordshire	275	326	329	3
BERKSHIRE				
Bracknell	232	276	322	46
Newbury	183	243	338	95
Reading	227	252	303	51
Slough	138	199	339	140
Windsor and Maidenhead	243	301	336	35
Wokingham	205	280	353	73
BUCKINGHAMSHIRE				
Aylesbury Vale	194	242	326	84
South Bucks	225	300	353	53
Chiltern	240	315	353	38
Milton Keynes	212	269	335	66
Wycombe	219	294	353	58
CAMBRIDGESHIRE				
Cambridge	239	291	330	39
East Cambridgeshire	202	221	297	76
Fenland	215	217	280	63
Huntingdonshire	195	231	313	83
Peterborough	245	260	293	33
South Cambridgeshire	185	243	336	93
CHESHIRE				
Chester	271	289	295	6
Congleton	272	284	289	6
Crewe and Nantwich	286	286	286	-
Ellesmere Port and Neston	285	288	288	-
Halton	282	282	282	-
Macclesfield	268	320	329	10
Vale Royal	267	267	278	11
Warrington	283	283	283	-

TABLE 1: ASSUMED 1990/91 COMMUNITY CHARGES IF ALL AREAS ASSUMED TO SPEND UP TO SSA

	Assumed 1990/91 CC without safety net	Assumed 1990/91 CC with safety net	Alternative assumed 1990/91 CC with net	Difference (Col 3 - Col 2)
	1	2	3	4
CLEVELAND				
Hartlepool	323	265	265	-
Langbaugh-on-Tees	357	325	325	-
Middlesbrough	343	304	304	-
Stockton-on-Tees	318	318	318	-
CORNWALL				
Caradon	228	228	278	50
Carrick	235	240	283	43
Kerrier	228	216	267	50
North Cornwall	225	225	278	53
Penwith	224	221	275	54
Restormel	222	222	278	56
CUMBRIA				
Allerdale	296	190	190	-
Barrow in Furness	330	194	194	-
Carlisle	283	239	239	-
Copeland	306	191	191	-
Eden	276	210	211	2
South Lakeland	294	270	270	-
DERBYSHIRE				
Amber Valley	328	270	270	-
Bolsover	353	220	220	-
Chesterfield	352	282	282	-
Derby	315	315	315	-
Erewash	334	283	283	-
High Peak	340	279	279	-
North East Derbyshire	359	297	297	-
South Derbyshire	317	301	301	-
Derbyshire Dales	330	316	316	-
DEVON				
East Devon	238	247	287	39
Exeter	242	242	278	36
North Devon	231	210	256	47
Plymouth	225	226	279	53
South Hams	242	249	285	36
Teignbridge	239	239	278	39
Mid Devon	236	220	262	42
Torbay	303	290	290	-
Torridge	236	171	213	42
West Devon	233	231	276	45

TABLE 1: ASSUMED 1990/91 COMMUNITY CHARGES IF ALL AREAS ASSUMED TO SPEND UP TO SSA

	Assumed 1990/91 CC without safety net -----1-----	Assumed 1990/91 CC with safety net -----2-----	Alternative assumed 1990/91 CC with net -----3-----	Difference (Col 3 - Col 2) -----4-----
DORSET				
Bournemouth	256	264	286	22
Christchurch	245	282	315	33
North Dorset	203	213	287	75
Poole	236	265	307	42
Purbeck	209	230	299	69
West Dorset	217	222	283	61
Weymouth and Portland	239	239	278	39
East Dorset	248	284	314	30
DURHAM				
Chester-le-Street	301	258	258	-
Darlington	303	278	278	-
Derwentside	324	211	211	-
Durham	300	268	268	-
Easington	305	192	192	-
Sedgefield	342	225	225	-
Teesdale	252	187	213	26
Wear Valley	334	209	209	-
EAST SUSSEX				
Brighton	318	335	335	-
Eastbourne	260	298	316	18
Hastings	230	256	304	47
Hove	223	272	327	55
Lewes	235	279	322	43
Rother	230	285	333	48
Wealden	231	270	317	47
ESSEX				
Basildon	357	395	395	-
Braintree	233	266	311	45
Brentwood	391	404	404	-
Castle Point	241	289	326	37
Chelmsford	234	307	351	44
Colchester	232	257	303	46
Epping Forest	266	340	352	12
Harlow	411	416	416	-
Maldon	230	283	330	48
Rochford	252	312	338	26
Southend-on-Sea	254	320	345	24
Tendring	248	285	315	30
Thurrock	315	346	346	-
Uttlesford	234	303	346	44

TABLE 1: ASSUMED 1990/91 COMMUNITY CHARGES IF ALL AREAS ASSUMED TO SPEND UP TO SSA

	Assumed 1990/91 CC without safety net -----1-----	Assumed 1990/91 CC with safety net -----2-----	Alternative assumed 1990/91 CC with net -----3-----	Difference (Col 3 - Col 2) -----4-----
GLOUCESTERSHIRE				
Cheltenham	259	268	287	19
Cotswold	231	266	313	47
Forest of Dean	232	231	277	46
Gloucester	229	230	278	49
Stroud	244	251	284	34
Tewkesbury	221	246	302	56
HAMPSHIRE				
Basingstoke and Deane	159	202	321	119
East Hampshire	188	242	332	90
Eastleigh	199	241	320	79
Fareham	194	240	325	84
Gosport	202	226	302	76
Hart	202	261	337	76
Havant	191	236	323	87
New Forest	197	233	314	80
Portsmouth	213	217	282	65
Rushmoor	187	213	304	91
Southampton	199	208	287	79
Test Valley	175	223	326	103
Winchester	193	248	333	85
HEREFORD AND WORCESTER				
Bromsgrove	193	232	317	85
Hereford	187	187	278	91
Leominster	174	174	278	104
Malvern Hills	203	239	313	75
Redditch	223	245	300	55
South Herefordshire	166	183	294	112
Worcester	222	241	297	56
Wychavon	204	246	320	74
Wyre Forest	227	234	285	51
HERTFORDSHIRE				
Broxbourne	275	303	306	3
Dacorum	263	326	341	15
East Hertfordshire	282	318	318	-
Hertsmere	309	371	371	-
North Hertfordshire	275	335	338	3
St Albans	267	337	348	11
Stevenage	334	359	359	-
Three Rivers	288	363	363	-
Watford	271	316	323	7
Welwyn Hatfield	341	390	390	-

TABLE 1: ASSUMED 1990/91 COMMUNITY CHARGES IF ALL AREAS ASSUMED TO SPEND UP TO SSA

	Assumed 1990/91 CC without safety net -----1-----	Assumed 1990/91 CC with safety net -----2-----	Alternative assumed 1990/91 CC with net -----3-----	Difference (Col 3 - Col 2) -----4-----
HUMBERSIDE				
Beverley	310	310	310	-
Boothferry	304	217	217	-
Cleethorpes	339	292	292	-
Glanford	300	276	276	-
Great Grimsby	323	277	277	-
Holderness	304	271	271	-
Kingston upon Hull	330	231	231	-
East Yorkshire	329	250	250	-
Scunthorpe	374	310	310	-
ISLE OF WIGHT				
Medina	235	242	285	43
South Wight	258	270	290	20
KENT				
Ashford	196	223	305	82
Canterbury	206	222	294	72
Dartford	243	234	269	35
Dover	193	199	283	84
Gillingham	192	203	289	86
Gravesham	203	218	293	75
Maidstone	186	211	303	92
Rochester upon Medway	160	182	300	118
Sevenoaks	204	232	305	74
Shepway	233	259	304	45
Swale	212	212	278	66
Thanet	215	229	293	63
Tonbridge and Malling	227	228	279	51
Tunbridge Wells	199	226	305	79
LANCASHIRE				
Blackburn	245	193	226	33
Blackpool	295	261	261	-
Burnley	267	166	177	11
Chorley	247	247	278	31
Fylde	260	270	287	18
Hyndburn	269	181	189	9
Lancaster	264	248	261	14
Pendle	278	172	172	-
Preston	225	229	282	53
Ribble Valley	262	249	265	16
Rossendale	288	197	197	-
South Ribble	259	246	264	19
West Lancashire	250	264	291	28
Wyre	259	259	278	19

TABLE 1: ASSUMED 1990/91 COMMUNITY CHARGES IF ALL AREAS ASSUMED TO SPEND UP TO SSA

	Assumed 1990/91 CC without safety net -----1-----	Assumed 1990/91 CC with safety net -----2-----	Alternative assumed 1990/91 CC with net -----3-----	Difference (Col 3 - Col 2) -----4-----
LEICESTERSHIRE				
Blaby	241	255	292	37
Charnwood	224	255	309	54
Harborough	258	281	300	19
Hinckley and Bosworth	244	251	285	34
Leicester	284	260	260	-
Melton	248	248	278	30
North West Leicestershire	261	261	278	17
Oadby and Wigston	259	272	291	18
Rutland	224	253	307	54
LINCOLNSHIRE				
Boston	214	214	278	64
East Lindsey	201	201	278	77
Lincoln	223	214	268	55
North Kesteven	212	215	281	66
South Holland	218	218	278	60
South Kesteven	219	219	278	59
West Lindsey	216	216	278	62
NORFOLK				
Breckland	228	228	278	50
Broadland	229	240	289	49
Great Yarmouth	247	239	269	30
North Norfolk	226	234	286	52
Norwich	262	262	278	16
South Norfolk	242	247	283	36
King's Lynn and West Norfolk	219	219	278	59
NORTHAMPTONSHIRE				
Corby	259	260	279	19
Daventry	256	283	305	22
East Northamptonshire	227	230	280	51
Kettering	246	246	278	32
Northampton	285	294	294	-
South Northamptonshire	222	261	317	56
Wellingborough	226	234	285	52
NORTHUMBERLAND				
Alwick	319	271	271	-
Berwick-upon-Tweed	317	248	248	-
Blyth Valley	360	293	293	-
Castle Morpeth	305	311	311	-
Tynedale	308	286	286	-
Wansbeck	367	239	239	-

TABLE 1: ASSUMED 1990/91 COMMUNITY CHARGES IF ALL AREAS ASSUMED TO SPEND UP TO SSA

	Assumed 1990/91 CC without safety net -----1-----	Assumed 1990/91 CC with safety net -----2-----	Alternative assumed 1990/91 CC with net -----3-----	Difference (Col 3 - Col 2) -----4-----
NORTH YORKSHIRE				
Craven	255	205	227	23
Hambleton	253	247	272	25
Harrogate	289	289	289	-
Richmondshire	247	230	262	31
Ryedale	266	237	248	12
Scarborough	282	224	224	-
Selby	262	231	246	16
York	255	186	209	23
NOTTINGHAMSHIRE				
Ashfield	271	212	219	7
Bassetlaw	272	253	259	6
Broxtowe	272	272	278	6
Gedling	267	274	285	11
Mansfield	290	242	242	-
Newark and Sherwood	259	259	278	18
Nottingham	254	254	278	24
Rushcliffe	255	281	304	23
OXFORDSHIRE				
Cherwell	216	257	319	62
Oxford	194	269	353	84
South Oxfordshire	222	277	334	56
Vale of White Horse	204	262	336	73
West Oxfordshire	206	253	325	72
SHROPSHIRE				
Bridgnorth	210	222	290	68
North Shropshire	222	222	278	56
Oswestry	241	218	254	37
Shrewsbury and Atcham	241	246	283	37
South Shropshire	212	212	278	66
Wrekin	270	270	278	8
SOMERSET				
Mendip	244	246	280	34
Sedgemoor	255	255	278	23
Taunton Deane	249	252	281	29
West Somerset	263	266	281	15
South Somerset	253	256	281	25

TABLE 1: ASSUMED 1990/91 COMMUNITY CHARGES IF ALL AREAS ASSUMED TO SPEND UP TO SSA

	Assumed 1990/91 CC without safety net -----1-----	Assumed 1990/91 CC with safety net -----2-----	Alternative assumed 1990/91 CC with net -----3-----	Difference (Col 3 - Col 2) -----4-----
STAFFORDSHIRE				
Cannock Chase	266	266	278	12
East Staffordshire	240	240	278	38
Lichfield	247	273	304	31
Newcastle-under-Lyme	268	257	267	10
South Staffordshire	241	271	308	37
Stafford	240	250	288	38
Staffordshire Moorlands	259	252	271	19
Stoke-on-Trent	265	232	245	13
Tamworth	258	258	278	19
SUFFOLK				
Babergh	243	247	282	35
Forest Heath	220	252	310	58
Ipswich	281	281	281	-
Mid Suffolk	227	235	287	51
St Edmundsbury	215	224	287	63
Suffolk Coastal	244	281	315	34
Waveney	242	242	278	36
SURREY				
Elmbridge	302	375	375	-
Epsom and Ewell	316	367	367	-
Guildford	220	281	338	58
Mole Valley	267	302	313	11
Reigate and Banstead	270	303	311	8
Runnymede	229	263	312	49
Spelthorne	240	265	303	38
Surrey Heath	240	306	344	38
Tandridge	285	296	296	-
Waverley	244	305	339	34
Woking	297	339	339	-
WARWICKSHIRE				
North Warwickshire	325	325	325	-
Nuneaton and Bedworth	331	329	329	-
Rugby	292	307	307	-
Stratford on Avon	286	338	338	-
Warwick	295	338	338	-

TABLE 1: ASSUMED 1990/91 COMMUNITY CHARGES IF ALL AREAS ASSUMED TO SPEND UP TO SSA

	Assumed 1990/91 CC without safety net -----1-----	Assumed 1990/91 CC with safety net -----2-----	Alternative assumed 1990/91 CC with net -----3-----	Difference (Col 3 - Col 2) -----4-----
WEST SUSSEX				
Adur	251	270	297	27
Arun	217	254	315	61
Chichester	204	248	322	74
Crawley	273	273	278	5
Horsham	184	220	314	94
Mid Sussex	219	253	313	59
Worthing	214	231	295	64
WILTSHIRE				
Kennet	234	235	279	44
North Wiltshire	254	254	278	24
Salisbury	228	243	294	50
Thamesdown	275	273	276	3
West Wiltshire	262	262	278	16
Isles of Scilly	95	162	345	183

TABLE 1: ASSUMED 1990/91 COMMUNITY CHARGES IF ALL AREAS ASSUMED TO SPEND UP TO SSA

	Assumed 1990/91 CC without safety net -----1-----	Assumed 1990/91 CC with safety net -----2-----	Alternative assumed 1990/91 CC with net -----3-----	Difference (Col 3 - Col 2) -----4-----
Total England	277	272	298	26
Total Inner London	397	275	281	6
Total Outer London	305	320	336	16
Total Shire Areas	255	262	295	33
Total Metropolitan Areas	300	277	291	15

TABLE 2: ASSUMED 1990/91 COMMUNITY CHARGES IF AUTHORITIES ASSUMED TO SPEND
SAME PERCENTAGE BELOW SSA IN 1990/91 AS BELOW GRE IN 1989/90

	Assumed 1990/91 CC without safety net -----1-----	Assumed 1990/91 CC with safety net -----2-----	Alternative assumed 1990/91 CC with net -----3-----	Difference (Col 3 - Col 2) -----4-----
GREATER LONDON				
City of London	363	357	357	0
Camden	321	344	344	0
Greenwich	537	252	252	-
Hackney	310	297	297	0
Hammersmith and Fulham	515	347	347	0
Islington	402	380	380	0
Kensington and Chelsea	223	253	253	0
Lambeth	390	308	308	-
Lewisham	458	249	249	-
Southwark	471	254	254	0
Tower Hamlets	496	247	247	0
Wandsworth	341	171	171	-
Westminster	237	259	259	-
Barking and Dagenham	385	278	278	0
Barnet	245	315	343	29
Bexley	288	281	281	0
Brent	463	481	481	-
Bromley	269	269	269	-
Croydon	160	222	265	43
Ealing	302	328	328	-
Enfield	270	300	300	-
Haringey	573	573	573	-
Harrow	251	295	295	0
Havering	296	291	291	-
Hillingdon	401	359	359	-
Hounslow	347	352	352	0
Kingston-upon-Thames	317	326	326	-
Merton	287	287	287	0
Newham	307	326	326	-
Redbridge	238	239	258	20
Richmond-upon-Thames	297	341	341	0
Sutton	291	305	305	0
Waltham Forest	255	297	297	-

TABLE 2: ASSUMED 1990/91 COMMUNITY CHARGES IF AUTHORITIES ASSUMED TO SPEND
SAME PERCENTAGE BELOW SSA IN 1990/91 AS BELOW GRE IN 1989/90

	Assumed 1990/91 CC without safety net -----1-----	Assumed 1990/91 CC with safety net -----2-----	Alternative assumed 1990/91 CC with net -----3-----	Difference (Col 3 - Col 2) -----4-----
GREATER MANCHESTER				
Bolton	269	269	269	-
Bury	332	326	326	0
Manchester	243	314	314	0
Oldham	285	269	269	-
Rochdale	341	269	269	0
Salford	308	308	308	-
Stockport	291	305	305	0
Tameside	320	265	265	0
Trafford	238	268	277	9
Wigan	362	293	293	0
MERSEYSIDE				
Knowsley	285	301	301	0
Liverpool	269	303	303	-
St Helens	319	297	297	0
Sefton	292	296	296	-
Wirral	364	381	381	0
SOUTH YORKSHIRE				
Barnsley	371	222	222	0
Doncaster	369	264	264	-
Rotherham	353	240	240	-
Sheffield	392	286	286	0
TYNE AND WEAR				
Gateshead	350	264	264	-
Newcastle upon Tyne	349	328	328	0
North Tyneside	375	334	334	0
South Tyneside	328	256	256	0
Sunderland	300	234	234	0
WEST MIDLANDS				
Birmingham	180	248	328	80
Coventry	326	329	329	0
Dudley	270	284	284	-
Sandwell	236	262	283	21
Solihull	233	285	285	-
Walsall	276	298	298	-
Wolverhampton	222	269	307	37
WEST YORKSHIRE				
Bradford	284	229	229	-
Calderdale	408	245	245	0
Kirklees	351	220	220	-
Leeds	271	257	257	0
Wakefield	351	240	240	-

TABLE 2: ASSUMED 1990/91 COMMUNITY CHARGES IF AUTHORITIES ASSUMED TO SPEND
SAME PERCENTAGE BELOW SSA IN 1990/91 AS BELOW GRE IN 1989/90

	Assumed 1990/91 CC without safety net -----1-----	Assumed 1990/91 CC with safety net -----2-----	Alternative assumed 1990/91 CC with net -----3-----	Difference (Col 3 - Col 2) -----4-----
AVON				
Bath	300	300	300	-
Bristol	354	331	331	-
Kingswood	274	274	276	2
Northavon	285	296	296	0
Wansdyke	299	299	299	-
Woodspring	294	304	304	-
BEDFORDSHIRE				
North Bedfordshire	229	274	293	20
Luton	234	295	323	28
Mid Bedfordshire	249	289	289	-
South Bedfordshire	275	326	326	0
BERKSHIRE				
Bracknell	232	276	324	48
Newbury	183	243	300	57
Reading	227	252	300	48
Slough	138	199	283	84
Windsor and Maidenhead	243	301	349	48
Wokingham	205	280	328	48
BUCKINGHAMSHIRE				
Aylesbury Vale	194	242	258	17
South Bucks	225	300	302	3
Chiltern	240	315	315	0
Milton Keynes	212	269	269	-
Wycombe	219	294	307	12
CAMBRIDGESHIRE				
Cambridge	239	291	314	23
East Cambridgeshire	202	221	264	43
Fenland	215	217	264	47
Huntingdonshire	195	231	269	38
Peterborough	245	260	284	23
South Cambridgeshire	185	243	274	30
CHESHIRE				
Chester	271	289	289	-
Congleton	272	284	286	3
Crewe and Nantwich	286	286	286	-
Ellesmere Port and Neston	285	288	288	-
Halton	282	282	282	-
Macclesfield	268	320	321	1
Vale Royal	267	267	267	0
Warrington	283	283	283	0

TABLE 2: ASSUMED 1990/91 COMMUNITY CHARGES IF AUTHORITIES ASSUMED TO SPEND
SAME PERCENTAGE BELOW SSA IN 1990/91 AS BELOW GRE IN 1989/90

	Assumed 1990/91 CC without safety net -----1-----	Assumed 1990/91 CC with safety net -----2-----	Alternative assumed 1990/91 CC with net -----3-----	Difference (Col 3 - Col 2) -----4-----
CLEVELAND				
Hartlepool	323	265	265	-
Langbaugh-on-Tees	357	325	325	-
Middlesbrough	343	304	304	-
Stockton-on-Tees	318	318	318	0
CORNWALL				
Caradon	228	228	245	17
Carrick	235	240	257	17
Kerrier	228	216	233	17
North Cornwall	225	225	242	17
Penwith	224	221	238	17
Restormel	222	222	249	27
CUMBRIA				
Allerdale	296	190	190	-
Barrow in Furness	330	194	194	0
Carlisle	283	239	239	0
Copeland	306	191	191	-
Eden	276	210	229	20
South Lakeland	294	270	274	4
DERBYSHIRE				
Amber Valley	328	270	274	4
Bolsover	353	220	220	-
Chesterfield	352	282	282	-
Derby	315	315	329	14
Erewash	334	283	283	-
High Peak	340	279	279	-
North East Derbyshire	359	297	297	0
South Derbyshire	317	301	318	17
Derbyshire Dales	330	316	316	-
DEVON				
East Devon	238	247	259	12
Exeter	242	242	249	8
North Devon	231	210	218	8
Plymouth	225	226	243	17
South Hams	242	249	257	8
Teignbridge	239	239	247	8
Mid Devon	236	220	228	8
Torbay	303	290	298	8
Torrige	236	171	179	8
West Devon	233	231	239	8

TABLE 2: ASSUMED 1990/91 COMMUNITY CHARGES IF AUTHORITIES ASSUMED TO SPEND
SAME PERCENTAGE BELOW SSA IN 1990/91 AS BELOW GRE IN 1989/90

	Assumed 1990/91 CC without safety net	Assumed 1990/91 CC with safety net	Alternative assumed 1990/91 CC with net	Difference (Col 3 - Col 2)
	-----1-----	-----2-----	-----3-----	-----4-----
DORSET				
Bournemouth	256	264	277	13
Christchurch	245	282	294	13
North Dorset	203	213	243	30
Poole	236	265	278	13
Purbeck	209	230	252	22
West Dorset	217	222	242	20
Weymouth and Portland	239	239	252	13
East Dorset	248	284	296	13
DURHAM				
Chester-le-Street	301	258	258	0
Darlington	303	278	278	0
Derwentside	324	211	211	-
Durham	300	268	268	-
Easington	305	192	192	-
Sedgefield	342	225	225	-
Teesdale	252	187	208	21
Wear Valley	334	209	209	-
EAST SUSSEX				
Brighton	318	335	365	30
Eastbourne	260	298	328	30
Hastings	230	256	290	34
Hove	223	272	304	31
Lewes	235	279	309	30
Rother	230	285	315	30
Wealden	231	270	300	30
ESSEX				
Basildon	357	395	395	-
Braintree	233	266	281	15
Brentwood	391	404	404	-
Castle Point	241	289	289	-
Chelmsford	234	307	313	5
Colchester	232	257	266	9
Epping Forest	266	340	340	0
Harlow	411	416	416	0
Maldon	230	283	297	14
Rochford	252	312	312	-
Southend-on-Sea	254	320	320	0
Tendring	248	285	287	1
Thurrock	315	346	346	0
Uttlesford	234	303	303	-

TABLE 2: ASSUMED 1990/91 COMMUNITY CHARGES IF AUTHORITIES ASSUMED TO SPEND
SAME PERCENTAGE BELOW SSA IN 1990/91 AS BELOW GRE IN 1989/90

	Assumed 1990/91 CC without safety net	Assumed 1990/91 CC with safety net	Alternative assumed 1990/91 CC with net	Difference (Col 3 - Col 2)
	-----1-----	-----2-----	-----3-----	-----4-----
GLOUCESTERSHIRE				
Cheltenham	259	268	281	13
Cotswold	231	266	295	29
Forest of Dean	232	231	244	13
Gloucester	229	230	248	18
Stroud	244	251	264	13
Tewkesbury	221	246	267	21
HAMPSHIRE				
Basingstoke and Deane	159	202	247	45
East Hampshire	188	242	277	35
Eastleigh	199	241	277	35
Fareham	194	240	276	35
Gosport	202	226	261	35
Hart	202	261	296	35
Havant	191	236	271	35
New Forest	197	233	269	35
Portsmouth	213	217	253	35
Rushmoor	187	213	253	41
Southampton	199	208	244	35
Test Valley	175	223	270	47
Winchester	193	248	283	35
HEREFORD AND WORCESTER				
Bromsgrove	193	232	237	5
Hereford	187	187	187	0
Leominster	174	174	207	33
Malvern Hills	203	239	239	-
Redditch	223	245	245	0
South Herefordshire	166	183	205	22
Worcester	222	241	241	-
Wychavon	204	246	246	-
Wyre Forest	227	234	234	0
HERTFORDSHIRE				
Broxbourne	275	303	303	-
Dacorum	263	326	330	4
East Hertfordshire	282	318	318	-
Hertsmere	309	371	371	0
North Hertfordshire	275	335	335	0
St Albans	267	337	341	4
Stevenage	334	359	359	-
Three Rivers	288	363	363	-
Watford	271	316	316	-
Welwyn Hatfield	341	390	390	0

TABLE 2: ASSUMED 1990/91 COMMUNITY CHARGES IF AUTHORITIES ASSUMED TO SPEND
SAME PERCENTAGE BELOW SSA IN 1990/91 AS BELOW GRE IN 1989/90

	Assumed 1990/91 CC without safety net -----1-----	Assumed 1990/91 CC with safety net -----2-----	Alternative assumed 1990/91 CC with net -----3-----	Difference (Col 3 - Col 2) -----4-----
HUMBERSIDE				
Beverley	310	310	310	-
Boothferry	304	217	217	0
Cleethorpes	339	292	292	0
Glanford	300	276	276	0
Great Grimsby	323	277	277	-
Holderness	304	271	271	-
Kingston upon Hull	330	231	231	-
East Yorkshire	329	250	250	0
Scunthorpe	374	310	310	-
ISLE OF WIGHT				
Medina	235	242	242	0
South Wight	258	270	270	0
KENT				
Ashford	196	223	255	32
Canterbury	206	222	253	32
Dartford	243	234	266	32
Dover	193	199	231	32
Gillingham	192	203	242	38
Gravesham	203	218	250	32
Maidstone	186	211	257	46
Rochester upon Medway	160	182	225	43
Sevenoaks	204	232	264	32
Shepway	233	259	291	32
Swale	212	212	244	32
Thanet	215	229	261	32
Tonbridge and Malling	227	228	259	32
Tunbridge Wells	199	226	258	32
LANCASHIRE				
Blackburn	245	193	206	13
Blackpool	295	261	273	13
Burnley	267	166	178	13
Chorley	247	247	260	13
Fylde	260	270	282	13
Hyndburn	269	181	193	13
Lancaster	264	248	260	13
Pendle	278	172	184	13
Preston	225	229	262	33
Ribble Valley	262	249	262	13
Rossendale	288	197	209	13
South Ribble	259	246	258	13
West Lancashire	250	264	277	13
Wyre	259	259	271	13

TABLE 2: ASSUMED 1990/91 COMMUNITY CHARGES IF AUTHORITIES ASSUMED TO SPEND SAME PERCENTAGE BELOW SSA IN 1990/91 AS BELOW GRE IN 1989/90

	Assumed 1990/91 CC without safety net -----1-----	Assumed 1990/91 CC with safety net -----2-----	Alternative assumed 1990/91 CC with net -----3-----	Difference (Col 3 - Col 2) -----4-----
LEICESTERSHIRE				
Blaby	241	255	268	13
Charnwood	224	255	268	13
Harborough	258	281	290	9
Hinckley and Bosworth	244	251	266	15
Leicester	284	260	269	9
Melton	248	248	266	19
North West Leicestershire	261	261	270	9
Oadby and Wigston	259	272	281	9
Rutland	224	253	280	27
LINCOLNSHIRE				
Boston	214	214	226	12
East Lindsey	201	201	213	12
Lincoln	223	214	226	12
North Kesteven	212	215	227	12
South Holland	218	218	229	12
South Kesteven	219	219	231	12
West Lindsey	216	216	228	12
NORFOLK				
Breckland	228	228	234	6
Broadland	229	240	255	15
Great Yarmouth	247	239	245	6
North Norfolk	226	234	254	20
Norwich	262	262	268	6
South Norfolk	242	247	254	6
King's Lynn and West Norfolk	219	219	247	28
NORTHAMPTONSHIRE				
Corby	259	260	260	0
Daventry	256	283	283	0
East Northamptonshire	227	230	242	12
Kettering	246	246	257	12
Northampton	285	294	294	0
South Northamptonshire	222	261	270	9
Wellingborough	226	234	243	9
NORTHUMBERLAND				
Alnwick	319	271	271	-
Berwick-upon-Tweed	317	248	248	-
Blyth Valley	360	293	293	0
Castle Morpeth	305	311	311	0
Tynedale	308	286	286	0
Wansbeck	367	239	239	0

TABLE 2: ASSUMED 1990/91 COMMUNITY CHARGES IF AUTHORITIES ASSUMED TO SPEND
SAME PERCENTAGE BELOW SSA IN 1990/91 AS BELOW GRE IN 1989/90

	Assumed 1990/91 CC without safety net -----1-----	Assumed 1990/91 CC with safety net -----2-----	Alternative assumed 1990/91 CC with net -----3-----	Difference (Col 3 - Col 2) -----4-----
NORTH YORKSHIRE				
Craven	255	205	207	3
Hambleton	253	247	250	3
Harrogate	289	289	292	3
Richmondshire	247	230	233	3
Ryedale	266	237	239	3
Scarborough	282	224	227	3
Selby	262	231	234	3
York	255	186	189	3
NOTTINGHAMSHIRE				
Ashfield	271	212	212	-
Bassetlaw	272	253	253	-
Broxtowe	272	272	272	0
Gedling	267	274	274	0
Mansfield	290	242	242	0
Newark and Sherwood	259	259	259	-
Nottingham	254	254	259	5
Rushcliffe	255	281	290	10
OXFORDSHIRE				
Cherwell	216	257	270	13
Oxford	194	269	285	16
South Oxfordshire	222	277	285	8
Vale of White Horse	204	262	268	6
West Oxfordshire	206	253	266	13
SHROPSHIRE				
Bridgnorth	210	222	251	29
North Shropshire	222	222	237	15
Oswestry	241	218	233	15
Shrewsbury and Atcham	241	246	261	15
South Shropshire	212	212	253	42
Wrekin	270	270	285	15
SOMERSET				
Mendip	244	246	259	13
Sedgemoor	255	255	269	14
Taunton Deane	249	252	259	7
West Somerset	263	266	266	0
South Somerset	253	256	270	14

TABLE 2: ASSUMED 1990/91 COMMUNITY CHARGES IF AUTHORITIES ASSUMED TO SPEND
SAME PERCENTAGE BELOW SSA IN 1990/91 AS BELOW GRE IN 1989/90

	Assumed 1990/91 CC without safety net -----1-----	Assumed 1990/91 CC with safety net -----2-----	Alternative assumed 1990/91 CC with net -----3-----	Difference (Col 3 - Col 2) -----4-----
STAFFORDSHIRE				
Cannock Chase	266	266	266	0
East Staffordshire	240	240	257	17
Lichfield	247	273	282	9
Newcastle-under-Lyme	268	257	257	-
South Staffordshire	241	271	282	11
Stafford	240	250	258	8
Staffordshire Moorlands	259	252	252	-
Stoke-on-Trent	265	232	232	-
Tamworth	258	258	260	1
SUFFOLK				
Babergh	243	247	255	8
Forest Heath	220	252	271	19
Ipswich	281	281	289	8
Mid Suffolk	227	235	243	8
St Edmundsbury	215	224	240	16
Suffolk Coastal	244	281	288	8
Waveney	242	242	249	8
SURREY				
Elmbridge	302	375	375	0
Epsom and Ewell	316	367	367	0
Guildford	220	281	289	8
Mole Valley	267	302	302	0
Reigate and Banstead	270	303	303	-
Runnymede	229	263	267	3
Spelthorne	240	265	265	-
Surrey Heath	240	306	311	5
Tandridge	285	296	296	0
Waverley	244	305	305	-
Woking	297	339	339	-
WARWICKSHIRE				
North Warwickshire	325	325	325	0
Nuneaton and Bedworth	331	329	329	-
Rugby	292	307	307	0
Stratford on Avon	286	338	352	15
Warwick	295	338	338	0

TABLE 2: ASSUMED 1990/91 COMMUNITY CHARGES IF AUTHORITIES ASSUMED TO SPEND
SAME PERCENTAGE BELOW SSA IN 1990/91 AS BELOW GRE IN 1989/90

	Assumed 1990/91 CC without safety net -----1-----	Assumed 1990/91 CC with safety net -----2-----	Alternative assumed 1990/91 CC with net -----3-----	Difference (Col 3 - Col 2) -----4-----
WEST SUSSEX				
Adur	251	270	292	22
Arun	217	254	276	22
Chichester	204	248	270	22
Crawley	273	273	295	22
Horsham	184	220	252	33
Mid Sussex	219	253	275	22
Worthing	214	231	253	22
WILTSHIRE				
Kennet	234	235	267	32
North Wiltshire	254	254	271	17
Salisbury	228	243	270	26
Thamesdown	275	273	290	17
West Wiltshire	262	262	279	17
Isles of Scilly	95	162	270	108

TABLE 2: ASSUMED 1990/91 COMMUNITY CHARGES IF AUTHORITIES ASSUMED TO SPEND
SAME PERCENTAGE BELOW SSA IN 1990/91 AS BELOW GRE IN 1989/90

	Assumed 1990/91 CC without safety net -----1-----	Assumed 1990/91 CC with safety net -----2-----	Alternative assumed 1990/91 CC with net -----3-----	Difference (Col 3 - Col 2) -----4-----
Total England	277	272	283	11
Total Inner London	397	275	296	21
Total Outer London	305	320	326	6
Total Shire Areas	255	262	275	13
Total Metropolitan Areas	300	277	285	8



LOCAL GOVT: RABEN PR 16

