



Fly

Downing
Street

10 DOWNING STREET

Public Minister ②

I have prepared be attached
note dealing with Mr Hattersley's
fixation about the adjustment
of RSG. Although RSG was
operated differently under
Labour, these were usually
'close-ending' adjustments
which were often similar in
size to that seen this year.

The note shows that GLC's
esche grant does not, as I
had previously thought, arise
because it is avoiding holdback
(these adjustments are made
later in the year) but because
GLC has a high rate base and
a given change in rate poundage
affects its ability to finance
expenditure more than with a
poorer Council.

AT

17/4

RATE SUPPORT GRANT

CLOSE ENDING OF GRANT UNDER BLOCK GRANT AND THE PREVIOUS RSG SYSTEM

Line to take:

The Government decides each year how much block grant will be paid in aggregate to the local authorities. The amount paid to any individual authority therefore depends on its own budgeted spending level and the budget decisions of all other local authorities. This means that the amount of grant to each authority has to be set provisionally and then revised, a process known as "close ending", when the budgets of the other authorities are known. There is nothing new about these adjustments. This was a feature of the previous RSG system with its separate needs and resources elements of grants. In 1978/79, for example, the adjustment made by the last Labour Government was significantly higher than the $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent made in 1985/86.

Background

When the initial calculations of Rate Support Grant are made and announced in the December preceding the start of the financial year, authorities have not set their budgets or made their rates. The grant distribution depends on authorities' spending individually and collectively so in setting its initial distribution an assumption has to be made. Once the budgets are known, each authority's entitlement has to be scaled up or down by a common factor to keep within the cash limited total of grant voted by Parliament. In each of the last two years entitlements have been scaled up by a small amount. But in 1985/86 authorities' claims exceeded the amount of grant and they all had to be scaled down by about $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Under the old system which had separate needs and resources elements, the resources element had to be close

ended each year in a similar way when authorities' rates were known.

Close ending of the resources element under the old system was as follows:-

1975/76	- 0.2 per cent
1976/77	- 4.0 per cent
1977/78	+ 2.6 per cent
1978/79	- 6.5 per cent
1979/80	- 3.1 per cent
1980/81	- 5.0 per cent.

Since the resources element was about one-third of the needs and resources total, the adjustment in 1978/79 under the Labour Government was effectively higher than the 1½ per cent for 1985/86.

In December 1984 it was assumed that authorities were spending at their targets. The GLC was assumed to set a budget of £785 million. This gave it a provisional grant element of £2 million. In the event, the GLC budgeted at £745 million. The associated budget gives it a grant entitlement of £41 million. The GLC is an authority which gets more grant for spending less because it has a "negative marginal rate of grant". This is explained below and has nothing to do with hold back.

In total, the adjustment in March this year was £123 million nationally (i.e. England, as Scotland and Wales operate their own systems). Of this, the shire counties lost £56 million.

What are negative marginal rates of grant?

As Mr. Waldegrave and Mr. Heiser explained to you at the first meeting at Chequers, the block grant system is based on rate poundage equalisation. Each authority's grant is calculated to be sufficient for it to provide a similar level

of service to that of other authorities while at the same time charging a similar rate in the pound.

For levels of service above or below the average level there is a specified tariff of rate poundages. At present, for each £1 per head of additional expenditure above the average an authority is assumed to levy an extra 0.69 pence rate. The cash difference between the product of this rate and the extra spending is met by block grant. So, normally, extra spending attracts extra grant. (There are separate mechanisms for tapering the extra grant, and for applying penalties for spending above targets).

Some authorities, including the GLC, have particularly large rateable values per head of population. They can actually raise more rate income from an 0.69p rate than they need to finance a £1 per head increase in expenditure.

Rate poundage equalisation requires the same poundage increases for equivalent increases in expenditure. The only way in which this can be achieved is to reduce block grant for those authorities as their spending increases. Such authorities are said to have negative marginal rates of grant.

The converse is that as expenditure per head falls, such authorities become entitled to more grant. This is what has happened to the GLC. For each £1 per head less of expenditure the GLC is assumed to levy 0.69p less in its rate. Because of its high resources this reduced its rate income by more than the reduction in expenditure. It therefore needs additional block grant to make up the difference.

If authorities with high resources were not subject to negative marginal grant rates, they would be able to finance an increase in their spending with a much lower rate increase than other authorities.

The Supplementary Report

In July of each year a supplementary report is made. This may make further adjustments on two counts:

- (i) There may be still further adjustment to budgets which require still further close ending. Normally these are small.
- (ii) More importantly some councils may have exceeded their targets and incurred hold back. The proceeds of this accrue to the Treasury and do not affect other local authorities. This, of course, had no parallel under Labour's system.

AT

File

RATE SUPPORT GRANT

CLOSE-ENDING OF GRANT UNDER BLOCK GRANT AND THE PREVIOUS RSG SYSTEM

Line to take The Government decides each year how much block grant will be paid in aggregate to local authorities. The amount paid to any individual authority therefore

Block grant has to be "close-ended" because each authority's entitlement depends on its own budgeted spending level, and the budget decisions of all other local authorities. There is nothing new about ~~close-ending~~ ^{these adjustments}. ~~This~~ was a feature of the previous RSG system, with its separate needs and resources elements of grant.

a process known as "close-ending"

This means that the amount of grant for each authority has to be set provisionally and then revised when the budgets of all authorities are known.

If pressed

In 1978/79, under the last Labour Government, ~~close-ending~~ ^{the adjustment} was significantly higher than the 1½% for 1985/86 - a reduction of about 6½% in each authority's entitlement to resources element.

Background

Once budgets are known each authority's entitlement needs to be scaled up or down by a common factor to keep to the cash-limited total ~~of~~ grant voted by Parliament. In each of the last two years entitlements have been scaled up by a small amount. But in 1985/86 authorities' claims exceeded the amount of grant, and they all had to be scaled down by about 1½%. Under the old system, ^{with separate needs and resources elements,} the resources element had to be close-ended each year when authorities' rates were known. In 1980/81, the last year of the old system, all authorities' resources element entitlements had to be scaled down by nearly 5%. Since resources element was about ½ of the needs and resources total, this was very similar to the scale of close-ending in 1985/86.

The closure of the



PS/SECRETARY OF STATE

cc PS/Mr Baker
PS/Mr Waldegrave
Mr Ennals
Mr Owen
Mr Hobson

Mr Roberts
Ms Maclean/Mr Stevens INF
Mr Wells

CLOSE ENDING OF BLOCK GRANT
BRIEFING FOR THE PRIME MINISTER

1. I attach as requested:

- (i) a briefing note on why the GLC gets more grant for spending less;
- (ii) a copy of Mr Roberts' submission of 29 March.

2. You will see from the print out attached to the submission that the shire counties get about £56m less (out of £123m nationally) than would have applied if the original RSG settlement grant schedule had applied to the overall budgeted level of spending. This is the correct measure of the amount of close-ending being applied, as mentioned in the original Carvel article.

3. The briefing apparently being put about by the Opposition talks of a £70m "reduction" for the shire counties. This is a bogus figure. It compares their original grant entitlements if all authorities had spent at target with the entitlements at each authority's budgets, after we apply close ending. It is universally known that this is only a neutral assumption for illustration only. It is an inherent feature of the present grant system, as of the old one that:

- (i) grant varies with budgeted expenditure;
- (ii) grant claims based on budgets are scaled to the amount of grant available.

To represent this as a £70m grant cut is completely wrong.

4. Close-ending of resources element under the last Labour Government's RSG settlements was as follows:

1975/76	-0.2%
1976/77	-4.0%
1977/78	+2.6%
1978/79	-6.5%
1979/80	-3.1%

5. Finally, close-ending is completely separate from grant penalties which will be applied after the first Supplementary Report next July.

L B HICKS
FLG

L B Hicks

19 April 1985

WHY THE GLC IS GETTING MORE GRANT FOR SPENDING LESS IN 1985/86

Background

1. When the initial calculations of rate support grant were made and announced in December 1984 authorities had not set their budgets or made their rates.
2. The grant distribution depends on authorities' spending, individually and collectively, ^{in setting initial distribution} so an assumption about this had to be made. (As usual this was that authorities were spending at their targets.)
3. The GLC was assumed to set a budget of £785m. This gave it a provisional grant entitlement of £2m.
4. In the event, the GLC budgeted at £745m. The associated budget gives it a grant entitlement of £41m.
5. The GLC gets more grant for spending less because it has a "negative marginal rate of grant". *as explained below. This is due to the*
subsidy

What are negative marginal rates of grant?

At the end of the year, the GLC's expenditure is less than the average of other authorities.

6. The block grant system is based on rate poundage equalisation. Each authority's grant is calculated to be sufficient for it to provide a similar level of service to that of other authorities while at the same time charging a similar rate in the £.
7. For levels of service above or below the average level there is a specified tariff of rate poundages. At present, for each £1 per head of additional expenditure above the average an authority is assumed to levy an extra 0.69 pence rate. The cash difference between the product of this rate and the extra spending is met by block grant. So, normally, extra spending attracts extra grant. (There are separate mechanisms for tapering the extra grant, and for applying penalties for spending above targets).
8. Some authorities, including the GLC, have particularly large rateable values per head of population. They can actually

raise more rate income from an 0.69p rate than they need to finance a £1 per head increase in expenditure.

9. Rate poundage equalisation requires the same poundage increases for equivalent increases in expenditure. The only way in which this can be achieved is to reduce block grant for those authorities as their spending increases. Such authorities are said to have negative marginal rates of grant.

10. The converse is that as expenditure per head falls, such authorities become entitled to more grant. This is what has happened to the GLC. For each £1 per head less of expenditure the GLC is assumed to levy 0.69p less in its rate. Because of its high resources this reduces its rate income by more than the reduction in expenditure. It therefore needs additional block grant to make up the difference.

11. If authorities with high resources were not subject to negative marginal grant rates, they would be able to finance an increase in their spending with a much lower rate increase than other authorities.

The Supplementary Report

1 - In July of each year a supplementary report is made. This may make further adjustments on two counts:

(i) There may be still further adjustment to budgets which require still further close-endings. Normally these are small.

(ii) More importantly some councils may have exceeded their targets and incurred hold-backs. The proceeds of these accrue to the Treasury and do not affect other local authorities. This, of course, had no parallel under Labour's system.

PS Wells NS/C.2
pl. copy & return
29/3

- 1. Mr Owen cc at 1 Mr Hicks
Mr Hobson
Mr Kidgell
Mr Young
Mr Sondheimer
- 2. PS/Mr Baker cc at 2 PS/Secretary of State
PS/Mr Waldergrave
PS/Mr Heiser
Mr Ennals

RSG: GRANT CLOSE-ENDING AND HOLDBACK 1985/86

1. The attached tables set out the results of our analysis of BG10 1985/86 grant claim forms for local authorities. 21 authorities have still to send in returns including 6 rate capped authorities.
2. Mr Owen's minute of 22 March set out the position on grant payments to authorities that have not sent in BG forms. The same assumptions have been used in this analysis for calculating close-ending and holdback: i.e, BG information has been used where available even when this shows budget higher than expenditure limits; for authorities that have not submitted forms we have used expenditure limits for rate capped authorities and targets for other authorities.
3. The first three columns of table 1 show target, budget and overspend against target. Overall 284 authorities have budgetted to spend at or below target, with a further 38 within 1% of target (some of the latter may be at target after disregards). More authorities have budgetted within target this year than in the last two years. Total overspend is shown as £156m but this may increase when returns from other authorities are included (Mr Martin in his minute to PS/Mr Baker of 27 March predicts an overspend of between £175m and £230m).
4. The largest percentage overspends are Harlow, Kingston-upon-Hull, Brent, Blackpool, Newcastle, Hounslow, Sunderland, Merseyside and Greater Manchester which are all more than 5% above target. Only Kingston-upon-Hull are more than 10% above target. GLC is the only major authority underspending by more than 5%.

Grant Close-Ending

5. This year there will be a negative close-ending adjustment to grant claims mainly as a result of the underspend by GLC (GLC gains £40m grant for spending 5% below target). This means that most authorities will receive less grant for spending at target than has been previously announced. This contrasts with recent years when large overspends by a few authorities (particularly GLC) resulted in large grant losses to those authorities and consequent gains elsewhere.

26/29.3

6. Columns 4 to 6 of Table 1 show the effect of percentage close-ending, which will form the basis for initial payment of grant, (percentage close-ending simply scales all BG grant claims so that they sum to total grant entitlement in the Settlement). The effect of schedule close ending, which will be implemented at 1st Supplementary Report stage together with holdback of grant, is shown in columns 7 and 8 of table 1. The table shows that under the switch from percentage to schedule close-ending, Essex, Hertfordshire and Surrey are each estimated to lose over £2m grant.

Holdback

7. The estimated amount of holdback in 1985/86 on the basis of these budget estimates is around £450m: this will rise if any authorities that have yet to submit returns budget above target. Of the authorities that have submitted BG returns those subject to the largest amounts of holdback in cash terms include Avon (£23m), Cleveland (£25m), Derbyshire (£23m), Nottinghamshire (£38m), Brent (£18m), Hounslow (£15m), Newcastle (19m), Greater Manchester (£31m), Merseyside (£13m) and West Midlands (£30m).

Grant Distribution

8. The implications of the 1985/86 budgets on grant shares before and after holdback are shown below: London and metropolitan areas shares will fall if authorities that have yet to submit returns are subject to holdback.

Grant Shares 1985/86

	Settlement	Budgets	
		Before Holdback	After Holdback
Non-met areas	52.5	52.4	52.9
Met areas	32.2	32.3	31.7
London	15.3	15.3	15.4
England	100.0	100.0	100.0

Authorities Out Of Grant

9. Mr Baker has also asked how many authorities we expect to be out of grant in 1985/86 and how many we expect to receive less than £500,000. On the BG returns so far available to us 14 authorities are out of grant and 21 authorities receive grant of less than £500,000. Details are given in Table 2.

Conclusion

10. The close-ending adjustments to the poundage schedule and holdback will be implemented in the 1st Supplementary Report in the summer. In the interim period for payment purposes BG claims by

authorities will be reduced by a factor of about 0.985 73.

D L H Roberts

D.L.H. Roberts
FLGR

29 March 1985

1985/6 BUDGETS

=====

Analysis of overspend against target, holdback and close-ending

[Budgets from block grant claim form BG10. Figures unchecked. *: form missing. Target/EL used for grant calculation]

	Target	Budget	Over-spend	Grant entitlement under Report	Grant after percentage close-ending	Diff-erence	Grant after schedule close-ending (bef hback)	Diff-erence	Grant after schedule close-ending (aft hback)
	(£m)	(£m)	(%)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)
TOTAL England	21,815.355	21,971.366	.72%	8,599.666	8,476.979	-122.687	8,476.982	.002	8,032.777
non-met districts	1,519.752	1,503.080	-1.10%	566.106	558.030	-8.076	557.148	-882	540.785
non-met counties	9,918.346	9,994.275	.77%	3,949.880	3,893.529	-56.351	3,881.803	-11,726	3,706.527
metropolitan districts	4,242.462	4,298.947	1.33%	2,142.732	2,112.162	-30.569	2,121.126	8,963	2,020.779
metropolitan counties	1,270.287	1,314.986	3.52%	624.284	615.378	-8.906	618.177	2,799	525.093
non-met total	11,438.098	11,497.354	.52%	4,515.986	4,451.559	-64.427	4,438.950	-12,608	4,247.312
metropolitan total	5,512.749	5,613.933	1.84%	2,767.016	2,727.540	-39.476	2,739.302	11,763	2,545.872
City and Westminster	125.465	122.716	-2.19%	-	-	-	-	-	-
West of Inner London	871.944	884.592	1.45%	346.191	341.252	-4.939	344.081	2,829	333.390
Inner London inc ILEA	1,897.775	1,907.675	.52%	346.191	341.252	-4.939	344.081	2,829	333.390
Outer London	1,795.299	1,818.643	1.30%	781.844	770.690	-11.154	772.274	1,584	723.853
LD and Met Police	1,170.181	1,132.495	-3.22%	187.859	185.178	-2.680	181.609	-3,570	181.609
London total	4,863.255	4,858.812	-.09%	1,315.894	1,297.121	-18.773	1,297.964	.843	1,238.852

1985/6 BUDGETS

=====

Analysis of overspend against target, holdback and close-ending

[Budgets from block grant claim form BGl0. Figures unchecked. *: form missing. Target/EL used for grant calculation]

	Target	Budget	Over-spend	Grant entitle-ment under Report	Grant after percentage close-ending	Diff -erence	Grant after schedule close-ending (bef hback)	Diff -erence	Grant after schedule close-ending (aft hback)
	(£m)	(£m)	(%)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)
HIRE COUNTIES									
von	316.788	327.071	3.25%	121.856	120.118	-1.738	119.725	-.393	91.749
edfordshire	195.641	195.641	-.00%	55.736	54.941	-.795	54.264	-.677	54.264
erkshire	239.496	239.496	-.00%	47.277	46.603	-.674	45.053	-1.550	45.053
uckinghamshire	209.030	209.030	-	57.219	56.403	-.816	55.444	-.959	55.444
ambridgeshire	205.994	205.994	-.00%	76.164	75.077	-1.087	74.636	-.441	74.636
heshire	346.129	346.129	-	122.623	120.874	-1.749	120.223	-.651	120.223
leveland	237.044	247.347	4.35%	112.132	110.533	-1.600	110.753	.220	85.805
ornwall	145.674	145.801	.09%	78.573	77.452	-1.121	77.743	.291	77.490
umbria	171.551	175.591	2.35%	95.516	94.153	-1.363	94.662	.509	86.887
erbyshire	314.688	326.455	3.74%	155.437	153.219	-2.218	153.580	.361	125.084
evon	320.558	320.558	-	151.669	149.505	-2.164	149.656	.151	149.656
orset	189.133	189.133	-	59.884	59.030	-.854	58.368	-.662	58.368
urham	214.086	217.075	1.40%	121.798	120.060	-1.738	120.786	.726	115.633
ast Sussex	206.765	206.765	-	57.507	56.687	-.820	55.745	-.942	55.745
sssex	499.939	499.939	-.00%	134.633	132.712	-1.921	130.509	-2.203	130.509
oucestershire	167.975	167.975	-.00%	67.556	66.592	-.964	66.402	-.190	66.402
ampshire	499.593	499.796	.04%	173.539	171.064	-2.476	169.801	-1.263	169.269
ereford and Worcester	219.052	219.129	.04%	88.933	87.665	-1.269	87.403	-.261	87.215
ertfordshire	334.087	334.087	.00%	61.566	60.688	-.878	58.618	-2.069	58.618
umberside	331.862	338.000	1.85%	176.158	173.644	-2.513	174.438	.794	162.562
isle of Wight	43.005	43.502	1.16%	21.269	20.965	-.303	21.030	.065	20.044
ent	494.726	495.103	.08%	219.199	216.072	-3.127	215.890	-.182	215.006
ancashire	509.799	515.445	1.11%	289.357	285.229	-4.128	286.850	1.621	276.984
oucestershire	306.792	306.792	-	136.589	134.640	-1.949	134.576	-.064	134.576
ncolnshire	195.450	195.450	-.00%	100.253	98.823	-1.430	99.141	.319	99.141
orfolk	225.319	225.416	.04%	94.595	93.245	-1.350	92.967	-.278	92.720
orthamptonshire	196.757	198.939	1.11%	85.216	84.001	-1.216	83.904	-.097	78.731
orthumberland	108.319	109.962	1.52%	54.517	53.739	-.778	53.928	.189	50.647
orth Yorkshire	232.780	232.980	.09%	111.121	109.535	-1.585	109.759	.224	109.349
ottinghamshire	362.390	377.540	4.18%	171.174	168.732	-2.442	168.980	.248	130.940
xfordshire	174.465	174.465	-	40.326	39.751	-.575	38.863	-.888	38.863
ropshire	133.798	133.798	-	69.595	68.602	-.993	68.806	.204	68.806
omerset	147.685	147.685	-	68.487	67.510	-.977	67.573	.063	67.573
taffordshire	366.929	370.590	1.00%	165.183	162.826	-2.357	162.977	.151	155.264
ffolk	197.494	197.787	.15%	75.287	74.213	-1.074	73.882	-.332	73.150
urrey	311.049	311.049	-.00%	36.825	36.299	-.525	33.829	-2.470	33.829
arwickshire	165.366	165.441	.05%	54.910	54.126	-.783	53.705	-.422	53.513
est Sussex	202.276	202.456	.09%	54.683	53.903	-.780	52.905	-.998	52.351
iltshire	178.862	178.862	-	85.519	84.299	-1.220	84.428	.129	84.428

1985/6 BUDGETS

=====

Analysis of overspend against target, holdback and close-ending

[Budgets from block grant claim form BGL0. Figures unchecked. *: form missing. Target/EL used for grant calculation]

	Target	Budget	Over-spend	Grant entitle-ment under Report	Grant after percentage close-ending	Diff-erence	Grant after schedule close-ending (bef hback)	Diff-erence	Grant after schedule close-ending (aft hback)
	(£m)	(£m)	(%)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)
GREATER LONDON									
City of London	58.154	58.154	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Camden	115.667	117.429 *	1.52%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Greenwich	66.584	66.584	-	31.852	31.397	-.454	31.701	.304	31.701
Hackney	81.399	82.315 *	1.13%	49.455	48.749	-.706	49.288	.539	48.620
Hammersmith and Fulham	58.915	58.915	-	35.038	34.538	-.500	34.874	.335	34.874
Islington	84.280	85.564 *	1.52%	22.973	22.646	-.328	22.731	.085	21.374
Kensington and Chelsea	39.749	38.880	-2.19%	8.410	8.290	-.120	8.075	-.215	8.075
Lambeth	111.854	116.212	3.90%	45.151	44.507	-.644	44.896	.388	40.786
Lewisham	78.111	81.682	4.57%	47.092	46.420	-.672	46.932	.512	43.871
Southwark	106.811	108.437 *	1.52%	39.312	38.751	-.561	39.044	.294	37.549
Tower Hamlets	64.562	64.562 *	-	18.202	17.943	-.260	18.036	-.094	18.036
Wandsworth	64.012	64.012	-	48.706	48.011	-.695	48.505	.494	48.505
Westminster	67.311	64.562	-4.08%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Barking and Dagenham	61.722	61.978	.41%	25.766	25.399	-.368	25.458	.059	25.011
Barnet	101.276	101.376	.10%	32.585	32.120	-.465	31.877	-.243	31.632
Bexley	80.402	80.402	-	44.861	44.221	-.640	44.501	.280	44.501
Brent	138.208	148.315	7.31%	64.325	63.407	-.918	63.746	.339	45.552
Bromley	96.652	96.660	.01%	41.552	40.960	-.593	40.966	.007	40.949
Croydon	110.200	110.200	-	43.736	43.112	-.624	42.942	-.170	42.942
Ealing	117.506	117.506 *	-	55.424	54.634	-.791	54.779	.146	54.779
Enfield	95.808	96.766	1.00%	42.622	42.014	-.608	42.066	.052	40.117
Haringey	126.722	130.833	3.24%	58.180	57.350	-.830	57.774	.424	52.442
Harrow	73.335	74.801	2.00%	32.621	32.156	-.465	32.217	.061	29.182
Havering	87.356	87.356	-	42.251	41.648	-.603	41.812	.163	41.812
Hillingdon	89.936	90.628	.77%	16.552	16.316	-.236	15.879	-.436	14.066
Hounslow	87.173	92.625	6.25%	21.531	21.224	-.307	20.985	-.239	6.406
Kingston-upon-Thames	46.915	46.915	-	14.329	14.124	-.204	14.000	-.124	14.000
Merton	59.669	59.669	-.00%	28.112	27.711	-.401	27.756	.045	27.756
Newham	124.154	124.154 *	-	75.417	74.341	-1.076	75.007	.666	75.007
Redbridge	77.909	77.960	.07%	38.975	38.419	-.556	38.552	.133	38.455
Richmond-upon-Thames	51.724	52.758	2.00%	15.717	15.493	-.224	15.355	-.137	12.642
Sutton	56.930	56.930	-	25.691	25.325	-.367	25.355	.031	25.355
Waltham Forest	111.702	110.811	-.80%	61.596	60.717	-.879	61.245	.528	61.245
LC	785.233	744.660	-5.17%	41.985	41.387	-.599	38.244	-3.143	38.244
LEA	900.366	900.366 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
st. Police	384.948	387.835	.75%	145.873	143.792	-2.081	143.365	-.427	143.365

1985/6 BUDGETS

Analysis of overspend against target, holdback and close-ending

[Budgets from block grant claim form BGI0. Figures unchecked. *: form missing. Target/EL used for grant calculation]

	Target	Budget	Over-spend	Grant entitle-ment under Report	Grant after percentage close-ending	Diff -erence	Grant after schedule close-ending (bef hback)	Diff -erence	Grant after schedule close-ending (aft hback)
	(£m)	(£m)	(%)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)
GREATER MANCHESTER									
Bolton	94.532	95.318	.83%	56.426	55.621	-.805	55.990	-.369	54.721
Bury	59.651	59.688	.06%	30.287	29.855	-.432	29.990	.135	29.926
Manchester	250.654	250.654 *	-	93.981	92.640	-1.341	92.824	-.184	92.824
Oldham	85.393	86.420	1.20%	54.683	53.903	-.780	54.331	-.428	52.811
Rochdale	85.370	87.924	2.99%	51.821	51.082	-.739	51.496	-.415	47.607
Salford	96.219	98.381	2.25%	52.616	51.865	-.751	52.160	-.295	48.227
Stockport	93.118	93.118	-	37.269	36.737	-.532	36.670	-.067	36.670
Tameside	79.660	82.620	3.72%	47.639	46.959	-.680	47.305	-.345	42.211
Trafford	74.242	74.232	-.01%	19.160	18.886	-.273	18.567	-.319	18.567
Wigan	108.946	111.613	2.45%	62.089	61.203	-.886	61.606	-.403	57.002
MERSEYSIDE									
Knowsley	70.807	73.113	3.26%	39.067	38.509	-.557	38.748	-.239	34.554
Liverpool	222.063	222.063 *	-	119.909	118.198	-1.711	118.880	-.682	118.880
St Helens	69.747	69.861	.16%	35.635	35.126	-.508	35.288	.162	35.090
Sefton	93.989	93.989	-	44.385	43.751	-.633	43.828	-.077	43.828
Wirral	115.993	119.300	2.85%	57.792	56.968	-.824	57.144	-.176	49.787
SOUTH YORKSHIRE									
Barnsley	78.636	78.890	.32%	47.640	46.960	-.680	47.339	-.379	46.998
Doncaster	106.219	109.046	2.66%	59.993	59.137	-.856	59.533	-.397	54.715
Rotherham	88.115	89.877	2.00%	54.536	53.758	-.778	54.176	-.418	51.471
Sheffield	214.644	218.631	1.86%	93.346	92.014	-1.332	92.328	-.315	85.271
TYNE AND WEAR									
Gateshead	77.237	77.237	-	42.695	42.086	-.609	42.372	-.286	42.372
Newcastle upon Tyne	125.725	134.331	6.85%	35.501	34.994	-.506	34.856	-.138	15.945
North Tyneside	75.866	75.866 *	-	38.001	37.459	-.542	37.678	-.220	37.678
South Tyneside	63.724	64.360	1.00%	37.305	36.773	-.532	37.066	-.293	36.231
Sunderland	105.589	111.615	5.71%	67.000	66.044	-.956	66.571	-.527	56.182
EAST MIDLANDS									
Birmingham	387.123	387.123	-.00%	187.739	185.060	-2.678	185.257	-.196	185.257
Coventry	122.548	122.548	-	53.852	53.083	-.768	53.175	-.091	53.175
Dudley	90.653	90.653	.00%	35.028	34.528	-.500	34.363	-.166	34.363
Sandwell	116.263	116.434	.15%	49.844	49.133	-.711	49.109	-.024	48.730
Solihull	64.958	64.985	.04%	25.158	24.799	-.359	24.701	-.098	24.635
Walsall	100.117	100.732	.61%	43.765	43.141	-.624	43.171	-.030	41.892
Wolverhampton	102.991	102.991	-	44.801	44.162	-.639	44.159	-.003	44.159
EAST YORKSHIRE									
Bradford	174.477	182.495	4.60%	119.948	118.236	-1.711	119.268	1.032	106.220
Calderdale	67.038	68.841	2.69%	44.692	44.054	-.638	44.436	-.381	41.713
Wakefield	135.477	139.321	2.84%	91.609	90.302	-1.307	91.106	-.804	85.435
Leeds	242.610	242.610 *	-	113.538	111.918	-1.620	112.162	-.244	112.162
Wakefield	102.068	102.068	-.00%	53.987	53.217	-.770	53.472	-.255	53.472

1985/6 BUDGETS

=====

Analysis of overspend against target, holdback and close-ending

[Budgets from block grant claim form BGL10. Figures unchecked. *: form missing. Target/EL used for grant calculation]

	Target	Budget	Over-spend	Grant entitlement under Report	Grant after percentage close-ending	Diff -erence	Grant after schedule close-ending (bef hback)	Diff -erence	Grant after schedule close-ending (aft hback)
	(£m)	(£m)	(%)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)
METROPOLITAN COUNTIES									
Greater Manchester	267.826	281.583	5.14%	141.556	139.536	-2.020	140.125	.589	109.170
Merseyside	202.501	213.000	5.18%	99.146	97.732	-1.414	98.335	.603	80.599
South Yorkshire	175.728	178.674	1.68%	72.163	71.133	-1.030	71.557	.424	67.796
Tyne and Wear	152.972	157.029	2.65%	91.026	89.728	-1.299	90.469	.742	84.653
West Midlands	254.024	264.459	4.11%	102.650	101.186	-1.464	100.880	-.306	70.766
West Yorkshire	217.236	220.241	1.38%	117.743	116.063	-1.680	116.810	.747	112.109

1985/6 BUDGETS

=====

Analysis of overspend against target, holdback and close-ending

[Budgets from block grant claim form BGI0. Figures unchecked. *: form missing. Target/EL used for grant calculation]

	Target	Budget	Over-spend	Grant entitlement under Report	Grant after percentage close-ending	Diff -erence	Grant after schedule close-ending (bef hback)	Diff -erence	Grant after schedule close-ending (aft hback)
	(fm)	(fm)	(%)	(fm)	(fm)	(fm)	(fm)	(fm)	(fm)
AVON									
Bath	3.843	3.511	-8.64%	2.411	2.377	-.034	2.384	.007	2.384
Bristol	28.939	28.939	-	10.785	10.631	-.154	10.643	.012	10.643
Kingswood	3.229	3.229	-	1.771	1.745	-.025	1.751	.005	1.751
Northavon	4.291	4.290	-.03%	1.120	1.104	-.016	1.081	-.023	1.081
Wansdyke	3.011	1.736	-42.35%	.752	.742	-.011	.732	-.010	.732
Woodspring	8.036	7.459	-7.18%	3.061	3.018	-.044	3.014	-.004	3.014
BEDFORDSHIRE									
North Bedfordshire	6.025	6.025	-	1.438	1.418	-.021	1.389	-.028	1.389
Luton	9.229	9.229	-	2.504	2.468	-.036	2.428	-.040	2.428
Mid Bedfordshire	3.098	3.098	-	.504	.496	-.007	.474	-.023	.474
South Bedfordshire	5.006	4.654	-7.03%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Berkshire									
Bracknell	3.448	3.290	-4.58%	.899	.886	-.013	.863	-.023	.863
Newbury	5.394	5.130	-4.90%	1.041	1.026	-.015	.995	-.031	.995
Reading	10.611	9.722	-8.38%	2.397	2.363	-.034	2.331	-.032	2.331
Slough	5.016	5.201	3.68%	1.598	1.575	-.023	1.542	-.033	.700
Windsor and Maidenhead	6.608	5.896	-10.78%	.711	.701	-.010	.648	-.052	.648
Wokingham	4.709	4.709	-.00%	.706	.696	-.010	.662	-.035	.662
Buckinghamshire									
Aylesbury Vale	4.077	4.077	-	.890	.878	-.013	.843	-.035	.843
South Bucks	2.362	2.362	.00%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chiltern	3.303	3.303	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Milton Keynes	7.468	7.468	-	1.426	1.405	-.020	1.368	-.037	1.368
Wycombe	5.562	5.136	-7.67%	.450	.444	-.006	.382	-.062	.382
Cambridgeshire									
Cambridge	5.470	5.470	-	1.646	1.623	-.023	1.594	-.028	1.594
East Cambridgeshire	1.916	1.344	-29.86%	.530	.522	-.008	.516	-.006	.516
Fenland	3.051	2.629	-13.82%	1.175	1.158	-.017	1.156	-.002	1.156
Huntingdon	4.594	4.594	-	1.166	1.150	-.017	1.128	-.021	1.128
Peterborough	9.039	9.039	-	1.594	1.572	-.023	1.543	-.028	1.543
South Cambridgeshire	2.759	2.759	.00%	.369	.364	-.005	.331	-.033	.330
Cheshire									
Chester	6.492	6.522	.46%	1.634	1.611	-.023	1.589	-.021	1.517
Congleton	3.776	3.299	-12.63%	.849	.837	-.012	.823	-.014	.823
Crewe and Nantwich	6.029	5.648	-6.31%	2.269	2.236	-.032	2.238	.001	2.238
Ellesmere Port and Neston	4.626	4.626	-	.275	.271	-.004	.234	-.037	.234
Halton	6.753	6.753	-	2.384	2.350	-.034	2.342	-.008	2.342
Macclesfield	6.494	6.494	-.00%	1.739	1.714	-.025	1.684	-.030	1.684
Vale Royal	5.149	5.116	-.64%	1.318	1.299	-.019	1.281	-.018	1.281
Warrington	9.322	9.322	-	2.686	2.648	-.038	2.625	-.023	2.625

1985/6 BUDGETS

=====

Analysis of overspend against target, holdback and close-ending

[Budgets from block grant claim form BGI0. Figures unchecked. *: form missing. Target/EL used for grant calculation]

	Target	Budget	Over-spend	Grant entitlement under Report	Grant after percentage close-ending	Diff-erence	Grant after schedule close-ending (bef hback)	Diff-erence	Grant after schedule close-ending (aft hback)
	(£m)	(£m)	(%)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)
LEVELAND									
Hartlepool	6.389	6.602	3.33%	3.911	3.856	-.056	3.887	.031	3.558
Langbaugh	11.796	11.796	-.00%	2.572	2.535	-.037	2.512	-.023	2.512
Middlesbrough	15.730	16.250	3.31%	8.899	8.772	-.127	8.857	.085	8.296
Stockton-on-Tees	11.423	10.756	-5.84%	2.285	2.252	-.033	2.218	-.034	2.218
CORNWALL									
Caradon	2.820	2.820	-	1.472	1.451	-.021	1.456	.004	1.456
Carrick	3.924	3.923	-.02%	1.815	1.789	-.026	1.793	.004	1.793
Kerrier	3.352	3.402	1.51%	1.758	1.733	-.025	1.738	.005	1.625
North Cornwall	2.951	2.951	-	1.543	1.521	-.022	1.526	.004	1.526
Penwith	2.909	2.908	-.03%	1.571	1.548	-.022	1.556	.008	1.556
Restormel	3.469	3.464	-.14%	1.398	1.378	-.020	1.373	-.005	1.373
CUMBERIA									
Allerdale	5.224	5.224	-	3.250	3.204	-.046	3.228	.024	3.228
Barrow in Furness	4.293	4.296	.07%	2.653	2.616	-.038	2.638	.022	2.634
Carlisle	6.302	6.393	1.45%	2.762	2.723	-.039	2.736	.013	2.596
Copeland	4.374	4.374	-	2.083	2.053	-.030	2.065	.012	2.065
Eden	1.697	1.697	-	.916	.903	-.013	.905	.003	.905
South Lakeland	5.277	4.814	-8.77%	2.388	2.354	-.034	2.363	.009	2.363
DERBYSHIRE									
Amber Valley	5.031	5.031	-	2.154	2.123	-.031	2.127	.003	2.127
Bolsover	3.588	3.578	-.28%	1.791	1.766	-.026	1.776	.011	1.776
Chesterfield	6.384	6.384	-	2.926	2.884	-.042	2.897	.013	2.897
Derby	12.770	12.770	-	5.491	5.412	-.078	5.417	.005	5.417
Erewash	5.358	5.358	-	2.373	2.339	-.034	2.345	.006	2.345
High Peak	4.090	4.090	-	1.578	1.555	-.023	1.556	.001	1.556
North East Derbyshire	4.715	4.715	-	2.029	2.000	-.029	2.008	.007	2.008
South Derbyshire	2.364	2.364 *	-	.472	.465	-.007	.449	-.016	.449
West Derbyshire	3.250	3.250	-	1.422	1.402	-.020	1.405	.004	1.405
DEVON									
East Devon	4.743	4.743	-	2.236	2.204	-.032	2.204	-.000	2.204
Exeter	5.005	5.005	-.01%	2.659	2.622	-.038	2.624	.003	2.624
North Devon	3.739	3.739	-	1.852	1.825	-.026	1.832	.006	1.832
Plymouth	12.640	12.640	-	7.074	6.973	-.101	7.000	.027	7.000
South Hams	3.380	3.321	-1.76%	1.670	1.646	-.024	1.653	.007	1.653
Teignbridge	4.774	4.774	-	2.261	2.228	-.032	2.234	.005	2.234
Mid Devon	2.588	2.255	-12.87%	1.158	1.141	-.017	1.145	.003	1.145
Torbay	6.751	6.751	-	3.082	3.038	-.044	3.041	.003	3.041
Torridge	2.498	2.498	-	1.535	1.513	-.022	1.525	.012	1.525
West Devon	1.576	1.576	.00%	.877	.864	-.013	.867	.003	.867

1985/6 BUDGETS

Analysis of overspend against target, holdback and close-ending

[Budgets from block grant claim form BG10. Figures unchecked. *: form missing. Target/EL used for grant calculation]

	Target	Budget	Over-spend	Grant entitle-ment under Report	Grant after percentage close-ending	Diff -erence	Grant after schedule close-ending (bef hback)	Diff -erence	Grant after schedule close-ending (aft hback)
	(£m)	(£m)	(%)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)
DORSET									
Bournemouth	10.111	10.111	-	4.867	4.797	-.069	4.808	.011	4.808
Christchurch	1.966	1.966	-	.687	.678	-.010	.672	-.005	.672
North Dorset	1.444	1.444	-	.773	.761	-.011	.761	-.001	.761
Poole	6.636	6.221	-6.25%	1.976	1.948	-.028	1.928	-.020	1.928
Purbeck	1.449	1.449	-	.578	.570	-.008	.565	-.005	.565
West Dorset	2.955	2.955	-	1.680	1.656	-.024	1.658	.002	1.658
Weymouth and Portland	3.226	3.226	-	1.796	1.770	-.026	1.780	.010	1.780
Wimborne	2.814	2.814	-	.849	.837	-.012	.827	-.009	.827
DURHAM									
Chester-le-Street	3.234	3.234	-	1.589	1.566	-.023	1.578	.012	1.578
Darlington	8.284	8.657	4.50%	3.335	3.288	-.048	3.304	.016	2.717
Derwentside	6.529	6.529	-	3.558	3.507	-.051	3.540	.033	3.540
Durham	5.636	5.636	-	2.150	2.120	-.031	2.128	.008	2.128
Easington	6.423	6.423	-	3.983	3.926	-.057	3.965	.039	3.965
Sedgefield	8.251	8.251	-	3.419	3.370	-.049	3.398	.028	3.398
Teesdale	1.042	1.041	-.07%	.602	.593	-.009	.596	.003	.596
Wear Valley	5.187	5.187	-	2.451	2.416	-.035	2.437	.021	2.437
EAST SUSSEX									
Brighton	13.831	14.406	4.16%	6.732	6.636	-.096	6.671	.036	5.631
Eastbourne	5.781	5.805	.42%	3.041	2.997	-.043	3.007	.010	2.958
Hastings	5.079	5.079	-	2.829	2.788	-.040	2.805	.017	2.805
Hove	5.479	5.479	-	3.333	3.285	-.048	3.296	.011	3.296
Lewes	4.216	4.030	-4.42%	1.394	1.374	-.020	1.365	-.010	1.365
Rother	4.223	4.223	-	1.787	1.761	-.025	1.761	-.001	1.761
Wealden	4.628	4.628	-	1.858	1.832	-.027	1.825	-.006	1.825
SUSSEX									
Basildon	13.457	13.662	1.52%	1.317	1.298	-.019	1.259	-.039	.936
Braintree	4.377	4.377	-	1.273	1.254	-.018	1.235	-.019	1.235
Brentwood	2.929	2.929	-	.126	.124	-.002	.094	-.030	.094
Castle Point	3.936	3.936 *	-	1.233	1.215	-.018	1.204	-.011	1.204
Chelmsford	4.996	4.996	-.00%	1.227	1.209	-.018	1.170	-.040	1.170
Colchester	5.912	4.920	-16.78%	2.180	2.149	-.031	2.134	-.016	2.134
Epping Forest	5.703	4.954	-13.13%	.707	.697	-.010	.660	-.037	.660
Harlow	8.652	9.992	15.49%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maldon	1.833	1.670	-8.88%	.338	.333	-.005	.320	-.013	.320
Rochford	3.430	3.073	-10.40%	.832	.820	-.012	.806	-.013	.806
Southend-on-Sea	10.682	10.507	-1.63%	4.357	4.294	-.062	4.290	-.004	4.290
Tendring	6.475	6.475	-	2.835	2.795	-.040	2.797	.002	2.797
Thurrock	8.349	8.349 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uttlesford	2.217	2.217	-	.582	.573	-.008	.562	-.011	.562

1985/6 BUDGETS

=====

Analysis of overspend against target, holdback and close-ending

[Budgets from block grant claim form BGl0. Figures unchecked. *: form missing. Target/EL used for grant calculation]

	Target	Budget	Over-spend	Grant entitle-ment under Report	Grant after percentage close-ending	Diff-erence	Grant after schedule close-ending (bef hback)	Diff-erence	Grant after schedule close-ending (aft hback)
	(£m)	(£m)	(%)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)
GLOUCESTERSHIRE									
Cheltenham	4.926	4.698	-4.63%	1.923	1.895	-.027	1.888	-.008	1.888
Cotswold	2.794	2.794	-	1.080	1.064	-.015	1.057	-.007	1.057
Forest of Dean	2.776	2.776	-	1.481	1.460	-.021	1.465	.005	1.465
Gloucester	3.916	3.916	-	2.143	2.113	-.031	2.112	-.001	2.112
Stroud	3.619	3.619	-	1.445	1.424	-.021	1.417	-.007	1.417
Tewkesbury	2.628	2.628	-	.563	.555	-.008	.536	-.019	.536
HAMPSHIRE									
Basingstoke and Deane	5.958	5.658	-5.04%	1.327	1.308	-.019	1.277	-.030	1.277
East Hampshire	4.141	4.141	-	1.367	1.348	-.020	1.341	-.006	1.341
Eastleigh	3.765	3.766	.02%	.861	.849	-.012	.829	-.020	.826
Fareham	4.294	4.294	-	1.104	1.088	-.016	1.074	-.014	1.074
Gosport	3.911	3.922	.29%	1.967	1.939	-.028	1.944	.005	1.920
Hart	2.995	2.995	-	.582	.574	-.008	.558	-.016	.558
Havant	5.561	5.110	-8.11%	2.357	2.323	-.034	2.321	-.003	2.321
New Forest	6.570	6.570	-	2.007	1.978	-.029	1.955	-.024	1.955
Portsmouth	16.511	16.511	-	8.645	8.522	-.123	8.589	.067	8.589
Rushmoor	5.025	4.800	-4.48%	1.801	1.776	-.026	1.772	-.004	1.772
Southampton	13.617	13.617	-	6.486	6.393	-.093	6.410	.016	6.410
Test Valley	3.730	3.721	-.24%	.843	.831	-.012	.811	-.020	.811
Winchester	3.980	3.980	-	1.029	1.015	-.015	.998	-.017	.998
HEREFORD AND WORCESTER									
Bromsgrove	2.708	2.659	-1.82%	.565	.557	-.008	.537	-.020	.537
Hereford	2.499	2.499	-	.922	.909	-.013	.906	-.003	.906
Leominster	1.505	1.505	-	.743	.733	-.011	.735	.002	.735
Malvern Hills	3.640	3.814	4.79%	1.268	1.250	-.018	1.244	-.007	.750
Redditch	3.728	3.728	-	.933	.920	-.013	.907	-.013	.907
South Herefordshire	1.646	1.553	-5.67%	.717	.706	-.010	.704	-.002	.704
Worcester	4.163	4.163	-	1.220	1.202	-.017	1.189	-.014	1.189
Wychavon	4.654	4.654	-	.726	.715	-.010	.692	-.024	.692
Wyre Forest	6.490	5.865	-9.64%	1.152	1.135	-.016	1.120	-.015	1.120
HERTFORDSHIRE									
Broxbourne	5.164	3.842	-25.59%	1.059	1.043	-.015	1.030	-.013	1.030
Dacorum	6.876	6.875	-.02%	1.227	1.210	-.018	1.171	-.038	1.171
East Hertfordshire	5.469	5.343	-2.31%	1.035	1.020	-.015	.994	-.026	.994
Hertsmere	5.439	5.439	-	.290	.286	-.004	.251	-.035	.251
North Hertfordshire	5.254	5.175	-1.50%	.813	.802	-.012	.768	-.034	.768
St Albans	5.392	5.392	-	.855	.843	-.012	.801	-.043	.801
Stevenage	6.110	6.110 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Three Rivers	4.226	3.989	-5.62%	.570	.562	-.008	.539	-.023	.539
Watford	5.446	5.446	-	1.043	1.028	-.015	1.004	-.024	1.004
Welwyn Hatfield	5.599	5.629	.54%	-	-	-	-	-	-

1985/6 BUDGETS

=====

Analysis of overspend against target, holdback and close-ending

[Budgets from block grant claim form BGI0. Figures unchecked. *: form missing. Target/EL used for grant calculation]

	Target	Budget	Over-spend	Grant entitlement under Report	Grant after percentage close-ending	Diff -erence	Grant after schedule close-ending (bef hback)	Diff -erence	Grant after schedule close-ending (aft hback)
	(£m)	(£m)	(%)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)
NUMBERSIDE									
Beverley	4.165	4.165	-.01%	1.864	1.838	-.027	1.837	-.001	1.837
Boothferry	3.719	3.521	-5.32%	2.048	2.019	-.029	2.035	.016	2.035
Cleethorpes	4.583	4.583	-	2.364	2.330	-.034	2.342	.012	2.342
Glanford	3.696	3.696	-	1.597	1.574	-.023	1.577	.003	1.577
Great Grimsby	5.979	6.111	2.21%	3.834	3.779	-.055	3.806	.027	3.569
Holderness	1.902	1.902	-.00%	1.042	1.027	-.015	1.031	.004	1.031
Kingston upon Hull	21.040	23.962	13.89%	17.467	17.217	-.249	17.398	.181	13.219
East Yorkshire	4.244	4.244	-	2.328	2.295	-.033	2.311	.016	2.311
Scunthorpe	6.200	6.200	-	1.686	1.662	-.024	1.663	.001	1.663
ISLE OF WIGHT									
Medina	3.326	3.326	-	1.480	1.459	-.021	1.461	.001	1.461
South Wight	2.768	2.768	-	1.163	1.146	-.017	1.148	.002	1.148
SENIOR									
Ashford	4.296	4.293	-.07%	1.969	1.941	-.028	1.941	-.000	1.941
Canterbury	6.827	6.827	-.00%	3.174	3.129	-.045	3.138	.009	3.138
Dartford	5.507	5.507 *	-	1.696	1.672	-.024	1.672	-.000	1.672
Dover	5.253	4.793	-8.75%	2.595	2.558	-.037	2.568	.010	2.568
Gillingham	2.648	2.648	-	1.960	1.932	-.028	1.934	.002	1.934
Gravesham	5.047	4.885	-3.21%	2.026	1.997	-.029	1.996	-.001	1.996
Maidstone	5.703	5.703	-	2.190	2.158	-.031	2.148	-.010	2.148
Rochester upon Medway	7.250	7.250	-.01%	3.159	3.114	-.045	3.104	-.010	3.104
Sevenoaks	5.261	5.261	-	1.685	1.660	-.024	1.652	-.009	1.652
Shepway	5.300	5.300	-	2.196	2.165	-.031	2.167	.002	2.167
Swale	5.541	5.541	-.01%	2.431	2.396	-.035	2.400	.004	2.400
Thanet	8.922	8.920	-.02%	4.602	4.536	-.066	4.565	.029	4.565
Tonbridge and Malling	5.813	4.913	-15.48%	1.381	1.361	-.020	1.349	-.012	1.349
Tunbridge Wells	4.532	4.532	-	1.910	1.883	-.027	1.881	-.002	1.881
LANCASHIRE									
Blackburn	14.073	14.724	4.62%	9.324	9.191	-.133	9.291	.100	8.657
Blackpool	10.827	11.568	6.85%	6.753	6.657	-.096	6.708	.051	5.377
Burnley	8.481	8.487	.07%	4.253	4.193	-.061	4.233	.040	4.228
Chorley	4.251	4.251	-	2.095	2.066	-.030	2.074	.008	2.074
Fylde	3.758	3.758	-	1.521	1.499	-.022	1.500	.001	1.500
Hyndburn	5.370	5.550	3.35%	3.377	3.328	-.048	3.361	.032	3.142
Lancaster	7.583	7.583	-	3.835	3.780	-.055	3.802	.021	3.802
Pendle	5.702	5.767	1.13%	3.554	3.503	-.051	3.539	.035	3.477
Preston	8.797	8.797	-	4.736	4.669	-.068	4.699	.031	4.699
Ribble Valley	2.533	2.533	-	1.093	1.077	-.016	1.081	.004	1.081
Rossendale	4.765	4.765	-	2.466	2.431	-.035	2.454	.023	2.454
South Ribble	3.869	3.981	2.89%	1.769	1.743	-.025	1.745	.002	1.476
West Lancashire	5.257	5.255	-.03%	1.953	1.925	-.028	1.923	-.002	1.923
Wyre	5.475	5.415	-1.10%	3.037	2.993	-.043	3.012	.018	3.012

1985/6 BUDGETS

=====

Analysis of overspend against target, holdback and close-ending

[Budgets from block grant claim form BG10. Figures unchecked. *: form missing. Target/EL used for grant calculation]

	Target	Budget	Over-spend	Grant entitlement under Report	Grant after percentage close-ending	Diff-erence	Grant after schedule close-ending (bef hback)	Diff-erence	Grant after schedule close-ending (aft hback)
	(£m)	(£m)	(%)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)
EICESTERSHIRE									
Blaby	2.496	2.496	-	.849	.836	-.012	.827	-.009	.827
Charnwood	4.766	4.444	-6.75%	1.315	1.296	-.019	1.269	-.028	1.269
Harborough	2.439	2.444	.20%	.611	.603	-.009	.593	-.009	.581
Hinckley and Bosworth	2.921	2.802	-4.09%	.766	.755	-.011	.738	-.016	.738
Leicester	24.116	24.392 *	1.14%	12.182	12.008	-.174	12.081	.073	11.670
Melton	1.749	1.749	-.01%	.504	.497	-.007	.491	-.006	.491
North West Leicestershire	3.598	3.598	-	.958	.944	-.014	.933	-.011	.933
Dadby and Wigston	1.718	1.718	-	.613	.605	-.009	.597	-.007	.597
Rutland	1.078	1.078	-.03%	.350	.345	-.005	.341	-.004	.341
INCOLNSHIRE									
Boston	2.637	2.637	-	1.365	1.346	-.019	1.350	.004	1.350
East Lindsey	4.562	4.469	-2.04%	2.052	2.023	-.029	2.021	-.002	2.021
Lincoln	4.766	4.863	2.02%	2.570	2.533	-.037	2.545	.012	2.354
North Kesteven	3.008	3.008	-	1.244	1.226	-.018	1.225	-.001	1.225
South Holland	3.318	3.135	-5.53%	1.547	1.525	-.022	1.531	-.006	1.531
South Kesteven	4.154	3.717	-10.52%	1.673	1.649	-.024	1.644	-.005	1.644
West Lindsey	3.423	3.423	-.01%	1.369	1.349	-.020	1.350	.000	1.350
DREFOK									
Breckland	3.523	3.338	-5.26%	1.315	1.296	-.019	1.288	-.009	1.288
Broadland	3.076	3.075	-.04%	1.248	1.230	-.018	1.224	-.007	1.224
Great Yarmouth	5.453	5.581	2.36%	2.673	2.635	-.038	2.645	.010	2.387
North Norfolk	3.796	3.795	-.02%	2.027	1.998	-.029	2.001	.003	2.001
Norwich	10.253	10.253	-	2.085	2.055	-.030	2.030	-.026	2.030
South Norfolk	3.033	3.033	-	1.257	1.239	-.018	1.233	-.006	1.233
King's Lynn and West N	5.991	5.673	-5.30%	2.181	2.150	-.031	2.142	-.008	2.142
DRTHAMPTONSHIRE									
Corby	3.446	3.446	-	1.100	1.085	-.016	1.081	-.004	1.081
Daventry	2.121	2.128	.33%	.299	.295	-.004	.278	-.017	.253
East Northamptonshire	1.732	1.732	-	.906	.893	-.013	.890	-.003	.890
Kettering	3.678	3.563	-3.14%	1.717	1.692	-.024	1.697	.004	1.697
Northampton	10.587	10.692	1.00%	4.757	4.689	-.068	4.690	.001	4.457
South Northamptonshire	1.852	1.794	-3.14%	.680	.670	-.010	.662	-.008	.662
Wellingborough	3.148	3.073	-2.38%	1.127	1.111	-.016	1.106	-.004	1.106
DRTHUMBERLAND									
Alnwick	1.519	1.519	-	.964	.950	-.014	.956	.006	.956
Berwick-upon-Tweed	1.197	1.201	.33%	.638	.629	-.009	.631	.001	.622
Blyth Valley	5.169	5.409	4.64%	2.867	2.826	-.041	2.851	.025	2.546
Castle Morpeth	2.095	2.152	2.72%	.669	.660	-.010	.654	-.006	.486
Iynedale	2.580	2.580	-	1.122	1.106	-.016	1.107	.001	1.107
Wansbeck	4.955	4.976	.43%	1.443	1.422	-.021	1.423	.002	1.395

1985/6 BUDGETS

=====

Analysis of overspend against target, holdback and close-ending

[Budgets from block grant claim form BG10. Figures unchecked. *: form missing. Target/EL used for grant calculation]

	Target	Budget	Over-spend	Grant entitlement under Report	Grant after percentage close-ending	Diff -erence	Grant after schedule close-ending (bef hback)	Diff -erence	Grant after schedule close-ending (aft hback)
	(£m)	(£m)	(%)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)
NORTH YORKSHIRE									
Craven	2.317	2.062	-11.02%	1.031	1.016	-.015	1.019	.003	1.019
Hambleton	2.703	2.698	-.20%	1.059	1.044	-.015	1.039	-.005	1.039
Harrogate	8.771	8.513	-2.94%	2.746	2.707	-.039	2.706	-.001	2.706
Richmondshire	2.143	2.143	-	1.031	1.016	-.015	1.020	.004	1.020
Ryedale	3.000	3.000	-	1.480	1.459	-.021	1.461	.002	1.461
Scarborough	5.946	5.946	-	3.220	3.174	-.046	3.192	.018	3.192
Selby	3.337	3.337	-	.289	.285	-.004	.257	-.028	.257
York	5.119	5.119	-	3.374	3.326	-.048	3.346	.020	3.346
NOTTINGHAMSHIRE									
Ashfield	5.398	5.139	-4.81%	2.364	2.330	-.034	2.339	.009	2.339
Bassetlaw	5.996	5.985	-.19%	.127	.125	-.002	.087	-.038	.087
Broxtowe	4.779	4.779	-.00%	2.122	2.092	-.030	2.093	.002	2.093
Gedling	4.857	4.854	-.07%	2.177	2.146	-.031	2.150	.004	2.150
Mansfield	6.089	6.399	5.10%	3.727	3.674	-.053	3.709	.035	3.325
Newark	4.642	4.455	-4.03%	1.820	1.794	-.026	1.793	-.001	1.793
Nottingham	19.504	19.956	2.32%	12.149	11.975	-.173	12.048	.072	11.142
Rushcliffe	4.177	4.026	-3.62%	.765	.754	-.011	.734	-.020	.734
OXFORDSHIRE									
Cherwell	3.899	3.099	-20.53%	1.102	1.087	-.016	1.062	-.025	1.062
Oxford	6.862	6.862	-	3.405	3.356	-.049	3.354	-.002	3.354
South Oxfordshire	5.263	3.979	-24.40%	1.154	1.138	-.016	1.110	-.027	1.110
Vale of White Horse	2.874	2.444	-14.96%	.396	.390	-.006	.354	-.037	.354
West Oxfordshire	3.082	3.082	-	1.086	1.071	-.015	1.062	-.009	1.062
SHROPSHIRE									
Bridgnorth	1.656	1.656	-	.620	.611	-.009	.606	-.005	.606
North Shropshire	2.104	1.848	-12.18%	.990	.976	-.014	.978	.002	.978
Oswestry	1.252	1.252	-	.664	.655	-.009	.657	.002	.657
Shrewsbury and Atcham	3.841	3.845	.11%	1.208	1.191	-.017	1.178	-.013	1.167
South Shropshire	1.537	1.537	-	.822	.811	-.012	.814	.004	.814
The Wrekin	7.579	7.579	-	2.812	2.772	-.040	2.775	.003	2.775
SOMERSET									
Mendip	2.907	2.907	-	1.303	1.284	-.019	1.278	-.006	1.278
Sedgemoor	3.931	3.931	-	1.601	1.578	-.023	1.575	-.003	1.575
Taunton Deane	3.777	3.777	-.00%	1.747	1.722	-.025	1.721	-.001	1.721
West Somerset	1.237	1.237	-	.479	.472	-.007	.464	-.008	.464
Yeovil	4.304	4.368	1.49%	2.075	2.045	-.030	2.038	-.007	1.839

1985/6 BUDGETS

=====

Analysis of overspend against target, holdback and close-ending

[Budgets from block grant claim form BG10. Figures unchecked. * : form missing. Target/EL used for grant calculation]

	Target	Budget	Over-spend	Grant entitle-ment under Report	Grant after percentage close-ending	Diff-erence	Grant after schedule close-ending (bef hback)	Diff-erence	Grant after schedule close-ending (aft hback)
	(£m)	(£m)	(%)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)
TAFFORDSHIRE									
Cannock Chase	4.126	4.126	-	1.441	1.421	-.021	1.415	-.006	1.415
East Staffordshire	4.203	4.203	-	1.766	1.741	-.025	1.736	-.006	1.736
Lichfield	3.092	3.083	-.28%	.664	.655	-.009	.635	-.020	.635
Newcastle-under-Lyme	5.784	5.784	-	2.351	2.318	-.034	2.319	.001	2.319
South Staffordshire	3.097	3.097	-	.720	.709	-.010	.690	-.019	.690
Stafford	4.730	4.473	-5.44%	1.367	1.347	-.019	1.327	-.020	1.327
Staffordshire Moorland	3.943	3.328	-15.58%	1.357	1.337	-.019	1.333	-.004	1.333
Stoke-on-Trent	13.882	13.885	.02%	6.410	6.318	-.091	6.333	.014	6.327
Tamworth	3.235	3.206	-.89%	1.531	1.509	-.022	1.512	.003	1.512
SUFFOLK									
Babergh	3.062	3.064	.07%	1.203	1.186	-.017	1.181	-.005	1.175
Forest Heath	2.535	2.450	-3.35%	1.094	1.078	-.016	1.080	.002	1.080
Ipswich	7.934	8.300	4.61%	3.215	3.169	-.046	3.169	-.000	2.282
Mid Suffolk	3.007	3.007	-.00%	1.174	1.157	-.017	1.155	-.002	1.155
St Edmundsbury	3.185	3.185	-	1.220	1.203	-.017	1.192	-.011	1.192
Suffolk Coastal	4.099	4.099	-	1.314	1.295	-.019	1.281	-.014	1.281
Waveney	5.242	5.242	-	2.845	2.805	-.041	2.817	.012	2.817
SURREY									
Elmbridge	5.818	5.818	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Epsom and Ewell	3.540	3.540	-	.497	.490	-.007	.471	-.019	.471
Guildford	5.521	4.875	-11.70%	.364	.359	-.005	.310	-.049	.310
Mole Valley	3.099	2.903	-6.31%	.259	.255	-.004	.229	-.026	.229
Reigate and Banstead	4.970	5.037	1.35%	.346	.341	-.005	.300	-.041	.074
Runnymede	3.130	2.732	-12.71%	.360	.355	-.005	.332	-.023	.332
Spelthorne	4.301	4.301	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Surrey Heath	3.335	3.061	-8.23%	.092	.091	-.001	.061	-.031	.061
Tandridge	2.994	2.346	-21.64%	.524	.517	-.007	.500	-.017	.500
Waverley	4.875	4.406	-9.62%	.527	.520	-.008	.486	-.033	.486
Woking	4.409	4.424	.34%	1.121	1.105	-.016	1.087	-.018	1.047
WARWICKSHIRE									
North Warwickshire	2.807	2.807 *	-	.711	.701	-.010	.693	-.009	.693
Nuneaton and Bedworth	7.429	7.373	-.76%	2.366	2.332	-.034	2.334	.002	2.334
Rugby	4.125	4.125	-	1.142	1.125	-.016	1.111	-.014	1.111
Stratford on Avon	4.561	4.269	-6.41%	.683	.673	-.010	.645	-.028	.645
Warwick	5.355	5.355	-.01%	1.219	1.201	-.017	1.172	-.029	1.172

1985/6 BUDGETS

=====

Analysis of overspend against target, holdback and close-ending

[Budgets from block grant claim form BG10. Figures unchecked. *: form missing. Target/EL used for grant calculation]

	Target	Budget	Over- spend	Grant entitle- ment under Report	Grant after percentage close- ending	Diff -erence	Grant after schedule close- ending (bef hback)	Diff -erence	Grant after schedule close- ending (aft hback)
	(£m)	(£m)	(%)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)
WEST SUSSEX									
Adur	3.719	3.420	-8.03%	.682	.672	-.010	.661	-.011	.661
Arun	6.569	6.568	-.02%	2.843	2.803	-.041	2.802	-.000	2.802
Chichester	4.721	4.180	-11.45%	1.717	1.692	-.024	1.685	-.007	1.685
Crawley	6.770	6.770 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Horsham	4.416	4.415	-.02%	1.257	1.239	-.018	1.224	-.016	1.224
Mid Sussex	4.809	4.809	-	.997	.982	-.014	.957	-.026	.957
Worthing	6.425	6.297	-1.99%	2.724	2.685	-.039	2.689	.004	2.689
WILTSHIRE									
Kennet	2.505	2.426	-3.15%	1.121	1.105	-.016	1.105	-.000	1.105
North Wiltshire	4.106	4.230	3.02%	1.909	1.882	-.027	1.884	.002	1.576
Salisbury	3.725	3.725 *	-	1.306	1.287	-.019	1.274	-.013	1.274
Thamesdown	14.023	14.199	1.26%	2.223	2.191	-.032	2.171	-.020	1.937
West Wiltshire	3.434	3.419	-.44%	1.408	1.388	-.020	1.381	-.007	1.381
Isles of Scilly									
Isles of Scilly	1.253	1.266	1.04%	.771	.760	-.011	.764	.005	.742